

The International Situation and Tasks of Communist International

Comrade Bukharin's Report of the Executive Committee of the Communist International

This is the official text of the report of Comrade Nicolai Bukharin made to the Sixth Congress of the Communist International on July 18 and 19, on behalf of its Executive Committee on the international situation and the tasks of the Communist International. Because of the unexpected length we can publish only one half of the report in this issue. The other half will be published in an early issue of the Daily Worker.

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 up of the Soviet Government in Bavaria, in April, 1919; the bourgeois national revolution in Turkey in January, 1920; the seizure of the factories by the workers in Italy in September, 1920. This period must also include the Red Army's march on Warsaw and finally, we have the so-called March action in Germany in 1921.

We see, therefore, that this first period was crammed full of revolutionary events of great magnitude and of great historical significance. These events brought out very sharply the process of collapse of the capitalist system and primarily of European capitalism. The first period must be regarded as having come to a close at the end of the year 1923. In September, 1923, the rebellion in Bulgaria ended in severe defeat and in the Autumn of 1923, the German proletariat suffered a fresh defeat.

The defeat of the proletariat in Western Europe served the bourgeoisie as the political starting point for further development. These defeats, and particularly the defeat of the German proletariat, marked the beginning of the second period of development in Central Europe and in Europe as a whole. This was the period of the capitalist offensive, the period of defensive proletarian struggles generally, and defensive strikes in particular. It was the period of the partial stabilization of capitalism. It must be said, that several of the defensive battles of the proletariat assumed colossal dimensions. Among these were the General Strike and the Miners' Strike in Great Britain. The second period brought greater "peace and order" to European capitalism and to world capitalism. Direct revolutionary events passed from the continent of Europe to the colonial and semi-colonial countries. In 1925, we had the rebellion in Morocco, in August, 1925, we had the rebellion in Syria and in the same year the great struggle in China assumed a more acute form. While in the first period the direct revolutionary situation bore a sharply expressed European character, in the second period the direct revolutionary situation became the characteristic feature of the situation in the colonial periphery of world imperialism.

From the economic point of view, from the point of view of the analysis of capitalist economy, the second period may be described as the period of the restoration of the productive forces of capitalism. In this period, relying on its political victories and on its relative political stabilization, capitalism strove to achieve, and ultimately did achieve, a certain economic stabilization.

The second period passed away to give place to the third period, the period of capitalist reconstruction. This reconstruction was expressed in the pre-war limits being exceeded qualitatively and quantitatively. The growth of the productive forces of capitalism is due on the one hand to the rather considerable progress achieved in the technique of industry and on the other hand to the extensive reorganization of capitalist economic contacts. Technical reconstruction, economic reorganization and the rapid process of capitalist trustification are, however, accompanied by the growth of the forces hostile to capitalism and by the extremely rapid development of its inherent contradictions.

Among these must be included first of all the growth of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. The period of the reconstruction of capitalism "coincides" with the period of reconstruction in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics; the period of the establishment of a new technical basis for, and corresponding with that, the reorganization of our apparatus of production—reorganization in the social economic sense (the growth of the socialized section of our economy) as well as in the sense of its increasing consolidation. The economic and political growth of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the development of the Chinese revolution, the ferment in countries like India, and finally the rapid growth of the inherent contradictions in the capitalist section of modern world economy and the growing danger of war—all represent the "reverse" side of world development.

It is necessary to analyse carefully the new world situation that has arisen in the third period. Unless we appreciate all the fundamental world economic and political changes that have taken place, we shall be unable to mark out a correct political line and be unable to approach properly the tactical problems of the present time.

Right from the outset we must clearly state that the postulate regarding the stabilization of capitalism now bears a different character from that which it bore several years ago, and this alteration in the manner of presenting the question must be taken into consideration in analyzing the international situation.

I come now to the analysis itself.

THE ELEMENTS OF TECHNICAL PROGRESS.

First of all I will deal with the technique of the present day capitalist world. We must concede that a considerable growth has taken place in the electrification of production in the important capitalist countries. Important inventions have been brought out in the sphere of applied chemistry. The new methods of producing synthetic fuels, the Bergius method of producing benzene, the production of artificial silk, etc., all these are characteristic features of present day capitalist production. At the same time we must take note of the growing utilization of light metals, particularly of aluminum, the wider application of new machinery and apparatuses in industry as well as in agriculture, for example the combined harvesters in the United States; the development of automobile transport; the extensive application of the endless conveyor system and the new method of organizing labor in the factories; standardization, mass production, etc. All these are the most characteristic features of present day capitalist technique.

I will quote a few figures concerning the production of electrical power in the United States.

Production in Million Kilowatt Hours:	1912	1922	1926	1927
	17,572	47,569	73,791	79,724

Numerous illustrations can be quoted showing convincingly that the curve of development of capitalist economy, both from the qualitative and quantitative point of view, marks definite progress.

A few figures to characterize the dynamics of the growth and the redistribution of the parts played by various metals in world industry. If we take the total production of 1913 at 100, the figures of production of various metals in 1926 will be as follows:

Steel	122
Copper	150
Lead	107
Aluminum	310

Aluminum is successfully competing with other metals in the electrical industry, in railway construction and in the construction of street cars in the United States and in Germany.

Still more interesting are the figures illustrating the production of artificial silk. The world production of artificial silk is shown in the following figures (in thousands of kilograms):

Pre-war production	11,000
1921	30,000
1925	84,000
1927	125,000

Taking the pre-war figure at 100, the index numbers for the subsequent years will be as follows:

1921	173
1925	668
1927	1,036

In regard to the latest inventions and their influence on production, we will take as an example the Bergius method. In Germany, synthetic benzene produced by this method, already represents 12 per cent of the total amount of benzene utilized in the country.

At the present time extensive plans for the introduction of new technical processes are being laid down in many countries, for example in Germany and in England, which will have very important economic consequences. These are the schemes to supply gas over long distances in Germany, electrification in Great Britain, etc. It is easy to understand that these technical successes, even if we put the word successes in inverted commas, will inevitably lead to an increase in the productivity in social labor. Gunter Stein, in the "Berliner Tageblatt" writes for example that in the United States the gross output of the manufacturing industries during 1923-1924 increased by 4.5 per cent compared with the normal, whereas in the same period the number of workers employed diminished by over 5 per cent. This means that the productivity of the worker has increased approximately by 30 to 40 per cent.

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 utilization 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 organizations 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 organizations "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 organizational forms in which the economic organizations of the imperialist bourgeoisie become grafted on to organs of the bourgeoisie 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 organizations of the imperialist bourgeoisie. All the facts reveal a state-capitalist 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 Knapen, 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 government department 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 organizations and the capitalist political state organizations.

STRUCTURAL CHANGES.

The following questions arise: assuming all these facts are correct, what becomes of our analysis of the so-called stabilization of capital? What becomes of our thesis concerning the partial, temporary, etc., stabilization—stabilization 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 organizations and when we on these grounds admit that capitalism has undergone considerable consolidation? What becomes of our special and specific characterization of stabilization? 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 Fifth Congress our thesis on the state and ultimate fate of capitalist economy was formulated somewhat differently. Then the word "stabilization" 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 favorable 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 stabilization as relative stabilization, 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 labor movement—to speak in the words of Marx—"variable capital—the value of labor 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 labor 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 prerequisite 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 ruin and pauperization 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 stabilization 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. Stabilization 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 stabilization can be only relative stabilization. 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 stabilization 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. Stabilization 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 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 stabilization, 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 emphasis.) 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: American-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 crystallize corresponding relationship between states. In analyzing the general complex of political relationships between capitalist states, the thing that stand 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

"Not Support Imperialist War, But Convert Into Civil War Against Bourgeoisie"

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 significant 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 America in economic servitude, and now it is fairly successfully competing with Great Britain in the southern parts of Latin America. I repeat and emphasize 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 reorganization 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 markets, 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 Germany 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 at 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 leveled 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 Apollo Treaty and Germany 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 crystallized. 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 maneuvers 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 maneuvers do not annul the fundamental tendency of the development of Germany, which

II. Internal Political Processes in the Bourgeois Countries.

THE ACCENTUATION OF INTERNAL CONTRADICTIONS.

In analyzing stabilization I pointed out that the fact that it was only relative stabilization 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 stabilization holds out the prospect of war.

The process of stabilization affects the situation of the largest capitalist countries in various ways. Partial stabilization is a two-sided process. On the one hand there is a certain technico-economic 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 stabilization makes possible the improvement of the material conditions of certain strata of the working class. In this connection we must analyze 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 this so treacherous social democracy leave the stage, why does it possess such maneuvering 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 stabilization. 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

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 democrat babble about the realization 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 Labor," 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 organizational 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 organizations on the organs of the bourgeoisie 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 organizations 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 rationalization 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 decentralization 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 utilized for the purpose of mobilizing the whole of national economy for the pursuit of war.

This evolution in the organizational forms of state power, this powerful concentration of the political and economic organizations 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 organized 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.

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 organizations. This is to be noticed in many countries and particularly in Germany. The tendency towards grafting the reformist labor organizations with the employers' organizations 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 organizations. 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 organization, the Streltsi. This is a "voluntary" organization. Officially, of course, the organization is composed of volunteers, nevertheless it is a semi-state organization. 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 maneuvering 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 stabilization creates an economic basis for social democracy and on the other hand the contradictions of stabilization 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 stabilization in each capitalist country accentuate the class struggle also when the changes in the organizational 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 organizations 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 Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the collapse of certain bourgeois parties, which the proletariat formerly followed, for example the Centrist Party in Germany, the Catholic organizations 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 stabilization 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 labored 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 81.4 million votes. Herr Hilferding's prediction was a miserable failure! This can be seen also from the vernal 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 stabilization. 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 appetizing 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 Bismarck. The kind of political figure Lasalle represented is now pretty well known. In his letter to Bismarck, 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 Bismarck 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 favor of National defense. 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 Hilferding 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 honored 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 subdivision—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 Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. 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 Union of Socialist Soviet Republics 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 Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

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 Executive Committee of the Communist International 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 organizations? 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 organizations, "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.

(To Be Continued.)

ONE BIG DAY
of Sports, Amusements and Fun

Daily Worker
International Costume Carnival

Sunday, August 19
Pleasant Bay Park

Admission, 35c

Tickets on Sale at
Daily Worker, 26-28 Union Sq.,
New York City

Games,
Contests,
Open Air
Dancing,
Athletics,
Mass
Singing

Directions:

E. 180th St. Subway to 177th
St., then take Unionport car to
end of line—Free buses to park

The International Situation and Tasks of Communist International

Comrade Bukharin's Report of the Executive Committee of the Communist International

This is the concluding instalment of Bukharin's report, made to the Sixth Congress of the Communist International on July 18 and 19, the first half of which appeared in the Daily Worker last Saturday, August 18. The portion published Saturday consisted of: "I. A General Analysis of Modern Capitalism and the Special Forms of the Crisis of Capitalism," and "II. Internal Political Processes in the Bourgeois Countries." The report continues:

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 Labor Party, which at one time was a loose organization without party discipline is now becoming a real social democratic party on the model of the continental parties. It has a program and party discipline; it is striving 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 organized 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 organizational methods of the labor party, by new relationships that arose between our party and the labor 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 boosting 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. This 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 the 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

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

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

Before analyzing 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 analyzed 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 analyzed. 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 criticize 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 labor 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 favor of such terminology. It little suits the occasion and explains nothing. The purpose of analyzing 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."

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 center 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 Bolshevization of our Parties: we have quite considerable gains, and 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 prerequisite 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 Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 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 defense of the Chinese Revolution did not fully correspond to the objects and re-

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 emphasize 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 two-fold 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.

THE RETURN OF THE REVOLUTIONARY TIDE IN CHINA IS INEVITABLE.

We characterize 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 us 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 of 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.

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 terrorist organizations 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 decolonization 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 maneuver against British imperialism. It is maneuvering. 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 defense 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 maneuvers. 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 emphasized, 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 behavior 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.

requirements of the period and the revolutionary duty to the Parties. Interest in the Chinese Revolution was not sufficiently sustained. Nor did the Party press deal adequately with the Bolshevization of the Communist Party of China and the Bolshevization of the labor 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 labor 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 organize 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 favor 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' organizations. 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 labor 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' organizations, 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 labor organizations, they stand for collaboration between the labor organizations and the employers' organizations. This is an integral system of tactics. From the reformist viewpoint the labor organizations 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 labor organizations with the organizations 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 organizations 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: here, 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 union 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 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 realized. For instance, the problem of uniting the factory committees on the lines of the organization 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 favor of unification, this centralization 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 emphasized, 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 organizations, 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 organization 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 organized 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 organizations where masses of young workers are to be found and to influence them. Our tactical orientation in the youth organizations 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, realizing 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 Young Communist League's losing their specific political and Communist features. I think that this is a mistake. The youth organization must be a Communist organization. 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 endeavor to bring about a situation in which the youth organization 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 organizationally and politically, as the instructions point out, to carry our influence to all organizations 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 organizations, which some regard as a method of fostering bourgeois culture, are, in general, of very great political significance. The importance of sport organizations is closely related with the central problems of politics, first and foremost with the question of war. Through these organizations 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 organization. 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 organizations—I do not speak directly of organizational 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 more organized than the adult proletariat. This is 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 organized 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 neutralized 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 neutralizing the youth. It does not require more than that.

An improvement of our work in the youth organizations is therefore absolutely necessary. We must say this definitely and the congress must give corresponding instructions to the Young Communist International.

MORE ATTENTION TO THE PEASANT PROBLEM.

Further, there is the question of sympathizing organizations. 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 organizations 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 analyze it separately. The election results in Germany and France have shown that our influence in the rural districts in these 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 Rumania. True, the Communist Party of Rumania was smashed, but no one uttered the warning that great events were approaching in Rumania. 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 Rumania. 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 Rumania, 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 organization. I cannot give you a report on the activities of that organization, but I must say that they are more or less of a propagandist character, that its work consists chiefly in publishing various material. Its organizational connections are exceedingly meagre. The numerical strength of the organization 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 organization, we have not devoted sufficient attention to its work. This is clearly borne out by the Rumanian 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 organization 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

Questions of War and Defending Revolution in U. S. S. R. and China Are Decisive

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 sympathizing forces—their will be 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 organizations 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 organization.

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 organizations, 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 illegal organizations, 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 organizations and in our sympathizing organizations properly we will be able to remove the notorious discrepancy between the growth of our political influence and its organizational 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 Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but in many other Parties. Now and then this finds expression in super-centralized leadership, in the total lack of initiative on the part of local organizations, etc. Of course, centralism is necessary and so is centralized leadership. Central Committees must be strong, leading bodies. This is an elementary truth.

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 endeavored to set up an international organization. After the defeat of the opposition in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 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 arrested that Trotskyism 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 stabilization, which I have analyzed, 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 endeavoring 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 endeavor 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 honored 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 Czech-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 organize protests against anti-Communist laws. If we continually make concessions to the government and do not exert sufficient effort to mobilize 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 mobilize 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 organizations did not even know that a strike was brewing in a particular factory. We had several cases like this in France.

But we find that very often local organizations 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, maneuver 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.

INADEQUATE APPRECIATION OF THE CONCRETE SITUATION.

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 Trotskyist opposition, we must adopt a very definite policy against these Right tendencies and small Right oppositional groupings.

Now is the time to criticize 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 have a similar example in Great Britain when the Labor 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 "Burger-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 the 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 workers, 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 grasp it quickly enough, do not give a clear enough characterization 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 organizational 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 Executive Committee of the Communist International 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 strife 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. Reorganization 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 to 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 realizes 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'état 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 naught. And yet after this congress, the only thing that prevented the disruption of the Polish Party was the ex-

VII. Favorable Perspective.

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 unfavorable. On the contrary. The big political questions, such as the war danger and the situation arising from the ever-growing contradictions in capitalist stabilization, provide us with increasingly favorable 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 favorable. There is not the slightest

ground for saying that technical progress, the partial consolidation of the capitalist organism, the process of capitalist stabilization 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 labor 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.")

Judgment Day Arrives in Dedham, Mass.

By EUGENE LYONS.

(From First Anniversary Memorial Edition of "The Life and Death of Sacco and Vanzetti. International Publishers, New York.)

SACCO and Vanzetti were brought into the neatly swept court room at Dedham on April 9, 1927, to hear themselves sentenced to die in the electric chair. The scene was fully illumined; the press of the entire world was represented, millions who felt deeply about the case watched with bated breath. The sentencing was merely a formality, yet it seemed that something might happen.

And something did happen. Vanzetti made a speech to the court. For the great epic of the class struggle there is a prologue ready-made: Bartolomeo Vanzetti and Judge Webster Thayer facing each other in the illumined court room of Dedham.

Judge Thayer on the rostrum of authority, a narrow figure mumbled dead words. Words as cold and precise as corpses. Words disinterred from the morgues of statute and precedent. Words that evoke a musty ingrown past.

And Vanzetti in the prisoner's cage. Alive, far-seeing, reaching out for words to express a new vision, groping for electric words to light up new vistas. Finding words that touch off the imagination and explode the walls of the narrow court room.

Behind Thayer, the dead accumulation of precedent and wealth and privilege, guarded by bayonets. A narrow world that is organized, rigid and unfeeling. Behind Vanzetti, the multitudes, as yet unorganized: the amorphous multitudes, surging forward and retreating and surging further forward, their live bodies and their live hopes against the dead past and its bayonets.

Thayer barricaded by statute books and surrounded by bayonets is yet a weak, shrinking figure, frightened by his own black coil, by the sinister memories of witch-hangings, by the sting of light on eyes accustomed to shadow. He rises to pronounce the dead formula of death.

"The jury did it," he mumbles, "the jury, not I. The jury and the law and the court—not I. I am just a small sick man about to die."

And Vanzetti standing, it seems alone, but erect and unafraid, speaking with the voice of a million. He, too, pronounces a death verdict. It is directed against the decaying past; not merely against the lonely frightened figure on the rostrum of authority. He speaks for the weak, the despised, the intimidated. Vanzetti does not explain nor apologize. He condemns with words of fire and challenges with the resonance of a million throats.

Thayer—old, worn, dyspeptic, bitter—has come to judge the men in the prisoner's cage. But he shrinks from their words and their gaze. The skeleton clatter of his formula is lost in the echoes of Vanzetti's verdict. For it is Vanzetti—calm, eloquent in the aware-

"I Know the Sentence Will Be Between the Oppressed and Rich Class"—Vanzetti

ness of multitudes speaking thru his voice—who does the judging.

"Nicola Sacco," the clerk asked, "have you anything to say why sentence of death should not be passed upon you?"

Sacco replied that his friend Vanzetti would speak for both.

Nevertheless his feelings got the better of him, and he exclaimed:

"I never knew, never heard, even read in history anything so cruel as this court. After seven years' prosecuting they still consider us guilty."

"I know the sentence will be between two classes, the oppressed class and the rich class, and there will be always collision between one and the other. We fraternize with the people with the books, with the literature. You persecute the people, tyrannize them and kill them. We try the education of people always. You try to put a path between us and some other nationality that hates each other. That is why I am here today on this bench, for having been of the oppressed class. Well, you are the oppressor."

"You know it, Judge Thayer—you know all my life, you know why I have been here, and after seven years that you have been persecuting me and my poor wife, and you still today sentence us to death. I would like to tell all my life, but what is the use?"

"Bartolomeo Vanzetti," the clerk repeated, "have you anything to say why sentence of death should not be passed upon you?"

"Yes," Vanzetti replied.

He talked quietly, with a gentle smile, as one talks to children. He paused to find a word in the tongue foreign to him—but the simple homely sentiments which are not in law books came without pauses, from somewhere deep within him.

"What I am innocent," Vanzetti began, "is that I am innocent, not only of the Braintree crime, but also of the Bridgewater crime. That I am not only innocent of these two crimes, but in all my life I have never stolen and I have never killed and I have never spilled blood. That is what I want to say. And it is not all. Not only am I innocent of these two crimes, not only in all my life I have never stolen, never killed, never spilled blood, but I have struggled all my life, since I began to reason, to eliminate crime from the earth."

"Everybody that knows these two arms knows very well that I did not need to go into the streets and kill a man or try to take money. I can live by my two hands and live well. But besides that, I can live even without work with my hands for other people. I have had plenty of chance to live independently and to live what the world conceives to be a higher life than to gain our bread with the sweat of our brow."

"My father in Italy is in a good condition. I could have come back in Italy and he would have welcomed me every time with open arms. Even if I come back there with not a cent in my pocket, my father could have given me a position, not to work but to make business, or to oversee upon the land that he owns."

"... Well, I want to reach a little point farther, and it is this, that not only have I not been trying to steal in Bridgewater, not only have I not been in Braintree to steal and kill and have never stolen or killed or spilt blood in all my life, not only have I struggled hard against crimes, but I have refused myself of what are considered the commodity and glories of life, the prizes of a life of a good position, because in my consideration it is not right to exploit man. I have refused to go in business because I understand that business is a speculation on profit upon certain people that must depend upon the business man, and I do not consider that that is right and therefore I refuse to do that."

"Now, I should say that I am not only innocent of all these things, not only have I never committed a real crime in my life—though some sins but not crimes—not only have I struggled all my life to eliminate crimes, the crimes that the official law and the moral law condemns, but also the crime that the moral law and the official law sanction and sanctify—the exploitation and the oppression of the man by the man, and if there is a reason why I am here as a guilty man, if there is a reason why you in a few minutes can doom me, it is this reason and none else."

"There is the best man I ever cast my eyes upon since I lived, a man that will last and will grow always more near to and more dear to the heart of the people, so long as admiration for goodness, for virtues, and for sacrifice will last. I mean Eugene Victor Debs. He has said that not even a dog that kills chickens would have found an American jury disposed to convict it with the proof that the commonwealth has produced against us."

"... He knew, and not only he knew, but every man of understanding in the world, not only in this country but also in other countries, men to whom we have provided a certain amount of the records of the case at times, they all know and still stick with us, the flower of mankind of Europe, the better writers, the greatest thinkers of Europe, have pleaded in our favor. The greatest scientists, the greatest statesmen of Europe have pleaded in our favor."

"Is it possible that only a few, a handful of men of the jury, only two or three other men, who would shame their mother for worldly honor and for earthly fortune; is it possible that they are right against the world? For the whole world has said that it is wrong and I know that it is wrong. If there is one that should know it, if it is right or if it is wrong, it is I and this man. You see, it is seven years that we are in jail. What we have suffered during these years no human tongue can say, and yet you see me before you, not trembling, you see me looking you in your eyes straight, not blushing, not changing color, not ashamed or in fear."

"... We have proved that there could not have been another judge on the face of the earth more prejudiced, more cruel and more hostile than you have been against us. We have proven that. Still they refuse the new trial. We know, and you know in your heart, that you have been against us from the very beginning, before you see us. Before you see us you already know that we were radicals, that we were underdogs, that we were the enemy of the institutions that you can believe in good faith in their goodness—I don't want to discuss that—and that it was easy at the time of the first trial to get a verdict of guilty."

"We know that you have spoken yourself, and have spoke your hostility against us, and your despicement against us, with friends of yours on the train, at the University Club of Boston, at the Golf Club of Worcester. I am sure that if the people who know all what you say against us have the civil courage to take the stand, maybe Your Honor—I am sorry to say this because you are an old man, and I have an old father—but maybe you would be beside us in good justice at this time."

"... We were tried during a time whose character has now passed into history. I mean by that, a time when there was a hysteria of resentment and hate against the people of our principles, against the foreigners, against slackers, and it seems to me—rather, I am positive of it, that both you and Mr. Katzmann have done all what it were in your power in order to work out, in order to agitate still more the passion of the juror, the prejudice of the juror, against us."

"... We believe more now than ever that war is wrong, and we are against war more now than ever, and I am glad to be on the doomed scaffold if I can say to mankind, 'Look out; you are in a catacomb of the flower of mankind. For what? All that they say to you, all that they have promised to you—it was a lie, it was an illusion, it was a cheat, it was a fraud, it was a crime. They promised you liberty. Where is liberty? They promised you prosperity. Where is prosperity? They have promised you elevation. Where is the elevation?'"

"From the day that I went in Charlestown, the misfortunate, the population of Charlestown, has doubled in number. Where is the moral good that the war has given to the world? Where is the spiritual progress that we have achieved from the war? Where are the security of life, the security of the things that we possess for our necessity? Where is the respect for human life? Where are the respect and the admiration for the good characteristics and the good of the human nature? Never before

Continued on Page Six