

THE COMINTERN IN DANGER OF DEGENERATION

The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International is now in session in Moscow. It is premature to attempt an evaluation of its discussions and decisions on the basis of the meager documents so far before us. Yet the fantastic inventions of bourgeois correspondents like Denny of the *Times*, the buzz of questions and gossip in "intellectual" circles, the misrepresentations in the socialist press, the confusion in the columns of the *Daily Worker*, and the eager interest of the class conscious workers in the doings of the Communist International, all make it necessary to make certain observations, however tentative and provisional and incompletely documented they may be.

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE CONGRESS

First it must be recorded that the Congress of the Communist International is not entirely what its name implies. It is not the representative body of the communist movement of all lands. It is the Congress of a faction of the communist movement, the majority faction to be sure, but nevertheless a faction. Upon it devolves the duty of reuniting the divided ranks of communism, of healing the split arbitrarily created immediately after and in contravention of the decisions of the Sixth World Congress of 1928.

That seven long years have elapsed between the Sixth Congress and the Seventh when the statutes of the International require a Congress every two years, is in itself sufficient indication of the fact that the Comintern has been going thru a profound organizational and political crisis. Those seven years have witnessed the arbitrary expulsion of many of the founders and builders and best leaders of the communist movement in many lands for advocating tactics which today are being acknowledged as correct by the Seventh Congress. Those seven years have witnessed the scrapping of Leninist tactics on the trade union question and the united front, a false attitude toward the socialist workers, the scrapping of revolutionary realism in the formulation of tactics, the abandonment of party democracy and collective leadership. They have witnessed great vic-

Flashlights on the Seventh Congress of the Communist International

By Bertram D. Wolfe

tories in the Soviet Union but great defeats in many other lands, with Germany at the head, defeats which the Seventh Congress admits might have been avoided by sounder tactical methods. They have witnessed an actual decline in the total membership of the C.I. outside of the Soviet Union, a decline during crisis years so favorable to Communism and so unfavorable to the bourgeoisie and to reformism. They have witnessed the strangulation of inner party life, the development of paralyzing bureaucracy, of puppet leaderships, of mechanical blue print tactics transplanted from land to land without regard to their appropriateness, of an unwholesome monopoly of leadership by the Russian Party, of a shameful anti-communist hero cult built around a single individual at the expense of any effort to build up a collective leadership for the workers of the world.

The World Congress has much to do to set the house of the Communist International in order. But the absence of any genuine discussion prior to the Congress, the failure of the Executive even to honor the request of the International Communist Opposition to be represented by fraternal delegates, the shamefully dishonest way in which the tactics advocated by the Communist Opposition on a variety of questions have been suddenly accepted without acknowledgement, without an attempt to reeducate the bewildered membership, without its participation in the decisions, without understanding on the part of those who must execute the decisions, without even adequate understanding by the Executive of the International, without withdrawal of a single one of the slanderous terms of abuse directed against those only yesterday "counter revolutionary" tactics and their advocates, gives little promise that the Seventh World Congress will be able to tackle the most urgent tasks

with any likelihood of fruitful conclusions.

Despite negotiations between the C.I. and the I.C.O., despite the elimination of certain differences, despite a less slanderous tone in official documents and improved relations, even cooperation in certain lands and fields, the Seventh Congress will still leave the Communist movement divided, confused, paralyzed, unequal to its tasks.

PARTIAL VICTORY IN SIGHT

It is already clear that the victory of one phase of the struggle of the International Communist Opposition is at least in sight. The official summary of Pieck's opening report for the Executive Committee of the Communist International as cabled to the *Daily Worker* of July 29, proves that though the International may wriggle and squirm, misunderstand and misapply, and fail in its duty of educating the membership and the masses thru an honest examination of its errors, and may fail thereby to clarify its new line, yet one thing is certain, it has been obliged to abandon its open rejection of Leninist tactics on mass work.

SIX YEARS TOO LATE

In 1929 we were expelled and slandered for opposing the tactics of union-splitting. In 1935 (June) the members of the American Party were still being told that the union-splitting had been correct, but that "changed conditions," "the masses' going into the A. F. L.," etc. compel the C.P. to liquidate its dual unions and reenter the organized labor movement. But Pieck's report on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Communist International abandons this sorry subterfuge. After tipping his hat to

the unhappy "third period," after taking a try at a verbal salvage of the unfortunate interpretation of "class against class" by which was meant not proletariat against bourgeoisie but Communist Party against Socialist Party, Pieck declares:

"... the Strassburg Conference resolutions in 1929 for independent leadership 'in spite of and against the reformist unions' was incorrect." (*Daily Worker*, July 29).

The reader will note uneasily that not Lozovsky whose words are to be found in the single quotes, and not the Executive of the International which gave the union-splitting instructions and expulsion orders to all lands, are held responsible, but the Strassburg Conference is to blame!

"It was correct," continues Pieck, "to oppose the Brandler theory of 'compelling the Bonzes' (misprint for Bonzen, meaning bureaucrats—BDW) but it was incorrect to say that no influence could or should be brought to bear on the bureaucrats."

Of course, Brandler never advocated anything else, but apparently it is incorrect, even counter-revolutionary, if you say "Bonzen" in German but perfectly correct if you translate them into English as "bureaucrats"! Such are the sorry subterfuges with which the Seventh Congress comes around to an acknowledgement six years too late of the correctness of the struggle for Leninist trade union tactics which we took up in 1929 and for which struggle we were expelled!

STALIN CAN DO NO WRONG!

Not the Executive Committee of the Communist International is at fault for forgetting the ABCs of sound tactics in trade union work and still less could the "great, good, wise" leader be at fault. Pieck puts the blame on those who unquestioningly carried out the line. Says Pieck:

"There was underestimation of the fact which Stalin emphasized in 1925—that the average worker saw his safety in the trade unions be they good or bad."

What miserable double bookkeeping with the party and the proletariat in this sycophantic discovery that Stalin knew what everybody in the International knew in 1925 (and what Stalin forgot and denied from 1928 to 1935)!

Not Stalin is to blame! Those who carried out orders in America are to blame! Pieck explains:

"In the United States for a long time Communists considered the American Federation of Labor as only a strike-breaking organization and saw only Green and such leaders and overlooked the average members."

How many comrades of little faith thought they would never live to see the day when such a statement would again be made from the rostrum of a Congress of the Communist International! Or that the reporter of the ECCI would ever say the following:

"While correctly fighting the mass expulsion policies of the bureaucrats (incorrectly, he should say since splitting tactics helped the bureaucrats in their expulsions—BDW) we still made mistakes in transforming the Red Union Opposition into new unions."

ANOTHER NOTION

On fascism too there is a tardy recognition of the position of the International Communist Opposition. How our German comrades were abused in 1928, '29, '30 and '31 when they warned against vainglorious boasting, against an underestimation of the Hitler menace, against a deliberate abandonment of the united front struggle and against the habit of seeing fascism where it wasn't, in Von Papen, Von Schleicher, Bruening, the Social Democracy!

Now when it is painfully late, costly in its lateness, Pieck declares:

"A great mistake was underestimation of the fascist danger, but on the other hand fascism was seen where it did not exist."

No name was too vile for the German Opposition when it urged a united front of Socialists and Communist Parties and defense organizations in Germany before it should be too late. Now Pieck declares:

"In order to avoid the fascist catastrophe in Germany there was needed a broad united front and the Red Front organization should have formed a united fighting organization with the Reichsbanner." (Socialist Defense Corps—BDW).

Once more, in cowardly, uncommunist fashion, the ECCI puts its blame on other shoulders when Pieck adds:

"The majority of the workers (!!!) did not do this and instead blindly followed the Social Democratic leadership despite the Communists warnings."

Such are the tragic dying echoes of the fatal slogan of "social fascism" and (Continued on Page 2)

By AUGUST THALHEIMER

Polish Communists To Fight For Bourgeois Republic

It is well known that during the last crisis the Communist Party of France urged the formation of a "left" cabinet inclusive of the Radical Socialist Party and declared its readiness to support such a government inside and outside of parliament provided it carried out certain immediate demands of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie. This policy has now been extended to Poland.

The Central Committee of the Polish Communist Party has just published a "declaration" called "the platform of struggle for the overthrow of the Sanacja clique government (the successors of Pilsudsky), of the oppressors of the people and war adventurers—for freedom, bread, work and peace." In this declaration the C.P. proposes to the Bund, the Social Democratic Party and the Executive Committee of the Left Peasant Party, the joint organization of mass struggles and strikes; the preparation of a general strike on a national scale including peasants and other petty bourgeois elements.

PROPOSE TO SET UP A "PEOPLE'S FRONT"

The C.P. proposes the following as the basis for the joint struggle:

"An uncompromising struggle for the overthrow of the Sanacja regime, the jingoistic oppressors of the people, for the overthrow of the fascist constitution and electoral system; for freedom of the press, assembly; for the right to strike; for the liquidation of the concentration camp Beresa Kartuska; for the liberation of all political prisoners; elimination of national oppression; guarantee of all rights for oppressed nationalities; elimination of anti-Soviet alliances with Japan and Germany; for a mutual assistance pact (Eastern Pact) with the U.S.S.R.; restitution of social legislation—unemployment relief thru state funds and thru the building of public works and taxation of capitalists and big peasants for this purpose.

"The C.P. of Poland declares that in placing in the forefront the struggle to overthrow the regime of Sanacja, IT STANDS READY TO SUPPORT THE SLOGAN OF A CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY, i.e., a constitutional assembly elected on the basis of the five-fold electoral sys-

tem (general, equal, direct, secret and proportional) whose task it shall be to realize the above program. The C.P. of Poland, in fighting for a workers and peasants government, for proletarian, soviet democracy as the only genuine democracy for workers, is ready to support the democratic activities of any anti-fascist government which promises to carry out the above program. We are convinced that this platform serves the interests and the will of the broad masses and that this platform can serve as the basis for an agreement between all anti-fascist forces in Poland. We appeal to all workers organizations, to all peasant organizations to take a stand on the proposed platform." (July 1935).

RECALLING THE WEIMAR REPUBLIC

This policy is an almost literal transference of that proposed by the C.P. of France during the recent cabinet crises. France is still a bourgeois republic so that grave as the error of the C.P. may be it is much worse in Poland—a fascist dictatorship which supplanted the bourgeois democratic republic. The C.P. now proposes to replace the fascist dictatorship with a bourgeois parliamentary republic—the constituent assembly. In other words the reestablishment of the bourgeois republic.

How long ago is it that Trotsky proposed the struggle for the reestablishment of the Weimar Republic, as a means of uniting all anti-fascist forces? His proposal was then rejected by the C.P. (as also by us) as rank opportunism. Now the C.P. of Poland returns to precisely this proposal.

C.P. TO SUPPORT CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

Perhaps it will be said that the policy of the Polish Party is an application of Lenin's tactics in 1917. Did not Lenin and the Bolsheviks support the call for the Constituent Assembly in Russia? Do we need to point out that the Constituent Assembly was the slogan of the bourgeois democratic stage of the revolution and that the Bolsheviks pushed forward the slogan of "All Power To The Soviets." Do we need to point out

that in Poland the bourgeois democratic revolution is over and that not the former but the latter slogan applies?

Perhaps some one will ask: is it not possible to reestablish the bourgeois republic in Poland? That possibility exists with all fascist dictatorships. It will depend on whether Social Democracy regains its hold over the proletariat at the time of the break-up of the Fascist regime. If it does bourgeois democracy will result. If on the other hand the Communists were to win the masses then proletarian dictatorship would result. It is therefore the duty of the Communists not to play with such dangerous slogans as Constituent Assembly but at every stage of the struggle to advance the slogan of soviet power and proletarian dictatorship.

NEW DEFEATS IF OPPORTUNISM CONTINUES

The policy of the Polish Party is in reality nothing but the extension of the reformist policies of bourgeois coalition and the theory of the "lesser evil" which have brought defeat upon the working class of Germany and Austria. These policies, proved bankrupt in Austria and Germany, are all the more dangerous now that they have found their way into the hands of the C.P.

The Communist Parties are committing these errors because they have never really assimilated the lessons of 1923 in Germany. One of the most important lessons to be drawn from 1923 is that the united front is not applicable in the struggle for power, that the united front tactics are applied only in struggles for partial demands or for revolutionary transition slogans and that beyond that the united front leads to opportunism and defeat.

The Polish Party may continue to speak of Soviet Power but it becomes merely a propaganda slogan pure and simple while the slogan of Constituent Assembly becomes the practical slogan for which the masses are being mobilized.

We of the C.P.O. must vigorously fight against this opportunist course which will surely lead to the victory of fascism in France. If transferred to countries where fascism is in power it will either strengthen fascism or play right into the hands of Social Democracy.

COMINTERN IN DANGER OF DEGENERATION

(Continued from Page 1)

"united front from below"! At any rate it is good to know that that much at least has been learned at a frightful price from the defeat in Germany.

"EXCEPTIONALISM" NO LONGER A CRIME

The Daily Worker of August 3 carries the complete text of the Resolution of the Communist International on the Report of Comrade Pieck on the activities of the E.C.C.I. It makes additional important steps toward the adoption of the position of the Communist Opposition. A feeble gesture in the direction of collective leadership, greater initiative for the individual parties, an acknowledgement that the E.C.C.I. was itself at fault in not attempting to correct the sectarian line from 1929 to 1934 or '5.

Most important is a recognition of the position of the Opposition on the question of "exceptionalism" and our opposition to the mechanical transference of blue print tactics from land to land without regard to the concrete conditions in each land and at each moment. The very language is our own.

Says the resolution:

"The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International instructs the Executive Committee to proceed in deciding each question from the concrete situation and specific conditions obtaining in each particular country and as a rule to avoid direct intervention in internal organizational matters of the Communist Parties. . . To assist the Communist Parties in making use of their own experience as well as the experience of the world Communist movement, avoiding, however, mechanical application of the experience of one country to another country and the substitution of stereotyped methods and general formulations for concrete Marxian analysis."

It is indeed heartening to see such words as these after six years and more during which these first principles were forgotten. They have been "out of fashion" ever since the peerless leader enunciated directly opposite views in his speeches on the American Question in 1929, a pamphlet of Stalin's which fortunately has been withdrawn from circulation.

NEW DANGERS THREATEN!

Unfortunately, there is other news from the Seventh World Congress which shows that this is no time to celebrate, no occasion for the Communist Opposition to rest on its hard won or almost won laurels. History takes strange revenge on those who have ignored and sought to defy its laws. Six or more years of sectarianism are still exacting an awful price. They have unfitted the leadership and membership of the Comintern for understanding and executing the policies for mass work they have so long rejected and villified. It is one thing to acknowledge, another to apply those policies to the tricky, shifty, changing, complicated conditions of struggle in the actual world. As we long warned, the Comintern is swinging from the Scylla of sectarianism headlong towards the Charybdis of opportunism. On many questions it is making a complete about face, a turn of 180°. From the slogan of "social fascism" it is swinging dan-

Flashlights on the Seventh World Congress of Comintern

gerously toward the slogan of "organic unity" with Social Democracy. From the rejection of the united front (under the slogan of "united front from below") it is swinging to the dangerous swamp of the non-aggression pact, which means in practice cessation of Communist agitation, surrender to Social Democracy. From refusal to work in the organized labor movement (under the slogan of "red unions") it swings over to a readiness to work in fascist unions, company unions, churches, everywhere on the same basis, making no distinction today, any more than before, between trade unions which should be built and made militant and enemy organizations which should be disrupted and destroyed.

From its slogan of "class against class," so interpreted that it prevented joint action with other working class parties and the trade unions, it has swung over to the People's Front, an alliance not merely with the Socialists but with the less reactionary sectors of the bourgeoisie (like Daladier and Herriot) on their program, with them in the leadership! The "non-aggression pact" leads to non-criticism of allies. Non-criticism leads to praise.

"Is it not evident," write Thorez, "that we can come to an agreement to safeguard peace with a party whose most eminent leaders and notably President Herriot (!) have never ceased to say and to prove their friendship for the Soviet Union." Humanite, June 30, 1935).

Does not the working class reader draw a sharp breath of pain when he sees such vile stuff in a Communist paper? What will Humanite say the day after tomorrow when France joins in a war on the Soviet Union and the French bourgeoisie calls the demagog politician Herriot, whom the Communists have helped to build, into the prime ministership? Is the C.I. sliding towards coalitionism?

"Non-aggression" leads to non-criticism; non-criticism to sycophancy; sycophancy leads to toleration; toleration leads to coalition. Error has its logic as well as truth!

In Humanite, Thorez writes:

"We say to M. Herriot and the Radical Socialist leaders, if you will take over the leadership of a radical government which really pursues a radical policy, a policy in line with the demands of the majority of the people, you can be assured of our support not only in the Chamber but also in the country."

Norman Thomas never wrote anything as shamefully opportunistic about Franklin Roosevelt (who is the American equivalent of Herriot) as this that Thorez, General Secretary of the French C.P. wrote to the French Roosevelt, Herriot! Millerand gave better pretexts in his day for support of a bourgeois government "to save the republic and win concessions for the masses." This was the touchstone of opportunist degeneration in the old Second International.

Was Thorez's declaration an accident, a momentary aberration quickly corrected? Alas no!

In the Daily Worker of July 30 we have a report of the speech of Comrade

Slansky of Czechoslovakia to the Seventh Congress, made "amid great applause." It reads:

"To maintain the Socialists' participation in the government is not an obstacle to the united front provided," emphasized Slansky, "that the Social Democrats really oppose fascism and fight for democratic rights and for the shifting of the crisis burdens on the capitalists."

So it is possible for coalition with the bourgeoisie to help the masses! Where will such tactics lead the Comintern?

THE SHADOW OF 1914

I write this article on August 4, exactly 21 years after the fatal day when German, French and other socialist leaders voted war credits, joined their bourgeois governments against the working class, pronounced the moral death of the Second International. They did it in the name of various slogans, all of them false. Some joined the Kaiser to "overthrow Czarism"; others supported the Allied bourgeoisie to "make the world safe for democracy" or to "defend small nations" like Belgium and Serbia.

Fearful coincidence. William Pieck is speaking 21 years later to the Seventh Congress of the Comintern:

"Should German fascism attempt to conquer the small European states, their war against fascism will be a righteous war which we will support." (Daily Worker, July 27, 1935).

What fuel for the fires of French imperialist chauvinism! Is the Communist International to call upon the Roumanian masses to defend Boyar-dominated, feudal-monarchist, pawn-imperialist Roumania? Shall the Yugoslavian workers lay down their lives to defend fascist Jugoslavia? Will Lithuania or Latvia or Estonia play a different role from Belgium? What dangerous sophistry to substitute the talk of small nations for the analysis of class forces, to take size as a measure of imperialist policy and governmental structure, when all the small nations of Europe are but pawns of the great imperialist powers! Have we learned nothing from the role of Belgium and Serbia in the last war? Nothing from the role of the Balkans? Nothing from the use of "self-determination for small nations" by the Versailles map-carvers in Finland, Poland, Jugoslavia, Georgia, etc.?

THE DAILY WORKER EXPLAINS

Recent issues of the Daily Worker are full of explanations that do not explain, quotations that do not illuminate, apologetics that have a fearfully reminiscent ring.

They bring in "selected" quotations, oh how carefully "selected," from Lenin: "We Marxists differ both from pacifists and anarchists in that we recognize the necessity of an historical study of each war individually . . . There have been many wars in history . . . which had a progressive character. . . . It is therefore necessary to examine the historic characteristics of the present war taken by itself."

Quotations in themselves prove nothing. Yet, quotations properly chosen, show the position of the quoted authority. Why did the Daily Worker not explain that the sentence it quoted was preliminary to proving that the European bourgeoisie, while it had waged progressive wars when it was young and revolutionary and the leading class fighting for progress, was now decrepit, decadent, reactionary and no longer capable of waging progressive wars; that today only the proletariat in struggle against its own bourgeoisie, everywhere, could turn imperialist war into civil war. re-

in danger of breaking with revolutionary principles. It is at a railway junction and has thrown the wrong switch. If it does not speedily, decisively reverse its path, it is headed for the gravest crisis in the history of the International, so grave that 1928-35 will seem insignificant in comparison.

The root of the new evil is not evil intention. Comrade Kalmen is absolutely right in his discussion article (published elsewhere in this issue) when he emphasizes that the Comintern is making its blunders with good i.e., revolutionary intentions, namely a mistaken notion of how to defend the U.S.S.R. But good intentions are not enough. The road to hell, it is notorious, is paved with the good intentions of mistaken people. Hence it is high time to reiterate a few ABC's. That we have to remind Communists of such things proves the gravity of the crisis that threatens.

SOME ABC'S

1. There is an identity of interest and unity of aim between the proletariat in power (the government) in the U.S.S.R. and the proletariat struggling for power (struggling against its government) in France, Germany, etc.

2. The unity of aim and interest does not mean an identity of tactics. (Once more there is the danger of mechanical transference).

When the Soviet Government recognizes the bourgeois government of Italy, Germany, France or enters into a trade pact, or military pact, or whatever, the Italian, French, German proletariat does not therefore "recognize" its government or enter into a pact with it. It continues its efforts to overthrow its government so that the proletariat in power will no longer be forced into such coexistence, compromise pacts.

3. The Stalin-Laval Pact was correct and an achievement of proletarian diplomacy. A declaration such as Stalin's if necessary for the pact would have been permissible for a Soviet diplomat, but was impermissible for a spokesman of the Comintern.

4. The leopard does not change its spots because it steps into the shade of a pleasant tree. French imperialism did not cease to be capitalist and imperialist any more than the Soviet Government ceased to be proletarian and socialist, when the pact was signed. As the latter entered for proletarian purposes, the former entered for its own imperialist purposes.

5. A leopard is still a carnivorous animal even if it is full and has a partially unconsumed carcass resting under its paws and "peacefully" licks its chops. There is no difference in principle between sated imperialisms and aggressive unsated ones. Since Lenin is being quoted here is his view of that:

"Assuming that the first country has three-quarters of Africa whereas the second possesses one-quarter, and that the objective meaning of their war is the redivision of Africa, which side would we wish success? . . . It is not the business of modern democracy (i.e., proletarian) either to help the first country to maintain its "right" to three-quarters of Africa, or to help the second. . . ."

6. The bourgeoisie is no longer capable of progressive wars. Even the petty-bourgeoisie in France has long revealed (since 1848) its impotence as a force struggling for bourgeois democracy.

7. It is dangerous to accuse the Hitler government controlled by Thyssen and Co. of being the sole disturber of the peace, and to exonerate by implication or otherwise the government of France

controlled by the Comite des Forges. It is dangerous to denounce the appetite for colonies and conquests on the part of Germany and to keep silent about the conquests and tyrannies of France in Somaliland, Tunis, Morocco, Indo China, etc., and its preparations to hold on, even add to its share.

8. To talk of the differences in governmental structure in France and England on the one hand, and Germany on the other, without stressing that they are all, varying degrees of bourgeois dictatorships, is to pave the way for votes of confidence in such capitalist dictatorships. Hence the confusion on coalition government. Suppose "democratic" England and dictatorial Germany are allies, what then? Have we learned nothing from the hypocritical use of the slogan of democracy in the last war.

9. We must study not merely some of the concrete circumstances of an event (Hitler Fascism, presence of Soviet Union) but all the concrete circumstances (e.g. not omit a "little detail" such as the fact that France is a great imperialist and capitalist power, the dominant one in continental Europe, and the further fact that it is an irreconcilable enemy of its "temporary and superficial" ally, the Soviet Union, and the further fact that it mercilessly exploits its own working class and colonial peoples, and the further fact that its treaty with Russia is like all bourgeois treaties, even its treaties with bourgeois countries, even, that is to say, with less mortal enemies, a mere diplomatic maneuver, a "scrap of paper," and the further fact that on the outbreak of a war, French imperialism, on its part, will establish just as ruthless and merciless a dictatorship in the name of the military totalitarian state as Hitler has).

10. If the French proletariat enters into a class peace with its bourgeoisie (merely opposing "fascist officers" but not the bourgeois army, merely opposing "reactionary administrations" but not the bourgeois government) then we can take care of our enemies but who will protect us from our friends?

Have we learned nothing from the Paris Commune, when French and German "enemy" governments united against the workers? Nothing from the world war when Entente and Central Powers united against the Soviet Union? French diplomacy will play with Soviet Alliances to further its imperialist aims, but the deadly enemy of the French as of all bourgeoisies is the Soviet Union. Utilize imperialist differences but don't depend on them, don't disarm before them, don't paralyze your most effective force, the ceaseless irreconcilable struggle of the French workers for the overthrow of the French bourgeoisie, its army and government.

Utilize diplomacy as a subordinate aid but don't forget that it is at best a precarious, secondary instrument during peace time, and insignificant in comparison with the only effective force for the defense of the Soviet Union, its own proletarian power and the power of the revolutionary workers in France, Germany and all lands. If we subordinate that to diplomacy then the Comintern and the Soviet Union are indeed in danger.

CONCLUSIONS

This is no-time for panic. We must not exaggerate the degree to which the Comintern has gotten off the rails. Its motives are those of unswerving loyalty to the proletariat and that is an asset to be counted on in fighting to correct its incipient blunders. Neither is this a time to pull our punches. We long to ease the way to the reuniting of the International for which we have fought so earnestly, and we long to rest and celebrate the victory already in sight in our struggle against ultra-leftism.

But the regime has not been changed.

(Continued on Page 4)

From Democratic Socialism To The Democratic Party

Prince Hamlet, the big dagger- and-arsenic man from Denmark, has for centuries stood as the prime exponent of hesitation and general all-around flightiness. But the old soliloquy mutterer's

It was for his activities in the American League that Matthews was suspended from the Socialist Party of New York for a year. He resigned from the American League thereupon and became the

Seventh C.I. Congress

(Continued from Page 2)

Lines are changed, made wrong, corrected, made wrong in new directions, from above, mechanically, without consultation. Mechanical transference is condemned at last in words, but persists in deeds, transference from Soviet diplomacy to French revolutionary struggle, from France to all lands. Even if there were no new errors, there could be no health till that regime were altered.

But today there are new errors, errors involving fundamentals, not tactics, errors which if persisted in, systematized and carried out in action, will provoke the gravest crisis the working class has known since August 4, 1914.

Now it is the duty of every loyal Communist to take up the fight to prevent this danger. It overshadows all others. This struggle against the danger of opportunist and chauvinist degeneration should not take as long as the not yet completed six year struggle against sectarianism. It is easier to convince revolutionaries, and the loyalites are revolutionaries, on basic principles than on problems of strategy and tactics. It dare not last so long. But it must be much more intense. Time presses. History cries aloud for a sound stand on these questions. Every day's delay is dangerous. Tomorrow, the day after, there will, there must be unity on revolutionary principles, on healthy organization, on sound tactics. But today, now, every revolutionist, every loyal Communist must rally to the Communist Opposition for an uncompromising, irreconcilable, hard-hitting struggle against the poison of opportunism before it gets absorbed into the system of the International and destroys it as the organism of revolutionary struggle. That is the task set by the Seventh Congress deliberations as so far recorded. That is the road, the only road, to Communist unity and victory.