

# **SPECIAL NUMBER**

**English Edition.**

**Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.**

# **- INTERNATIONAL -**

Vol. 8 No. 41

# **PRESS**

30<sup>th</sup> July 1928

# **CORRESPONDENCE**

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

## **SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.**

(FULL REPORT.)

### **Second Session.**

18th of July 1928 (Afternoon):

Comrade Semard was in the chair at today's session which was opened at 5 p. m.

Before dealing with the agenda he introduced Comrade Degeyter to the Congress who is now in the Soviet Union as the guest of the Russian workers.

Today, too, several workers' delegations made their appearance to welcome the Congress on behalf of the Russian workers.

After these speeches of welcome Comrade Semard called on Comrade Bukharin to make his report on the first item of the agenda:

## **The International Situation and the Tasks of the Comintern.**

### **Comrade BUKHARIN'S Report of the Executive Committee of the Comintern.**

#### **I. A General Analysis of Modern Capitalism and the Special Forms of the Crisis of Capitalism.**

##### **THREE PERIODS OF POST WAR DEVELOPMENT.**

Comrades!

Much has happened since the last Congress of the Comintern. In order that we may be able better to appreciate the events that have taken place during this period, and in order that we may correctly outline our future prospects, we must examine the stage of development through which we have just passed not separately and isolately, but in conjunction with the preceding stages. The general appreciation of the whole of the post-war development must be divided into three periods.

The first period was the period of acute revolutionary crisis, particularly in European countries. It was the period in which revolutionary development reached its highest stage, when an enormous revolutionary wave swept over the whole of Europe. The culminating point of this period was reached in the years 1920—21.

This first period includes the February and October revolutions in Russia; the workers' revolution in Finland, in March 1918; the rice riots in Japan in August 1918 (called forth by the rise in the price of rice); the revolutions in Austria and Germany in November 1918; the proletarian revolution in Hungary; the rebellion in Korea in March 1919; the setting

facturing industries during 1923—1924 increased by 4.5% compared with the normal, whereas in the same period the number of workers employed diminished by over 5%. This means that the productivity of the worker has increased approximately by 30 to 40%.

The development of the chemical industry is important not only from the general point of view, but also from two other points of view: 1. from the point of view of war preparations; for the chemical industry is a first class war industry, and 2. from the point of view of the possibility it holds out of introducing very important changes in the methods of agricultural production. The world output of chemical products in pre-war times amounted to 10 billion German Reichsmarks; in 1923—24 it amounted to 18 billions. Taking the previous figure at 100 the index number of the second figure will be 140. You will observe that the production of chemical products has greatly increased. The utilisation of nitrate products in the important capitalist countries has increased as follows:

(In thousands of tons of pure nitrates.)		
	Pre-war	1926
Germany . . . . .	260	430
Great Britain . . . . .	54	61
France . . . . .	79	152
Italy . . . . .	22	54
United States . . . . .	167	341

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALIST MONOPOLIES, STATE CAPITALIST TENDENCIES AND THEIR POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE.

I do not think these figures require any comment, they speak for themselves. The changes in technique which in some countries, primarily in the United States, is assuming the character of a technical revolution, are quite definitely linked up with the trustification of national economy, with the establishment of gigantic banking consortiums and already in the post-war period, with the growth of state capitalist tendencies in multifarious forms. I will mention a few examples. Everyone knows, for example, of the existence of gigantic trusts like the German Dye Trust, etc. Everyone must know to what colossal dimensions the chemical industry has become trustified in the Mond concern in England (hence the origin of the notorious term "Mondism"). All the comrades are aware of the existence of "Standard Oil" in the United States. We are now passing through a period not only of the birth and rapid development of colossal capitalist organisations within each capitalist country, but we are also passing through a period of the establishment of giant international trusts. I have before me a whole list of such trusts, which it would be rather boring to read out here.

A short time ago, at the Congress of our Party, I advanced the thesis that we are now observing a certain growth in state capitalist tendencies, not in the pre-war form of "war capitalism" (the social-deceivers of all breeds had the impudence to describe this penal servitude war capitalism as "war socialism"), with the card system of rationing and the specific features connected with war, but in a new form, or rather in new forms. We observe at the present time a growing process in which trusts, cartels and banking consortiums are becoming more linked up with and grafted on to the organs of state of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The nature of the shell in which this process is developing is not important. In some cases it may take the form of the State ownership of industrial enterprises and increased State interference in economic life. In other cases it may take the form of the so-called capitalist economic organisations "capturing the State" from "below" as the Liberals express it. Of course, we must categorically reject this latter expression: there is no need to capture the State if the State apparatus is already in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie. What we have in mind is the organisational forms in which the economic organisations of the imperialist bourgeoisie become grafted on to organs of the bourgeois State. Thus, the form this process assumes is of secondary importance. All that I wish to assert and stress here is that this process is definitely taking place. We observe it taking place in Italy, in Japan, in the United States and in Germany in

a variety of forms. There is not the slightest doubt that the process is taking place. Certain comrades formerly expressed doubt concerning this matter. But since then the works of the comrades who have specially investigated this matter have been published; I have in mind particularly the works of Comrades Wurm and Lapinsky who have investigated this subject from the point of view of the development of State and municipal industry and from the point of view of the mutual relations between the private capitalist and State organisations of the imperialist bourgeoisie. All the facts reveal a State-capitalistic tendency in the modern development of imperialist economy.

What are the political results of this process? This we can see from the following example. In America a certain Theodore Knappen, in an article in the "Magazine of Wall Street" for March 19, 1928, entitled, "Business Qualifications of the Leading Presidential Candidates", wrote as follows:

"It is not an exaggeration to say that he has considered himself and has actually been the director general of American business. Never before, here or anywhere else, has a governmental dept, been so completely fused with business... He respects big business and admires big business men, he considers that there is more good in one man who does well a big job than a dozen learned dreamers talking about what they have never attempted and will never accomplish... There can be no doubt that Hoover as president would be without precedent. He would be a dynamic business president even as Coolidge has been a static business president. He would be the first business as distinguished from political president the country has had."

The fact that Hoover is described as Director General of Trusts is in itself a striking political expression of the process of grafting that is taking place between the capitalist trust organisations and the capitalist political state organisations.

#### STRUCTURAL CHANGES.

The following questions arise: assuming all these facts are correct, what becomes of our analysis of the so-called stabilisation of capital? What becomes of our thesis concerning the partial, temporary, etc., stabilisation — stabilisation with all the definitions and qualifications? What becomes of the question of the general crisis of the world capitalist system when we ourselves admit technical achievements, the growth of trusts and other capitalist organisations and when we on these grounds admit that capitalism has undergone considerable consolidation? What becomes of our special and specific characterisation of stabilisation? I think that these questions must be clearly presented and clearly replied to. Otherwise we stand the risk of dropping into ideological confusion.

First of all I want to quote a few literary and political references to this question. How did we, a few years ago, picture to ourselves the process of the further development, or the further collapse of the capitalist system? First of all I will deal with the period when we drew up the first draft of our programme. We then formulated the thesis on the condition of capitalism in this way: the capitalist system is undergoing a process of collapse — a process of collapse without qualification. The fate of capitalism as it presented itself to us at that time may be described in the form of a steadily drooping curve.

When we took up the discussion of the draft a second time, we came to the conclusion that some changes ought to be made in the definitions. Already at the V Congress our thesis on the state and ultimate fate of capitalist economy was formulated somewhat differently. Then the word "stabilisation" came into use with various qualifications such as "partial", temporary, etc.

Now I submit the following question: what meaning have these definitions and qualifications at the present time? Have they any meaning at all? If they have any meaning, is it the same meaning that we attach to it before, or is it some other? In my opinion the meaning of these definitions now differ somewhat from the meaning we formerly attached to them.

I think that, taken as a whole, we may, in a semi-literary style, define our previous position on this question in the following manner:

It was assumed that some increase in production was observed in only one or two countries and that only as an exception. This increase did not appear to be particularly characteristic

and was regarded merely as an auxiliary or "conventional" circumstance. Tomorrow or the day after another process would set in. If on a certain day we observed in a certain country a growth of technique or of productive forces, or a favourable economic situation, we said that this was only a sort of economic "special day" which could not be taken seriously.

It can, and it should be said that at that time there were definite grounds for appraising the situation in this way, but the definition of stabilisation as relative stabilisation, in many respects, no longer corresponds to the present situation.

Take each country in turn.

The United States is marching ahead. Let us assume that predictions concerning a relative crisis in America are true. This possibility is by no means excluded; in fact it is very probable. But the general course of development shows a growth of industry, a growth of production. For the first time in world history and in the history of the labour movement — to speak in the words of Marx — "V" (variable capital, — the value of labour power) in the United States is diminishing not only relatively to "C" (constant capital — the value of means of production), but also absolutely. The number of workers employed in industry is diminishing. This is occurring for the first time in world history and in the history of the labour movement on so large a scale.

Some comrades may say that this is a pessimistic view. This is not true. We must draw a distinction between optimism and stupidity. These are two different things. If we do not wish to be stupid, we must take the facts as they are. This is the first obligatory pre-requisite for all non-stupid tactics.

Take another country, Germany. Some time ago, when I wrote about the growth of technique and of the forces of production in Germany, the "Ultra-Left", anti-Communist Maslov roundly abused me. Now one must be blind not to see that German capitalism is developing rather rapidly and the talk one hears now about imperialism, the dreaming about "mandates" and the longing for colonies, the building of battleships, etc. are by no means accidental.

Take France. It must be clear to everyone that a tremendous difference exists between pre-war France and post-war France; everyone must see that old, usurer France is acquiring new qualities and is now becoming transformed into a substantial industrial country.

Take Great Britain. On the whole Great Britain is passing through a period of decline; her strength is undermined, the might of her Empire is waning. On certain sectors the British bourgeoisie is succeeding in increasing the forces of production: for example the so-called new industries.

But even if these facts are true, does it mean that we have to confess that the crisis of capitalism has been liquidated? Or does it mean something else? I would like to put this same question in a more sharply political form: does this analysis coincide with the analysis made by the Social Democrats?

I think it is quite easy to understand the real state of affairs. The correct reply to this question should be: The general crisis of capitalism continues, more than that, it is developing, although the forms of the crisis are now different. Formerly, we examined the most important symptoms of the crisis in the following manner: we took each in turn and said: in this country capitalism is undergoing a process of decline, in that country and in another the same process is observed, in a fourth perhaps the process is not so rapid, but it is nevertheless there. Like everything else in the world, our appreciation of the crisis of that time had its roots in the economic conditions then prevailing. Germany had reached the lowest ebb of economic collapse. In a number of other countries, particularly in Central Europe, the situation was the same. Thus, our former definitions were based on a somewhat exaggerated estimation of certain real facts. Now the former forms of the crisis have given way to new forms. That is the whole point.

We must not picture the crisis of capitalism and of the capitalist system as a steady decline in almost all capitalist countries or even in a majority of countries. The situation is not quite that. The crisis of capitalism lies in that as a result of the preceding war and post-war phases a fundamental structural change has taken place in the whole of world economy, a change which inevitably intensifies the contradictions of the capitalist system a thousand fold, and will finally lead to its doom.

Take for example the fact of the existence of the U. S. S. R. What does it imply? In the first place, the existence of the U. S. S. R. is the result of the post-war crisis of capitalism, and secondly, it implies that the crisis continues; for we observe the development of an alien, hostile, and on principle, antagonistic body in the world economic system of capitalism. An alien body! Is this not a fundamental structural change in world economy?

#### CHANGES IN THE ALIGNMENT OF FORCES.

I have already noted the fact that the direct revolutionary situation has passed to the Orient and to the colonial periphery generally. This too, is a result of the post-war crisis. Are not the powerful revolutionary shocks in this periphery of capitalism an expression of profound crises?

Further, what does the so-called disproportion between the United States and Europe, — which is striving to liberate itself from the hegemony of America, imply? It, too, implies a structural change in the world economic system. Finally, the contraction of the home markets in capitalist countries and the ruination and pauperisation of the colonies make it necessary to present the question of the relations between production and consumption in an entirely different manner from that in which it was presented in the "normal" conditions of capitalism. The situation is developing in such a way that the whole of the future development of the capitalist system may proceed entirely in the forms created by the previous critical periods of capitalism. Capitalism cannot proceed as if the U. S. S. R. did not exist. It cannot proceed as if the Chinese Revolution, as if the disproportion between the United States and Europe, as if the contradiction of markets, etc., etc., did not exist.

These structural changes are of enormous significance for the whole development of the capitalist system and for the appraisal of its prospects. Take for example the development of all the permanent contradictions of capitalism in itself: the fight for markets, the growth of the apparatus of production, which is surpassing the growth of purchasing power, and all the other contradictions with which we are so familiar. I ask you: what conclusions must we draw from the structural changes in world economy that I have noted? I think the following reply must be made: the ferment in the colonies and the surging development of the class struggle imply that the inherent contradictions of the capitalist system are becoming more acute. If the Chinese Revolution is regarded as a mere bagatelle — as the Social Democrats do, then of course there is no serious crisis of capitalism. If the U. S. S. R. does not exist, then again there is no crisis of capitalism. When the Social Democrats go so far as to assert that the present phase of capitalism does not inevitably lead to war, and that Marx has become completely obsolete because he advanced the thesis that war is the inevitable outcome of the development of capitalism, then of course, the situation according to the Social Democrats is quite idyllic, — no crisis of capitalism! But if we admit that all the things I have referred to actually exist — and they do exist! — then the method of presenting the question and the reply to it will be entirely different.

If we say that stabilisation is decaying, then I ask: What are the facts upon which we base this conclusion? Not from the fact that capitalism is in a state of direct collapse in one country or another. Stabilisation is decaying because in the present situation development is proceeding along new lines created by the preceding phase and these new lines in their turn cause all the contradictions of capitalism to become more intensified. This intensification of contradictions in its turn leads to the great collapse, to the final catastrophe. That is why capitalism is unstable. That is why stabilisation can be only relative stabilisation. That is why the crisis of capitalism has not disappeared. It has been driven deep down into the heart of the capitalist system and threatens to develop with greater intensity than ever. But this crisis must not be regarded from the point of view of a single country taken separately, but from the point of view of the general contacts which all countries have with one another within the framework of world economy. At the same time we must take into consideration the mutual relationships between the imperialists, the relationships between capitalist countries, the relationship between various "capitalisms" and the U. S. S. R., etc.

## THE CONTRADICTIONS OF CAPITALISM DEVELOP IN THE MOST ACUTE FORM.

Only in this manner can the question of stabilisation be presented. And I think that this manner of presentation is sufficiently clear. Many capitalist countries are developing, but this development is proceeding in forms created by the war crisis; it is proceeding simultaneously with the existence of the U. S. S. R., with colonial revolutions, etc. The inherent contradictions of capitalism become more and more acute. Stabilisation is really decaying, not because capitalism in every country is declining, but because the structural changes that have occurred in world economy are creating a new situation and are inexorably leading to the collapse of the whole system. These contradictions of course, are linked up with the internal contradictions in separate countries, with the development and intensification of the class struggle and with the growth of the elements of a revolutionary situation. But this process is not now linked up with the process of the direct economic collapse of capitalism in separate countries, but with the process of the development of the contradictions of stabilisation, of contradictions which are being enormously intensified by the general conditions of the crisis of capitalism.

I have only briefly touched upon a few of the structural changes of world economy. Permit me to make a few remarks concerning the manner in which our opponents treat the phenomena of the crisis: I will mention the so-called "German problem" which, from a certain angle, is nothing more than the problem of the relationships between the United States and Europe. I have before me an article written by the English statistician and economist, Paish, published in the last issue of "Zeitschrift für Geo-Politik", No. 4. Paish presents the question in the following manner:

"Now the debtor countries all over the world are unable to sell their commodities on the scale necessary for the purpose of enabling them to meet their obligations and at the same time to obtain from the sale of their commodities the money necessary for purchasing the things they require for the satisfaction of their needs. For that reason they continue as before to raise large foreign loans. But the crediting countries cannot advance credits on the same scale that they have been doing during the past few years. Unless relief comes in the near future the whole system must very soon collapse..."

And then he goes on to say:

"Thus, the collapse of the international credit system becomes dangerously imminent (Author's italics). This collapse will be inevitable unless immediate measures are taken to enable the debtor countries to meet their obligations by selling their goods rather than by further loans. Symptoms of the crisis have accumulated in abundance: flooded markets, growing unemployment in the United States and the enormous magnitude of credit operations in the important industrial countries, primarily in Germany."

I rather doubt the accuracy of this author when he predicts catastrophe all along the line. Here other interests are on the board and it is not difficult to guess which they are. But certain grounds for making assertions of this kind do exist.

But, the German problem is a partial problem which arises out of the fundamental crisis forms of modern world economy. We now observe a number of most acute contradictions. These acute contradictions develop along the various lines: America-Great Britain; Germany-France; Italy-France, etc., all these disproportions, — from the point of view of peace and quiet in the capitalist system — find their expression in the fact that after the war a situation arose in which the genuine economic power of certain States do not correspond to certain of their other features, as for example the possession of colonies. Take for example the United States on the one hand and Great Britain on the other. We observe a powerful growth of American capitalism and yet, to this day, the United States is not a great colonial power. The British world Empire is a colonial Empire and yet it is in regard to Great Britain that we can say that she is passing through a period of decline, notwithstanding her great colonial monopoly. A similar disproportion can be observed in other countries. Take present day Germany. From the economic and technical point

of view she is a first class country and yet she has neither colonies nor mandates nor protectorates. Of equal interest would it be to compare Italy with Spain, etc.

But as contradictions arise from the growth of productive forces and as the struggle for spheres for the investment of capital becomes more acute, we have nothing more nor less than the "resurrection" of the profoundest of imperialist problems — a fresh distribution of the globe, of colonies or other territories. And this means war. From the point of view of the economic analysis of present-day world economy, from the point of view of the specific relationships within imperialist States, from the point of view of the general crisis of capitalism, — from all these decisive points of view, war is the central problem of the present day. That is why, from the point of view of policy and tactics we must put this problem in the forefront. The Social Democrats say that war — is our programme! What stupidity, — it is not a lie, it is just stupidity! This problem objectively is the central problem. And our subjective collective task is to solve this problem, not on imperialist lines, but on proletarian lines; not by supporting imperialist war, but by converting war into proletarian civil war against the bourgeoisie.

## INTER-STATE ANTAGONISMS.

It is quite understandable that the process of economic development should determine and crystallise corresponding relationship between States. In analysing the general complex of political relationships between capitalist States, the thing that stands out prominently is the great antagonism that exists between various State forms: antagonism between capitalist countries and the colonies, particularly in China; antagonism between capitalist countries and the U. S. S. R. and the antagonism between Europe, particularly Great Britain, and the United States of America. In regard to specific European relationships they are to a considerable degree determined by the changes that have taken place in Germany's position and the resuscitation of German imperialism. I have already referred to the growing contradiction between the economic and political power of the United States and the relatively insignificant dimensions of her colonial possessions. This contradiction finds expression in the growing aggressiveness of the United States of America. The slogan "peaceful penetration" is gradually giving way to open political and military occupation. The events in Nicaragua are a striking expression of this change in the policy of the United States. Notwithstanding all her Liberal professions, the position of the United States is not far removed materially from military occupation.

The aggressive policy of the United States is countered by her rival Great Britain. Anglo-American antagonism is now the pivot around which all the antagonisms between capitalist States revolve.

Conflicts between the United States and Great Britain take place in the most varied spheres. In the rather big conflict over rubber, Britain suffered a defeat and was compelled to compromise. Britain was defeated also in the struggle for oil. Now the fight is taking place over cotton. I have in mind the plans of United States capital affecting Africa — in Abyssinia and through her to Egypt. United States capitalism has already stretched out its feelers towards India.

On the South American Continent the United States already holds the Northern part of Latin American in economic servitude, and now it is fairly successfully competing with Great Britain in the Southern parts of Latin America. I repeat and emphasise that the conflict between the United States and Great Britain is the pivot around which the contradictions within the capitalist sector of world economy revolve.

## THE RESUSCITATION OF GERMAN IMPERIALISM AND THE CRISIS OF THE VERSAILLES TREATY.

In Germany a peculiar "Renaissance" is taking place, which is extremely important from the point of view of European relationships, namely, the resuscitation of German imperialism. What does this imply? Germany has not yet its own army or navy, but its position has changed very considerably. Germany was crushed,

German monopolist capital went out of the war "game" greatly ruined. Politically and nationally Germany was degraded. But with the aid of credits, primarily with the aid of American credits, German capitalism restored its affairs. The technique of German capital, or rather, the dynamics of technical progress in Germany, show record figures for Europe and in certain sectors Germany shows record figures for the whole world. In regard to economic reorganisation the process of trustification in Germany has assumed classical forms. Giant trusts, which exercise enormous international influence, the strong position occupied by German capital in the world market, the relative cheapness of German goods and the growth of the competitive power of German capitalism and of German industry, about this there can be no doubt at all.

It is quite understandable that a strengthened economic foundation should find its reflection in politics: the Versailles peace treaty has in part practically been annulled already. The political position of German capitalism has become considerably consolidated compared with what it was several years ago. Germany now plays a fairly important role in the concert of European states and on certain questions sometimes even plays a determining role. It is not difficult to understand that this feature of development, or rather this general process of development of Germany, is equal to the growth of the aspirations of German monopolist capital in regard to foreign politics. The quest for "mandates", for protectorates and for colonies has become a political fashion in Germany. But this is not merely a "fashion", but something more material. This "fashion" does not lack real prospects, for in the play of various antagonisms and forces, in the complex of relationships between France and Italy, France and Great Britain, France and Germany, Germany and Poland, etc., in this complicated tangle of European relationships, Germany on the one hand is the subject and on the other hand the object and in certain circumstances a number of countries may and will support Germany. This tendency in the development of German capitalism is linked up with the phenomenon known as the "western orientation" of German capitalism. A few years ago Germany was menaced by Entente capital. The muzzle of the French revolver was levelled at her head; she lost her fortified positions and the only outlet German capital had for a short time was the bloc with the U. S. S. R. This was expressed by the Rapallo Treaty and German foreign policy of that period.

Now the situation is changed. The colonial aspirations of Germany grow in proportion to the growth of monopolist capitalism and correspondingly the western orientation of German capital becomes more and more crystallised. It goes without saying that the present situation must not be simplified too much in our analysis; this fundamental tendency in the development of Germany does not by any means exclude the possibility of various moves and manoeuvres on the political chess board, of Germany taking advantage of the intermediary position she occupies between the western powers and the U. S. S. R., etc. This is an indisputable fact. But these chess moves and manoeuvres do not annul the fundamental tendency of the development of Germany, which will willingly allow itself to be "violated" and will march side by side with its colleagues against the U. S. S. R.

#### THE CHANGES IN INTER-STATE RELATIONSHIPS AND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE U. S. S. R.

The crisis of capitalism finds its reflection also in the kaleidoscopic changes in the relationships between the various powers. Not a single alliance is permanent or durable. On the contrary, a continuous regrouping of forces is taking place before our very eyes. But running like a thread through all these regroupings, changes and various constellations of European capitalist powers, runs the fundamental tendency of — the grouping of forces against the U. S. S. R. We have repeatedly reverted to this theme. I will not dwell here on the question of the various alliances of the so-called small Entente, on the agreements concluded between the various Border States, between the more powerful States, etc. All these facts are now known even to infants.

If the analysis of the economic foundation I made in the first part of my report is correct, then it is perfectly understandable that the relationships between States should represent the political expression of the preparations being made for war against the U. S. S. R. We of course must build up our tactics accordingly.

#### PREPARATIONS FOR WAR.

As a consequence, the internal processes in the important capitalist countries are proceeding along the lines of preparation for war. These processes loudly contradict the Social Democratic babble about the realisation of pacifism, about "ultra-imperialist" era, etc. The growth of armaments, the passing of laws, like Paul Boncour's military law in France, and the general feverish preparations of the bourgeoisie for preserving so-called "peace and order" in their respective countries in the event of war, are sufficiently well known to all. In the latter category of measures must be included the British Anti-Trade Union Act, Mussolini's "Charter of Labour", the incredible terror raging in a number of countries like Hungary, Poland, Roumania, and in the Balkans generally, and in Italy, the extensive plans for corrupting certain sections of the peasantry, so-called "industrial peace", "Mondism", the American methods of corrupting the proletariat — measures carried out on the one hand with the aid of Fascism and on the other hand with the aid of the Social Democratic Parties.

With all this are linked up the organisational changes in the structure of the State power. I have already spoken of state capitalist tendencies and of the tendencies towards the direct grafting of private capitalist organisations on the organs of the bourgeois State. This tendency not only has a general economic political significance; it also has enormous significance from the point of view of preparations for war. It would be a mistake to assert that the bourgeoisie consciously strives to graft the private capitalist organisations with the organs of the capitalist state, or that it sees in this a means of preparing for war. The process bears a more spontaneous character, but objectively there is not the slightest doubt that the evolution of the state power and the growth of State capitalist tendencies serve the aims of war preparations. Already in the period of the first world war we passed through a phase of state capitalism decorated in peculiar tones. In the language of the German economists this was called "compulsory economy". The fundamental reason for the regulation of industry was the considerable decline that took place in the forces of production, the pursuit of rationalisation and the more expedient regulation of consumption in the conditions prevailing in the "besieged fortress". Subsequently all this passed away. Today, however, State capitalist tendencies are developing on a new basis, on the basis of growing productive forces of capitalism, on the basis of decentralisation of capitalism and without specifically compulsory regulations. There is not the slightest doubt that in the event of war and during it these state capitalist tendencies will be utilised for the purpose of mobilising the whole of national economy for the pursuit of war.

This evolution in the organisational forms of State power, this powerful concentration of the political and economic organisations of the bourgeoisie is of extreme significance for further development. These phenomena are of great significance also from the point of view of proletarian class struggle. Not all have yet sufficiently appreciated the fact that the proletariat now has to deal not only with individual capitalists or even with separate trusts, but with the whole of the organised power of the bourgeoisie as a class, and that this is the reason why the position of the proletariat in every economic battle is so difficult and so complex. In so far as the proletariat has to deal directly with large trusts and cartels which have become grafted with the bourgeois State apparatus, every strike has a tendency of becoming transformed into a political strike and every partial conflict into an extensive working class struggle. I will deal with this subject again in another connection.

I will now pass to the question of the position of the classes in the important European countries and primarily in the United States.

## II. Internal Political Processes in the Bourgeois Countries.

### THE ACCENTUATION OF INTERNAL CONTRADICTIONS.

In analysing stabilisation I pointed out that the fact that it was only relative stabilisation was revealed in the conflicts among the various States, in the danger of war, in the antagonisms between the imperialist world and the Soviet Union. This, however, does not imply that the contradictions exist only as between States and that the contradictions in each given imperialist country are not becoming sharper. The internal contradictions in the capitalist countries are becoming intensified and inevitably must become intensified. However, the nature of these contradictions is quite different. These contradictions, inherent in every capitalist society, have now been accentuated in view of specific causes, and they considerably accentuate the class struggle. The perspective of partial and temporary stabilisation holds out the prospect of war.

The process of stabilisation affects the situation of the largest capitalist countries in various ways. Partial stabilisation is a two-sided process. On the one hand there is a certain technico-economical consolidation of capitalism, and on the other — which must not be left out of sight — contradictions grow, the class struggle becomes more acute, unemployment increases.

The United States may serve as a classical example. It is a country where capitalist development proceeds at a most rapid rate and where side by side with growing productive forces, unemployment is constantly increasing. This unemployment itself is organically bound up with the development of the productive forces. It is absolutely clear that this is tantamount to an accentuation of the class struggle in the United States. Four million unemployed is no trifle. Unemployment affects also the other sections of the proletariat. It is the burden of capitalism. At the same time stabilisation makes possible the improvement of the material conditions of certain strata of the working class. In this connection we must analyse also the special relations that exist within the proletariat. Here I raise the problem of the Social Democracy in its general form.

We have been maintaining that Social Democracy, opportunism, is bankrupt, and this is absolutely true. Nevertheless this cursed social democracy still lives. In some countries both its numbers and significance are on the increase. The Comintern has great achievements to record in Germany, especially since the previous defeats. Nevertheless, Social Democracy polled 9 million votes at the last elections and this is no trifle. In the present period of our development and struggle we must occupy ourselves with the question as to the roots of this phenomenon.

### THE ROOTS OF SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC VITALITY.

Usually we discuss the question of the roots of opportunism in connection with the question of the colonies and super profits received by the capitalists from the colonies by means of which they are able to corrupt the upper stratum of the working class. Germany has no colonies. Why then is German Social Democracy, or let us say its positions, becoming stronger? Why does not this treacherous Social Democracy leave the stage, why does it possess such manoeuvring power? In explaining this it is not sufficient to speak of cunning and skill — this is not of decisive importance, it is not this that determines all the rest. The vitality of Social Democracy is closely bound up with the process of stabilisation. The economic side of this is very complicated. Hitherto we have been speaking of super-profits directly extorted by one country or another from the colonies. The United States has not a large number of colonies. Does not the United States receive super-profits? It does. I recall that Marx quoted a number of examples in the case of a big industrial country which occupied a relatively strong position in world economy and received differential profits, thanks to the superiority of its technique. These super-profits of capitalism are playing an enormous role of late. Hence, the economic basis of reformism is not super-profit obtained directly from colonies, but also super-profit obtained from the general exchange of commodities on the world market, and from capital exports, apart from that invested in colonies.

Take the United States. That country extracts enormous super-profits, thanks to the monopolist position occupied by American capitalism, although it has no large colonial possessions.

Take Great Britain. Here we see a declining curve of development but the colonial monopoly has not yet disappeared. The basis of British imperialism is being narrowed down but it still exists. Within the country, the proletariat is swinging to the left; the influence of the Communist Party is growing, etc., but the end of monopolist domination of British imperialism is not coming as rapidly as we thought formerly. The colonial monopoly of the Kingdom of Great Britain still serves as a large and broad base for British reformism.

I have already dealt with Germany.

In order to understand the underlying cause of the strength of the Social Democracy it is necessary to understand a whole series of most vital factors. Among these are the very important internal political changes which have taken place in several countries. Large numbers of former Social Democratic and trade union officials are now becoming State or municipal officials or officials in capitalist organisations. This is to be noticed in many countries and particularly in Germany. The tendency towards grafting the reformist labour organisations with the employers' organisations and the organs of the imperialist bourgeois State practically signifies a partial conversion of the trade union and Party bureaucracy in to State officials of private capitalist organisations. This is what we call, peculiar methods of corruption employed by the bourgeoisie.

### FASCISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

I believe that the same process is going on also in the Fascist countries. Let us take for example a country like Poland, with Pilsudski's military organisation, the Streltsi. This is a "voluntary" organisation. Officially, of course, the organisation is composed of volunteers, nevertheless it is a semi-State organisation. Are there any socialist workers in it? Yes, there are. Moreover, large numbers of them constitute a definite stratum of the State structure. Thus, on the whole, the main causes of the strength of the Social Democracy are the economic and political factors which I have pointed out. Of course, the manoeuvring capacity of the Social Democratic parties, their experience and political shrewdness also play their part. All these factors naturally play a very important role. But these and these alone do not explain the situation. It may be said that on the one hand the process of stabilisation creates an economic basis for Social Democracy and on the other hand the contradictions of stabilisation create a basis for the development of the Communist Parties. Hence, we frequently observe a parallel growth in the influence of both the Communists and the Social Democrats. Of course, various other causes must be borne in mind. They cannot be ignored. Take for example, the social re-grouping that takes place among the strata of the population under the influence of Social Democracy. Social Democracy at times recruits its strength from the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie. During elections Social Democracy grows also at the expense of the bourgeois parties by winning away from the latter a large number of petty bourgeois votes. It must be borne in mind however, that in many countries, including Germany and France, we so far have won over only a small section of the workers employed even in the largest enterprises, the biggest trusts, where Social Democracy is still strong.

### THE INTENSIFICATION OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

The internal contradictions of stabilisation in each capitalist country accentuate the class struggle also when the changes in the organisational structure of the modern State and of contemporary capitalism, of which I have already spoken, have taken place, and convert every strike of any magnitude into a political event of first class importance. This was the case with the British strike, with the metallurgical strike in Germany and such will be the case in the future. The transformation of

an economic into a political strike is determined by the specific features of the situation — trustification of capitalism and the grafting of private capitalist organisations with the State.

That is how the internal contradictions in each capitalist country grow. The inherent contradictions of capitalism in each country result in a sharpening of the class struggle and a growth in Communist influence. This can be illustrated and substantiated by many facts. I have in mind the strike wave in various countries — France, Czechoslovakia, Germany, the so-called swing to the Left of the proletariat, the growing sympathy with the U. S. S. R., the collapse of certain bourgeois parties, which the proletariat formerly followed, for example the Centrist Party in Germany, the Catholic organisations in Italy, etc. The election results in France and Germany also serve as an expression of the accentuation of the class struggle. The process of stabilisation is full of contradictions, that is why we are growing, if not in every case numerically, at least nearly in every case in political influence. Last year, in his speech at the Social Democratic Congress of Germany, Hilferding said:

“Comrades, sooner or later the Communists will come to their end. I can quite understand that people who for many years have laboured under the curse of unemployment, who have been driven to desperation by the loss of their all during the inflation, who have been disappointed in everything and have retained only their belief in violence, should, on the impulse of a passing sentiment vote for the Communists at election times. But the Communist Party is of no importance whatever as a political movement. It is played out.” (Laughter.)

In reality we see that things have developed differently. The Communist Parties are constantly growing. This has been borne out even by the elections in Germany, where the Communist Party polled 3¼ million votes. Herr Hilferding's prediction was a miserable failure! This can be seen also from the elections in France, if we do not regard it from the venal point of view of the Social Democrats, who measure their influence by the number of seats in parliament they have obtained. Our political influence is growing parallel with the growth of the contradictions in capitalist stabilisation. But side by side with this the influence of the Social Democrats, and Social Democracy itself grows for a time.

Social Democracy has gone through a profound evolution during recent years. It would be wrong to judge the Social Democrats by what they were, let us say, in 1914. Social Democracy of August 4, 1914 was merely the embryo of contemporary Social Democracy. Social Democracy of today has cast off the last shreds even of quasi-Marxian phrases. The spiritual food of Social Democracy consists now of MacDonald's absurdities imported from Great Britain and the Social Democratic leaders are trying to prepare as appetising a meal out of these as they possibly can.

#### THE CAESARIST FEATURES OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

Comrade Riazanov, recently published in “Pravda”, the organ of our Party, the correspondence between Lasalle and Bismark. The kind of political figure Lasalle represented is now pretty well known. In his letter to Bismark, Ferdinand Lasalle says that it would be well to set up a social monarchy with a “crown” at the head. This proposal established an intimacy between Lasalle and Bismark and prompted the former to concoct a political intrigue. Notwithstanding this, Social Democracy has now advanced the slogan of “back to Lasalle”. The meaning of this instinctive gravitation, “back to Lasalle”, is now clear to us. It represents a sort of ideological basis for the rapprochement between the followers of Noske and the Italian Fascists. “Social Caesarism” with a dynasty at its head is an ideology exceedingly suitable for contemporary Social Democracy. In August 1914 the Social Democrats betrayed Marxism, and declared themselves in favour of National Defence. In our days Social Democracy is an active force, consciously building the capitalist State. This home policy of Social Democracy has its concomitant in its foreign policy. Not only does it now defend the capitalist fatherland, but from the capitalist viewpoint it is the most outspoken champion of the aggressive ambitions of its fatherland. I ask you: are

there not Social Democrats in Germany who demand colonies for their country? Of course there are, many of them, and they put forward this demand quite openly. In the history of German Social Democracy we have the Hilderbrand case. The Chemnitz Congress expelled him from the party for having written a book in which he flirted with ideas of this kind. In the ranks of present-day Social Democracy, its honoured and respected members openly advocate the colonial idea. This is no accident and no exception. Take for example the last resolution passed by the II. International on the colonial problem. It is possible that Bauer edited this resolution and gave it a quasi-Marxian tinge. In that resolution we find the following sub-division — some colonies must become autonomous, others should be left under a protectorate, while others are in such a low stage of development that the status quo must be retained. As far as I know this is exactly what is said in the documents in the League of Nations. Thus we find that there is no difference whatever between the would-be socialists and the sharks in the camp of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Or take another example, the question of war, their attitude towards the League of Nations, and their attitude towards the U. S. S. R. Compare Kautsky of 1914 with the Kautsky of today and you will find an entirely different person, with outspoken counter-revolutionary strivings.

#### SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC ANTI-SOVIET ACTIVITY.

All Communists must understand that in the coming war the despicableness of the conduct of Social Democracy will exceed all our predictions. Of course we must differentiate between the Social Democratic leaders and the Social Democratic workers, among whom serious crises, splits, discontent, regroupings, etc., will manifest themselves. But the upper clique will act hand in hand with the greatest criminals of the imperialist camp. Of this there can be no doubt at all. Herr Hilferding already has the audacity to advance the following argumentation — in Europe there is also unemployment; this unemployment is caused by the fact that the affairs of capitalism are not all too smooth; it were better if the U. S. S. R. would be drawn into the general complex of capitalist countries; but the monopoly of foreign trade prevents that. The conclusion this argumentation leads to is that the proletariat is interested in breaking the foreign trade monopoly of the U. S. S. R. I ask you what is that? It is nothing more nor less than ideological preparation for a direct war of aggression against the U. S. S. R. As yet there is much that is academic, theoretical, etc., in Hilferding's thesis. But in the process of development this economic thesis will become a very vital and concrete political thesis. What was first formulated theoretically will later be turned into action. The practical application of Herr Hilferding's formula means nothing more nor less than war against the U. S. S. R.

Naturally, the evolution of Social Democracy as I have just described it called forth a corresponding reaction on our part. All the comrades know that the last Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. called for a change in the tactics of the French and the British Parties and to a certain extent along our whole line. This took place on our initiative, the initiative of the Executive Committee. Some comrades link up this change with all kinds of secondary factors. But this is wrong, because the change in tactics was called for by reason of the factors to which I have already referred; it was called forth by the entire evolution of Social Democracy. It would be childish to think that we are trying to go “to the Left” because of the reproaches hurled against us by the opposition, etc. This argument is not worthy replying to. The only sound reason which caused us to change our tactics was the change that had taken place in the objective situation, the change in the correlation of forces of the various classes, various parties, etc. The question must be approached thus — has a change taken place in the relations between ourselves and the Social Democrats? The answer is: Yes, a change has taken place. Are we to make any practical deductions from this? Yes. Why do the Social Democrats attack us more fiercely now than ever before in the trade unions and other organisations? Because not only in big questions of foreign policy but on all questions, in all spheres, our political policy is directly opposite

to theirs. Take for example the position in a single factory. What is the Social Democratic policy in the factory? Civil peace, no desire to call out strikes, merging of the factory committee with the capitalist organisations, "Mondism", all along the line — such is the Social Democratic position in the factory, and not only in the factory but also in relation

to the trust, to the State, to the League of Nations and everywhere. This line of policy in its complete form did not arise at one bound. It developed gradually. But, being what it is, must we draw certain conclusions from it or not? Of course, we must draw certain practical conclusions from it, otherwise the enemy will beat us.

### III. Our Line of Tactics.

#### THE CHANGE IN TACTIC CORRESPONDS TO THE CHANGE IN THE OBJECTIVE SITUATION.

The changes in the objective situation compelled us to change our tactics. It was a proper reaction to the altered state of affairs. A clear example of this is afforded by Great Britain. The Labour Party, which at one time was a loose organisation without Party discipline is now becoming a real Social Democratic Party on the model of the continental parties. It has a programme and Party discipline; it is striving to bind us with Party decisions and to bind us politically by means of its influence in the trade unions. It expels us, it launches attacks against us. If we were to retain our former attitude at the present time and preserve our former relationship so as not to break the common front of the organised proletariat, we would be doomed. We would lose our political independence and thereby our right to existence. The enemy would break us. It would be silly not to draw the proper conclusions from such a state of affairs. The change in the attitude of our British Party was determined by the change in the objective situation, by the new organisational methods of the Labour Party, by new relationships that arose between our Party and the Labour Party. These are all political factors of first rate importance.

The same may be said about France. It is no accident that the contemporary representatives of Social Democracy in France are Paul Boncour, with his military law and Albert Thomas, who is boasting Mussolini. The Thomases and Boncours are not expelled. On the contrary, the Social Democrats strive to justify their conduct. The "Left" Fritz Adler writes a pitiful article in which he actually tries to defend Thomas, the bard of Fascism. That is how the most "Left" elements of the II. International act, and that is how the man, who during the war assassinated a Cabinet Minister as a protest against that war, writes now!

As far as the Communist Party of France is concerned, there were certain other considerations compelling us to change our tactics. It is a well-known fact that survivals of

parliamentary illusions are still prevalent in the French Party. The recent elections marked a turning point for the Party, a turning point which must be regarded not only from the viewpoint of the elections, but also from the angle of the entire future policy of the French Communist Party. Having come to the conclusion that we were on the eve of great class conflicts in which parliamentarism, in the worst sense of the word, may play a very pernicious role, we had to do everything in our power to break down this tradition.

Thus the change in our tactics was bound up with the change in the objective situation and this was the signal for a change in the tactics in the larger of our Communist Parties. The political pivot of this change is our changed attitude towards the Social Democratic Parties. The question of our attitude towards the Social Democratic Parties is a cardinal political question. Intensification of the struggle against Social Democracy — such is the political orientation of the Communist International, and I think that this slogan, this political orientation, will be adopted by the VI. Congress. At the same time I must emphasise that the adoption of sharper methods of struggle against the Social Democratic Parties is not in any way identical with the abandonment of the united front tactics, as some comrades are inclined to think. On the contrary, the more sharply we come out against Social Democracy and against its political line, the more determinedly must we take up the task of capturing the masses, including the mass of rank and file Social Democrats, including the mass of workers who follow the lead of Social Democracy, and the more strenuously must we fight to win these masses. But in order to conduct a successful struggle for the masses we must employ proper methods of approaching them. Only those lacking intelligence would argue that since we are waging a desperate struggle against Social Democracy we must have no dealings with rank and file Social Democratic workers. There are many comrades who still fail to appreciate this twofold task. Many have not as yet given serious thought to the matter. But the fact is that this is one of our most important and fundamental tasks.

### IV. The Revolution in Colonial and Semi-Colonial Countries.

#### CORRECTNESS OF THE MAIN LINE AND BLUNDERS IN ITS APPLICATION TO CHINA.

Before analysing our fundamental tasks in general, I should like to deal with the question of the colonial movements. I will deal with China and India, but will limit myself merely to a few remarks, because these questions will be dealt with partly in discussing the programme and, particularly, in discussing the colonial question.

On the questions of the Chinese revolution, we had an extensive discussion with our opposition on points of principle. Here we can in retrospect deal once again with some of the major problems of the Chinese revolution. The Communist Party of China, as all of you know, has suffered a severe defeat. This is a fact. The question arises, was this defeat a result of the wrong tactics pursued by the Comintern in the Chinese revolution? Perhaps indeed, it was inexpedient to have entered into a bloc with the bourgeoisie; perhaps this was the original sin, the basic error, which determined all other errors, and, gradually, step by step, brought about the defeat of the Chinese proletariat? Most likely this question will be analysed in great detail at this Congress when the colonial problem will be up for discussion in as much as this is an extremely vital question which must be critically and

scrupulously examined and analysed. But I think, and the analysis will bear me out in this, that the mistake does not lie here.

On the whole, it is not the main line of tactics that was at fault, but the political actions and the practical application of the line pursued in China. Firstly, at the beginning of the Chinese revolution, in the period of collaboration with the Kuomintang, our mistake was that we did not sufficiently criticise the Kuomintang. Instead of being an ally, our Party was at times an accessory of the Kuomintang. Secondly, the Communist Party of China failed to understand the change that took place in the objective situation, the transition from one stage to another. Thus, it was possible for a time to march together with the national bourgeoisie, but at a certain stage of development it was necessary to foresee imminent changes. It was necessary to prepare for that. In concluding an alliance it is always necessary to bear in mind the possibility of changes and, consequently, to prepare for a struggle. On a critical analysis of all phases of the Chinese revolution we find that the C. C. of the Chinese Party and partly also our representative in China committed a grave blunder. They did not take this coming change into account, they did not foresee it and therefore did not effect a timely change when the

former ally turned into a deadly foe. Thirdly, our Party at times acted as a brake on the mass movement, a brake on the agrarian revolution, and a brake on the Labour movement. These were fatal blunders and, naturally, they helped to bring about the defeat of the Communist Party and of the Chinese proletariat. After a whole series of defeats the Party set to work resolutely to rectify its opportunist blunders. But this time, as frequently happens, some comrades fell into the other extreme. They did not prepare uprisings with sufficient care, they displayed glaring putschist tendencies and adventurism of the worst type. The IX. Plenum of the C. I. called for a change in the tactics of the Communist Party of China, but not in the same direction as that of the West European parties.

By manipulating such terms as "Left", "Right", etc., we can say that in France and Great Britain a change has been effected towards the "Left" and in China towards the "Right". However, I wish to make a reservation: I am not in favour of such terminology. It little suits the occasion and explains nothing. The purpose of analysing any given situation is to discover whether certain tactics are correct or not, suitable or unsuitable for the given situation and not whether the tactics are "Right" or "Left".

### THE RETURN OF THE REVOLUTIONARY TIDE IN CHINA IS INEVITABLE.

We characterise the present period in the Chinese revolution as the culminating point of a great period when the revolutionary wave rose high and the beginning of a period in which the main task is to unite the masses and to rally the forces in preparation for a new great revolutionary upheaval.

All objective symptoms show that another revolutionary upheaval is inevitable. The whole experience of the past struggle shows that without gigantic mass movements it will be impossible to solve the problem of the Chinese revolution and that the objective pre-requisites for its victorious completion exist. But this brings up against the main task of uniting the masses so as to deprive the enemy of the opportunity to gradually destroy our proletarian army unit by unit. Iron necessity demanded that the Party abandon the position of immediate insurrection and take up the position of preparation, mass preparation, for an uprising with a maximum chance of victory. I think that the resolution adopted by the IX. Plenum on the Chinese question helped greatly to further the development of the Communist Party of China. I hope that the Congress decisions will be in keeping with the spirit of the resolution.

## Third Session.

19th of July 1928 (Morning).

# Continuation of Comrade Bukharin's Report.

Chairman, Comrade Foster opens the Session and calls upon Comrade Bukharin to continue his report. Comrade Bukharin proceeds:

## V. Our Main Tasks and our Shortcomings.

### MORE INTERNATIONALISM!

Comrades, I now come to our main tasks and our shortcomings. From my analysis of the world situation, certain conclusions follow in relation to our basic orientation in the sphere of tactical problems. First of all, I will deal with the question of the international character of our movement. It stands to reason that in the present period, when great political questions occupy the centre of attention of the Communist Parties, when the war problem is the main problem, the activities of the Communist International must be chiefly based on international training and on the tasks of the Communist Parties arising from them. Regarding our Party activity from this viewpoint, it must be stated that notwithstanding the relative numerical weakness of our Communist Parties, we have achieved fairly great successes in regard to the Bolshevisation of our Parties: we have quite considerable gains, and

## NEW PROCESSES IN INDIA.

The situation in India is shaping itself differently. There the situation and the correlation of forces are different from those in China, where in the course of an entire period, in the course of many years, the bourgeoisie conducted an armed struggle against the imperialists. This is a fact. It is otherwise in India. There it is inconceivable that the bourgeoisie will play a revolutionary role for any length of time. This of course, does not apply to the various petty bourgeois parties or terroristic organisations now existing in India. I have in mind the principal cadres of the bourgeoisie, the Swaraj Party.

I am not in a position to make an economic analysis of the situation in India, but I should like to state that I do not share the opinion that India is ceasing to be a colonial country and that a process of decolonisation is going on there. That theory is a one-sided one. On the contrary, recently, following the period of concessions, British imperialism has increased its colonial oppression of India in general and of the Indian bourgeoisie in particular. This compels the Swaraj Party once again to manoeuvre against British imperialism. It is manoeuvring. But this is a far-cry from armed struggle. At the very first outbreak of mass action the Swaraj Party will turn towards British imperialism and seek to compromise with it. I have in mind such mass action in which the masses will advance independent radical slogans such as a demand to confiscate the land or radical slogans for the defence of working class interests. It seems to me that in the event of independent mass action and the advancement of more or less revolutionary slogans the Swaraj bourgeoisie will very rapidly come to an agreement and compromise with British imperialism. Now it manoeuvres. At some points it may play even an objectively revolutionary role, but it is inconceivable that it will play a revolutionary role for any length of time. There is no doubt, and this must be emphasised, that the bourgeoisie will desert to the camp of counter-revolution at the first manifestation of a mass movement. The Communist Party must from the very outset expose the half-heartedness of the bourgeoisie, accentuate the slogans, from the very beginning come out against the bourgeoisie and open the eyes of the masses of the workers to the future behaviour of the Indian Swarajist bourgeoisie. A mechanical application of Chinese tactics to India is fraught with great danger. A special analysis and special tactics based on the particular conditions prevailing in India are necessary.

\* \* \*

Owing to late hours it is proposed to interrupt the report and to conclude it in the next session. This proposal is adopted.

increase in influence to record, we have ideologically gained new territories for Communism, etc. Nevertheless, the degree of internationalism of the Communist Parties is still very small compared with the tasks confronting the Communist International and its Sections. Experience of recent years has revealed these shortcomings and I think that it is our duty to speak of them openly. A frank admission of these shortcomings is an important pre-requisite for their elimination.

During the strike in Great Britain many Parties inadequately supported the British working class and this we have stated in the resolutions of Enlarged Plenums of the Communist International. With the exception of a few Parties, and particularly the C. P. S. U., the Parties rendered very meagre help to the British proletariat.

Practically the same thing was manifested in connection with the Chinese events. The magnitude of the international

campaign in defence of the Chinese Revolution did not fully correspond to the objects and requirements of the period and the revolutionary duty of the Parties. Interest in the Chinese Revolution was not sufficiently sustained. Nor did the Party press deal adequately with the Bolshevisation of the Communist Party of China and the Bolshevisation of the labour and peasant movement in China. Thoroughgoing and systematic work in this sphere was not observed. Sufficiently broad political campaigns corresponding to the requirements were not conducted. Sporadic attempts were made to remove these shortcomings, but persistent systematic work was not undertaken and as a result, the Parties were not always able to cope with the tasks that confronted them in the period of big campaigns.

Take the question of Fascism. I have in mind not only Italian Fascism; I want to deal with this question on somewhat broader lines, I want to take up the question of Fascism in Italy, in Poland and Fascism in general. The Communist Parties' struggle against Fascism and the attention they paid to this question was totally inadequate.

Events like the United States incursion in Nicaragua have not been sufficiently counteracted, particularly by the American Party. Even the American Party, for which this question should have been the Central Question in all its activity, was not in a position to develop a sufficiently broad campaign. This is no less true of the other Parties. Nicaragua is far away from Europe, but geographical conditions should not so seriously affect the work of Communist Parties. In some Parties, particularly in Europe, both small and large, certain survivals of provincialism are to be observed; a lack of understanding of the significance of international high politics. If we are to prepare seriously for world historical events like imminent war, we must now stress the problems of high international politics, for otherwise, we will be unable to prepare seriously for the outbreak of war. It stands to reason that in order to launch this campaign properly, in order to carry it on with the necessary energy, we must link up questions of international high politics with questions of daily life and revolutionary activity in the respective countries. Here again the problem of war comes to the fore. Almost all internal political questions, including questions of the labour movement of each country, encounter this problem. The capitalist offensive is bound up with the bourgeois preparations for war and is called forth by the necessity to strengthen the positions of the bourgeoisie, to establish civil peace, to organise protection against the workers, etc. Generally speaking, this is a very complicated problem. While handling day to day questions it is necessary at the same time to make them the basis for the further development of our more general slogans and tasks. A certain politico-tactical art is involved in this. But this is an argument in favour of taking up big political questions, and it is precisely here that the art of Bolshevik tactics comes in, namely, to start out with minor questions and to lead them up to big questions. If we fail to acquire this art, if we fail to react sufficiently to great international problems it will signify that we will fail to carry on systematic work in preparation for a struggle against war. This we must understand and state in our resolution. The question of war, the question of defending the revolution in the U. S. S. R. and in China — are questions of central and decisive significance. Systematic work in this direction is the fundamental task of all Parties, of all Sections of the Communist International.

The question of the general line of the Communist Parties is a question of attitude towards the present form of capitalism and to the capitalist State. In this sphere, minor questions imperceptibly grow into big political problems. If, for example, we take the tactical orientation of the Social Democratic Parties — I have already referred to that in passing — we find a fully consistent line. It is a line of unity with the employers' organisations. It passes on from the individual factory to the League of Nations. The Social Democrats advocate "industrial peace" and the so-called "American" method of collaboration between labour and capital. Such is the main line of contemporary Social Democracy. This main policy finds its reflection also in the sphere of foreign affairs. But we also meet with it in dealing with questions of home affairs, in the question of relations with the State, the question of coalitions, the attitude towards the so-called employers' organisations, viz., the magnates of Trust Capital. The Social Democratic slogan

is a slogan of unity with Trust capital. The question of the class struggle no longer exists as far as they are concerned. In the economic sphere they are opposed to strikes, they are opposed to the industrial struggle. They stand for industrial peace. Instead of extension of strikes, they stand for compulsory arbitration. To them it is not a question of the dependence or independence of the labour organisations, they stand for collaboration between the labour organisations and the employers organisations. This is an integral system of tactics. From the reformist viewpoint the labour organisations must abandon their class independence. Class struggle has become "obsolete" in the eyes of these gentlemen. The Social Democratic line is a line of grafting the reformist labour organisations with the organisations of monopolist capital and the monopolist capitalist State. We see these consistent Social Democratic tactics operating all along the line.

#### UNITED FRONT TACTICS ONLY FROM BELOW.

What is our tactical orientation? Our tactical orientation in all these questions, from the factory nucleus to the League of Nations is diametrically opposite to that of the Social Democrats. Not industrial peace, but class struggle, not arbitration, but struggle against compulsory arbitration; exposure of all the traps which the capitalist organisations or the capitalist State are laying down for the working class; fight against every attempt to fetter the strike movement, etc. This is our basic tactical orientation. We have discussed these questions on many occasions already and our answer to them in my opinion was absolutely clear. The final conclusion to be drawn from this tactical line is, that we must steer a course for the overthrow of the bourgeois State power — for revolution. This does not in the least imply that we must abandon the tactics of the united front. But, regarding the sharpening of our struggle against Social Democracy, certain changes must be made in the conduct of that struggle. United Front tactics must, in most cases, now be applied only from below. No appeals to the Central Committee of the Social Democratic parties. In rare cases appeals may be made to local Social Democratic committees. In the main, we must appeal only to the Social Democratic masses, to the rank and file Social Democratic workers.

The united front tactic is closely bound up with the questions of our systematic work.

#### TRADE UNION WORK. — A VITAL PROBLEM.

We are not concerned here with the various campaigns conducted from time to time. All these tactical questions first and foremost concern systematic work. You are all aware of the theses laid down in numerous resolutions of the Communist International to the effect that in this domain the most important problem is trade union work. We have already pointed to many of the shortcomings of our Parties in this respect. The trade union problem must be taken up also at this Congress. We will put the experience of our Parties under the microscope and search carefully for the causes of our defects in this sphere. If there is a section of our work that stands in need of thorough self-criticism it is these very sections of our work in the trade union. Our ideological influence is growing in the trade unions as in other spheres, but as trade unionists the authority of our comrades is still negligible. The authority of our comrades as political leaders, as initiators of big political campaigns, fighters in the revolutionary class front of the proletariat, as defenders of its great historical interests, is growing. But their specific authority as trade unionists, is not great enough. The disproportion between the authority of our comrades as political leaders and their authority as trade unionists is very big and this is due to the various shortcomings of our work in the trade unions. I would like to give a few illustrations. Take France for example: there, the Communists in the trade union movement have committed a series of errors. The relations between the Communists and the non-Party trade union members are not what they should be. The Communists have got into the habit of commanding, they do not exercise their influence by persuasion, they do not work systematically enough. Many other shortcomings can be mentioned. On the other hand there are trade unionists who do their trade union work "well". But this trade union work is almost Social Democratic work. It

almost entirely lacks the specifically Bolshevik formulation of trade union problems, specifically Communist problems. Such trade unionists may have a very good reputation among the trade union masses, but their work cannot be approved of from the Communist viewpoint. Experience in Germany shows that some comrades have become so accustomed to Social Democratic methods of work that they do not carry out Party instructions; during elections they refuse to publish our Party appeals, etc. They have submitted to general reformist trade union discipline in order to become "good" trade union workers. This is another unsatisfactory side of Communist work in the trade unions. We have also observed blunders committed by our trade unionist Comrades during strike movements — a very serious aspect of our trade union work. In some cases we meet with what is known as *khvostism*, i. e. the lack of initiative and inability to play a leading role. In time of strikes we are carried along by the masses instead of leading them. In the past period, in France for example, there have been cases where strikes have taken place without our participation.

On the other hand, very often we play with revolutionary phrases in time of strikes, but do not devote sufficient attention to the solid preparation of campaigns connected with such strikes, we do not sufficiently take into account the objective situation and all the possibilities of the strikes; we are unable to choose the proper moment for declaring strikes or for calling them off and we are unable to lead them properly, etc. But all these qualities of leadership are absolutely essential precisely at the present time, because the situation, as far as strike leadership is concerned, is a very serious one. Potentially, almost every strike has the more or less marked tendency to grow into a **big political event**. It is possible to lead strikes under such conditions only if one has a good knowledge of the situation and is able to take into account all phases of the movement. Revolutionary enthusiasm is necessary, of course, but that alone is not enough. A knowledge of the economic and political conditions of the struggle is essential. Never have questions of strike struggles been so involved as they are now. At the bottom of this complex problem lies partly the correlation between the forces of capitalism and the united forces of the working class. But, comrades, the situation is that these specific circumstances have not yet been realised. For instance, the problem of uniting the factory committees on the lines of the organisation of Trusts has as yet remained unsolved and it is still insufficiently advocated in the Communist Parties even of the most developed capitalist countries. However, this propaganda in favour of unification, this centralisation of the struggle, must be our reply to the merging of trustified capital. In the trade union domain we are now waging a struggle not so much against individual employers as against capitalist Trusts. The word Trust must be emphasised, it must be accentuated. It is the specific feature of the situation with which we now have to deal.

### THE YOUTH PROBLEM — ONE OF OUR MAJOR TASKS.

Comrades, there are shortcomings that I want to refer to, shortcomings in our mass organisations, although we have made great progress in this sphere. For example, our **Young Communist movement**. In this sphere, we have certain considerable achievements to record, particularly in our anti-militarist struggle and in the various military campaigns. Take the French youth organisation during the Morocco war and the work of our Young Communists in the struggle against the war danger in general. Nevertheless, we have great shortcomings. The number of organised young comrades is either declining or stationary. There is no doubt that the youth movement suffers from excessive sectarianism; our Youth International is unable to penetrate all the organisations where masses of young workers are to be found and to influence them. Our tactical orientation in the youth organisations is still distinguished by a certain narrowness. These shortcomings have lately become even more marked. This is one of the most dangerous spots in our activity. Some comrades, realising that great blunders have been committed, that we suffer from great defects in this respect, seek to remedy it by doses of medicine, so big that we run the risk of the Y.C.I.'s losing their specific political and Communist features. I think that this is a mistake. The youth organisation must be a Communist organisation. Of course, it must not duplicate the Party, but the general Communist orientation in the struggle must be the basis of Young Communist development in the future.

### MAXIMUM OF VARIETY AND FLEXIBILITY IN THE METHODS OF WORK.

What we lack, and what we must acquire, is diversified methods of work. We must endeavour to bring about a situation in which the youth organisation will react, not only to questions of high politics and to big political campaigns, but also to political and cultural questions, to all questions of interest to the youth. Our young comrades must have their say in all spheres, from sport to the Chinese Revolution; they must react organisationally and politically, as the instructions point out, to carry our influence to all organisations where young workers are to be found. We must abandon sectarianism and restricted methods of work, the general effect of which is to nullify united front tactics in the sphere of the youth movement.

Comrades, the youth problem is one of the most vital problems of our time. In Western Europe, in America and in other countries, this problem is an exceedingly grave one for us. The bourgeoisie is waging a feverish and strenuous struggle for the youth and is waging it with great skill, much more skillfully than we are waging it. All the big sport organisations, which some regard as a method of fostering bourgeois culture are, in general, of very great political significance. The importance of sport organisations is closely related with the central problems of politics, first and foremost with the question of war. Through these organisations the imperialist bourgeoisie provide military training for the youth in a form which appears innocent and non-political, but which, if regarded in the light of the general process of development, and not as an isolated fact — plays a great political role in these days. The young worker becomes absorbed in and enthusiastic over football, but imperceptibly he is caught in the web of bourgeois organisation. Various military gymnastic stunts take the place of military training, not only from the technical viewpoint, but also from the viewpoint of politics, from the problem of war. And if we devote our attention mainly to great political problems without at the same time trying to penetrate all mass organisations, — I do not speak directly of organisational penetration, I have in mind our influence and our political authority — the great masses of the young human material will be lost to our cause.

Why do I say that the youth problem is one of our central problems? Firstly, because, while we have devoted considerable attention to the trade union problem, for example, we have paid very little attention lately to the youth movement. What is the situation in the youth movement? The youth are now much worse organised than the adult proletariat. This is just as true of the Social Democratic youth as of our youth.

One of the most striking historical paradoxes of the present day is that the post-war generation, the generation born during the war, is worse organised than the preceding generation. What does this signify? I think, partly, this means that large sections of the youth have either directly or indirectly been neutralised by the bourgeoisie, or that the youth has become non-political. This, too, is to be explained by the influence of the imperialist bourgeoisie, because the bourgeoisie is quite satisfied if it succeeds merely in neutralising the youth. It does not require more than that.

An improvement of our work in the youth organisations is therefore absolutely necessary. We must say this definitely and the Congress must give corresponding instructions to the Y. C. I.

### MORE ATTENTION TO THE PEASANT PROBLEM.

Further, there is the question of sympathising organisations. If it is correct to say that we are approaching catastrophic events, although we cannot tell exactly when they will occur, in what year and on what day, — it would be absurd to predict dates, we must understand that it is precisely because of such perspectives that the question of auxiliary organisations play a very important role. In the near future we shall have to take up the question of the peasant movement and of the Farmers' and Peasants' International and analyse it separately. The election results in Germany and France have shown that our influence in the rural districts in those countries has not increased; on the contrary it has somewhat diminished. This is an important symptom. Of course, our work among the peasants in many advanced capitalist countries is not easy, but it must be borne in mind that it is the masses of the

peasantry that are hurled against us in the struggle and we must not forget that the bourgeoisie is working feverishly in this domain. The bourgeoisie does its utmost to win over the masses of peasants whereas the Communist Parties have forgotten about their work among the peasants. In some countries we have allowed opportunities to slip by — recall the great peasant movement in Roumania. True, the Communist Party of Roumania was smashed, but no one uttered the warning that great events were approaching in Roumania. Neither the Comintern as a whole nor the Executive Committee, foresaw them, nor did they take timely measures to meet them. This was a great oversight, even if we admit that the situation was a very difficult one and that we had almost no connection with Roumania. These events occurred without our Party exercising hardly any influence upon them. Therefore we must draw certain conclusions regarding the peasant movement in all Balkan countries, not only in Roumania, but also in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, etc., and even in Poland.

We must devote more attention to the peasant question and from this viewpoint we must help the Farmers and Peasants International to become a real live organisation. I cannot give you a report on the activities of that organisation, but I must say that they are more or less of a propagandist character, that its work consists chiefly in publishing various material. Its organisational connections are exceedingly meagre. The numerical strength of the organisation is negligible, although it has certain successes to its record. I think that in this the Farmers' and Peasants' International is not alone to blame; the fault rests also on the Comintern. We have not appropriated sufficient forces for that organisation, we have not devoted sufficient attention to its work. This is clearly borne out by the Roumanian events and the election results in France and Germany. We must take this question up in the immediate future and do everything we can to remedy the defects.

I think we are not giving enough support to the **Anti-Imperialist League**. Some comrades think that, in general, this League is not worth maintaining. In reality, experience has shown something quite different. Experience has shown that this organisation has great potential powers and chances of development and that we are doing very little to help to release these potential forces. It is said that the Congress of the League was a grand parade, a big political demonstration. But this was not an accident. This "parade" was a big political demonstration because the objective need for such a parade existed and the revolutionary forces were really in need of unification. From the viewpoint of our general strategy, we must say that the more rallying points there will be along our line of march in the shape of our sympathising forces — be it in Europe, Asia, Africa, or any other Continent — the more prepared will we be for the moment of catastrophic upheavals, the greater will be the number of real live organisations in the revolutionary camp. Why we should hold a liquidatory viewpoint on this question I cannot understand. People sometimes try to throw all blame upon the objective situation, upon forces and events outside of our sphere of influence. This is a grave mistake. We are mostly to blame, because we have given too little aid to that organisation.

#### LINKING UP OF LEGAL WITH ILLEGAL WORK.

I will now touch another question — the problem of linking up legal with illegal work. Again, if our analysis of the general situation is correct, then we must immediately commence illegal work, we must immediately undertake the task of linking up our legal activity with illegal activity. We have now gathered considerable experience of illegal work in some countries. We have such experience in Poland, in the Balkan countries, in Italy, and now in Japan. Finally, we have a wealth of experiences in China, etc. Some Parties have had no such experience. This applies mainly to the West European Parties. But, comrades, the attacks upon us will from now on become more severe. Our French Party has already had a taste of what it may expect in the future. There is no doubt that immediately on the eve of war and even some time before that, a series of extraordinary laws will be passed against our Parties. Of this there is no doubt. This must be foreseen. That is why it is necessary now to lay the foundation of our underground organisations, particularly in the army and navy, etc. Otherwise, events will take us by surprise and because of lack of preparation we will suffer great losses. The question of ille-

gal organisations, which includes also the question of legal and illegal connections in the army and navy, is now a very acute one. You can understand why I cannot go into details, give advice and instructions here. But this task must be brought to the forefront of our attention and dealt with thoroughly. We cannot confine ourselves to generalities. We must work out concrete instructions for our daily practical work and these instructions must be registered.

If we apply the united front tactics in our trade union work, in the youth organisations and in our sympathising organisations properly we will be able to remove the notorious discrepancy between the growth of our political influence and its organisational consolidation.

#### SYMPTOMS OF BUREAUCRACY.

I want to draw attention to another drawback in our Party work. It seems to me — and I must say this openly — that the symptoms of bureaucracy have lately increased, not only in our Party, the C. P. S. U., but in many other Parties. Now and then this finds expression in super-centralised leadership, in the total lack of initiative on the part of local organisations, etc. Of course, centralism, is necessary and so is centralised leadership. Central Committees must be strong, leading bodies. This is an elementary truth. But we find that very often local organisations display no initiative, that the pulse of political life does not always beat fast enough in our nuclei, that many campaigns and questions of trade union struggle play an exceedingly insignificant role in our nuclei, that minor officials and rank and file members work on a very small scale and that inner Party life consists in very many cases of the activities of a group of officials. This defect is related to other defects. We strongly advocate the reanimation of the rank and file, drawing new people into the leadership, attracting new people into the Party. But these new people do not fall from the skies as ready made practical workers. They must receive training in the process of active Party life not only on the part of officials, but also of the rank and file. Unless we succeed in eliminating these shortcomings, we shall run short of active Party workers. Unless we accelerate the pulse of Party life among the lower ranks of the Party, we shall not be able to provide a reservoir from which to draw able Party leaders. In surveying the Party Congresses and the Congresses of the Communist International, one is struck by the fact that the percentage of rank and file workers participating in them has not increased. Here too, a tendency is observed to delegate Party officials, professional and paid Party officials to these Congresses exclusively. This tendency is obvious here. Of course, the danger must not be exaggerated, but a warning must be uttered against it. This is only bound up with a whole series of highly complicated problems of internal Party life. We must draw attention to the inadequate beat of the pulse of inner Party life particularly among the lower ranks of the Party, in the factory nuclei, etc. This must be placed on record so that the situation may be improved.

#### THE NEED FOR IMPROVING THE PARTY CADRES.

A few more words on the cultural and political level of our Parties and our Party cadres — the method of inner Party discussions. Here again there is a discrepancy between the objective requirements of the mass of the membership and the abilities and qualifications of our Party cadres. It seems to me that we have ignored a whole series of theoretical tasks, that our Party cadres are devoting too little time to studies, that our literature is weak and does not correspond to the present objective requirements; that we do not work out our problem deeply and intelligently enough — and this reflects itself in the methods of our discussion. I have already said at a previous Congress, or Plenum, that our inner-Party discussions largely consist of making strong, sweeping statements and that they reveal an insufficiently serious attitude to the problems under discussion on the part of those participating in them. We have learned very well to perform operations with various kinds of deviations, this we do splendidly, but as far as a genuine study of the problems is concerned, the presentation of sound arguments instead of merely slogging away at an opponent — this we have not yet learned sufficiently.

However, every further step our Party takes along the path of development demands that we must deepen our political thinking, and that we must manipulate, manoeuvre and react in every situation in a thoughtful manner. This is one of the

extremely important problems that face us. I think we must devote serious attention to raising our theoretical level, to improving our press and to the development of studies in our Parties.

## VI. Tendencies in the Communist International.

### RIGHT TENDENCY, THE GREATEST DANGER.

Comrades, I will now say a few words about the various tendencies in the Communist International. Some time ago, the greatest danger in the Communist International came from the so-called "ultra lefts", who endeavoured to set up an international organisation. After the defeats of the opposition in the C. P. S. U. these were frustrated, but the very process of disintegration of the opposition, the culminating point of which was the collapse of the so-called "Lenin Bund", leads us inevitably to certain conclusions. We asserted that **Trotzkyism** is a Social Democratic tendency. Some comrades in their inward mind consider this to be a gross exaggeration. But the history of the Lenin Bund has shown that the core of the opposition has migrated to the Social Democrats. Was this a chance occurrence? Certainly not. We can see distinctly the dialectics of the relationships between the so-called "ultra-Left" and the Right. At present the principal danger comes from the Right tendency, if we take the Communist International as a whole. The period of stabilisation, which I have analysed, the survival of parliamentarism, the influence of Social Democracy, certain specific peculiarities in trade union activity — are the main elements which keep this danger alive. This danger assumes various forms in the individual Parties. How did it manifest itself? Firstly by aspiration to legality at any price, by the Parties' fear to exceed the limits of bourgeois legality, even in cases when it was necessary to go beyond such limits; by excessive submission to bourgeois laws. This Right tendency manifested itself also in ignoring the necessity for accentuating the class struggle, for instance, during strikes; necessary strikes were not carried out. This tendency manifested itself also in the adoption of a wrong policy towards Social Democracy and in an insufficient accentuation of the struggle against "Left" Social Democratic leaders. It manifested itself also in the inadequate internationalism of the Parties. We notice that on the whole even Parties with a correct orientation do not always perform their international duties, as was the case in regard to the Chinese revolution. This certainly is a definitely Right tendency. The same tendency is observed also in the trade union activity, where general trade union discipline is frequently considered more important than our Party discipline, as well as in various other forms with which I will deal presently.

### LEFT TENDENCIES.

Failure to understand what relations should be between the Party and the trade unions, results in that the Party sometimes rules over the masses in its capacity of Communist vanguard without endeavouring to convince these masses and without carrying on systematic work. There is also a general tendency to abandon the tactic of the United Front.

Following on a period of gross right-wing errors, left tendencies are also noticeable in China. There they take the form of putschist moods and tactics. But on the whole deviations from the correct line are at present more to the Right than to the Left. Take France, for example. In our French Party strong parliamentary traditions in the bad sense of this term are still to be observed. These manifested themselves at the recent elections when a tendency to sabotage our tactical measures was very marked. This of course, is due to the somewhat exaggerated orientation towards parliamentarism, with some opportunistic deviations from the correct political path. In the French Party these tendencies originate in deeply rooted historical traditions, and it goes without saying that our French brother Party must continue systematically to combat this phenomenon and must endeavour first of all to persuade its own members that these methods are now obsolete. This is not a matter of combating individuals. Rather is it a matter of attacking the strong and time honoured traditions of public

life in France, the practice of the Socialist Party, a considerable section of which formed the Communist Party. These tendencies were observed also in the French Party when the question of so-called repressions came up for discussion, when a number of French comrades, and the whole Party made mistakes, which they subsequently remedied.

We also notice such errors in our Czecho-Slovak brother Party. Our Party in Czechoslovakia is a real mass Party but it is seriously afflicted with the "legality" disease. The Czech Party sometimes cannot make up its mind to go to the masses to organise protests against anti-Communist laws. If we continually make concessions to the government and do not exert sufficient efforts to mobilise the masses for struggle against legislation and government regulations directed against Communists, we will never be able to pave the way for the preparation of mass actions on a larger scale, which infringe the conception of bourgeois legality. Some comrades have not the ghost of a notion as to how events will develop. They argue somewhat like this: We will work within legal limits up to such and such a day, for instance, up to the outbreak of war, and then we will change our tactics. But comrades, we must make preparations beforehand. Mass actions must be regarded as one of the best means in our struggle. Our tactics must be to mobilise the masses, to become masters of the streets, to attack again and again the law and order of the bourgeois State and to smash it, to capture the street by revolutionary means, in the strict sense of the word and then to go further. Only on the basis of a whole series of such events and on the basis of the development of these events — mass actions, etc. only through such a process can we prepare ourselves for fiercer and more stubborn mass struggles on a larger scale.

Then again in regard to the strike movement and the inadequate leadership of this movement. There have been cases when certain Party organisations did not even know that a strike was brewing in a particular factory. We had several cases like this in France.

In regard to the erroneous attitude towards Social Democracy, we have several striking examples of mistakes made by many Parties, in Germany, France, Czechoslovakia, etc. These erroneous political tendencies at times assumed the form of erroneous slogans, mainly in Germany where several comrades issued the slogan: "Control of production", when the necessary revolutionary situation for this did not exist: objectively, this was nothing but a step towards the Social Democratic tactics of "economic democracy", towards adapting ourselves to the system of "industrial peace". Therefore, a slogan which is correct and revolutionary in itself becomes the very opposite if the necessary revolutionary situation does not exist. In such a case it ceases to be merely an erroneous political line. This Right danger is assuming considerable proportions just now, and it is but natural that after smashing the Trotzkyist opposition, we must adopt a very definite policy against these Right tendencies and small Right oppositional groupings.

Now is the time to criticise our other shortcomings, to examine them, so to speak, through the microscope. In regard to some Parties we observe that they cannot cope with the newly arisen situation and generally fail to see that something new has occurred. This for instance, was the case in France when Poincaré came into power. We had a similar example in Great Britain when the Labour Party and the General Council of the Trade Union Congress made a complete turn. We witnessed another example of this in Great Britain when a new phase in the correlation of social forces was ushered in. Neither did we react with the necessary rapidity in Germany when the so-called "Bürger-Bloc" was formed, etc.

## INADEQUATE APPRECIATION OF THE CONCRETE SITUATION.

Thus, in regard to almost everyone of our Parties we must say that it reacts too late to changes in the situation. Even when the situation has already changed our Parties fail to react, or react too late; they issue directive slogans much too late, etc. It seems to me that this applies also to the Comintern and its Executive: the Comintern does not always react in good time to new circumstances, new events to a newly arisen situation. Directive slogans are not always issued at the right moment, we are not always prepared and ready at the moment when general fundamental slogans should be issued. It happens sometimes that in one and the same Party twenty diverse slogans are brought forward; if twenty slogans are issued simultaneously they lose their significance, the attention of the Party is split up in too many directions. It happens sometimes that leading Party organs are unable to coordinate these slogans properly: to group secondary slogans around the most important ones. This is a great defect in our leadership. At times it happens also that slogans, which are in themselves correct, are put into practice without the necessary zest.

On the one hand we issue too many slogans without having a single central slogan. On the other hand we sometimes adopt general revolutionary language, forgetting all about the slogans of every day "routine" work and struggle. The thesis regarding the accentuation of the struggle against Social Democracy is perfectly correct. The mistake we make is that we do not directly approach the Social Democratic workers themselves. The more we talk about the errors of the Social Democratic party, the more we must try to convince the Social Democratic workers of the correctness of our own policy.

We have not yet learned to link up questions of every day work with our chief aims and tasks. We either talk big about world problems and do nothing to solve every day questions, or we do not get beyond every day questions and forget that it is essential to link them up with big political questions: moreover, in many cases our Parties are unable to make a timely and correct appreciation of current events with all their specific implications. Another defect our Parties suffer from is that they do not immediately react to a specifically new situation, that they do not grasp it quickly enough, do not give a clear enough characterisation of it and do not always issue an adequate slogan depicting the new situation as a whole. I am dwelling on these defects at length in order that they may be subjected to business-like criticism. It seems to me, particularly since so long a time has elapsed since the last Congress, that we must lay stress on these defects and weaknesses of ours also in respect to our Communist International. Take the question of organisational defects, the fact that the carrying out of decisions is not sufficiently controlled. We send out various circulars, open letters and other communications but we do not ascertain if all this has been put into practice. We use up a tremendous amount of paper for all this, but our control over the actual carrying out of our decisions is very weak. We have repeatedly resolved that in regard to this our Executive must be truly international and that individual Parties must send to the E. C. C. I. their best representatives for permanent work. But up till now this has been merely a pious resolution.

## AGAINST FRACTIONAL STRIFE.

I must also lay stress on something else which is perhaps not directly connected with the present question but which is nevertheless of considerable importance to the existence of the Communist Parties. I mean fractional struggle carried on without adequate political reasons and without adequate political justification. The main reasons for this are very complicated; they are to a certain extent connected with historical traditions. In some Parties the danger of fractional strife is, in my opinion, so great that it will be necessary to adopt extraordinary measures to combat it. Allow me to give you two examples.

Take the situation within the Yugo-Slav Party. Fractional strife on a big scale went on for seven years and did much

harm to the Party. At all our recent international conferences, Congresses, Plenums etc. there was a consensus of opinion that political differences are gradually subsiding. In spite of solemn declarations made that henceforth fractional strife will be brought to a stop, this strife continued, and waxed fiercer and fiercer. The Party suffered serious damage not so much as a result of police terrorism as because of internal fractional strife. Reorganisation is taking place now on the basis of a complete regrouping within the party itself: a new rank and file and new leaders have been created. It was a miracle that the Party was saved even by these means. I think we must ponder very deeply over this matter and draw our lesson from it. The crisis within the Yugo-Slav Party which lasted so long has been more or less overcome by means of the extraordinary measures I have already mentioned.

We are now confronted by another danger which is threatening a very big Party, namely the **Polish Communist Party**. Up till now I have not spoken about individual Parties, I merely summed up the various shortcomings of our Parties and mentioned some of them as examples. But I consider it my duty to deal separately with the Polish question. In the present situation our Polish Party occupies a very responsible post. Everyone realises what an important role our brother Party in Poland is destined to play in the event of war. The Party will become one of the principal forces at the disposal of the Communist International. At the time of the Pilsudski coup d'Etat the Polish Party committed a gross and dangerous opportunist error. This error was committed by the leaders of all tendencies without exception. Responsibility for this fundamental opportunist error cannot by any means be placed on the shoulders of any one group, as we, the Comintern, have already declared. At the last Congress of the Communist Party of Poland, which lasted over three months — because on every question and in regard to every incident differences and disputes arose between the two fractions — the representatives of the Comintern were unanimous in declaring that political differences within the Polish Party have been practically reduced to nought. And yet after this Congress, the only thing that prevented the disruption of the Polish Party was the extremely strong pressure brought to bear upon it by the Executive and the whole Comintern. Had we not intervened there would now have been two Parties in the Polish Communist movement, notwithstanding that political differences — I say this with a full sense of responsibility — were reduced to a minimum. We must consider that this has been going on recently, in an atmosphere in which the Pilsudski-ites are openly preparing for war; at a time when it is clear to everyone that the insults hurled at the Seim, etc. are not merely the coarse antics of a man who has taken leave of his senses, but a definite Caesarist policy directed first and foremost against the Soviet Union, — and I must say that this Caesarist policy is an extremely clever and agile one. Pilsudskiism has really succeeded in splitting several oppositional Parties, it has succeeded in splitting our Ukrainian Party, the opposition in the White Russian Hromada, etc. Finally, in international politics, Pilsudski-ism has carried out successfully a very cunning policy. (A voice from the audience: "It succeeded in inoculating the working class with its policy".) Yes, it succeeded in penetrating into the working class. In fact, it was not our Party alone that achieved victories in Poland; a considerable number of Warsaw workers voted for Pilsudski. Our Party achieved considerable success in the situation which had arisen; a positively brilliant success. But from the last report received the day before yesterday we learn that there are now two committees in the Warsaw organisations. I do not think that this is a matter that the Communist Party, or the Communist International can be proud of (applause). Comrades, I think — although I did not draw up the draft theses — that the Congress will be unanimous in empowering the Executive Committee to adopt measures that will secure unity. (Loud Applause.) It will be far better to have a united Party headed by ordinary workers who, in the event of war, will fight boldly as soldiers of the revolution, than to have an organisation of leaders who are continually quarrelling and who at the moment of extreme danger will ruin our Party. (Applause.)

## VII. Favourable Perspectives.

### FORWARD: TO THE STRUGGLE AND TO VICTORY!

Comrades, I have not dwelt so much on our shortcomings because I consider the general situation and the general premises for our activity unsatisfactory or unfavourable. On the contrary. The big political questions, such as the war danger and the situation arising from the ever-growing contradictions in capitalist stabilisation, provide us with increasingly favourable ground for our work among the whole working class. That ours is the predominating influence in colonial countries is an indisputable fact, particularly so in China; we are on the eve of it becoming an indisputable fact also in India; our influence is also predominating, beyond dispute, among the working class of west European countries, where we confront them with important questions like the war danger. Therefore, having regard to the accentuation of general contradictions, the accentuation of the inherent contradictions of capitalism and the accentuation of the class struggle, i. e. having regard to the conditions as they exist objectively at present everywhere, the ground and the prospects of our work and our success can be said to be favourable. There is not the slightest ground for saying that technical progress, the

partial consolidation of the Capitalist organism, the process of capitalist stabilisation will break us as the Social Democrats have prophesied. On the contrary, the more acute these contradictions which are the inevitable concomitant of the present situation become, the wider and the more solid becomes the ground under our feet. When we have learned — and we will of course finally do so — to link up our every day work with important political questions, we will succeed in winning over the broad masses of the working class in the West European countries, we will bring under our influence the Labour movement in the big capitalist States and we will be able to link them up with the truly powerful and great historical movement of the oppressed peoples. And when the hour, when Imperialism will raise its standard of war, approaches, our Communist International, all our Parties, the great phalanx of the world's workers will be ready to take up the challenge. They will hurl forth the battle-cry of civil war, of a fight to a finish against imperialism. And this battle-cry will be the cry of the Communist International! (Loud and prolonged applause. The Delegates rise to their feet and sing the "Internationale".)

---



---

### 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. R. . . . .	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.**