

# THE NEXT TASKS OF THE INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTIONARY TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

By A. LOSOVSKY

(Speech at the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.)

COMRADES, only a little over a year has passed since the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., but much has changed in the relations between States and classes. All the promises of the bourgeoisie and the pseudo-Marxist astrologists that they would find a way out of the crisis have turned out to be idle talk. The idea that not all is well with the capitalist system is becoming more and more widespread in leading circles of the bourgeoisie. Very characteristic in this respect is the speech recently made by the "saviour" of the capitalist world from Bolshevism, Benito Mussolini. In one of his speeches made two years ago he asked the question as to whether the developments taking place throughout the world represent a *crisis within the system or a crisis of the system itself*. Recently, however, in the fifth year of the crisis, Mussolini made the following statement to the fascist Grand Council:

*"The crisis has penetrated so deeply into the system that it has become a crisis of the system itself. It is no longer a case of surface injury, it is an organic disease. We can state today that the capitalist mode of production has outlived itself."*

One of the captains of finance in France and one of France's leading statesmen, J. Caillaux, is no less definite in his views. This outstanding bourgeois financier has, on the basis of an analysis of the world economic situation and of the state of international finance, come to the conclusion that "this crisis is a transition from one economic order to another". We can quote dozens of similar statements which go to show that outstanding politicians of the capitalist countries and noted economists and leaders of industry are compelled to acknowledge the fact that it is now a case of a crisis of the very system itself. As to the social-fascists, even they are now gloomily writing about the end of capitalism. This means that having created so much destruction in the sphere of industry, agriculture, and finance, the crisis has shaken bourgeois ideology and the faith of bourgeois ideologists in the capitalist system. To emerge from the crisis at all costs—that is the problem. And this explains the feverish armament race, accompanied by feverish negotiations, and the ever new combinations which aim at cutting the Gordian knot and finding a way out of the crisis in the struggle for the redivision of the world and war against the

Soviet Union, all of this being done, of course, under cover of a fog of pacifist phrases.

Never before have the two ideologies, the two policies—Communism and fascism—come into such sharp conflict. Both systems have their territorial bases and huge natural resources, and they clearly embody the forces of dying capitalism on the one hand and the forces of growing and victorious Communism on the other. Bolshevism, which is profoundly international, and is organically linked up in theory and practice with the international proletariat and the toiling masses of the colonies, stands face to face with the zoological nationalism and animal-like rage of counter-revolution which is now exerting all its strength to hold up and turn back the wheels of history. In this struggle between Communism and fascism, international social-democracy which has suffered a moral, political, and organizational defeat in connection with the bankruptcy of German social-democracy, has taken the side of fascism and is callously, cynically, or under cover of "Left" phrases, carrying out its basic line, namely, "Better fascism than Bolshevism".

The report of Comrade Kuusinen, the co-reports of Comrades Pieck and Pollitt, the speeches of Comrades Piatnitsky, Manuilsky, Knorin, Lenski, Thorez, Wan Ming, Okano and others, have already thrown light upon the basic problems which now confront the international Communist movement. I will therefore devote my speech to a series of trade union questions which in spite of their trade union modesty are of serious political significance in this period of preparation for revolution into which we are entering. Never before have *trade union* questions assumed, to such an extent, the importance of *political* questions.

The first question requiring an answer is the following:

What has happened to international reformism since the Twelfth Plenum, what is the position of our main enemy within the working class, *viz.*, international social-democracy, and what stage of regression has been reached by the Amsterdam and Second Internationalists?

The crash of the German trade unions and German social-democracy has caused not only organizational and financial losses to the Second and Amsterdam Internationalists, but it has been a great moral and poli-

tical blow to them. If we limit ourselves to just the trade union sphere we get the following picture: The membership of the Amsterdam International, which was about 13,000,000 at the end of 1932, has fallen after the defeat of the German General Federation of Labor (A.D.G.B.) to 8,000,000. The same has been the fate of all the international trade union federations which are under the direct political influence of the Amsterdam International. Thus, for example, in the Food Workers International, the Germans accounted for 29.8 per cent of the total membership. Among the builders the figure was 43.9 per cent, among the earthenware workers 83.3 per cent, among the leather workers 44 per cent, among office employees 50 per cent, among the printing workers 37 per cent, among the quarry workers 53 per cent, among the postal workers 54 per cent, among municipal workers 55 per cent, among tobacco workers 61 per cent, among glass workers 65 per cent, among metal workers 44.8 per cent, etc. Immediately after the capitulation of the German trade union bureaucracy, the leaders of the Amsterdam International, constrained by the disgust of the masses, began to express their criticism of the conduct of their German colleagues. Then the second period came on, when the Amsterdam leaders passed from condemnation of the Germans to expressions of sympathy, to forgiveness and justification of their policy and tactics. How can we explain this change in the tactics of the Amsterdam leaders? This is to be explained by the fact that the bankruptcy of the German trade union bureaucracy signifies the moral and political bankruptcy of the reformist trade union bureaucrats in other countries. Having begun by criticizing the capitulation of the German reformists, they discovered that the disgust of the masses with reformist policy in general was directed along these lines. This, therefore, compelled the trade union leaders to make a complete change in their tactics, and they began to look for factors which would lessen the guilt of the leaders of the German trade unions, and prove that they could not have acted otherwise.

But the fact remains that the membership of the Amsterdam International was reduced at one blow by 39 per cent, and from the European International it had been, it became transformed in the main into a federation of trade union members of the countries of the Entente, who under the banner of struggle against fascism are actually carrying out the policy of the Entente. This may be seen from the slogan calling for the boycott of German goods, the aim of which is to increase exports from their own countries. This may be seen further from the attitude taken by the Amsterdam International towards the Austrian problem. The Amsterdam International set up a special commission to render assistance to the Austrian trade unions, but this aid is directed along

lines worked out by the French General Staff, and the commission keeps strictly within the framework of these directives (financial aid for anti-German strikes, etc.).

The International reformist trade union movement received a heavy blow for another reason, namely, that Germany provided an example demonstrating the relative value and stability of the big mass reformist trade unions and the small Red trade unions and revolutionary trade union opposition. Everyone knows that German fascism aimed its chief blow against the Communist Party and the Red Trade Union Opposition. How did it happen that the Red trade unions and Red Trade Union Opposition, which were weaker than the A.D.G.B., have held out, and notwithstanding their heavy losses, are continuing their work and are establishing independent class unions under the most difficult conditions, whereas the German General Federation of Labor (the A.D.G.B.), with its huge apparatus, its millions of members, its rich treasury, etc., after the first serious blow, has disappeared from the scene of political struggle? The German social-democrats themselves, both in Germany and abroad, have raised the slogan with regard to the A.D.G.B. and their Party, that "the apparatus has died, long live the movement!" How did this happen? The German example proves once more that numbers are not the decisive factor in the struggle. The decisive factor is quality, *i. e.*, that a correct revolutionary policy be pursued by the given organization, and this correct policy can only be a Bolshevik policy. The small Red Trade Union Opposition, with its correct militant policy, has weathered the storm and is continuing the struggle, but the huge German General Federation of Labor, with its reformist and anti-working class policy, has ceased to exist. It would be a mistake to draw the conclusion that we do not need to pay attention to quantity. No the conclusion to be drawn is that it is necessary to combine quantity with revolutionary Bolshevik quality and then we will be able to fulfill our tasks in the struggle for Soviet Power.

The bankruptcy of the German trade unions could not but create a great feeling of indignation among the masses of reformist workers in all countries. They are now asking their leaders what has happened to the million-strong trade unions in Germany. The leaders are maneuvering and are trying to put the blame on the Communists, but this is much more difficult than it was before, because even the bourgeois press throughout the world acknowledges the fact that the Communist Party and the Red Trade Union Opposition are conducting an heroic struggle against fascism, whereas the leaders of the social-democracy, both in Germany and abroad, simply pass their time debating the question as to how good it would be if

things were better, while attempting to put the blame for their own bankruptcy upon the working class of Germany.

The rapidly progressing process of fascization in capitalist countries, of course, creates *additional difficulties* for us in our work, but the sharpness of class relations, the unheard of bankruptcy of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, create *new great possibilities for us*. Our main enemy within the working class has become weaker but has not completely disappeared, even in Germany where social-democracy is attempting to revive its organizations and to hold the workers back from the united front with us, and once again to direct the energy of the masses along the lines of "democratic socialism." However, the situation has changed. International social-democracy now has a much smaller field for maneuvering, and this creates new possibilities for the Comintern and the Profintern not only in the capitalist countries, but in the colonies and semi-colonies.

International social-democracy has been considerably weakened since the Twelfth Plenum, although in a number of countries (Great Britain, France, Czechoslovakia, etc.) it still has millions of followers. As far as our struggle is concerned, the situation has become more favorable notwithstanding new difficulties. *The rank and file Social-Democratic worker listens more attentively now to our words and proposals, and is more ready than previously to struggle alongside of us.* Proof of this is contained not only in all the information we receive from Germany, but also in the numerous facts quoted here by speakers from various countries. *The relation of forces within the working class has changed in our favor.*

The central task facing the international Communist movement is to prepare the working class for the struggle for Soviet Power. Everything else is subordinate to this central task. What, then, is the obstacle which hinders the preparation of the broad masses for the revolution? What needs to be done for the preparatory period to be passed through as rapidly as possible and to achieve the transition to the period of action?

Of all the conditions which are needed for the direct struggle for power in the countries where the elements of a revolutionary crisis are rapidly maturing, the one thing lacking for us is the majority of the working class. *Therefore the problem of problems at the present time is the struggle for the majority of the working class.* What needs to be done in order to approach this central strategic task more rapidly? All the congresses and plenums of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. have dealt with this, and especially insistent in this regard were the Eleventh and Twelfth Plenums of the E.C.C.I. The working class will come to Communism in the long

run, but the path can and must be shortened by the use of tested Bolshevik methods of winning over the masses. Experience teaches us that we should seize on the elementary demands of the workers, that we should develop the struggle of the employed and the unemployed for their vital demands (questions of wages, social insurance, unemployment relief, etc.) and not set up a theory that the working class is split into two permanent groups, the employed and unemployed (Varga). All these questions should excite our organizations, which must take an interest in them. The Party organizations must all the time urge the revolutionary trade unions and the Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition (R.T.U.O.) to direct their energies towards these everyday tasks. The nearer we approach these questions, the more varied the economic struggle becomes, and the easier will it be to switch the economic struggle over into a political struggle, to transfer economic strikes into political strikes, and to win the masses rapidly to our side.

Since the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. have conducted a number of very serious economic and political struggles. The delegates from France, U.S.A., Japan, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Balkan countries, etc., have already spoken about them here. They have all quoted good and bad examples, and they have all very seriously examined here the weaknesses and mistakes of the Party and trade union organizations in conducting these struggles. But if we ask ourselves what is common in all this self-criticism, what are the characteristic features of all the positive and negative examples given here, we must say that they are as follows:

1. The insufficiently consistent, systematic and stubborn preparations of these struggles.
2. The inability to utilize and consolidate even those movements which arose and developed under our direct leadership.
3. The uneven nature of our activity, *i. e.*, after intense efforts during the struggle and the movement, a decline of energy and a halving in activity.

Even if we examine the best movements, we find in them, with few exceptions, all three of these elements or one of them. This is why, in spite of the growth and the influence of the Communist Party, we move ahead organizationally with extreme slowness, with few exceptions. I will give only two examples. The Citroen strike was the outstanding event in the working class movement in France during the last year. Have we maintained up to the present time the positions which we possessed during the strike? Have we widened them? We have to declare that not only have we failed to widen them, but we have not even kept them. It looks as if we are

waiting for a new outbreak at this factory before we display any activity. Take another example. After a long struggle Comrade Arthur Horner was elected miners' agent in South Wales, and he succeeded in getting 10,000 votes against 7,000 cast for the reformist candidate. This was a great success. Of course the Party exerted pretty big efforts to attain this. And what followed? Did the Political Bureau and the leaders of the Minority Movement discuss how Horner should work, how to utilize this position, how to organize the 10,000 miners who voted for Horner? I think that our British friends cannot give us a positive affirmative reply on this matter. Why is this? It is because they look on elections as an end in themselves, and not as a means of widening our influence, of consolidating our positions and struggling for new positions. I come to this conclusion on the basis of another example from the same region, from South Wales. In the Executive Committee of the South Wales Miners' Federation we have one Communist and two sympathizers. What is being done by this Communist and these two sympathizers, how do they carry on the work, what is their platform, in what way do they differ from the non-Communists and non-sympathizers? Nobody knows because nothing is said of this either in the Party or the trade union press.

When we win a certain position, we do not utilize it, though the reason we win positions is to utilize and widen them.

The basic task is to get right down into the midst of the masses, to explain to every worker that we are a party of revolution while the reformists are the party upholding the constitution, to use the terms which were first formulated thirty years ago at the Second Congress of the C.P.S.U., and that the reformist parties are now parties of counter-revolution.

I come once more to a question on which we have systematically adopted resolutions at all the plenums and congresses of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. Moreover this is a question which is elaborated day by day by the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. when solving current questions of the political and economic struggle of our sections. I refer to the united front. Is everything clear on this question? Here at the plenum everything seems to be clear. But the united front suffers a series of unexpected transformations in the interval between the clear formulations and the putting of them into practice. We have seen this in the numerous examples which have been given by those who have spoken before me and especially by Comrade Piatnitsky.

We have all decided thousands and thousands of times that we form the united front only for the struggle against capital. It turns out that there are tens and hundreds of cases in which the united front is formed for joint discussions. We have all decided

thousands and thousands of times that the united front does not mean the liquidation or concealment of our views. None the less, the comrades who have spoken before me have given scores of examples showing how we have been engulfed in the united front, out of fear to face the enemy with open vigor. We have all decided thousand and thousands of times that the united front does not mean the slurring over of the views and the criminal activity of the trade union bureaucrats, but we can see numerous cases—a vivid example is Strasbourg, dealt with by Fachon, in which we tie our own hands and keep quiet as to the crimes committed by the reformists. We have all decided thousands and thousands of times that the united front must be used to strengthen and consolidate our positions by recruiting workers into the Red trade unions, to strengthen and widen the opposition in the reformist and other unions, to organize factory sections, etc., but the speakers here have given a tremendous number of examples which show clearly that in some cases, after we have taken the initiative in forming the united front, we not only have not grown stronger but we have even become weaker, *i. e.*, the united front turns against us in the places where we conduct an incorrect line. Why? Because frequently the united front is understood as an agreement between the leaders, as a mutual amnesty, and not as the unity of the rank and file for the struggle against the reformist leaders.

We have all decided thousands and thousands of times that the united front must serve to bring out the initiative of the rank and file, to promote new active elements from the masses, to attract social-democratic and non-Party workers to active struggle, but experience shows that in a whole series of cases the united front does not produce these results, and that at best we and the social-democrats remain where we started. Then why a united front? What do we get from it? Why does it work this way? Why is it that the correct decisions of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. and the overwhelming majority of the leading organs of our Parties and trade unions arrive at the lower cells in a distorted form? Why is it that in some cases even, a fear of the united front shows itself? It is because the leading organs of our Parties and our revolutionary trade unions and the trade union opposition consider a question settled when they publish theses or resolutions, whereas *the question only begins with the publication of the thesis or resolution*. It is necessary not only to print resolutions but to explain the methods and forms of creating the united front in all the lower organizations, to gather together all the members of the lower organs, to mobilize all the fractions from top to bottom, to decide on a plan of action, to work it out to suit every factory, every dis-

trict, every branch of industry, and to face every member of a trade union, and especially every Communist with extremely concrete tasks. For instance, one must recruit several members to the Red trade union or the trade union opposition, another must form a group of several members at his factory, a third must distribute such and such a quantity of Party and trade union literature, a fourth must specialize on establishing contacts with the social-democratic workers, a fifth has the task of selecting a group of non-Party workers, a sixth is instructed to speak at social-democratic and fascist meetings, etc. If the lower Party organizations keep track of the activity of each one of their members, direct his work, advise him what to do, and correct his mistakes, not *post factum* several months afterwards, but while the work is being carried through, *then our work will give us hundreds of per cent more than it gives now*. The situation is taking on a more and more intense character, while our work is by no means being carried on with the intensity which is required under the present conditions.

I have spoken of *how* to apply the united front. Now I wish to speak of the question of where to apply it. The united front should be carried into practice primarily in the factories. We must take the initiative in formulating the direct demands of the workers. We must organize the interchange of opinion on questions affecting the workers of the given shop, the given factory, the interchange of opinions on more general questions of the policy of the fascists or "democratic" government, etc. We must press forward the election of all kinds of commissions for the protection of wages, to investigate the position of the workers, and of the working women, and to study the conditions of labor. We must press forward the election of delegates to present the demands of the masses, etc. As members of these delegations we should propose the most influential workers, social-democratic, and non-Party, discuss all problems with them, create a feeling of comradeship and internal discipline so that the social-democratic workers will not be able to refuse to carry out a decision adopted jointly. We must prepare movements of protest, demonstrations, strikes, etc., and must without fail draw social-democratic, non-Party workers, and workers belonging to fascist organizations as well, into all the organs leading these movements. *Activity in the factory is the starting point for the achievement of influence over the masses*. It is not essential to shout "Let's form a united front, a Red united front, a revolutionary united front", etc., etc. This is not always needed and not always useful. Even the reverse is the case. Joint actions in defense of the smallest interests of the factory workers are the united front in the best and really Bolshevik sense of the word.

Where else should we apply the united front? In the reformist, independent, and other unions. How can it be done? We, as members of the given organization, must take the initiative on ourselves and gather together the members of the trade unions employed in the given factory to discuss the specific questions affecting the workers of the shop, factory or some particular category of workers. We must get the revolutionary workers, the supporters of the revolutionary trade union movement, elected as representatives and collectors of membership dues, and make certain that we win every elected office in the factory and the union. It is not sufficient to win an elected post. We must utilize the post we occupy to distribute our literature, to agitate for our views and our tactics. We must fight against capitulation to the reformist trade union bureaucrats, for *we fight for elected positions not to get jobs for our own people, but so that we shall be able, through them, to carry on a correct policy which will be advantageous for the working class*. Through the trade union members and functionaries who sympathize with us we must organize all kinds of protests and actions to the point of strikes, all the time impelling the movement ahead against the employers, against social-fascism. Our work in the reformist trade unions must take the line of criticizing the leaders of the reformist trade union movement for their treachery, their strike-breaking. But this criticism must be conducted on the basis of concrete facts. The main thing is to organize our forces, to form a strong and firmly welded trade union opposition with a definite program and internal discipline, and *not to allow that which we have already obtained to be frittered away*. The only way to consolidate our ideological influence is through the trade union group in the factory, through the unification of all the oppositional elements in the trade union, and the unification of all the lower oppositional trade union organizations for the struggle for our program. If we take this course, our work in the reformist trade unions will produce definite positive results.

We have some positive examples from France, but they are still isolated cases. Compared with the whole mass of workers in the reformist trade unions, these examples are not very outstanding, even though they are very welcome. We must fight for the lower reformist trade union organizations. If we display boldness and stubbornness, and carry on serious work among the masses, we can obtain big results. It is sufficient to quote Denmark as an example where we have succeeded in winning the Stokers' Union to the side of the revolutionary movement. It is true that this was done with the aid of the Seamen's and Harbor Workers' International, but nevertheless this fact is something serious and positive for the work of the Communist Party and the R.T.U.O. in Den-

mark. Such things are possible in other countries as well, but only if we display the maximum flexibility, endurance and Bolshevik persistence. Otherwise, we shall lose even the positions which we have won, as in San Paolo, Brazil, for example, where we won the textile workers' union and then lost it. How can we hold our own in the reformist trade unions when the trade union bureaucrats are against us? How can we hold our own if the entire state apparatus supports the trade union bureaucrats against us? If we fight furiously for trade union democracy, if day by day we expose the system of appointing functionaries, the red tape shown in the attitude to the workers' interests, the trickery behind the scenes and cases of strikebreaking, if every step which we take is not an isolated act of a few brave and bold people but is connected with the masses, it will become more and more difficult to expel the revolutionary workers.

Where else must we carry on our work for the formation of the united front? In the fascist trade unions. There are different types of fascist trade unions, for instance, in Italy, Poland and Germany. But what is common to them all? It is that the trade union leaders are appointed, the electoral principle is abolished, membership is compulsory, etc. Along these lines we can and must carry on tremendous work. First of all, the entire work should be concentrated in the factories among the masses of members. We should mobilize the workers against compulsory membership, against the payment of membership dues to the fascist trade unions. The whole agitation and propaganda among the working masses must be conducted under the slogan: *Where Do the Workers' Pennies Go?* We should demand that the fascist officials come to the workers' meetings and say what they do with the union funds, organize a boycott of all functionaries appointed by the fascists, take the initiative of calling meetings from below to discuss where the workers' money goes, expose all the fascists as hangers-on of the capitalists, and as spies and direct agents of the bosses. If the fascists themselves hold meetings, we must get into them and by means of questions, heckling and speeches disclose the treacherous face of the fascist functionaries, and introduce our resolutions at their meetings. As the fascists have abolished the election of trade union representatives, and there is no check on the way the money is spent, we should set going in the fascist unions the slogan of elections at the factories of special supervisory committees, organs to control the expenditure of the money, special committees to protect wages, to investigate conditions of labor, etc. Every time the fascist functionaries go to the bosses, we should set talk going and arouse discontent among the masses, by putting forward the idea that it is necessary to elect special authoritative commissions to negotiate with the employers

on the question of conditions of labor, and all the time lead the masses to the struggle against fascism.

The fascists are maneuvering. Mussolini has proclaimed the slogan: "To the people". In some cases the fascists are even trying to offer jobs to workers who are with us or who sympathize with us. Communists must not take jobs when appointed by the fascists. If the fascists allot a well-known influential worker who sympathizes with us to some post, the worker must not take this post without discussing the question at the factory, at a meeting of the workers. There he must say to the workers: "If you elect me, then I will carry out the functions given to me." Simultaneously he must advance the proposal that a special workers' commission should be elected to assist him, so as to work directly with the masses and strengthen his contacts with the masses. We must regard the acceptance of posts in the lower trade union organizations as an exception, but in these cases as well, the penetration into the lower organs of the fascist trade unions must be done only with the aim of disrupting them from within (collective withdrawals from the unions, etc.). But this must not be left to the initiative of individual workers. It must be discussed by the Party organization, which must be extremely vigilant, and if it decides to send anybody on such work, a thorough check must be taken of him. But even this is not enough. We must help him to carry out this difficult work. We must instruct him, tell him what to do and how to do it, otherwise the individual may find himself in the trap set by our enemies.

The question of the fascist trade unions is becoming more and more keen now in connection with the approach of war. Fascism is acting in two directions: On the one hand it is smashing even the reformist unions, and on the other hand it is forming its own unions. German fascism liquidated by decree everything that remained of the reformist, Catholic and Hirsch-Duncker trade unions, and, under the leadership of Krupp and Thyssen set up the *Labor Front*, which must be opposed by our *Workers' Front*. At the same time, in Poland an association of all the fascist trade unions (the so-called Z.Z.Z.) has been formed, the membership of which is already more than 100,000, and the basic line of the fascists is to extend this organization to all the war factories. This fact alone should make us take a much more serious attitude to the work in the fascist trade unions, to the questions of disintegrating them internally, to winning over the workers who are in these unions, and to forming points of support for ourselves in all organizations where the working masses are to be found.

I wish here to use the concrete example of the fascist trade unions in Poland to show how we should develop our work. Although Comrade Henrikowski

spoke of two types of fascist trade unions (voluntary and compulsory), in essence the difference between them is insignificant. What should Communists do in those factories where there are trade unions belonging to the fascist Association of Trade Unions? Our Party cell and illegal trade union group will carry on agitation against the workers joining the fascist trade union. If a section of the workers makes a decision which is binding on all, then we demand that a general meeting of workers be called, and also that meetings be held in the departments to discuss this question. We not only demand, but take on ourselves the initiative for calling such meetings. If we succeed in getting a general meeting or departmental meeting called, we carry a decision refusing to enter the fascist trade union, and we propose that the workers elect a committee, a commission or special delegates from the shops to discuss and decide current questions. If nevertheless all the workers are forcibly registered in the fascist union, we ourselves, of course, also join it, struggling against individual desertions from the union, which means dismissal from the factory. As members of the fascist trade union, we carry on systematic work to unite the workers, expose the leaders of the fascist trade union, the absence of democracy in it, etc., and lead the workers up to the struggle against the fascist system as a whole. If elections take place at the factory for any trade union organ (representative, delegate, member of committee, etc.), we put forward our candidates, get them elected and utilize the elected post to rouse the workers against the fascist union, showing them in practice by a series of concrete measures that the fascist trade union is an agency of the employer, while the fascist state is the weapon of finance capital for crushing the working class movement and enslaving the working class.

You may ask whether a Communist can really be a member of a fascist union? He can. Why cannot he trick the fascists and join the union at the instructions of his organization? To trick the enemy is of benefit to the working class. Lenin gave us very definite and unambiguous directives on this matter. The chief thing in such cases is systematic help to the Party organization or the Communists who carry out the line decided on. If there are no elections either at the factory or in the trade union, the committee and the representative being appointed from above, the acceptance of posts in the lower trade union organ of a fascist trade union is *permissible in the exceptional circumstances* of which I spoke above, and is dependent on the agreement of the workers of the given factory and the election of a special commission of support. The Party organization must pay special attention at these factories to the formation of *trade union groups of Communists and non-Party workers*, and on the activity of these groups the

success of our work in the fascist trade unions will depend.

If we were to count up how many times the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. have passed decisions on the need to strengthen and develop work in war factories, we should get a pretty long list, quite a few years old. But we are, in the literal sense of the word, moving along at a snail's pace in this connection. Can we continue to move at such a pace? We cannot. The factories producing rifles, machine guns, and tanks, the shipyards, the gun foundries, the explosives works, the chemical factories, etc., and finally transport must now be the central objective of our efforts.

In connection with the approach of war, I should like to speak of one question, namely, sea transport, and here I include the harbor workers. It is well known that since the imperialist war all the imperialist powers, when building passenger and merchant steamers, have in view the necessity of converting them into auxiliary steamers in case of war. For this purpose special platforms are built for mounting guns, and constructional alterations are made in cargo and passenger ships so as to make their transformation easier in case of war.

What have our Parties and trade unions done to expose to the broad masses this specific form of preparation for war? Sea transport will play and cannot help playing a tremendous role in a war. What have our sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. done to organize the seamen and harbor workers? Very little. And yet, there are great possibilities at the present time in this sphere. The biggest federation in the Amsterdam International was the International Transport Federation, led by the well known demagogue, Fimmen. It was the most active. The smashing of the German trade union movement led not only to this Federation being weakened numerically, but to its financial bankruptcy. The Federation even stopped the publication of its journal, even though, according to its own statement, it still has almost a million and a half members. On the other hand, in connection with the special strikebreaking policy of the International Transport Federation in the last class struggles of the seamen in the Baltic countries and in other European countries, the hatred towards this Federation is increasing among the masses. It would seem that there is every reason to gather the discontented, to organize them, to form groups, to help the International of Seamen in its work, but this is not being done. The International of Seamen and Harbor Workers which has carried on great work since the Hamburg Unity Congress does not find the proper support in the chief countries. What has the British Communist Party done to develop work among the seamen? Nothing. What has the American Communist Party done? Very little. What have the French Com-

unist Party and the C.G.T.U. done? Still less. And war is coming nearer and nearer. In this war, sea transport will play a very big role. In this sphere there are possibilities not only in the sense of forming a serious trade union opposition, but even in the sense of winning individual unions over. To ignore the work among the seamen and harbor workers is to show an insufficiently serious attitude to the approaching war. We must understand that one of the very important sections of our front is to prepare the masses for the forthcoming imperialist and anti-Soviet war. Think for a minute—if we seriously set this work going in Britain, U.S.A., France and Japan, what tremendous importance this will have for the further fate of the development of the world workers' movement and our struggle against war. Of course we cannot imagine that work among the merchant seamen is enough to deliver a shattering blow at war. That would be an exaggeration, but this is the section of the proletariat which can do more in the struggle against war than other sections of the proletariat, because the merchant seamen are most closely connected with the sailors of the navy.

Finally we should not forget that over 100,000 seamen pass through the ports of the U.S.S.R. every year. They come to our clubs, read our literature, listen to lectures, go to the Soviet cinemas and make themselves acquainted with our Socialist construction, etc. How do our Parties, our sections of the R.I.L.U. utilize these enormous permanent "workers' excursions"? We spend a long time preparing workers' delegations to the U.S.S.R. Sometimes all the workers' delegations comprise several thousand persons. The Parties, the revolutionary trade unions, the Friends of the Soviet Union and other bodies busy themselves with them. In sea transport, without the slightest effort on the part of the Parties and the revolutionary trade unions, we have over 100,000 "excursionists" a year to the U.S.S.R. They return with new impressions. Often they return already organized, but in Great Britain, for instance, they cannot find whom to get into contact with. How do the Parties utilize this tremendous mass of seamen? Do they establish contacts with those who return, and try to use them for developing and widening the work among the seamen? I know of no such cases. If they exist, it is very desirable that the comrades should not keep them secret. We must put a stop to the abnormal situation in which this sector of our front is utterly neglected, in which the seamen and harbor workers who are becoming revolutionary do not find sufficiently rapid and proper help from us. We must put an end to such a situation when the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. have a lukewarm attitude towards these problems. We must put an end to the situation in which hundreds of thousands

of seamen return from the U.S.S.R., and neither the Party nor the revolutionary trade unions realize that they should utilize these natural agitators and propagandists, and not only utilize them among the seamen and harbor workers, but also among the broad strata of the workers of other branches of industry:

What are the conclusions which we have to draw from an analysis of our work since the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.?

1. At every Plenum and Congress we disclose all our weaknesses and shortcomings over and over again, and it appears that *part* of the old mistakes are repeated year after year, and simultaneously new ones are added, as can be seen from the examples quoted by Comrade Piatnitsky. Cannot we once and for all agree to make an attack with our united forces against this repetition of old mistakes?

2. The influence of the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. has undoubtedly increased, because the strength of the organization is determined not only by absolute figures, but also by comparison with other organizations, and on the basis of the circumstances in which the given organization has to struggle. If we take into consideration the tremendous intensity of all the forces of our class enemy, who uses the refined methods of terror and provocation against the revolutionary trade union movement, we must say: Yes, we have moved ahead in spite of all, even though in different sectors there are hold-ups. But we very badly consolidate our growing influence (U.S.A., Japan, France, etc.).

3. Are we moving ahead with the same speed as the growth of the prerequisites for the revolutionary crisis? No, we have an uneven process of development of the revolutionary crisis in various countries. We have an uneven development of the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. But there is one common feature characteristic of all the sections, and that is they lag behind the tempo of the development of events. This lag is smaller in some countries (China, Germany, Poland), and greater in others (France, Great Britain, U.S.A.), but it characterizes the condition of our movement.

4. Are the section of the R.I.L.U. alone to blame for this condition? No, we must say quite frankly that the leadership of the R.I.L.U. is also to blame. We have by no means done all that could have been done. We lost time in the struggle against the Amsterdam International immediately after the destruction of the German trade unions, and this loss of tempo undoubtedly did harm to the international revolutionary movement. We do not react with sufficient speed, promptness and activity to the events which are taking place, and this, of course, is bound to have an influence on the world trade union movement. Comrade Heckert has spoken of this. He

has the *right* to do so, but it was his duty also to say that he is a member of the Executive Board of the R.I.L.U. and that he also bears some responsibility for this.

5. All the efforts of the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. must be directed to overcoming this lagging at all costs and in the shortest possible time. All the efforts of the leaders of the R.I.L.U. must take this direction. Otherwise events may catch us unawares. We must bear in mind that although the sphere for the maneuvers of social-democracy has become narrower and smaller, still it continues to maneuver quite smartly. I will give an example. A few days ago, Paul Faure, the leader of the French Socialist Party, which, as you know, has now split, spoke at a big meeting in Bordeaux and literally said the following:

"From the international point of view, we go to Geneva and together with the people of the Russian revolution we demand general disarmament. If we [?] do not achieve this, then we shall join with Soviet Russia, with the other Red Nations, and ensure international peace."

This same socialist who for long years closed his ears to the Soviet peace proposals, now threatens to form an alliance with Soviet Russia. And in order to confuse things still more, this social demagogue exclaims that he is prepared to unite with the other "Red Nations". What does this mean? What is he talking about? What Red Nations has Paul Faure found? Is this a synonym for the allies of France—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia? Evidently it is. But why are these countries Red?

6. We must undermine and finally abolish the influence of social-democracy. By the example of the U.S.S.R. we must teach the working masses to fight. We must remember that events are developing with tremendous speed and that any lagging in a situation when class contradictions are rapidly developing, plays into the hands of the enemies of the proletariat. This is why the slogan of all the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. must be: "Down with lagging behind"! This is the lever which we must press at all costs to raise the sections of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. to the necessary level.

7. The number of illegal sections of the R.I.L.U. is growing. The sections of the R.I.L.U. which are still legal may be driven underground in connection with the sharpening of the class struggle. And if our legal Communist Parties do not sufficiently prepare for this turn of events, the revolutionary trade unions and trade union opposition give still less thought to it. And yet, this question is one of extreme importance. Both the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions must combine a fierce struggle for the legal open existence of the

revolutionary trade union movement with the adoption of a series of measures in case they are forced to go underground.

8. The intense situation sharply faces us with the question of trade union cadres for legal, semi-legal and illegal work. We must realize that this is a neglected sector. In our Communist Parties and in our revolutionary trade unions, in the revolutionary trade union opposition, we have not as yet, with few exceptions, a well thought out Bolshevik policy of cadres. Very often people are sent into the trade unions when they are no good on other work, on the mistaken supposition that they will be good there carrying on mass work. This is not true. The growth of the mass movement demands leaders and creates leaders. We must be able to train them, and promote them from the ranks. This applies to the entire revolutionary trade union movement from top to bottom.

9. The more intense the class struggle becomes, the more vigilant must the Parties be in the struggle against deviations from the general line of the Comintern. The sharper the struggle, the more attentive the Parties must be towards the leadership of the trade unions, where in view of their composition, the vacillations of which Lenin warned us are inevitable. Without tireless Party control, without the formation of Communist fractions, the revolutionary trade unions may not only lag behind themselves but drag a certain part of the workers with them. Firm and systematic leadership over the trade union fractions is the prerequisite for utilizing the trade unions as one of the weapons for destroying the capitalist system.

10. Without the Communist Parties we cannot create a mass revolutionary trade union movement. The Communist Parties cannot concretely raise the question of power without basing themselves on a mass trade union movement. Therefore, at the present time, the question whether the sections of the R.I.L.U. are really revolutionary and really mass sections assumes exceptionally great importance.

Such are my conclusions. Can we carry out the tasks which we have set? Without a doubt. Once we raise the question of the struggle for Soviet Power seriously, we thereby presuppose that we shall carry out all these tasks. Then what is the matter? Our leading cadres frequently take an attitude of expecting more lengthy prospects than are called for by the objective situation. Therefore they do not sound the alarm regarding the lag behind, frequently acting with the unconscious thought that: "We have plenty of time". They often do not see that the masses and the events are getting ahead of them. They do not ponder the fact to the end that history has entered a period of sharp turns and changes. The revolution may break out