

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8 No. 70

9th October 1928

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

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

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

I.

General Characterisation of the VI. Congress and its Work.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

II.

The Programme of the Communist International.

a) The Form of the Programme.

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

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

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

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

b) The International Character of the Programme.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

e) The Controversial Questions of the Programme.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

These were the main questions discussed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

and tactical main tasks of the Comintern are concretely defined. It begins with an analysis of the various currents among the working class and the toiling masses in general which are still hostile to communism. The different social bases of these currents are analysed: the ideology of reformism and its sub-varieties is systematically defined, and Sun Yat Senism, Ghandi-ism, and Harveyism characterised. This is followed by a survey of the strategic and tactical tasks of the C. I. in its struggle for the proletarian world dictatorship. The programme of the C. I. closes with the burning words of the "Communist Manifesto". The adoption of this programme undoubtedly constitutes a remarkable milestone in the history of the Communist movement. And it is undoubtedly a very important event in the life of the C. I. The elaboration of the Programme will determine the physiognomy of the VI. Congress in the further history of our movement. For our movement itself the Programme will play a leading, unifying, and directive role.

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

III.

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

a) The Question of Stabilisation of Capitalism.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

c) The Countenance of Social Democracy today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV.

Struggle Against War and the Colonial Question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

V.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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