

V. b. b.

**SPECIAL NUMBER**

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6. No. 22

25th March 1926

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

## Session of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.

Eleventh to Fourteenth Session.

(Detailed Report.)

Eleventh Session, 1st March 1926.

### Report of Comrade Lozovsky on the Immediate Tasks of the Communists in the Trade Union Movement.

#### Tempo and Development of the Labour Movement.

The post-war labour movement differs from the pre-war labour movement in that all molecular processes of change and development are a hundred times more rapid in it than in the epoch of the organic development of capitalism. That which before the war required many years and even decades to develop and to crystallise, takes place now literarily in the course of weeks and months. The tempo and development of events is at present entirely different. A strike in which a hundred thousand workers were involved was, before the war, a world event. It was talked and written about for years. At present, gigantic conflicts in which hundreds of thousands of workers participate, conflicts which take place in the remotest parts of the world have become everyday occurrences. We, ourselves, have somehow become accustomed to this tempo and development. If we are to compare the labour movement of ten years ago with the labour movement now, we can truly say that we are going forward at a terrific rate. It is this tempo and elan of the labour movement which bring with them every year a whole series of new phenomena which we must carefully study in order to be able to determine our further policy.

Only 18 months passed since the V Congress of the Comintern. Nevertheless the world trade union movement has made an enormous stride forward. During this period a whole series of tendencies made their appearance within the trade unions, there was a re-grouping of forces within the working class, and we can therefore speak of new phenomena in the world trade union movement. The new phenomena are as follows: 1. a further restriction of the political rights of the working class; 2. lowering of the standard of living of the toiling masses; 3. new forms of class collaboration; 4. increased influence of

the American Federation of Labour in the reformist trade union movement of Europe; 5. rapid pace of the development of the trade union movement in colonial and semi-colonial countries; 6. crystallisation of a Left Wing in a considerable number of reformist trade unions; 7. growing influence of the trade unions of the U. S. S. R. over the world trade union movement and a strong desire to send workers delegations to the U. S. S. R.; 8. the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee has been given a definite organisational form; 9. growing acuteness of the struggle within the Amsterdam International; 10. growing desire for unity among the workers.

The most characteristic feature of the period through which we are passing is, on the one hand, the desire of the masses for unity, and on the other hand, the new differentiation on this basis within the world trade union movement. The differentiation in the world labour movement is at present following two lines: The American and the Soviet Line. The orientation of the masses is towards the U. S. S. R., the orientation of the reformist leaders is towards America. These are the two opposite poles in the world trade union movement, just as the Soviet State and the republic of millionaires are two opposite poles.

The cause of the orientation along these two lines is the role which American capitalism and Soviet Russia have assumed in the world policy. This increasing proportional weight of two opposite and hostile systems which negate each other, reacts in a very definite manner on the toiling masses, on the trade unions and their leading cadres and creates premises for two definite orientations — the American and the Soviet orientation. The American trade union movement and the Soviet trade union movement are inimical to one another — and cancel each other — (as far as tactics and ideology are concerned) as the full blooded American imperialism and the Soviet Socialist Republics.

This is precisely the factor which determines the orientation of the masses and of the reformist leaders towards these opposite poles. The Comintern and the Communist Parties could not have adopted a correct policy if we had failed to understand the internal process going on in the world trade union movement in connection with orientation either towards America or towards the U. S. S. R.

### The Growth of Political Reaction.

The last 18 months were characterised by a further pressure on the working class. In nearly all countries the working class during the last 18 months has been on the defensive, and frequently it has even not been able to maintain its old positions and was obliged to retreat. The pressure of the bourgeoisie was above all political: bourgeois democracy is at present not at all inclined to guarantee any liberties to the working class. Even the old and much lauded constitutional Great Britain did not stand the test, and embarked on a policy of defending privileges and attacking liberties when the interests of the ruling classes came into collision with formal liberties. More and more countries are coming under a semi-fascist and reactionary regime. Just recently the ideological and political influence of Italian fascism has extended beyond Italy. The Italian example is having its influence on the bourgeoisie of all countries. Fear of Bolshevism makes the ruling classes study the doctrines of fascism. This is precisely the explanation for the growth of anti-parliamentary tendencies among the French bourgeoisie, and for the growth of fascist organisations in a considerable number of countries.

There is no doubt whatever that the main features of the last 18 months were a restriction of the political rights of the working class, a change for the worse in its political position, the mobilisation of the entire bourgeois State apparatus for the struggle against the "disintegrating" influence of Bolshevism in the labour movement, and finally, the exposure of the class nature of all the "non-class institutions" of the bourgeois State. All of this had not only a negative, but also a positive meaning.

### Lowering of the Standard of Living of the Working Class.

This political pressure on the labour movement was accompanied by strong economic pressure. The aim of the bourgeois offensive was and is to cheapen production by lowering the standard of living of the workers and by worsening their working conditions. The greater the economic difficulties in the capitalist countries, the greater the role the U. S. A. are beginning to play in world economics and the fiercer is the attack of the European bourgeoisie on the working class in its endeavour to lower the cost of production at the expense of the workers.

What form did this attack take? It took several forms. Reduction of the real wage of the workers. It is a well-known fact that the fundamental reason of the extreme tension in social relations in Great Britain is this endeavour to lower wages, and first and foremost the wages paid in the industry. We witness similar offensives in almost all the European countries. The campaign for the reduction of wages goes hand in hand with a very successful attack on the working day. There are already very few countries and very few industries where the 8-hour day is actually applied. This offensive against the working day has produced excellent results for the bourgeoisie. This is particularly noticeable in Germany. The success is so great that the British bourgeoisie is now raising in all seriousness the question of the working day. As the British bourgeoisie is as yet not strong enough to compel the working class of Great Britain to adopt a longer working day, it is taking the initiative in the convocation of an international conference for the standardisation of working hours. If the conference which it is intended to convene will express itself for the status quo, this will be one more argument for the British bourgeoisie against "its" workers. If standardisation does take place, this will be all to the good for the British bourgeoisie.

This is a very peculiar manifestation of the "internationalist" aspirations of the British bourgeoisie, called forth by the stubbornness with which the British proletariat is defending the short working day which was won at the cost of so many efforts. For several years the long working day and the cheap labour in Germany weighed heavily on the entire labour movement in Europe. The Dawes Plan which has the blessing of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, resulted first and foremost in the lengthening of the working day, which was bound — in

boomerang fashion — to lengthen the working day in other countries.

The attack on the working day was accompanied by an attack on social insurance: reducing the cost of social insurance to the employers, reducing the unemployment dole as unemployment increased, etc. Side by side with this the old taxation policy was pursued which aimed at transferring the whole burden of state expenditure and of all the consequences of the war on to the poorest sections of the population. During the last few years, the burden of taxation has considerably increased, not only in the vanquished countries, but also in the victorious countries. It suffices to mention Great Britain, France, etc.

Another form of pressure is the effort to raise the productivity of labour.

If we add to this the increasing house rent, the growing price for gas, electricity, transport, etc., we must come to the indisputable conclusion: the tendency to lower the standard of living of the working class is pursuing its course. If we classify the countries according to the change for the worse in the economic position of the workers we must give first place to Italy, then comes Poland, which is followed by Germany. The standard of living of the German workers is the ideal of the British bourgeoisie, which dreams of Germanising "its own" proletariat. Never before has the correlation of the economic position of the workers of the various countries been so evident as during the last few years. If the majority of British workers have begun an attack on the Dawes Plan, this is due to the fact that they have realised to what extent the Dawes Plan applied in Germany finds its reflex in the position of the workers of Great Britain.

### New Forms of the Economic Enslavement of the Workers.

In this connection it is a question of the efforts made by the bourgeoisie to attach to its enterprises a section of the workers by establishing all sorts of workers welfare institutions, thereby frustrating a successful economic struggle. All this, of course, takes place in the guise of charity and employers' care for the "poor" workers and their families, but the social-political meaning of this kind of institution is more than obvious. The U. S. A. are the country where the system of this kind of institution has reached the highest state of development. Over there in the most important branches of industry, every enterprise or group of enterprises has all sorts of mutual aid funds organised by the employers which ties the workers hand and foot. This kind of reaction on the workers is at present also taking place in Europe, particularly in France. Towards the middle of 1925 there were in France 176 benefit funds embracing 11,200 institutions employing 1,210,000 workers. These benefit funds paid out during the first half of 1925, 160,000,000 francs in various forms of relief. They include a grant for every child, payment at the birth of a child and payments during the nursing period, relief during sickness, etc. etc. These funds embrace only about 10% of the manual and office workers and only a small minority of the contributors to these receive relief. But nevertheless, this kind of institution contributes considerably to the weakening of working class solidarity. These funds attach a section of workers to the enterprise, for all these forms of mutual relief depend entirely on the employer. Aid is given only to good, conscientious and loyal workers, and everyone knows what this means.

This must be taken into consideration in our struggle for the improvement of the position of the working class.

### New Forms of Class Collaboration.

Simultaneously with the pressure of the employers on the working class, with the adoption of new forms of its enslavement and with the discovery of new forms and methods to get a certain section of workers interested in the prosperity of the enterprises, new forms of class collaboration have made their appearance and have taken a concrete form. They surpass everything which has hitherto been done in this direction. These forms of class collaboration hail from America. America is now the promised land for the present collaboration between workers and employers. It is a well-known fact that even the "Gompers" Unions could not exist in the American heavy industry. The employers themselves are forming mixed unions (company unions). The character of these organisations varies. In some enterprises workers elect the committees into which, subsequently, the same number of employers' representatives are included. In other enterprises the two chamber system is adopted: the workers elect the lower chamber and the employers the upper cham-

ber. All these organisations have a well-developed relief system, they also have their own press, the be-all and end-all of which is praise of the generosity of the employers and of their care for their workers, etc.

However, America is just now the arena for a number of new phenomena which are beginning to find their way to Europe. These new phenomena are as follows: agreement between the trade unions and employers, concerning increased productivity of labour, the trade unions making themselves responsible for this. This kind of agreement is known in America under the title of B. & O. Plan (Baltimore and Ohio Plan), after the name of the railway where such an agreement was first made. In this respect the trade unions are drivers, in the literal sense of the word, who get out of the workers as much as can be squeezed out of them.

In order to achieve definite results mixed "industrial conferences" are organised, and in this question the trade unions closely collaborate with the employers with respect to a further increase of the productivity of labour and with respect to a more or less rational — from the point of view of the employers — organisation of labour.

Then there is in America great enthusiasm for labour banks, these banks being labour banks only in name. In a considerable number of these banks the employers have a considerable number of shares and play a very big role on the Managing Boards. These banks own a number of enterprises and it has frequently happened that enterprises belonging to this kind of labour banks employ only unorganised workers, and this is done not only with the consent, but by direct orders of the trade union leaders. One can well imagine what kind of labour banks they are and what kind of labour policy these banks can have.

But this is not all. These banks which are connected with the entire banking system of the U. S. A., are, generally speaking, auxiliary capitalist institutions. Trade union money deposited in these banks is invested in all sorts of shares and bonds, and this is how the "socialisation" of the entire economics of America is achieved.

The only "benefit" derived from these labour banks is — that the trade union upper stratum has been freed from any control on the part of the workers. Trade union members play only the role of depositors. Their business is to deposit their money in the bank. When the trade unions did not have at their disposal this kind of institution, the leading upper stratum was to a certain extent dependent on the rank and file contributors of membership fees. But when trade unions have capital at their disposal, when they participate in speculation and profit by it, leaders have enough money to be able afford to carry on the policy which suits them best. Labour banks and all other financial institutions attached to the trade unions free the bureaucratic upper stratum of any control on the part of the rank and file members of the union, and this is really the whole substance of these banks.

We witness at present in Germany a great inclination to adopt the American forms of class collaboration. The German Reformists are endeavouring to place their new American orientation on a philosophical theoretical foundation. There is just now in Germany a very popular and widespread catchword: "Economic Democracy". There has been already for several years a great deal of talk about this economic democracy, and the more it is talked about the less — as everyone knows — is it making itself felt. Economic democracy is workers' collaboration in the economy of the country, "equality of rights" as between capital and labour, of course with the retention of the entire economic and political power in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Under the title "The Economic Emancipation of the Working class", the organ of the metal workers, published on May 16th, 1925, an article which welcomed enthusiastically the organisation of labour banks, making the following statement on this subject:

"This means freeing ourselves from the chains of the capitalist methods of production."

The same metal workers' organ writes as follows about the Baltimore & Ohio-Plan: "From the purely trade union viewpoint one cannot underestimate the positive results of this system. An ever increasing number of workers attend the meetings of the local trade union branches. Trade union life is gaining an interest and substance and its development is positively magnificent (!). It is self-evident that this wealth of thought, this continuous seeking of new ways for the perfecting of

production is a regular gold mine for the employers. Of course workers also profit by it, for according to the agreement employers must share their profits with them."

Thus the Social Democrats who reproached the Russian unions for participating in production for their share in the improvement of the Soviet economic system, the same Social Democrats who blame the Soviet Union for endeavouring to raise the productivity of Labour and the productivity of the enterprises of the Workers' State, talk enthusiastically about the workers' endeavours to raise productivity of labour in America and demand that this plan should also be applied in Germany.

This entire new ideology is so curious that I will take the liberty to give a couple of quotations from the works of a theorist of the German trade union movement.

In his "Sociology of the Trade Union Movement" (1925) Karl Zwing gives expression to the following remarkable idea: "The equality of the fundamental economic factors — capital and labour — the former of which predominates at present over the latter, must be achieved. The theory and practice of the trade union movement must endeavour in the current epoch to make labour an entity of equal value."

In order to prove that this is the only path to be pursued by the labour movement, the same "Sociologist" of the German trade union movement arrives at the following amazing conclusion: "One must bear in mind that the working class is part of the capitalist system. The downfall of this system will be its downfall. There can be no life and death struggle between two active economic forces."

I do not think that we need enter into a controversy with this "sociologist". These few quotations are quite enough for us to understand that in Germany Gompersism has supplanted Marxism. We can see what this new orientation represents. We have before us an utterly bourgeois philosophy and practice transferred to the toiling masses, a philosophy and practice resting on a section of the working class and separating the latter from its direct, concrete and most important tasks. The struggle against this ideology and practice is one of the most important tasks of all the Communist Parties and of the Comintern.

#### Rapid Development of the Trade Union Movement in the Colonial and Semi-Colonial Countries.

A characteristic feature of the last eighteen months is the considerable growth of the workers' trade union organisations in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. This was very vividly shown in 1925 by the actions of the Chinese proletariat. As you know, the Chinese revolution began in 1911, but it is only in 1925 that it began to develop and to assume a special character. The explanation for this is — that in 1925 the Chinese proletariat and its trade union organisations appeared in the arena in the role of determinate champions of the labour movement. It is only a few years ago that the Chinese trade unions came into being. They had to work all the time under extremely difficult conditions. Death sentence for leadership of trade unions was a quite usual occurrence in China. Nevertheless the young labour movement was able during the last few years to form its own organisations, it was able to strengthen its unions and to take such energetic action against British and Japanese imperialism, that the correlation of forces underwent a change in favour of the national liberation movement. A strong proletarian character was given to the national liberation movement of China by the gigantic Shanghai, Hongkong and Tientsin strikes. These strikes showed that the Chinese proletariat is the most consistent and the most active enemy of the imperialist powers. These actions were a surprise not only to the enemies of the working class, but — we must admit — also to the friends of the Chinese proletariat and the Chinese revolution. Very few people have an idea how much revolutionary energy and strength is latent in the working class of China.

The action of the Chinese proletariat has given a new development to the national liberation movement of China, and this is the most important point in the recent events. We have in China a bona-fide trade union movement. It is true that it finds itself as yet in a very difficult position. In comparison with its population, China has not a very big proletariat. Moreover, an enormous part of China is still occupied by the forces of the counter-revolutionary generals. But nevertheless there are in most industrial centres well organised trade unions, which, side by side with the struggle against British and Japanese impe-

rialism, carry on a relentless fight for a human existence and for the consolidation and perfecting of their organisations.

The Chinese trade unions, which a few years ago counted their members by tens of thousands, have now a membership of about one million. Moreover, they are growing fast wherever the People's Army is victorious. One example will be sufficient. Only a few months ago the People's Army occupied Tientsin, the industrial centre of China, and now, three to four months later, there are already 50,000 organised workers in Tientsin, a trade union weekly organ is published, etc. The same thing happens also in other centres of China. I must draw your attention to the fact that the Chinese workers, in their struggle against imperialism, are using peculiar methods which are quite new. For instance, when the strike broke out in Hongkong about 100,000 workers were moved from Hongkong to Canton. This dealt a severe and irreparable blow to Hongkong — the Far-Eastern centre of British imperialism.

We have before us a young labour movement which is rapidly developing and is conscious of its strength. It would be the greatest mistake to underestimate the importance of this movement for the world labour movement. We must study this new movement, we must try to understand that the action of the Chinese proletariat is the most important event after the October Revolution. It has dealt imperialism a severe blow. This action means that the army of the world revolution has been reinforced, and therefore it deserves our consideration.

During the last year or two the labour movement in the other colonial and semi-colonial countries has also received an impetus. The gigantic strikes in India are no doubt a new page in the labour movement of this "pearl of the British Crown". Last year we witnessed an acute struggle for the reconstruction of revolutionary unions in Tunis, of the unions which were destroyed by the French Government. In spite of the insurrection, and just when it is at its height, trade unions are being formed in Syria. In Indonesia the workers are carrying on a stubborn struggle for the preservation of their trade union organisations, for their extension and consolidation.

If it were not for the Soviet Press and the Soviet press agencies, the capitalist press would have no doubt organised a conspiracy of silence regarding China, and it would have been an easy matter for British imperialism to strangle the Chinese people. The age-long gagging and censorship of the colonial and semi-colonial people is being raised now by the Soviet press and partly by the Communist press of all countries. But not enough is done in this direction, and we must the attention of all our Communist Parties to this matter.

Of course, this applies particularly to the Communist Parties of countries with colonial possessions.

#### International Reformism and the Chinese Revolution.

Whilst the Comintern and the Profintern, the Communist Parties and revolutionary trade union were doing their utmost to help the Chinese proletariat in its struggle, international reformism revealed itself during these events as the aider and abettor of imperialist powers. When the Shanghai workers began the struggle, they appealed to the Profintern and the Amsterdam International for help. The Profintern did everything it could.

More than that; the Executive Committee of the Comintern and the Executive Bureau of the Profintern approached the Second and the Amsterdam Internationals with the proposal to organise joint aid for the struggling workers of China. No reply was received to this proposal from Amsterdam. A few weeks later we could read in the Bulletin of the Amsterdam International the following enigmatic statement: "For various considerations the proposal of the Comintern and Profintern concerning joint help for the Chinese workers could not be accepted." What these "various considerations" were, the Amsterdam International did not take the trouble to explain. I must say I find it difficult to understand what considerations can prevent giving joint help to struggling workers. There is only one consideration — disinclination to help. Other considerations do not exist. That the refusal rested on disinclination to help is shown by the resolution (end of June 1925) adopted by the Amsterdam International in answer to the appeal of the Chinese trade unions. The resolution contains the statement: "To ask the Chinese trade union organisations known to him (to whom?) for information with respect to the desirability or possibility of giving help and to what extent." This reply is truly unique: the Chinese workers are appealing for help, they send radio tele-

grams, and the Amsterdam International is in doubt if help is needed.

During the strike of the Bombay Textile Workers (end of 1925) the Amsterdam International appealed to its organisations for assistance for the Bombay strikers. The concluding sentences of the appeal of the Amsterdam International offers an explanation for the reason of the sudden sympathy for colonial workers: They are as follows: "We hope that the trade union movement of India will soon reach a stage of development which will enable it to enter the international trade union movement as a full-fledged member."

The distinction made by the Amsterdam International between the trade union movement of China and the trade union movement of India can easily be explained. The Chinese trade union movement has entered upon the path of revolutionary struggle. The case is different in India. These moderate people are at the head of the trade unions. With respect to India one can expect a return for assistance rendered in the shape of the affiliation of the Indian trade unions to the Amsterdam International, which would restore its waning prestige. This is the explanation for the unheard of cynicism of the leaders of the Amsterdam International with respect to China. Wherever it smells of revolution, Amsterdam, in the best case, washes its hands of it.

The events in China and the appeal of the Chinese proletariat for help drew an expression of opinion from a number of organisations affiliated to the Amsterdam International. Perhaps the most remarkable statement is that of the A. D. G. B. (Allgemeiner Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund, German General Federation of Trade Unions). The reformists at the head of the German trade unions in their manifesto concerning the Chinese events, write, among other things, as follows: "The administration of the A. D. G. B. express the desire that the sanguinary events will stir the conscience of the representatives of European civilisation in China, and will indicate to them their moral duty to put an end, in agreement with the Chinese proletariat, to conditions of labour which are a disgrace to culture." Is there anything more pathetic than this appeal to the conscience of the representatives of European civilisation, can there be anything more remarkable than this appeal to the imperialists to do their moral duty?

I could give scores of examples when, openly and unashamedly, the leaders of trade unions and of Social Democratic parties speak of the necessity of the "economic modernisation" (colonisation) of China when, instead of attacking the imperialists they indulge in exposing "Bolshevik conspiracies" in China and in discovering a "national-Bolshevik tendency in the Chinese Revolution" (Jouhaux). This is how international reformism responded to the appeal for help on the part of the Chinese proletariat. This is how the Amsterdam International and the Sections affiliated to it responded to the struggle of the Chinese proletariat against imperialism. It will be as well to mention here that the Amsterdam International has no opinion whatever with respect to the war in Morocco and Syria. It is silent as if it were tongue-tied, in spite of the grandiose resolutions against war in general. Why is Amsterdam silent? Ask the Swiss Social Democrats. The newspaper "Berner Tagwacht" gives the answer: Because the first vice-President of the Amsterdam International, Leon Jouhaux, does not want any mention made about the war in Morocco and Syria.

But the Reformists are not always so passive when the colonies are concerned. They do not always confine themselves to resolutions appealing to moral duty. They become very active when it is a question of organising counter-action to the growth of revolutionary ideas in the colonies, when it is necessary to defend the civilisation of their countries against "backward and savage barbarians". With respect to this the Vice-President of the Amsterdam International, Leon Jouhaux, played a very characteristic role in the suppression of the revolutionary trade union movement in Tunis. The Left Confederation of Labour which was formed in Tunis was destroyed after Monsieur Jouhaux's visit. The leaders of this Confederation were sent to prison, were charged with conspiracy and were condemned. Many of them were expelled from their country. Jouhaux's role in this affair was worse than contemptible. The revolutionary movement was destroyed not only with the moral, but even with the material co-operation of the leaders of the reformist trade union movement of France.

Just at present the leaders of the Labour Party of Great Britain are actively engaged in shaping the labour movement

in India. On the initiative of the British Fabian Society has been formed in India. A number of prominent members of the Labour Party have gone to India and are making speeches there against Bolshevism, Communism and every kind of Left movements and tendencies. Thus we see that the Reformists become very active whenever it is a question of sabotaging the revolutionary trade union movement, whenever it is necessary to assist the bourgeoisie. But they are extremely passive when it is a question of helping the workers in the colonies to throw off the yoke of their exploiters. The labour movement of the colonies cannot expect any help except from the Comintern and the Profintern.

#### The Formation of a Left Wing in the Reformist Trade Unions.

The most distinguishing feature of the modern world trade union movement, is — the birth of a new opposition. Within the organisations affiliated to the Amsterdam International there had always been a revolutionary opposition headed by the Communist Parties. There is not a single reformist organisation without Communist influence within it. The repeated decisions of the Comintern concerning the obligatory nature of work in reformist trade unions have resulted in the Communist Parties having everywhere a more or less well-organised minority which carries on the policy and tactics of the Communist Party in the trade union movement. But at present, side by side with this organised revolutionary wing, a new opposition has sprung up which occupies a position between the Right and the extreme Left Wing. Ideologically this new opposition is not homogeneous, it is extremely heterogeneous, it has no uniform platform or tactics. But nevertheless it is getting hold of one country after another and has fairly strong bases in all organisations, and its stronghold is Great Britain.

The British Labour Movement is now going through a revolutionising stage. This revolutionising of the British proletariat is entirely due to the economic decline of the British Empire, to the shrinkage of the market for British goods, to the growing competition of the U. S. A., etc. The objective conditions which interfere with the normal development of the British economic system and which consequently increase the pressure on the working class, give rise to serious discontent among the masses, which finds its reflex in the leading upper strata.

Left tendencies, discontent with the policy of the Right Wing have existed already before. It made its appearance for the first time after the occupation of the Ruhr and the inactivity of the Amsterdam International in connection with it. Subsequently it found a reflex even within the leading organs of the Amsterdam International where the British are occupying a Left position.

When the official representatives of the British trade unions came forward with a new policy, this found an echo in all countries. Analogous tendencies began to spring up and these tendencies we generally designate by the term "opposition".

What is the characteristic of the opposition in all the reformist unions, including the leading nucleus of the trade union movement of Great Britain? Its characteristic is: 1. Recognition of the futility of the old policy of the Amsterdam International; 2. desire to form a united front with the Soviet Trade Unions; 3. endeavour to preserve the unity of the trade union movement on a national scale; 4. the slogan of the re-establishment of unity in the world trade union movement; 5. dissatisfaction with coalition with the bourgeoisie; 6. the desire to form a united front to the Left, with the Left Wing of the labour movement; 7. rejection of class collaboration. Such are the characteristics which will be found to a varying degree and in different combinations in every opposition.

In spite of lack of co-ordination and its lack of organisation on an international scale, the opposition represents at the present juncture a factor to be reckoned with: on the one side the majority of the General Council of the British Trade Unions, and on the other side groups which are springing up in a considerable number of countries in sympathy with this policy and going by the name of unity groups. These groups are beginning to publish unity organs, at the head of which are members of the Second and the Amsterdam Internationals. A section of the members of these Internationals rally and organise themselves around these organs. These are already several such organs: "Trade Union Unity" in Great Britain, "L'Unité" in Belgium, "Einheit" in Holland and "Einheit" in Germany. Analogous tendencies and groups exist also in the reformist trade unions of France, Czechoslovakia, Austria

and Sweden, and it goes without saying that there, too, attempts will be made to give an ideological form to the opposition which has sprung up. The very nature of this opposition and the titles of its organs show that the central idea of all these oppositions is unity of the national and international trade union movement.

What must be our attitude to this oppositional movement? There is no doubt whatever that the oppositional movement has not put into proper shape and form. There are still in the actions of many of its leaders relics and traditions of an ideology alien to us. But in spite of the lack of adequate forms, lack of ideological clarity and consistency in these groups, Communists have no occasion to adopt hostile attitude to them or to act against them. On the contrary, we must support their work, we must co-operate with them and must support them to our utmost to increase their influence in order that new sections of workers be enlisted for the idea of the united front and of unity. Every tendency within reformist economic and political organisations which is in opposition to the policy of these organisations must have our wholehearted support. Hitherto, our main failing on this field was, that we frequently made the same demands on these tendencies as on Communists. We must not ask of them what is impossible for them to carry out, we can form a bloc with them by adopting an acceptable concrete and definite programme of action. This programme will not include our slogans (for instance, proletarian dictatorship, the Soviet system, etc.), but this does not mean that we cannot come to an agreement with them and form a bloc with them. They are our allies. If we did not do that all our talk about the united front would be a soap bubble.

This opposition is heterogeneous and varied in its composition and ideology, our attitude to it is as heterogeneous and varied. In some countries our followers are organised separately and endeavour to establish a united front and unity of action with the opposition outside the sphere of our organisational influence. An example of this is Great Britain, where the Minority Movement is organisationally and ideologically under the leadership of followers of the Profintern. Moreover, this Minority Movement keeps in contact with all the opposition elements.

Another form of mutual relations is represented by the Left Wing in Sweden, where Communists, Left Social Democratic and non-Party elements have formed altogether such a bloc. The nature of our mutual relations must depend in every country on the prevailing situation and conditions, and must be based on as close a connection as possible for action with all elements who are for the united front to the left and for unity in the national and international trade union movement.

#### Growing Influence of the Soviet Trade Unions and Growing Desire to Send Workers' Delegations to the U. S. S. R.

A characteristic feature of this new opposition within the reformist trade unions is its struggle for the recognition of the Soviet Trade Unions and its desire to establish fraternal relations with the Soviet proletariat. This show that ever-growing sections of workers are showing more and more interest in the U. S. S. R. This is due on the one hand to the rapid economic development in the U. S. S. R. and on the other hand to the growing deterioration of the economic position of the workers in the capitalist countries.

For the same reason there is a tremendous desire among the workers to send delegations to the U. S. S. R. Workers all over the world are interested in the life and activities of the working class and of the trade unions of Soviet Russia. This desire to know more about Soviet Russia has led to workers' delegations visiting the U. S. S. R. in order to see for themselves the state of affairs there. The characteristic feature of these delegations is that the majority of them are not official (except the British delegation), as the official centres, namely, the Amsterdamers are most decidedly and emphatically sabotaging any rapprochement between the workers of the West and the workers of the U. S. S. R.

Another characteristic feature of these delegations is their eagerness to learn how the Russian proletariat managed to get out of the terrible conditions in which it found itself in the period of the civil war. They are first and foremost interested in our economic system and in the position occupied by the trade unions. Having studied everything on the spot they begin to

understand what proletarian dictatorship is and what is the value of bourgeois democracy. What deserves mention is the sabotaging of these visits of these workers delegations by the Social Democracy and its eagerness for unfavourable reports about the U.S.S.R. It is a well-known fact that the Social Democrats go in for a systematic sabotaging of these trips to Russia, and lately they have been laying down conditions: "We will go to the U.S.S.R. if we are allowed to take with us whom we like as interpreters." And their interpreters they select from among the Russian Mensheviks, wishing thereby to legalise their colleagues in the U.S.S.R. I would like to draw your attention to the recent attack made by the President of the American Federation of Labor, William Green, on the delegations to the U.S.S.R. As soon as committees for the organisation of such delegations began to spring up in the U.S.A., this worthy successor of black hundred Gompers issued a venomous manifesto containing such gems as this:

"The plan to send delegations to Russia is not in the interests of the wage earners of the U.S.A., neither is it in the interests of the people as a whole. It is in the interests of the few Communists eager to retain power in Russia, in order that its influence should spread to the other nations of the world.

Not a single loyal trade union will help or give support to the nefarious plan. No contributions of any kind should be made towards this iniquitous affair."

Is it worth while to enter into polemics with this working class bourgeois who is frightened out of his wits? Certainly not. He surpassed everything which could have been said by the reptile press.

You know that the entire bourgeois and Social Democratic press eagerly picks up the least unfavourable expression used by any of the delegates against the U.S.S.R. Some delegates were promised good pay if on their return they would write their impressions, — of course in the spirit desirable to the client. Well, one of the Social Democratic delegates Gustav Müller-Weimar, on this return to Germany, published in the "Metallarbeiter-Zeitung" a fairly lengthy feuilleton in which, side by side with the fantastic assertion that in the U.S.S.R. "workers freedom of movement has been entirely abolished, that not a single worker has the right (!) to throw up his job when he so wishes and to look for another situation", we also find such a statement as that: "But one thing is certain: the Russian Government is doing its utmost to create something better and moreover, Russian Communists are quite different fellows to the German twaddlers who call themselves Communists." From this article we see how two souls are contending with each other in the breast of every working class Social Democrat. On the one hand — loyalty to Social Democratic ideas about the U.S.S.R., and on the other hand — admiration for the Russian Revolution. To an overwhelming majority of Social Democratic workers the path to the united front in their country leads via Moscow. These workers do not believe their own Communists, especially the ultra-left (in Germany this was the period of the Ruth Fischer policy). Hence the conviction that the path to the united front in Berlin, London and Prague, frequently goes via Moscow. This round about way is frequently the shortest between Social Democratic and Communist workers — such is the influence and the result of the Revolution.

#### Anglo-Soviet Unity Committee.

These new moods among the workers of capitalist countries have found their expression in the formation of the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee. The Anglo-Russian Unity Committee undoubtedly signifies a definite step along the path of development of the International Trade Union Movement. It did not spring up all at once, and its very inauguration met with very serious resistance on the part of the reactionary elements within the British Trade Union Movement and particularly on the part of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals.

After the delegation of the British Trade Unions had visited the U.S.S.R. (the end of 1924) the entire International Social Democracy raised an unprecedented hue and cry against the British Delegation and against the Soviet Trade Unions. The preliminary agreement concluded at that time in Moscow was met with bared teeth, for the reformists at once understood what danger this rapprochement between the British and Soviet Trade Unions constituted for their future policy. As a matter of fact the Soviet Trade Unions are the most important organi-

sations and the foundation of the R.I.L.U.: The British Trade Unions are one of the most important organisations of the Amsterdam International. If two organisations of two Internationals can find a platform for agreement, if they can jointly work out a plan of practical activities, why then could not the R.I.L.U. and Amsterdam form a united front for achieving definite concrete tasks? It was just this that provoked the anger of International Social Democracy, which for a period of many months sang a hymn of hate against the British Delegation and the Soviet Trade Unions, predicting that nothing would come out of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

When the first report of the British Delegation appeared, it was no less a person than Friedrich Adler who called it a "dishonest book", while the "Vorwärts" described the declaration of the Anglo-Russian Committee as a "shameful document". This characterisation above all goes to show the degree of panic of the reformists in connection with the agreement that had been arrived at. There was even a time when they hoped that the Congress of British Trade Unions in Scarborough would not ratify the preliminarily concluded agreement, and speculated on the informal and unofficial nature of this committee. But after the British Trade Union Congress at Scarborough ratified it, the opponents had to take up another position and commenced a fierce bombardment of the Anglo-Russian Committee with all available reformist weapons and attempted to drive a wedge between the British and Soviet Trade Unions.

At the same time the inauguration of the Anglo-Russian Committee evoked great enthusiasm amongst the wide masses. A number of organisations (Norway, Finland) gave their adherence to this committee, if not formally, at least in principle. In all countries unity groups began to appear who had the support of the activity of the Anglo-Russian Committee as the main point of their programme. All this signifies that the Anglo-Russian Committee responds to the demand of the epoch, it reflects the demand of the masses for unity, the desire of the conscious workers to find organisational forms for this unity and to turn from words to deeds. It is true the Anglo-Russian Committee unites only a section of the organised workers, but if we bear in mind that the Anglo-Russian Committee now represents about 13 million workers, and that it has the active support of the Comintern and the Profintern, that within all reformist trade unions there are considerable minorities who have already spoken in favour of the Anglo-Russian Committee; then it becomes perfectly clear that the overwhelming majority of the organised International proletariat are now already on the side of this committee.

But here a question arises: Why does it just happen to be the British Trade Union Movement which is the first to have come to an agreement with the Unions of the U.S.S.R.? Why not the German? Is the position of the German proletariat better than the position of the British proletariat? No. This is to be explained by the fact that the reactionary Social Democratic and Trade Union machine is pulling the German labour movement toward America, whereas the bureaucratic machine of the British labour movement is less permeated with Social Democratic practice and has proved to be more sensitive to the aspirations of the masses and closer connected with the masses than the German bureaucracy. Therein lies the reason for the swing round of the majority of the leaders of the proletariat, towards the U.S.S.R. and the swing round of the German Trade Unions bureaucracy, despite the will of the German proletariat, towards America.

#### Struggle of Tendencies within the Amsterdam International.

The formation of the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee, the stream of workers' delegations to the U.S.S.R., the growth of opposition moods within all unions, the worsening of the position of the working class and the quest for a new way out — all these factors, taken together, have to a considerable degree sharpened the struggle within the Amsterdam International and the organisations affiliated to it. The Amsterdam International is passing through a phase of crises, of internal frictions and discussions, and although this is all covered up by smooth and polite phrases, nevertheless inside Amsterdam all is not calm and tranquil.

In what direction are the growing friction and the growing differentiations developing? At the present time several points of divergence are observable: 1. the attitude to the Soviet Union; 2. the attitude towards the International Labour Office and the League of Nations; 3. United front with the bourgeoisie or with

the Communists; 4. how to struggle against the deterioration of the economic position of the workers and to drive back the offensive of reaction; 5. attitude towards the struggle of the colonial peoples for their liberation. These are the main questions which are having repercussion within the Amsterdam International and its organisations, which are shaking its very foundations and making the most keen-witted people think over things and find a reply. The workers cannot be satisfied by official wellbeing and a policy of waiting for something to turn up. The leaders of the Amsterdam International are placing all their hopes on the International Labour Office, on the League of Nations, and are awaiting some kind of miracle from the conferences of all kinds summoned by governments. Having duly sanctified the Dawes Plan, the Amsterdam International, through its leaders is now singing the praises of Locarno: "The Locarno Pact" — gushes Oudegeest — "is the first stone in the construction of a new peace (what about Versailles?). Locarno is one of the most important steps towards the formation of the United States of Europe. Locarno means the commencement of a new era, for which a labour movement has always fought..." This triumphant poem to Briand and to Chamberlain excellently characterises the mood of the Amsterdam leaders. These latter are looking for consoling phenomena where there are none, if only to embellish the unpleasant truth, if only to shirk the direct tasks which are now facing the working class.

I do not intend giving here an exposition of the various stages of struggles, of the "waiting and seeing", of the discussions, friction, and the statements of various Amsterdam leaders against one another, and so on. I will only point out that the secretary of the Amsterdam International, Oudegeest, threatened the chairman Purcell, that if he continues his policy any further, all relations with him will be broken off! This is a proof of anything except normal relations and well-being.

We do not attach any particularly great significance to all kinds of combinations, disputes, mutual discontent, polemics and the like among the Olympiads. We are more than anything interested in the mood of the masses of rank and file members. And indeed if we come down from these upper heights and look below at what is going on in the ranks of the Amsterdam organisations, we shall see that the majority of workers in every country is undoubtedly in favour of unity, of agreement with the Soviet unions, and if these moods have not been able to find their expression, this is only because the working class masses have been suffocated by the Social Democrat trade union bureaucratic apparatus, which is pulling the working masses away from the U. S. S. R. and unity.

#### Increase of American Federation of Labour Influence on European Trade Union movement.

Together with the weakening of European capitalism, the growth of Left Wing moods among the workers arising therefrom, the attraction of the workers of all countries to the U. S. S. R. and the simultaneous increase of the specific gravity of American imperialism, there has also grown the influence of the American Federation of Labour on European reformism. The correlation between the influence of the trade union organisations in the International and of the respective states in the world consortium of powers is a tradition of reformism. The last few years have brought out the growing power of American capitalism, and because of this the interest of the reformists for the American Trade Union Movement has increased to a considerable degree. The reformist leaders, faced in Europe with a fairly strong Communist movement and the leftward trend of the working masses, have begun to look for support throughout the whole world and cast their eyes on the methods which the leading oligarchy of the American Trade Union Movement applies in the struggle for maintaining its influence and affirming its rule.

There was a time when the American Federation of Labour enjoyed no authority at all in European Social Democratic circles. Those times have past. It is just this that characterises the evolution of International Social Democracy — this fact that it retreated further and further and continues retreating from socialist principles; and in the measure that it forgot Socialist theory and practice it approached nearer to the reactionary American Federation of Labour. Reformism has once more discovered America, and the interest of the leaders of

European reformism for America has increased particularly during the last two years in connection with the Leftward trend that has become apparent in the British Labour Movement. The more the British labour movement went to the Left, thereby weakening the ranks of the Amsterdam International, the more sharply did the reformists reveal their gravitation towards America, whilst the Amsterdam International started a flirtation with the American Federation of Labour and attempts were made to bring America back into Europe. It should be remembered that the A. F. of L. took a fairly active part in European affairs at the time peace was concluded and directly after the war; Samuel Gompers was chairman of the Labour Commission of the League of Nations. He was also one of the founders of the Amsterdam International, from which the A. F. of L. withdrew owing to the Amsterdam International being too "revolutionary and Left". The leaders of the Amsterdam International vainly tried to convince Gompers that they were not revolutionary and not Left, that the Socialism in their resolutions was not Socialism and was by no means of an obligatory nature for all members of the Amsterdam International — and Gompers departed from Europe.

This, of course, did not merely by chance coincide with the departure of the American Government for a short time from European affairs. Now the American trade union bureaucracy is once more beginning to be interested in European affairs, expressing sympathy for the leaders of the Amsterdam International in the disasters and misfortunes which have befallen it. Directly and indirectly the leaders of the Amsterdam International have attempted to bring the A. F. of L. inside its ranks. Special delegations were sent for this purpose, but up to now nothing practical has resulted therefrom, although the sympathy of the American stalwarts is undoubtedly on the side of European reformism.

This hunt for the Americans is also to serve as a basis for refusing to negotiate with the Soviet trade unions. At one of the meetings of the General Council of the Amsterdam International in December 1925, Frank Hodges stated that the affiliation of the A. F. of L. to the Amsterdam International would have tremendous significance in view of the growing influence of America on the economics of the whole world, and that this affiliation would be a much more important event than the recognition of the Amsterdam constitution on the part of the Russians. Other Amsterdam leaders have also frequently spoken on the same lines, promising the Americans full autonomy and all kinds of political privileges and privileges on principle...

These quests for aid from across the herring pond, the attempts to draw the A. F. of L. into the European movement as an arbitrator, at any rate testifies to the fact that reformism is already feeling that it is not sufficiently strong in Europe.

#### The Amsterdammers and Fascism.

Another factor that has made itself apparent during the last 18 months is the absolute bankruptcy of reformism in the face of reaction and fascism. There was a time once when the reformists threatened that by their democratic methods they would be able to overcome fascism. They have displayed such flexibility and such capability of becoming adapted to fascism as would have been hard to believe. In this respect what is very instructive is the policy of the leaders of the Italian Federation of Labour, who during the period of rise of the labour movement in 1920 formed the R. I. L. U. together with us and afterwards during the time of the victory of fascism, sank to the level of boot-blacks of Mussolini.

Italian reformism has proved to be so impotent, that it could not offer any resistance whatsoever even to the destruction of its own organisations. In vain did the reformists adapt themselves, in vain did they come down upon the Communists with disciplinary measures in order to please the Fascists. When they had done all their dirty work, fascism declared a monopoly for the fascist corporations and simply closed down all the reformist organisations. At that time three tendencies were in formation amongst the reformist leaders: one was for further adaptation, another for a beautiful death and the third for transferring the centre abroad. Thus there was not a single tendency in Italian reformism which was in favour of a persistent, systematic, ruthless struggle against fascism, even if only to maintain the existence of the trade unions.

A fairly large number of reformists, commencing with **D'Aragona**, became adapted to fascism. Some of them directly entered the services of fascism and assumed the role of commissars of the various unions, while the **secretary of the printers, Bruno**, who went over to the side of the fascists, argued that it was necessary to come to agreement with "highly respected" **Mussolini**, as "it was necessary to save the entire mutual aid system which had been created by the printers throughout a long number of years, and which would have been destroyed if I (Bruno) had not agreed to taking such a step as this". The reformists, by the way, not only adapted themselves, but they displayed firmness and strength of will against — sedition in general and the Communists in particular. At the very height of the breaking up of the trade unions, they themselves liquidated the local labour chambers, which are the centres of initiative and for rallying forces in the localities, and began excluding the Communists. Thus, for the Amsterdamers the main enemy even now is not fascism but Communism, and this at a time when the Communists — even on the acknowledgement of the enemies of Communism — are the most consistent and the most intransigent fighters against the fascist dictatorship.

But at that time we not only witnessed the moral and political bankruptcy of Italian reformism. The bankruptcy of the **Amsterdam International** also was no less manifestly displayed here. Directly after the fascist monopoly had been declared and the reformist organisations began to be broken up, the **R.I.L.U.** appealed to the **Amsterdam International** with a proposal to organise a joint campaign in defence of the Italian trade unions, which, it will be remembered, are affiliated to the **Amsterdam International**. **Amsterdam** did not give any reply to this proposition. It acted independently and this action consisted in the representatives of the **Amsterdam International** tabling motion at the **International Labour Office** to discuss the question of the situation of the trade union organisations in Italy at the next meeting. For the sake of justice, we are bound to say that they attained a tremendous success. It was decided to put this question on the agenda of the session of the **International Labour Bureau** in 1927!

Besides this, the Amsterdamers passed a resolution in which they reminded the Italian premier that the Versailles Treaty contains a section XIII, which guarantees freedom to the trade union organisations "of the high contracting parties". This reminder that the Versailles treaty, in addition to its direct intention is also a "Magna Charta" for the workers was probably a cause of considerable mirth to the renegade **Mussolini**.

That is how the **Amsterdam International** fought against fascism, and how the Italian reformists are fighting the destruction of their own organisations. Could one imagine a greater moral and political fall than that? Could there be a bigger capitulation before our enemies than a voluntary forsaking of the struggle for the liberty of trade union organisations, for the liberty of the working class to organise? There could hardly be found anything more shameful in the history of the international labour movement.

#### The All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and Amsterdam.

The mutual relations between the **A.U.C.T.U.** and the **Amsterdam International** have already a fairly long history. There was a time when international Social Democracy and the leaders of **Amsterdam** in general denied the existence of trade unions in the **U.S.S.R.** It became a hackneyed phrase amongst the reformists of all countries that in Soviet Russia no trade unions existed, but that there are state institutions bearing the name of trade unions, and therefore, the **Amsterdam International** "did not recognise" the Soviet trade unions. This coincided — of course, not by chance — with the period of non-recognition of Soviet Russia on the part of the capitalist world. However, as the capitalist countries one by one were compelled to recognise the Soviet Union, as the importance of the **U.S.S.R.** in world politics grew, the question as to mutual relations with the Soviet trade unions confronted the **Amsterdam International** and its organisations in all its magnitude.

The question was brought up for the first time by the **British** at the **Vienna Congress of the Amsterdam International** in 1924, and since then not a single meeting of the Executive Committee or of the **Bureau of the Amsterdam International** has taken

place at which this so old and yet ever new question as to the **Soviet Unions** has not cropped up.

The mutual relations between the **A.U.C.T.U.** and **Amsterdam** are not at all a purely Russian question. It is a question as to the mutual relations between the **Amsterdam International** and the revolutionary trade union movement of all countries. If the whole struggle has centered round the mutual relations between the **A.U.C.T.U.** and the **Amsterdam International**, this is because the **Soviet Unions** are most clear representatives of the revolutionary Trade Union movement of all countries and because the **R.I.L.U.** and the **Comintern**, in their endeavours to attain unity, have never clung to formalities: Why should not a section of the **R.I.L.U.** conduct negotiations, if this would only be a small step forward on the path to restoring the unity of the world trade union movement?

The slogan of the **V. Comintern Congress** and the **III. R.I.L.U. Congress**, as will be remembered, was for the merging of both Internationals, an **International Unity Congress**, on the basis of proportional representation, etc.

This slogan however met with fierce resistance on the part of the international social democracy and the leaders of the **Amsterdam International**. They, all the time, endeavoured to reduce the question of international unity to the mutual relations between the **A.U.G.T.U.** and **Amsterdam**. To the proposal for merging both Internationals the **Amsterdamers** replied with a counter-proposal on the entry of the **Soviet Unions** into the **Amsterdam International**. The entire international social democratic press, the entire press of the **Amsterdam Union**, over a period of already almost two years, has been hypocritically and demagogically declaring that the entry of the **Soviet Unions** into **Amsterdam** solved the question of unity. There is still fresh in everybody's memory the correspondence between **Amsterdam** and the **A.U.G.T.U.** and the action of the **Anglo-Russian Committee** on this question. What did the **A.U.G.T.U.** demand and still demands? A Conference between the representatives of the **A.U.G.T.U.** and **Amsterdam**, without any preliminary conditions, for discussing the question as to the means and methods of restoring the unity of the international trade union movement.

What do the **Amsterdamers** reply? "First announce your desire to come into **Amsterdam**, and then we will begin talking". And the more that the **A.U.C.T.U.**, acting in full agreement with the **R.I.L.U.**, demands of **Amsterdam** to make it clear as to what is hindering the restoration of unity, the more the **Amsterdamers**, notwithstanding the proposals of the **British**, insist on having their own way, not even desiring to enter into pour-parlers with the representatives of the **Soviet Unions** on the question of unity. At the same time, they make every concession to the **American Federation of Labour**, are ready to go out to meet it, to afford it every possible privileges as to principle or otherwise, if only to be able to arrive at some kind of agreement.

**International Social Democracy** and the **Amsterdamers** are all the time attempting to evade the question of unity presented by the **Comintern** and the **R.I.L.U.** And in order to confuse matters they concocted their counter-proposals, and in order to dupe the workers all the more successfully, the **Amsterdam press** commenced spreading all kinds of legends as to the motives which inspired the **A.U.G.T.U.** to demand a conference with the **Amsterdam International** without preliminary conditions. The most widespread of these legends are the following: 1. the **Soviet Unions** desire to leave the **R.I.L.U.**; 2. the **Soviet Unions** want to sever the ties connecting them with the revolutionary trade unions of other countries; 3. the **Soviet Unions** wish to become free from the influence of the **C.P.** of the **U.S.S.R.**; 4. the **Soviet Unions** have a new orientation: they are beginning to become "Europeanised", etc., etc. The **Mensheviks** of all countries have been writing on this theme for 18 months and not one serious person who has the slightest notion of what the **Soviet Unions** really are, can take this scribble seriously. The initiative in forming the **R.I.L.U.** for consolidating all revolutionary elements, belongs to the **Soviet Trade Unions**. At all their congresses they continuously reiterated that they recognise the ideological leadership of the **C.P.** of the **U.S.S.R.**; and the **XIV. Party Congress**, which in the opinion of the shortsighted politicians of the **Amsterdam International** signifies the commencement of the liberation of the **Soviet Trade Unions** from the influence of the **Communist Party**, strengthened still more the ideological and political leadership of the **C.P.** of the **U.S.S.R.** over the **Soviet Trade Union** movement.

Do the reformists themselves really believe what they are writing? among our opponents who endeavour to explain in this manner the desire of the A. U. C. T. U. to conduct negotiations with the Amsterdam International, there are **two groups**: one of them asserts this out of genuine belief whilst the other, without any belief whatever. On the one hand, it is ignorance and on the other hand, a strategic manoeuvre. In order to evade replying straightforwardly to the question on an international Congress of unity and the methods of restoring a real united fighting International, they raise an outcry over the Soviet Unions, distort every gesture of the A. U. C. T. U., dictate to the A. U. C. T. U. what it should do and what it should not do and then become hypocritically astonished when the A. U. C. T. U. does not act according to their counsels. But the game is too obvious to be taken seriously. We must fully realise that the Soviet Unions are an organic part of the R. I. L. U. They are trying to remove all obstacles standing in the way of the formation of a united, all-embracing international. And if the A. U. C. T. U. is ready to conduct negotiations with the Amsterdam International instead of the R. I. L. U., this is because none of us wants to hinder the rapprochement among the workers of various countries because of formal considerations, because of a question of precedence. **But the Soviet Trade Unions have never conducted, are not conducting and never will conduct any other policy than the policy of the R. I. L. U. and of the Comintern.** Both the friends and the opponents of the Comintern should understand this. As to the systematic refusal of the Right Wing of the Amsterdam International to negotiate, this is explained by their preference for a United Front with the bourgeoisie, rather than a United Front with the revolutionary proletariat.

#### Amsterdam and the R. I. L. U.

The Leaders of the Amsterdam International endeavour in all their speeches to assure us that the Amsterdam International is the only world organisation of trade unions. But their own reports refute this. There are 22 organisations affiliated to the Amsterdam international of which only three, (Palestine, Canada and South Africa) are outside Europe. Outside the bounds of Europe, only about 150 thousand workers adhere to the Amsterdam International.

But the Amsterdam International has no right to call itself even an all-European Federation of Trade Unions, as the Trade Unions of the U. S. S. R. in their entirety, one fourth of the trade union organised workers of Czechoslovakia and one half of the trade union movement of France belong to the R. I. L. U. The trade union movement of Roumania, Jugoslavia, Bulgaria and Greece do not belong to the R. I. L. U. in their overwhelming majority solely because of the police terror. The trade unions of Norway and Finland stand outside of both Internationals, while both of these federations are in favour of the Anglo-Russian Committee and of supporting the unity policy put forward by the R. I. L. U. Besides this, there are very considerable revolutionary minorities within all the Amsterdam organisations who, if not in an organised form, at any rate ideologically and politically, support the R. I. L. U. It is quite well known that it is the representatives of the German Trade Union Federation who are at present determining the political line and particularly the anti-Soviet and anti-Communist policy of the Amsterdam International. The German Trade Union movement is united. The representatives of Germany always speak very proudly on behalf of 5 million organised workers; But do all the 5 million workers support the viewpoint of Amsterdam? Do we not know that about one quarter of the organised workers follow the Communist Party?

A conference recently took place in Sweden which represented about one third of the organised workers. It pronounced itself in favour of the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee, for the class struggle, etc. Social Democracy and the leaders of the Swedish Trade Union Federation sharply attacked this conference, but the minority in disagreement with the Amsterdam International did not cease to exist on account of this. If we take the Amsterdam organisations one by one, we will see that in each one of them there are revolutionary minorities which entirely take up the standpoint of the R. I. L. U. Can we wipe off the political account of this section of the proletariat organised in the Amsterdam Unions, which is following us? If we were

to do this then the whole of our policy for winning the trade unions would be nonsense. The winning of the trade unions is expressed in the growth of our influence within the reformist trade unions. It is a result of our policy, of our work within the reformist trade unions. In determining the correlations of forces therefore we must bear in mind this section of the workers. Take for instance Czechoslovakia. There are 200,000 workers organised in the Red Unions, while at the last elections the Communists received nearly one million votes. Surely it is clear that hundreds of thousands of workers organised in the reformist unions are following the Communist Party, following our slogans...

I do not intend dealing here with each country one by one. There are present here representatives of the Communist Parties of all countries, and each of you knows the limits of influence of your Party and of your country. At any rate one thing is clear, and that is that the Amsterdam International not only cannot be called an international federation, but not even an All-European body. What kind of All-European Federation is it in which the U. S. S. R. and a number of other countries previously mentioned do not figure?

But when we turn from the European Continent we find that the position of the Amsterdam International is truly catastrophic. In May 1925 the whole Chinese trade union movement at its second congress unanimously affiliated to the R. I. L. U. The Conference of Japanese Left Trade Unions, if not formally — here the police regime should be borne in mind — at any rate in principle supports the R. I. L. U. policy. The trade unions of Indonesia, Persia and of quite a number of other Colonial countries all belong to the R. I. L. U. And we may ask: with such a situation can one take seriously the high-sounding statements of the Amsterdam leaders that they are the only "world organisation" and so forth? This is absolutely ridiculous. It can only be explained by European arrogance. For a Dutch reformist the workers of Indonesia are not much more than human dross, but for us, they are proletarians with equal rights class brothers. For the European reformists China does not play any role whatsoever, whilst for us the awakening of China and the activity of the Chinese proletariat is a new page in the history of the International Labour Movement and of all humanity. It in the R. I. L. U. there were only the trade union movement of the U. S. S. R. and China, and if everything in the Amsterdam International was running smoothly with no internal frictions, and without two oppositions, a Left and an extreme Left, then the Amsterdam International, if it were headed by people who even knew a little about the dynamics of historical events, would have to reckon that the R. I. L. U. represents a great rising force. But as the Amsterdam International is headed by inveterate reformists, people with a narrow point of view who look down on the workers of the Colonial and semi-Colonial countries in a condescending manner, people for whom Europe is the centre of the universe and for whom capitalism is an eternal immutable system — so they will never be able to appreciate what the young labour movement is bringing to humanity, and what great perspectives are opening up in front of the revolutionary trade union movement and to whom belongs the future. In two or three years time even the blind will become convinced that the Amsterdam International is taking a downward and the R. I. L. U. an upward line. As for myself, I am as convinced of that as I am convinced that Moscow is the capital of the U. S. S. R.

#### The Fight for a Single International.

The centre of attention of all Parties should be the question of forming a single trade union organisation in each country and a single international embracing the trade unions of all countries, all races and all Continents. Every worker and particularly the Communist worker, should understand that the labour movement of whole Continents has now awakened to conscious life, and that an International which does not include the labour movement of China, Japan, Australia and South America cannot be called an all-embracing International. There are a number of symptoms testifying to the increased activity of the workers of the new Continents. For instance, last year the idea arose for summoning a Pan-Asiatic Congress of trade unions. The well-known Japanese reformist Bundji Suzuki wished to take the initiative in this. From various interviews

he has given, it appears that on the one hand he is dreaming of forming a coloured international to counterweigh the Red International, but on the other hand, that he wants to translate into the Asiatic language the International Labour Office of the League of Nations. A few months ago, a representative of Suzuki came to Shanghai where he spoke about the summoning of a Pan-Asiatic Conference at which representatives of the Government, workers and employers' organisations, should be represented. But he got such a reception from the Shanghai workers that he hastened to make himself scarce. We thus see that the Japanese reformists are thinking about gathering together and organising the thin-blooded reformism of Asia. Reformism has more or less taken definite shape in Japan and India, and it is just from these two countries that the project for creating such a coloured International originates, whilst its political colouring would in no way differ from that of Amsterdam. Whether they will succeed in forming such an International or not, time will show, but the very attempt to form such an International goes to show the new needs of the labour movement in Asia.

As far as the Chinese labour movement is concerned, it does not present any claims whatsoever for separating the yellow workers from the white, but on the contrary, it affiliated to the R.I.L.U. knowing very well that the union of white and yellow workers, as Fimmen has justly said, will repaint the whole world red.

Further, the Australian Council of Trade Unions is summoning a Trade Union Congress of the countries of the Pacific for discussing all questions concerning the workers of these countries. It must be said that this idea deserves every attention. The Pacific Ocean countries will, in the near future, be the scene of a war compared with which the world war was mere child's play, and the union of the workers of the Pacific Ocean countries is more than timely.

As is known the Pan-American Federation of Labour has already existed for several years, uniting the trade unions of the U.S.A., Mexico and a few small countries of Central America. This is the embryo of an international for the whole Continent. The Pan-American Federation of Labour at the head of which stand the Gompertites, has "labourised" the Monroe Doctrine: "America for the Americans". If we translate this into a more simple language this will mean: "All Southern and Northern America for the American milliardaires". Nevertheless, this Pan-American Federation of Labour embraces more than 4 million workers. Finally, in March of the present year the All-American Seamen's Conference is to take place in Montevideo (Uruguay) for uniting the Seamen of Northern and Southern America into one organisation.

Add to this the existence of a big labour movement in India, and the Philippines, etc., and you will be compelled to acknowledge that in the present situation of the world trade union movement, the slogan for unity cannot be reduced to mutual relations between Amsterdam and the A.U.G.T.U. It is not a European slogan, it is a world slogan. Therefore, the struggle for a united international means the struggle for uniting the workers of all countries, all races and all continents.

How is this to be done? We propose a very simple means: By arrangement between Amsterdam and the R.I.L.U. summon a World Congress of Trade Unions at which all organisations affiliated to the R.I.L.U., to the Amsterdam International, and also those standing outside both Internationals should be represented. In order that the labour movement of the big countries shall have corresponding influence, we propose proportional representation. We declare in advance that the R.I.L.U. will cease to exist as such and will be merged into the new International. We further state, that if we remain in the Minority we will observe discipline and remain in the single organisation. We also invite the Social Democrats to undertake the same obligation. Both sides will preserve the right of free agitation and propaganda within the united organisation. We ask: What is there unacceptable in such an offer for all those who pose as champions of overcoming the present position of scission? Is it possible to think of anything more democratic? Up to now we have not yet received an articulate answer from the Amsterdam International on this, because not one of the Social Democrats could oppose such a democratically summoned congress. It is difficult to dispute the justice, democratic form and absolute ho-

nesty of such a proposal. That is why the Social Democrats are trying to obscure the issue, to create confusion, instead of working for the unity of the world trade union movement, they push forward their semi-European international, call it the "only" organisation and all in order to scotch the desire of the masses to form a really united and really universal International of trade unions.

But this does not mean that we should allow the Amsterdammers the possibility of confusing a question that is quite clear. The Comintern and all the Sections affiliated to it, should conduct a fierce struggle for a World Unity Congress, for an International which must embrace the workers of all countries, all races and all Continents.

#### Strengthen the R. I. L. U. at the Centre and in the Localities.

What are the tasks of the Communist Parties so long as the united International does not exist, so long as unity does not prevail in every single country? They must work at increasing their influence, strengthen their activity among the masses, organisationally consolidate our political influence, strengthen our independent organisations (France, Czechoslovakia), increase pressure wherever our forces exist within the reformist unions, support and strengthen in every way the R.I.L.U., which, it will be remembered, does not merely embrace Communist workers. The R.I.L.U. includes, Communists, syndicalists and non-Party workers. We must not forget this.

Whereas the Comintern embraces approximately 2 million members, the number of supporters of the R.I.L.U. is six times as great. This fact alone should make the Communist Parties pay greater attention to the R.I.L.U., to its policy, to all proposals it makes, which are always co-ordinated with the Communist International.

During the first two years following the inauguration of the R.I.L.U. there were tendencies in its ranks which struggled against its close relations with the Comintern. But this anarchistic tendency has been outlived. Every revolutionary worker knows very well that the collaboration between the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. has arisen from necessity, and that it is in the interests of the working class. One may often hear anarchistic demagoguery from Social Democratic quarters about the R.I.L.U. being not an independent organisation, but subjected to the Comintern, etc. The Social Democrats want to assure the workers that the Amsterdam International is an "independent" organisation. It is true, that the Bureau of the Amsterdam International very frequently holds joint meetings with the Bureau of the Second International; they summon all kinds of conferences, congresses and jointly draw up resolutions; it is true, the leaders of the Amsterdam International sit in the Labour Office of the League of Nations, and take upon themselves obligations arising from decisions made by the representatives of bourgeois countries and of the employers' organisations, support imperialist treaties and agreements (Dawes Plan, Locarno) but all this is called "independence". When, however, the R.I.L.U. together with the Comintern organises campaigns and activities, this is called subjection, etc. This of course is nothing but sheer demagoguery. Every worker, whether Communist, Social Democrat or non-Party, should, with the aid of our press, understand what distinguishes the R.I.L.U. from the Amsterdam International, why there exists such a close collaboration between the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. and what demands we in general present to an International of trade unions. It should be remembered that we will only be able to achieve unity in the event of our untiringly continuing our policy and strengthening our ideological and political organisational influence. The stronger the Communist Parties, Comintern and R.I.L.U. become, the sooner will we achieve the aim of Unity.

#### Our Strong Points in the Application of United Front Tactics.

In turning to the problem of the united front and unity. I want to draw attention to our strong points, in order that I may afterwards more freely refer to the extremely delicate question of our errors. At the present time we may register a number of very considerable successes. These successes are to be explained by the fact that the Comintern has all the time corrected the errors of each Party, has endeavoured to straighten out the deviating lines, to give the necessary indications and thus assist the Party to overcome their weaknesses.

Our strong points in the struggle for unity lie in that an ever increasing number of our parties are beginning to approach correctly the non-party and social democratic workers, for therein lies the centre of gravity of the united front and unity tactics. Everything that brings the Communist workers nearer to the workers of other tendencies in the struggle, all methods tending to remove obstacles in the path to unity of action of the workers of various tendencies, everything that breaks down the barrier that has risen up between the Social Democrat and the Communist workers, all these things are leading us forward onto the path of conducting the united front policy and increasing our influence over the masses.

This tactic has been applied most successfully of all by our **British Communist Party**. It must be remembered that the Communist Party of Great Britain has only 6,500 members, but that its ideological-political influence extends over hundreds of thousands of workers. One can confidently say that in Great Britain one Communist influences at least 100 workers. How do we explain such a wide zone of influence for such a small Party? It is explained by the fact that it has been able to establish correct mutual relations between the Party and the directly sympathetic revolutionary, but not Communist workers and all kinds of left and progressive elements. Therein is the secret of success. It stands to reason that this ratio of one to a 100 contains a whole number of dangers. The Party is too small in order, in the event of serious social upheavals and inevitable fluctuations of the working class, to be able to retain behind it all the masses which are now under its political influence. The solution to this problem lies in the way of increasing the ranks of the **Communist Party**, but the fact that it has been able to create such a correlation, that a small party has influence on such large masses of workers proves that our British Communist Party is proceeding along correct paths. That is an example of what is real Bolshevism, not in words but in deeds.

An example of the successful application of the tactics of united front and of the unity of workers of various tendencies may also be seen in the recently ended conference of left workers in Sweden. There they succeeded in uniting about one third of the workers on the platform of the class struggle, and the Communists, Social Democrats and non-Party workers found a common language for defining immediate tasks facing the working class.

Attention should also be called to the exceptional flexibility and capacity for manoeuvring of the **Italian Communist Party** which has to operate under extremely difficult conditions, under the blows of fascism and reformism. The Party has succeeded in drawing into joint activity the workers of all tendencies and is becoming the soul of the anti-fascist movement. This is the very essence of live, always active, elastic and flexible Bolshevism.

As a general rule we may establish the following: the more we draw the social democratic and non-Party workers into joint activity with the Communist workers against the bourgeoisie, the more successfully are we applying the united front tactics and the more successfully are we Bolshevising our tactics. To be able to determine the moment, to calculate the correlation of forces, to sense the momentary needs of the working masses, to put forward the most vital practical slogans, to link up these slogans with the entire struggle of the working class, to move the working masses into the struggle for these slogans and to lead the masses behind us not formally but in deeds by our example of energy, persistence and whole-hearted devotion, — all this is Leninism in action. We are all learning a little, but by no means have all Parties learned the art of winning the masses. Is that not so, comrades?

#### Our Weak Points in the Struggle for Unity and in the Application of United Front Tactics.

What are our weak points? First of all and above all that we approach this question in a formal manner. A careful study of everything done on this field by our Parties and our organisations during the last 18 months will show that our errors are to be attributed mainly to the following.

1. **Overestimation of our forces and underestimation of the forces of our opponents:** A typical example of overestimation of our forces is the report of the **French Communist Party** on the Labour Congress of the Paris district. The "Humanite" published a statement that 1,200,000 workers were represented at the

congress. I was startled, when I read this statement. By such "statistics" we are not going to frighten our opponents, but we might discredit ourselves. Moreover the actual number of workers represented at this congress was imposing enough, and there was no necessity whatever to have resource to such "statistics".

This same figure bears witness to an **underestimation of the forces of the Socialist Party** and of the reformist trade unions, who in France still exercise considerable influence. It is true, in the Paris district, they are in a minority among the workers as compared to us, but if we take the number of adult proletariat in the Paris district and the number of the votes polled by us at all the elections, we will see that hundreds of thousands of workers are still voting for Socialists, radicals, etc., etc.

2. **Overestimation of the forces of the opponent:** There are comrades who consider the Amsterdam International an all-powerful organisation. They give way to the hypnotic influence of the Amsterdam leaders and mistake a semi-European organisation for a real world International. It seems to them to be well nigh invincible. The only answer to this is: one must not consider Amsterdam from the view point of the speeches and writings of its leaders; one must, on the contrary, study the masses, the fluctuation of forces, the internal struggle, one must take into consideration the new phenomenon in the world labour movement, and one must be able to see the direction of the new orientation of the masses.

3. **Lack of faith in the forces of the working class.** At one of the debates on unity, comrade Christescu, member of the C. C. of the Roumanian Communist Party and member of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, made the following statement: "If the working class were class-conscious, it would bring about unity over the heads of the leaders. But owing to its cowardice and its slave spirit, the majority of the proletariat stands aside...." The least that can be said of this monstrous statement is that it is not the statement of a Communist but of a typical **Social Democrat**. People with this frame of mind must undergo a cure instead of occupying themselves with questions concerning the unity of the trade union movement.

4. **Putting forward as a platform for joint actions, demands unacceptable for social democratic workers.** There are many such examples in all the countries. There was a plethora of them in Germany, during the period when Ruth Fischer and Maslow were at the head of the C. C. There the united front was proposed only to get rid of the obligations undertaken with relation to the Comintern. At the same time, the authors of the proposal were all the time afraid that it would be accepted. In order to guard against such a "misfortune", the proposal was purposely formulated in such a manner as to render its acceptance impossible. The united front can only be established in a definite, concrete programme of action. Not all Parties took this into consideration.

5. **United front proposals by the upper stratum without drawing in the masses.** This is nothing more than a method of mere exchange of letters, not in order to achieve the united front, but to be rid of it. This kind of tactics was noticeable in Czecho-Slovakia on the part of the revolutionary trade unions. Something similar was also to be seen for a little while in France, etc. I must say that the proposal for a united front which reaches the masses only in the form of a literary document, which has not gone through the entire organisation, a proposal which has not been discussed in the primary nuclei of the Party and in the local trade unions, which has not reached the people, — such a proposal has only a literary and not a political importance.

6. **Unity at all cost, even to the extent of relinquishing one's views and principles.** This was noticeable last year in Jugoslavia when several leaders of the independent trade unions were hatching a conspiracy together with the Social Democrats against the Communist Party and the majority of the revolutionary workers, and sought to justify this on the plea that this was necessary for the re-establishment of unity. This kind of thing is also to be found in Roumania where some Party members make speeches which have nothing in common with Communism. In Roumania, the trade union movement was split, after the Social Democrats in 1923 with the aid of the police, had thrown out from the Trade Union Congress the majority of the Congress which consisted of Communists. During the unity negotiations the Communist Party and the Unitarian trade unions brought forward the following demands: 1) Establishment of workers

democracy; 2) admission to the trade unions of any workers regardless of their political opinions; 3) convocation of an All-Roumanian trade union congress to decide on the basis for uniting the trade unions. The reformists replied by the following counter-proposal: 1) trade unions must join Amsterdam; 2) leadership of the trade union movement in the country to be handed over to the reformists; 3) every Communist trade union official, and also every trade union member who carries on Communist propaganda is to be expelled from the trade union. And in spite of this highly provocative reply, the same Communist Christescu proposed to accept the ultimatum of the Roumanian Social Democrats, using the following argument in favour of his proposal: "It think that we can imitate Lenin's attitude at the Brest Litovsk negotiations when, to guarantee the future success of the revolution, he deemed it necessary to accept some (!) rather unacceptable conditions of the German imperialists."

This is no longer liquidationism, it is something much worse. Particularly absurd is the reference to Brest Litovsk. Can one really compare the Amsterdam trade unions with the armed to the teeth German imperialism? Christescu's appeal to Lenin is vain. He has nothing to do with this. These are the results of the formula "unity at all costs"!

7. **Passive attitude to the expulsion of Communists from trade unions out of regard to a mistaken idea of unity.** The most brilliant — if such a thing can be called brilliant — example are the tactics of the Belgian Communist Party. At the last trade union Congress, the Belgian Social Democrats passed a resolution concerning the expulsion of Communists from the trade unions. In connection with this, the following incident took place in Brussels. At the general meeting of the **Bronze workers union**, it was proposed to expel the leader of this union, the Communist **Lutens**, for his adherence to the Communist Party. The Communist Party and the unity group asked all their members and sympathisers to abstain from voting, with the following results: 294 abstained, 6 voted for the expulsion, and the Communist Lutens was expelled by 6 votes out of 300. The explanation for this remarkable strategy (the abstention proposal was brought forward at the general meeting by Lutens himself) we find in Paragraph 6 of the resolution of the C. C. of the Belgian Communist Party. This paragraph is as follows: "When expulsion measures are applied by reformist leaders, our fundamental policy must be based on the idea that it is better to sacrifice for the time being one or several comrades than to form a new organisation severed from the reformist trade unions."

The example of the bronze workers union has shown us the result of such tactics. This is more like **primitive Christian Communism** than Bolshevism, and I think that comrades **Jacquemotte** and **Overstraeten** will admit that themselves. If such a policy is adopted there will be unity, but there will be no Communists in the labour movement, and this would hardly suit our Belgian comrades. A little less Christian Communism, comrades!

8. **Not enough social democrats and non-party workers are drawn into the united front and unity organs.** I think that we could find many examples of such an erroneous method in our struggle for the united front. If we take the trouble to look for them we will find them in all countries. Let everyone present here recall to his mind the tactics of his Party and he will admit that this kind of mistakes has certainly taken place. And yet correct methods with respect to this question frequently mean so much. How are we to get into touch with the Social Democratic and non-Party masses if we are unable to make their representatives active participants in the organs which have been formed?

9. **Hostility between communist and social democratic workers.** This is one of the sore points in countries with a labour movement divided by Party allegiance. This kind of thing assumed very dangerous forms in Germany, where free fights took place between Social Democratic and Communist workers in the factories, where Communists broke up the meetings of Social Democratic workers, etc. These tactics are tactics for **frightening away** and not of capturing the masses. They must be severely condemned. People who do not understand that such tactics represent the nicest present which we could make to the bourgeoisie are not Communists, for they can only perpetuate the split in the labour movement and can make us despair of the possibility to permeate the masses with the ideas of Communism.

10. **Passivity and delay in the realisation of the united front and unity decisions.** This is a very serious evil in our work.

It is only now that unity tactics are beginning to be applied in Czechoslovakia. Much precious time has been wasted. In France neither the Party nor the Unitarian Confederation of Labour have found time to organise regular work within the reformist Confederation of Labour. This led to the weakening of the opposition which was so evident in August 1925, and to its being split up. In Germany only the first steps have been taken towards the formation of a **Left Wing**, in spite of the fact that the objective situation is very favourable for it, etc.

11. **United front with oneself.** Such a formula may appear strange, but unfortunately such cases exist. This is the result of tactics of self-isolation of the Communist Party. As the gulf separating Social Democratic and Communist workers is not growing narrower, but is rather becoming wider, there is the temptation to follow the line of least resistance: instead of establishing a united front with the workers of other tendencies and other organisations, a united front is established among Communists in the various organisations. This is not quite the same thing. Or to be more exact — it is not at all the same thing.

12. **Over eagerness for unity.** A few examples: In Germany the very correct course has been adopted of small independent unions joining the big reformist unions. This amalgamation has taken the form of the dissolution of the independent unions, regardless of the conditions made by the corresponding trade union bureaucrats. This had, for instance, the following result: In East Prussia of 60 groups of the independent agricultural labourers union only two went over to the reformist union, the other 58 groups simply disappeared. The same thing happened with the union of the expelled builders. The Social Democratic builders' union is making provocative conditions for the re-admission of the expelled members. And Communists form only one quarter of the Union. Under such conditions the slogan of unity at all costs and dissolution of one's own unions, must inevitably lead to a split within one's own ranks. Moreover, are the German comrades so sure that there will not be more exclusions in the very near future? As soon as you will become stronger the Social Democrats will again begin to throw whole local organisations out of the unions. How can non-Party and Social Democratic workers, who were expelled together with the Communists and because of the Communists, have confidence in the Party if we liquidate by such methods what was created in the struggle against expulsions. I think that in this case an excess of zeal was detrimental to the cause.

13. **One-sided fixation of period within which unity is to be established, regardless of the wishes of those with whom it is necessary to unite.** It has happened, that our comrades have fixed a certain date for the amalgamation, declaring beforehand that if by that date the reformist union has not decided for amalgamation the revolutionary union will be dissolved, and its members will have to join individually the reformist union. Such tactics are to say the least naive. What reformist union is going to discuss seriously the question of amalgamation if it knows that the workers will come into it anyhow. Such tactics do not stand criticism, they are worthless.

14. **Inadequate connection between united front proposals and concrete demands agitating the masses.** Did we have such unsuccessful actions? Yes, we had. Is it necessary to give examples? I think it will be better if I abstain from doing so, in order not to displease the company present, for I could find heaps and heaps of such examples in the activity of our Communist Parties.

15. **Substitution of the question as to the entry of the A. U. C. T. U. into the Amsterdam International for the slogan of fusion of the Profintern and Amsterdam by means of an International Unity Congress.** Such a narrowing down of the question did take place in several countries. Thus the resolution of the Enlarged Central Committee of the British Communist Party twice mentions entry of the A. U. C. T. U. into Amsterdam. There was not enough clarity on this question in a section of the Communist press. This did harm to our propaganda and agitation for the relation between the A. U. C. T. U. and Amsterdam is only part of the difficult international problem of one militant trade union international. Let us hope that after the informative letter of the C. C. of the A. U. C. P. (B.) and after the decisions of this Plenum of the E. C. C. I., everything will be clear with respect to this question.

16. Issuing the slogan of recruiting new members for the reformist trade unions when at the same time there exists a national centre of revolutionary trade unions. Such ridiculous proposals were made by some comrades in Czechoslovakia. They did not spread very much, but nevertheless it is necessary to mention this frame of mind among Communists if only in order to be able to eradicate it once and for all.

17. A liquidatory frame of mind with respect to organisations adhering to the Profintern and even with respect to the Profintern itself. In Czechoslovakia there were for instance press statements to the following effect: "The sooner the Federation of National Trade Union Sections is liquidated the better." Immediately after the V Congress of the Comintern a liquidatory tendency made its appearance in France, without, however, taking a definite form. This tendency issued the slogan of the dissolution of the Unitarian Confederation of Labour and of the entry of Unitarian trade unions into the reformist trade unions. Fortunately for the French Communist Party and for the entire French labour movement, these moods were nipped in the bud by the Comintern.

Similar moods were noticeable among comrades with respect to the Profintern, which, they considered, should liquidate itself in the name of unity. Such liquidatory tendencies have made their appearance from time to time, but they disappeared as soon as the Comintern turned its attention to them. I am convinced that moods of this kind will not interfere with the growth and development of the Profintern.

18. Under-estimation of difficulties in the struggle for unity and after the first failures, disillusionment and lack of faith in the possibility to achieve unity. This was particularly noticeable in France just before the inter-Federal Congress in August of the current year. Many comrades entirely forgot that this Congress was convened only by us, that the reformists had not only refused to participate in it, but even did not want to hear anything about it. Nevertheless, not only in the case of rank and file workers, but even in the case of some leaders, reaction set in after the failure to hold the congress, and the opinion was expressed that the cause of unity was a hopeless cause in France. To be swayed too much by sentiment is a very dangerous thing in the struggle for unity.

19. The unsystematic and sporadic character of the work for the united front and unity. We notice that in many countries the struggle for unity is sporadic. The impression is that the united front is talked about only on holidays when acute questions spring up, on week days one forgets all about them. One must realise once and for all that the welding together of the workers on the basis of the everyday struggle is the most important and urgent task. This must be our everyday work and occupy our holidays as well.

20. A not sympathetic enough attitude to the opposition springing up in the reformist trade unions. In some countries not sufficient attention and help is given to this opposition (France). In other countries no sooner is this opposition taking shape and form, than demands are made on it which frighten away some of the Left inclined elements and the opposition falls to pieces before it has had time to become properly established. To help the opposition, to support it is one thing, and to prematurely force on it its political self-determination is quite another thing.

21. Application of the same forms of polemics and methods of struggle against reformists before the establishment of the united front and during the negotiations about the united front and joint actions, etc. I think, comrades, that you will relieve me of the necessity to give examples. Let the representatives of the Parties here remember the examples of the united front in their respective countries, and let them from the viewpoint of all the errors pointed out here by me verify if everything was as it should be before and especially during the practice of the united front. I maintain that all the Parties must not only study most carefully what should be done but especially what should not be done if the united front and our struggle for unity are to be successful.

22. Inability during strikes to establish the united front, to unite the more active progressive elements among the strikers, and to show to the workers in practice that the party is urging a fight to a finish and is doing everything to achieve victory. In connection with this, I should like to give a negative example: I mean the recent three-months strike of 158,000 miners in the anthracite mines of America. What was the task before our American Party? To mobilise all the Party forces which had

any relation to the miners, to consider together with the committee of the progressive miners a plan of action, to concentrate agitation and propaganda around the miners' demands, to organise the most determined and consistent elements among the strikers around the slogan to fight to a finish, to send to the strike area people popular among the miners and experienced in the leadership of big economic conflicts. Well, comrades, just the opposite of all this was done: the Party came forward in the strike area with its own slogans, it began a struggle for the right of the Communist Party to organise meetings under the Communist banner, popular Communist miners were not sent there; as representative of the Party, Comrade Gitlow, member of the Politbureau, was sent there. He is a tailor by profession who must have found it rather difficult to deal with the complicated situation there. To cap this, Comrade Gitlow, when the strike was at its height, published in the Party press an article containing amongst other things the following statement: "The anthracite strike is the result of an agreement between the trade union officials and the mineowners. It will only benefit the latter. The strike does not give anything to the miners, it will only cause untold suffering to the workers of the Eastern States, who depend on anthracite coal. The anthracite strike is the logical outcome of class collaboration." I am not going to analyse this monstrous and irresponsible statement which was made in the midst of the strike, I leave it to you to put the right estimate on this remarkable strategy. I will only tell you about the result of the strike. After a 3-months strike the workers were defeated and the Party became isolated from the miners.

Such are, on the whole, the failures to be seen in our work. Of such failures there were as you see 22. Let us look upon them as 22 examples of how not to apply tactics of the united front and of unity.

One might form for oneself a very dark picture from the incidents enumerated by me. I mentioned so many failures that our enemies might make use of them and say that the tactics of the united front were nothing but a chain of errors. But this would be the usual demagogical utilisation of our self-criticism. They will not succeed in frightening us with their reformist demagogy. In the interests of revolution, we have exposed, are exposing and will expose our own errors, we know how to remedy them in order to pursue our path of the capture of the masses.

#### Struggle against the expulsion of revolutionary workers, against split and the persecution of the revolutionary trade union movement.

It behoves all Communist Parties to carry on a relentless struggle against the expulsion of Communists and against splits in the trade union movement which are being worked up in a considerable number of countries. There are already a series of facts which attest that the reformists are pursuing their split policy. This policy is pursued with extraordinary energy in Finland, for with their own forces the reformists of Finland are not able to capture the trade unions. They therefore set their hopes, in addition to the sympathy and assistance from the Amsterdam International, on the real help of the Finnish police.

In connection with this question, the Finnish Social Democrats tread the path already trodden by their Balkan colleagues: the Yugoslavian, Bulgarian and Roumanian Social Democracy. It is a well known fact, that in the Balkans 90% of the organised workers were behind the Profintern, and that only after the brutal persecutions of the White Terror, mass arrests and the handing over of the clubs and premises into the hands of the Social Democrats by the police, did the latter succeed in forming their own organisations which are of course affiliated to the Amsterdam International. Our Communist press does not give sufficient information about the monstrous persecution of the workers in the Balkans. Only few people know what a close fraternal union exists between the police and Social Democracy and the leaders of the Amsterdam Unions in Yugoslavia, Roumania and Bulgaria. At present, after the military coup d'Etat in Greece, matters there are proceeding on the same lines. The Finnish Social Democrats become jealous and they want to Balkanise the labour movement of Finland. We have not the least doubt that the Finnish proletariat will know how to resist this Social Democratic split policy. However, it is the duty of all the Communist Parties and for the entire revolutionary labour movement, and also of all honest workers, regardless of political convictions, to raise their voice in protest against the

expulsion of Communists from the trade unions, against the splitting of trade union organisations, against the persecution of the revolutionary movement, police and reformist raids, etc. The cause of these workers who have to carry on their struggle under the terrible conditions of oppression and white terror is the cause of the entire International. Comrades, a little more attention on your part to these countries! A little more attention to the courageous proletariat of these small countries which has to carry on a very hard struggle against its own bourgeoisie and Social Democracy.

#### Trade Unions — to the Masses!

Comrades, after six years have passed since the establishment of the Communist International, it seems rather strange to speak of the necessity of work in the trade unions. But one has to speak about it, for the figures given by the Parties in their reports concerning their members' participation in trade union work show that things are in a parlous state with respect to this. Such terms as "75% trade union work", "90% trade union work" are very much in vogue with us at present, but nevertheless you will not find a single Party except the British where even a 20% effort has been made with respect to trade union activity.

Study for yourselves in all the Parties the distribution of forces and means, verify the number of Party members in the trade unions, and especially the number of Party members active in the trade unions, and you will realise that with respect to work in the trade unions it is rather a question of words and not deeds. An excellent rule exists in the French Communist Party that no one can be a member of the Party unless he be a member of a trade union, and that no one can be admitted to the Party without being able to produce his trade union membership card. One can welcome such a decision. But if you take the trouble to verify what Party members do in the trade unions, how they work, you will soon learn that at the very least 90% of Party members are passive members of trade unions. The same is probably the case in other countries. The German Communist Party made an attempt to find out in the districts what percentage of Party members is to be found in trade unions and what percentage takes an active part in the trade union movement. It transpired that in the industrial Rhenish-Westphalian district only 50% of the Party membership are in trade unions. Some districts say that only 5-6% are active in the trade union movement. According to the data of the last congress of the American Communist Party, 32% of the Party membership are members of trade unions. What about the remaining 68%? Of these 26% cannot be members of trade unions, of course, not because they are millionaires, but because there are no trade unions for housewives. The remaining 42% who could join trade unions evidently think it beneath their Communist dignity to be members of trade unions. They prefer "high" politics to the rough everyday work. This communist aristocratism, or to put it more plainly communist lack of common sense must be most decidedly combated in all the Parties. The Communist International cannot allow the decisions of all its congresses to be systematically infringed. But what does the fact that 42% of the membership of the American Communist Party do not wish to belong to trade unions and to work actively in them really mean? What term are we to apply to this sabotaging of the decisions of the Communist International?

I consider that the discussion which has taken place in the American Party, which set agitation and propaganda in the trade unions against the struggle for control, for organisational leadership in the trade unions extremely dangerous. I consider setting one against the other pure metaphysics. We carry on agitation and propaganda, we organise the masses and this must find its organisational expression, otherwise our entire work will be ineffective. The slogan of the capture of the trade unions means struggle for leadership of the trade unions. One thing is quite clear: All our Parties must again take up very seriously work in the trade unions and must compel all communists under the threat of expulsion not only to join trade unions, but also to work actively in them.

#### The Programme of Action.

##### Conclusion.

The programme of action placed before you is far from complete and all-embracing. It does not contain many points, first of all, in order not to make it too formidable. On the other hand a whole series of points have been advisedly omitted. For instance, struggle against the Dawes Plan, against Locarno, etc. Why were they omitted? Because this programme of action must serve as a platform for the mobilisation of broad masses. With respect to this platform there can be agreement with us and the Social Democratic workers, whilst such questions as the Dawes Plan, Locarno, or for instance, fraternisation amongst soldiers in the present colonial wars, cannot serve as a basis for joint actions. It was very little heeded among us that in Alsace Lorraine the united front between the Unitarian trade unions and the trade unions adhering to the reformist Confederation of labour fell to pieces because we introduced into the programme of the Congress which was being convened, the slogan of the self-determination of Alsace-Lorraine including separation. As a Communist slogan or a slogan of the revolutionary trade unions it was quite right, but such a slogan cannot unite the workers of different tendencies, and therefore it should have been eliminated from that programme of action which was meant for joint actions of workers of different tendencies. I was guided by these considerations when I was drawing up the model draft programme of action. One should certainly bear in mind that it is essential to have in every country a practical programme of action not only of a general national character, but also for every district, industry, etc. It is in this sense and with these reservations that I recommend the Enlarged Plenum of the Comintern Executive to adopt the programme of action, showing thereby in practice that we are not placing unacceptable demands before the Social Democratic workers for our joint actions.

I must say in conclusion that we have quite a large number of these and excellent resolutions, but that our practical work is not always in keeping with the decisions which we have made. I should like to conclude my report by expressing the conviction that all the Communist Parties will do full justice to the obligations which they have taken upon themselves now with regard to the trade union movement, and that we will take in hand in good earnest and in a Bolshevik Leninist manner our work for the capture of the trade unions, for the capture of the majority of the working class, which means that we will do our utmost to prepare the workers for the social revolution.