

# SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 5 No. 32

# PRESS

16<sup>th</sup> April 1925

# CORRESPONDENCE

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

## Meeting of the Enlarged Executive.

Sixth Session. Moscow, 30<sup>th</sup>, March 1925.

### Continuation of the Discussion on the Political Situation and the Next Tasks of the Comintern for the Bolshevising of the Parties.

Chairman: Comrade Kolarov.

#### Comrade Tondl (Czechoslovakia):

The work of the Party was made very difficult, for our 100% patriots promised the people, and particularly the working class after the war, that national liberation would bring it great achievements. The Communist Party had to destroy these illusions. We had to enlighten the toiling people about the dangers in which it had become involved as a result of national liberation. The situation in Czechoslovakia is similar to that in France. The French nationalists also promised the working people that the victory over the Central Powers would provide the proletarians with a higher standard of living.

As workers we are principally concerned in determining a line along which to march in order to attain victory by honest work, regardless of personal questions. We will be victorious, but not if conflicts are systematically brought into the Party. The workers will not allow the Party to be injured by personal questions. The working class will protect the purity of the Party and every single person, whether right or left, who injured the Party, will be severely punished.

Comrades, I must add here that several times a well-planned campaign against the employers was annihilated at one stroke by careless people. Attempts were made to foist personal points of views upon others and hence unwholesomenesses arose in the Party. These conflicts give rise to personal hatefulnesses bound to have a bad effect on our activities. This state of affairs must disappear. The proletariat is only concerned in being led to victory by real honest work, and prepared for the moment of the social revolution.

In the interest of these aims we do not want personal conflicts to come into the Party. We must strictly preserve the purity and unity of the Party and when we have achieved that much, then we will also achieve victory.

#### Comrade Pepper (United States):

I am afraid that the Enlarged Executive is showing too little attention for the problems which the CI must solve. We must remember that here we have completely new parts of the globe and thus completely new problems which the CI and Marxism have not yet mastered.

The first period of the CI might be characterised as a **Central European period**. The second period was characterised by the fact that the CI succeeded in drawing the **Far East** into its sphere of interest. Since the Fifth World Congress (and for some of us even before then) it was clear that we must draw a new region into our sphere of interest, and **this region I want to call the Far West**. I believe that the policy of the CI will be dominated more and more powerfully by Great Britain, by the United States of America and by Latin America. That is the **new element** of our period.

**The dominating problem in this Far West is the problem of the labour party, just as social democracy was the specific problem for our parties in Central Europe and the revolutionary national movement for our movement in the Far East.**

Already at the Fifth World Congress I tried to bring the problem of the Labour Party into the forefront of the debate, evidently not with any great success. Still we have something new in Great Britain, two phenomena in fact; 1) the **minority movement**, which since the Fifth World Congress has become a mass movement, and 2) the crystallisation of a **left wing** within the Labour Party. There was no discussion with regard to the Minority Movement. The crystallisation of a **left wing** in the LP, however, encountered the resistance of a certain section of our British comrades. Developments showed, however, that the CI, which had energetically advocated it, was right. The Left Wing of the LP is already of great importance. It is, of course, not a Communist Wing, it is very vague; nevertheless it is already strongly antagonistic to the Mac-Donald-Snowden Wing and in the most important questions is even conducting an independent policy (Vote on the travelling expenses of the Prince of Wales, on air defense, etc.). One after the other, various sections of the Left Wing are being organised. It is becoming evident that ideologically, politically and even organisationally, the Left Wing is beginning to break away from the Right.

How shall our Communist Party work under these conditions? We said that it ought to affiliate with the Labour Party. The leaders of the LP wanted to throw the communists out, but this decision, in consequence of the good fight put up by our comrades, remained merely on paper. The organisation and mass character of the Minority Movement is perhaps a still greater victory of the ideas and the policy of the CI in Great Britain. The most important problem,

however, is: **How can the Communist Party seize the leadership of all these movements?** A Party with four or five thousand members cannot equal to so great a task. I therefore believe that the next and most important task for the British Party consists in finding the **specific british methods** which make it possible for our British Party — in spite of all the contrary traditions of the British labour movement — to become a mass party. So much the more is it a pity that Comrade Gallacher failed to touch on the specific concrete British problem in his report. Our British Party understands very well how to utilise the **trade union problems** energetically, but in the exploitation of **political problems** it is still not sufficiently energetic. For instance, it did not take sufficient advantage of the fight against the monarchy, although the debates in the Labour Party show that this question is a popular one and that this question — even though in a limited form — draws the attention of the workers to the **question of power**.

The second great country which must wrestle with the problem of the Labour Party, is the **United States of America**. The US is politically still more backward than Great Britain in the sense that in spite of the existence of a powerful industrial working class, it still has no organised political mass party of the proletariat. **Today the principal problem of the american working class is to make it politically and organisationally independent of the great parties of the bourgeoisie and of the petty bourgeois party of La Follette.** That is politically the most elementary class task of the proletariat. The CPA is faced by the task of transforming itself into a mass communist party. It is evident that in practice there is today a **great chasm** between these two tasks, which must be overcome by some sort of bridge. **This bridge is the Labour Party.** It is clear that parties built up on individual membership are a much more advanced, conscious, active form of labour party, than the collective form of labour party. Historical circumstances, however, determined that the development of the labour movement in Great Britain, America, Canada, South Africa, Australia and Belgium assumed the form of a labour party and not the form of social democratic parties. I explained the fundamental reason for this development at the Fifth Congress. They are certainly not due to the Anglo-Saxon character of these countries, but to the fact that the early imperialist industrial monopolistic development very early split the proletariat of these countries into the labour aristocracy and the oppressed, unskilled masses of workers, which led to the development of the labour party type. Not until after the smashing of the British industrial monopoly, when the bourgeoisie could no longer divide fat super-profits with the labour aristocracy, and when on the other hand, a process of organisation and of partially successful fights for a higher standard of living had begun in the deep masses of the unskilled proletariat, and when the two sections of the proletariat thus came nearer to each other to some extent, for the first time the possibility arose of organising a political mass party in Great Britain.

In America the social split of the working class is still more evidenced by national differences. The labour aristocracy lived on about the same scale as the bourgeoisie of the capitalist countries of Europe, the real proletariat, however, lived in much worse circumstances than the industrial worker of Germany or of other countries. **The war, however, changed all this.** America at last obtained a centralised, militarised, bureaucratised government. Besides **free land** and the **social split of the working class**, the absence of such a centralised national government was the third reason why no socialist movement developed in the United States. With the aid of this government, the bourgeoisie considerably shook the privileges of the labour aristocracy. Thus the labour aristocracy was compelled at first to concern itself with political questions. But now within the great masses of unskilled workers a new process is also manifest.

During the war, when war industry enormously expanded and no new masses of workers could be imported from Europe, the value of unskilled labour power and the standard of life of the unskilled masses increased tremendously. The war led for the first time to the organisation of millions of unskilled workers into trade unions. By this rapprochement between the labour aristocracy and the unskilled workers, the possibility of a political mass party of the proletariat arose for the **first time in the history** of the United States.

Now as to the role of the small conscious political group within the Labour Party. We have various groups in America

trying to organise a labour party under their leadership (such as the Socialist Party, the Fitzpatrick group in Chicago, the Lafolette group and the Workers' Party of America). Whether or not this will be useful for the proletariat is a matter of opinion. But it is a fact that it is not one group alone which wishes to organise a Labour Party, but that several groups wish to play the role of the British Independent Labour Party. And the Communist Party must take this into account.

The historical task of the CP in the USA can be nothing else in this period than to **transform itself into a mass communist party.** This means that it must take the initiative in organising a labour party, must join with every movement for a labour party, must drive this movement ahead, and get as much as possible out of this movement for itself. We had a discussion on this question in America. One group opposed this labour party policy, and the other group — our group — said that **we must exploit this historical course of development.** I will not go into detail on these fights. But it is necessary that the theses on Bolshevisation contain this important task of the American Party. We hope that this will happen.

This problem is not restricted to America alone but affects other great districts, as mentioned above. It would be anti-Marxist, injurious and impossible to solve these specific problems by ready-made means of solution imported from Central Europe. When the French, Czech, or German Party issue the slogan: "We are the only class party of the proletariat", it would be wrong to issue it for Great Britain and still worse for the United States of America.

Of course the Labour party is not a revolutionary class party of the proletariat. In spite of this fact we must not only join it in America, but must take the initiative in organising it. The CP cannot become a mass party so long as the proletariat is organised in the camp of the bourgeoisie. Development might skip certain stages, but to skip in America the whole history of the labour movement is impossible.

It is certain that development in America will be much shorter than development in Germany from the 'sixties to the world war. We must not see **only the backwardness** of America, but we must **also** see that America today is the dominating nation of the imperialist world, that today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow it may have conflicts, that at any moment it may be drawn into war and that America has **the greatest proletariat** and the mightiest industry.

In America one must not forget that on account of special historical circumstances, we are in a much better situation than the CP. GB. There is a possibility that the CPA can play the role of the ILP of Great Britain, the role of the organiser, the ideologist, the pioneer, the leader of a Labour Party. In this way, the CP can actually gain contact with the proletarian masses of America, secondly, it can become a real mass party, and thirdly, by the awakening of the class-consciousness of the proletariat, it can give an unexampled impetus to the whole development.

I believe that the correct solution of this problem can only be found when not only the British and American comrades engage in this work, but when all the leading parties of the Comintern and especially the trained parties, the Russian and German Parties, assist in solving this new problem of the Far West.

## Comrade Cannon :

The problem of Bolshevisation in America has certain concrete aspects: The problem is concurrent with the problem of organising the party, for we are at the **beginning of the task of forming a communist party in America**, and the situation is different from the countries of Europe. We never had a revolutionary mass movement in America and have few traditions and experiences to draw upon. We have a large proletariat in America, but the party has only 20,000 members, of which only 2,000 are in the English speaking organisations. The American proletariat is politically very backward and the most elementary tasks are necessary in the attempt to set it in motion.

**We must develop the propaganda of Marxist-Leninist theory.** In this sense I agree with comrade Bela Kun's report. The Party developed from two sources — the Socialist Party which never had any Marxian theory, and from the syndicalist

organisations, which also neglected theoretical questions. But in training a cadre of functionaries we must be careful not to train functionaries separate from the masses. We must be careful with the term professional revolutionaries — they must be workshop revolutionaries primarily. From the Central Committee to the lowest organisation the Party must attain a more working class character. The tendency toward Dilletantism and careerism must be combatted.

We have two fundamental problems: 1. **trade union work** and 2. **shop nuclei organisation**. Trade union work has been more or less neglected because the weakness of the trade unions made the work very difficult. We must combat the tendency to neglect this work, and instead, must actually help to build up the trade unions themselves. The second problem, that of organising shop nuclei, is very important, although its solution does not alone solve the problem of Bolshevisation.

Our main difficulties are: 1. we are a **small party in a big industrial country**; 2. the **trade union movement is very weak**; 3. **our party is divided into foreign language groups**, each with its own national apparatus, and each tending toward specialising in the problems peculiar to the group. The language Federation form of organisation is absolutely incompatible with a Bolshevist organisation. We must have a centralised form of organisation or we will never be a Bolshevist Party.

Now as to the **question of the Labour Party**. It is not quite correct to compare our situation with that of England. The British Labour Party is an old party and is supported by the entire trade union movement. The British trade union movement is much stronger than the American movement. There is no labour party in America. All attempts to create one in the past two years have been disastrous failures. The organised American workers are not yet class-conscious enough to develop a Labour Party on a mass basis, founded on the trade unions, and we want no other kind. We want no Communist Labour Party, for such a party will become a small group separated from the masses. A real mass labour party based on the trade unions, and not restricted to communists, will be a great step forward, and in forming such a party we can learn from the experiences of the past two years. Such a labour party must be (1) a mass organisation; (2) based on the trade unions; (3) a general labour movement in which the Communists can work, but in which they will not lose their identity. Under present conditions there can be no question of organising such a labour party. The thing for us to do now is to conduct agitation and propaganda based on the concrete immediate problems of the workers and to raise the issue of independent political action and an independent party in connection with them. We must bring the workers into conflict with the petty bourgeois ideas. It would be premature to form a labour party now, and even dangerous, for we would quickly become isolated from this growing mass labour movement. We know this from our own experience of the past two years, and especially in connection with the Federated Farmer Labour Party and the St. Paul convention. We hope for the assistance of our Russian comrades, so that our movement will not be derailed and side-tracked and will not become the victim of experimental theories. Concrete issues are in the foreground of our problems. The American workers still follow the parties of big capital or the petty-bourgeois movement of La Follette. We must reach the masses and set them into motion in the class struggle. Our means for doing this is **united front struggles** on the basis of the concrete immediate problems of the workers

Chairman, Comrade Kolarov:

## Comrade Kuusinen:

In my opinion the **task of bolshevisation** is identical with the leadership programme of the Communist Party, and from four points of view firstly, the correct leadership of the Communist Party, which indeed is identical with the task of bolshevisation in the narrow sense of the word, secondly, the correct leadership of the great mass of the proletariat; thirdly, the correct leadership of the reserves of the proletarian revolution, and fourthly the correct leadership of the fight against the enemies of the proletarian revolution. All this taken together is in fact identical with what we usually imply by the conception of the **role and character of the Communist Party**.

The most important factor is of course the **direction of the leadership**. Imagine an ideal Left socialist party which is earnestly-minded to become a Communist Party. Such a party can do much good. It can carry on the class struggle against the bourgeoisie, and in certain spheres very energetically. It does not commit any gross opportunist errors. In this respect it is careful; it does everything faultlessly, except for one thing: it makes no preparations for the revolutionary struggle. It lacks something, something very essential. It is not yet bolshevised. It would be very easy to imagine a contrary example: a revolutionary, or, shall we say, a communist sect, which also lacks a bolshevist character.

Our slogan — **bolshevisation** — is a **fighting slogan against opportunist tendencies**, but it does not favour sectarian tendencies. Sectarianism is indeed the antitheses of opportunism. Opportunism and sectarianism pursue the same path — but in opposite directions. The path of Leninism, however, goes in quite a different direction.

You know that mechanical combinations of both deviations, opportunism and sectarianism occur. Trotskyism represents such a mechanical combination.

It may be said that policy is one thing and the correct practical and organisational execution of that policy another. Comrade Kreibich the other day said that a right direction is not the only cure, but that the question of execution and of correct methods was also very essential. That is true in itself, but one thing must not be forgotten. We must first have a right direction. Without this prerequisite all the talk about correct execution is not worth anything. And it is just in that respect that Comrades Kreibich and Thalheimer have sinned. That is clear from the articles written by these comrades against the decisions of the Fifth Congress and especially on the question of the tactics of the united front and the Workers' and Peasants' Government.

For Thalheimer the important thing is to bring about common action with the social democrats not only with the masses, but also with their leaders. That is opportunist. He calls the social democrats, and especially their leaders, "partners", just as in a game of cards. He wants to win this partner for common action. We, however, want to win the masses for common action. On the other hand, we want to defeat the leaders of the social democrats in every action.

The same thing is to be observed with regard to the slogan of the **Workers' and Peasants' government**. Comrade Kreibich absolutely fails to understand the revolutionary significance of this slogan. For him there can only be either a common government with the social democrats or none at all. He fails to understand that in this slogan we are putting before the masses the question of power. For us the slogan is of course only a pseudonym for the proletarian dictatorship, and nothing else. But for the masses, who stand outside parties, and are backward, that is not the case. These masses do not understand and are still too immature to fight for the proletariat, and so this slogan is necessary.

I fear that in the **trade union question** also Comrades Thalheimer and Kreibich, although they say that this is the only question on which the Fifth Congress took a correct decision, failed to understand the correctness of the decision of the Fifth Congress and lent it an opportunist meaning. They place the whole emphasis upon the creation of unity in the trade union movement. Of course we have to count with that as a real possibility; I even believe that unity will be brought about. But supposing that it does not come about, are our tactics wrong? Of course not. By our slogan of the unity of the trade union movement we attempt to isolate the masses in the Amsterdam Federation from their reactionary leaders. That must be our aim.

I must say that in my opinion **our parties have only just begun bolshevisation**. In the leadership of nearly all the mass parties we still find too much slackness, too much renunciation of the leadership of the fight by the party leadership, too much following of a humdrum and routine path. The Bolshevist method of approaching the masses is still not sufficiently understood in our Parties. In this respect they commit daily errors in practice, errors which the opportunists can exploit in order to declare that their policy is right and ours is wrong. Our comrades are frequently guilty of practical errors, and in certain cases so far as to behave in face of the non-party masses as though in a party crisis, and as though one could appeal to the masses for party discipline. I must also say

that our theoreticians in this respect have not sufficiently worked out the principles of work. How do we explain the day-to-day political phenomena? or at least how do we explain in a Marxian way the fundamental features in the economic and social structure? This is a problem to which our theoreticians should pay far greater attention in order to further the development of our methods of practical work.

What in my opinion is the most important, and what we have hitherto little understood, is the **organisation of the day-to-day work among the masses**. In order to learn how to organise we must extend and train the leading cadres of our parties. In every capitalist country we must continuously draw fresh organisers from the ranks of the working class in industry. The training of organisers is closely bound up with nucleus work. Organisers will develop out of nucleus work: nucleus organisers, fraction organisers, group leaders, etc. in this way we shall develop a new revolutionary type of official. Many comrades cannot understand this duty, and that is especially true of Comrades Thalheimer and Kreibich. They do not see bolshevisation in this. They remind us that on the question of Party development in the West there is a different view from that in Russia. That is quite true. They say that in the West the Parties have been fused together from varying material, and that is true. But from that they draw the conclusion that bolshevisation in the West is therefore unnecessary. That is absolutely false. For that very reason bolshevisation in the West is needed. Comrades Thalheimer and Kreibich accuse the leaders of Comintern of regarding bolshevisation too mechanically and of wanting mechanically to transfer the Russian forms of organisation to the movement in the West. No, on the contrary. They themselves have a too mechanical conception of the problem of bolshevisation. They understand bolshevisation as meaning nothing else than removing the leaders from the sections in the western countries. The removal of leaders is only an extreme measure. To make the leaders communists, bolshevists, is quite a different thing. There are special situations in which that becomes necessary. Comrades Thalheimer and Kreibich say that so far we got most of our leaders from the old social democrats who were the "old guard" in the Western communist parties, and that now we want to remove the old guard. In other respects these comrades are opposed to Russian measures but on this point, they say, that they are in favour of Russian methods. They say that in Russia continuity has always been maintained. Yes, that is true, in Russia there has always been continuity of leadership. But the "social democrats" who stood at the head of the Bolshevik Party of Russia were something rather different from the social democrats of Western countries. They were not half social democrats, they were not half Mensheviks; on the contrary, they carried on a continuous fight against Menshevism. On the other hand, in many Western countries we had comrades standing at the head of communist parties who had not made a complete break with social democratic conditions. The analogy therefore is out of place. Comrade Kreibich is surprised that something more is expected of him that he should be absolutely loyal although he is pursuing a different policy. At least it should be good enough for party leadership. There are many people in Russia who are not revolutionaries but who are nevertheless loyal. These people are employed as specialists but they are not allowed in the Party leadership. The important question arises, how are we to make the comrades who were social democratic leaders and who have still not entirely purged themselves of the traditions, slough their skins? This "sloughing problem" of the former social democratic functionaries, does not apply to the workers. For them it is easier: they are helped by their proletarian class instinct, provided the Party leadership is sure and steady. For leaders, however, "sloughing" is very difficult under the best circumstances. How can it be assisted? It can be assisted only by what Comrade Smeral calls "massaging". Nothing else will do. That is always essential. I do not mean that it is necessary only on the part of the Executive but also on the part of the individual parties and the proletariat. Better still is it if the massaging is done by revolutionary history itself. That is the best way of making a revolution in the brain of these comrades.

**Expulsion is of course not a regular method of party leadership.** It is often necessary, as for example, in the case of Bubnik in Czechoslovakia. But when comrades accuse us of using it as a regular method of party leadership it is not true. Just as war is not a method of production, so expulsion is

not a regular method of party leadership. On the question of methods of party leadership, two deviations are to be noted: the opportunists insist upon unlimited formal party democracy, in which the leading party bodies play the part simply of a bureau for registration and representation, while the sectarians constantly appeal to pure violence, which simply results in the isolation of the leaders. There is also a third possibility: the mechanical combination of formal democracy in the periphery of the party with complete autocracy in the "central authority". We had a crass example of the latter only a year ago in the former Communist Party of Sweden. What we are aiming at is the exact opposite of what these deviations are aiming at. They renounce active revolutionary leadership, activity, and the active influencing of the Party masses by the leading Party bodies. Bolshevisation, however, implies a constant development and strengthening of the Party leadership, and clever leadership. How can this intensification of leadership be obtained? Only by energising the whole Party membership and only on the basis of the day-to-day participation of increasing numbers of the Party membership in Party work.

Of course, the **degree of severity of Party discipline** should be made dependent upon the acuteness of the war situation and of the level of revolutionary development of the party. In Russia the method of maintaining Party discipline was quite different during the period of military communism from what it is now. The method in the Scandinavian parties, of course, must at present be different from that, for instance, of the German and Polish Parties. But one thing must not be forgotten, and that is that the best developed Communist Party must not systematically neglect to apply the method of internal party democracy. On the other hand, a Party which is just making the first steps towards bolshevisation, must not renounce for one moment the development and strengthening of its leadership: It must develop it to an increasing degree by the methods of internal Party discipline, by trial and examination, by education and persuasion, and by the "massage" of the Party members.

In conclusion a word on the subject of **international leadership**. Comrades Kreibich and Thalheimer, in their articles written against the Fifth Congress, say that the Russian leadership of Comintern wants to remove the old and independent people from the leadership of the Western parties in order to make it possible to lead these parties directly from Moscow. In connection with this we hear the assertion that the "personal" question of Trotsky determined the decisions of the Fifth Congress as to who was to be driven out of the leadership of the Western parties and who was to remain. Such assertions smack of the *feuilletons* of liberal boulevard newspapers. It is essential to call the comrades who make such assertions to order.

They also talk of the development of a crisis in the Communist International and warn us against recommending the Western parties to pursue the path of the Russian Revolution.

It seems to me that what Thalheimer calls Russian is in fact **revolutionary**. The articles of these two comrades are permeated with an anti-Russian spirit. I do not mean that they are opposed to everything Russian. They are opposed only to what is Bolshevik Russian. This attitude is to be regarded as a grave symptom of an "independent" communism. We have seen this type of communism recently in Sweden and Norway. What is an independent Communist? He is an opportunist who calls himself a communist and believes himself to be one, but who in fact opposes the Communist International.

The comrades mentioned advise the leaders of the Communist International, and especially the Russian leaders of the Communist International, so to manage the leadership that it shall become superfluous. In other words, they advise the self-liquidation of the Russian leadership of the Communist International. They quote certain words of Lenin to the effect that the hegemony of the Russian movement in the international working class movement is only a transitional one. That may be true; but, in the first place the question of abolishing the Russian hegemony has been raised rather too prematurely. Secondly, even when the Russian proletariat no longer have the hegemony there will still be Russian comrades on the Executive. And thirdly — and what is most important — the Executive will play a leading role as long as it remains a Bolshevik Executive. It is against this leading role of the Executive that the attacks of the two comrades are directed.

What they call "Russian" is the revolutionary and bolshevist leadership in the Communist International. I think, however, that all criticism of the activities of the Executive must be justified. The Executive Committee recently, for instance, actively intervened in the situation of the Swedish Party since the Fifth World Congress. Was that right or wrong? That question they must answer. The second point is the improvement of the relations between the Executive and the Sections of the Communist International. Comrades must find in common methods of better organising these relations, mutual information and the work of the Executive. But not a single step must be made in the direction of de-bolshevisation.

It is not very long ago that a leader of the German Party wrote that "our path" in the Western countries was a different path from that of Russian bolshevism. Comrades, we now know where the path of that leader led — it led straight to hell.

## Comrade Kreibich (Czechoslovakia):

The keynote in our decision upon tactics is **the judgement of the general world situation**. I find that Zinoviev's speech was not as clear and precise as the theses submitted to us just on this point. It impressed me as blunting the edge of the theses. Zinoviev should have spoken here as unequivocally as Stalin in his article in the Pravda of March 22nd on the international situation and the tasks of the Comintern. Zinoviev's statement that capitalism is mortally wounded and therefore cannot recover from the wounds of the world war and of the Bolshevist revolution approaches closer to the Luxemburgist theory of mechanical collapse than to Lenin's declaration at the Second World Congress in 1920, that there is no blind alley for capitalism, and that it would find a way out, if it were not killed by the proletarian revolution. Since this statement of Lenin we have experienced the Polish war, the unsuccessful German Revolution and the Dawes Plan, and under these circumstances, a vaguer formulation is especially inexpedient. Varga is justified in denying that stabilisation has definitely succeeded, but nevertheless Stalin's precise and clear formulation is necessary, because this is the most important problem. Comrade Zinoviev has unfortunately linked himself up too closely with the German Left to formulate the matter anew and clearly and unhesitatingly. And nevertheless, the German Left phrases last year of preparedness at any moment for revolution render a sharper, clearer foundation of the theses necessary. This gives the impression that the theses are written in one way and speeches are made in another. No one in the CI has represented Anglo-American cooperation as an amelioration of imperialism, à la Kautsky. In the draft of the manifesto upon the tenth anniversary of the outbreak of the war, Trotsky wrote that the Anglo-American antagonism would be the focal antagonism of the future; this sentence was deleted at that time. The question of the duration of this collaboration, the question as to whether the forces and interests driving in this direction, i. e., the menace of collapse in Europe, the rise of the Asiatic colonial people, joint interests in China, and against Japan and Russia, will be stronger in the near future than the antagonisms in other problems of world politics. It is open for discussion whether the perspective of an Anglo-American war, or of a war of imperialism against the peoples of the East is correct, but one cannot call one of these Bolshevist and the other opportunist. We have regarded imperialism not as the epoch of a mortally wounded capitalism, but as the epoch of the intensification of the antagonisms between the capitalist states, of the antagonisms between capital and labour, and between the colonial peoples and the imperialist powers. The world revolution is a long process with temporary stabilisation, and, therefore, pointing out such a stabilisation can neither disappoint nor discourage us.

The Left have a very simple answer to the question of where the Right is to be found: whoever does not agree with us on all points is Right. Through their persecution and their mechanical measures the Left have rendered the ideological exposure of the Right impossible. We have no Right Wing in the Party, which wants to return to the Social Democracy, or wants to follow a social democratic policy. But the character of the Right Wing consists in the inability to carry on communist, Bolshevist agitation and propaganda policies, as well as Bolshevist inner political and organisational Party politics.

This results in errors, blunders, and very often in passivity. These phenomena are also to be found in the Left. Only free discussion and criticism can expose deviations in the eyes of the masses. Whether the danger is greater on the Left or on the Right is not a matter for snap judgement. After 1907 Lenin fought against the Otsoviki and Liquidators with equal vigour, and at the Third World Congress adopted an equally critical attitude towards the Right and towards the Left. We are emphatically pointing out the danger of a one-sided, mechanical fight against the Right. We do not threaten a split, but we issue a warning.

We most heartily agree with the theses laid before us. Their new content as against that of the Fifth World Congress consists in the detailing of Bolshevist tactics and the statement that Bolshevisation should not only be carried out from above but also through Party democracy and free discussion. Stalin emphasised that in the Czechoslovakian Commission when he demanded the open, ideological struggle against the Right. Unfortunately Zinoviev and Ruth Fischer did not mention just these points in the theses. In Germany, the ultra-Left as well as the Right were only fought against with mechanical disciplinary weapons. Through this the masses learned nothing of what the struggle is all about. We demand the methods of Party democracy and of free discussion and are against the pure Communist treatment of the illness of the Party.

**Bolshevisation requires grasping the situation in each country and adapting our methods to it.** There was very little of a definite nature to be heard on this point in the speeches of the representatives of the various Parties. The problem of the difference between the situation in Russia after 1907 and the present situation in the Western countries, and the resulting consequences for the methods of Bolshevisation must be thoroughly discussed. Otherwise, Bolshevisation will remain on paper or we will be menaced by the danger of the mechanical and exaggerated, forced execution of this serious and great task. Then we will experience such superficial, innerly untrue boasts, like the phrase of the German Left at the Fifth Congress, that the Party was at any day prepared for the revolution. The result of such tactics would be either the split, the disintegration, or the inner decay of the Communist Party. The personal problem of leadership is also important in this connection. We want the same thing as Zinoviev: an amalgam of the old and the young; nor do we want to use any rusty iron, but Comrade Zinoviev has had foisted upon him of late very much worthless tin. The last two elections in Germany are a signal of warning. The turning away of millions from the CPG cannot be explained simply by the immaturity of the masses and their illusions as Zinoviev does. Neither does the altogether too primitive statement suffice that in the period of the ebb tide of the revolution we must count with a temporary weakening of the Communist Party.

In **Czechoslovakia** we must reckon with the fact that authority and discipline in the masses are not as firmly implanted as in Germany. Our working class grew up in a decaying State. In the Czechoslovakian working class we have in addition the circumstance that they grew up in a national struggle against the authority of the State and against any authority at all. The Czech worker is no less revolutionary; our Party is comparatively stronger in the Czech working class than in the German working class. But the path to the Czech worker, through his revolutionary education, does not lead through the assertion of authority and discipline from outside; the Czech worker needs to be convinced and won over. The methods of command of the Left, their dogmatic, doctrinaire, bloodless language, which shows no signs of inner life, will not win the Czech worker. The methods of work of agents will not make a beginning here — and certainly not when insufficient attention is paid to purity. We call upon the Russian comrades, to send us serious, conscientious counsellors and helpers who will work with us. If the Russian comrades, with their rich revolutionary experience, with their comprehensive and profound theoretical training, assist us and the serious, able Left elements, we will succeed in bringing the revolutionary element out of the Czech worker and he, just as the entire proletariat of Czechoslovakia, will do his duty in the proletarian revolution.

## Comrade Neurath (Czechoslovakia):

This time the Executive did not adopt the same path in dealing with the Czech question as at the time of the Fourth Congress. At that time the Czech Question was discussed

first in the Plenum and then in the Commission. After it was decided this time without opposition to work first in the Commission and then to give a report in the Plenum, we had to follow this plan. The report of the Commission will show whether it is necessary to open the debate on the Czech question anew in the Plenum. When comrade Kreibich now happened to speak about the work in the Czech Commission, he ought not to content himself with intimations and insinuations, but either openly bring forth what he has to say on the Czech Question or await the report of the Commission.

Comrade Smeral made a panic speech in the Czech Commission with reference to economics and Comrade Kreibich in the Plenum with reference to politics. The views of Smeral and Kreibich in no way correspond with our conditions, or the views and feelings of the Czechoslovakian working class. The words of Comrade Zinoviev, that we are not confronted with an immediate revolutionary situation at the present moment in any capitalist state, must not be interpreted in relation to the situation in Czechoslovakia to mean that there is any stabilisation of the economic and political conditions. The bourgeoisie is feeling the superior competition of German industry, and fears the collapse of the Czech valuta. Hence it is taking a great number of firm economic measures directed against the proletariat and middle sections. The tax policy, the dismissal of tens of thousands of State employees, tariff policy, housing, and the reduction of unemployment doles. All the measures taken in these questions are directed against the social conditions of all the toiling masses of Czechoslovakia, and all these measures naturally arouse the resistance of the working class. The same is true of the results of the so-called land reform which the Czechoslovakian government is carrying out and which is nothing more nor less than a Czechification of large districts belonging to national minorities. The Czechoslovakian Government is also compelled to fight against unsurmountable difficulties, which are arising in consequence of its policy of national oppression. If one also takes into consideration that the Czech bourgeoisie, because of its whole economic and political situation, and as a consequence of its most ridiculous strategic situation, is compelled to do all sorts of laskey work for French imperialism in Central Europe, and consequently must spend huge sums for military armaments, then it is easily understood that the present economic and political situation in Czechoslovakia is far from being a stable one.

I would like at first to make a few supplementary remarks to the report of Comrade Hruska. Bolshevisation of the Party is of course no empty phrase for us. Bolshevisation, that is, that the CP Czechoslovakia was and is obliged to take the necessary tactical, organisational and political measures which will make it possible for it to establish really close contact with the masses of the social democratic and indifferent workers. Reorganisation of the Party does not mean merely taking mechanical and administrative measures. Just as we want to make the factory councils, by means of Communist influence capable not only of controlling production, but of taking over the administration entirely, in the same way we must see to it as quickly as possible that the factory nuclei are imbued with political life and are made capable of establishing our political power in the capitalist factories at the decisive moments of revolutionary conflicts.

The Bolshevisation of the Party, and the establishment of contact with the masses of indifferent and social democratic workers, must be based on the honest practical application of the trade union tactic adopted at the Fifth World Congress. The complicated situation in Czechoslovakia not only does not make these tactics superfluous, but on the contrary, compels us to apply the new trade union tactic more consistently than in the other States. At this moment the Czech bourgeoisie is organising a new and dangerous blow against the Czech proletariat. As usual, it is opening its attack in the Ostrau-Karvin District. It is no secret that the social democrats in the Government and those at the head of reformist trade unions etc. but the Germans and the Czechs, have practically formed a united front with the bourgeoisie against the working class. We will successfully further the resistance of the proletarians of the Amsterdam Unions against their reformist leaders only if we carry on far-reaching, active fractional work, especially in the Amsterdam Unions. The Party must, of course, support the Red unions with all the means at its command, especially in their fight against the so-called unions of offence. We

realise that the new trade union tactic cannot be applied in its entirety overnight, but what we consider necessary, possible, and taken for granted, is that our comrades who occupy responsible posts in the trade union movement will honestly strive to cooperate with the Party not only in words, but with suitable action.

• In this connection I want to say a few words on the **question of the workers' and peasants' government** which today again — unnecessarily — was raised by Comrade Kreibich. This question is no longer an object of conflict with us. It has never been difficult for us — and today certainly not — to show the working class of Czechoslovakia clearly that in the course of all social conflicts the Coalition Government stands firmly behind the bourgeoisie, always ready to place all the weapons of power of the State at the service of the fight of the exploiters against their labour slaves. The workers — and naturally not only those influenced by communism — large sections of the petty bourgeoisie and of the small peasants realise ever more clearly that the Coalition Government, whose measures are directed against the interests of all workers, must be driven out and replaced by a government of workers and peasants. The workers of Czechoslovakia clearly understand the revolutionary spirit of the slogan "Workers and Peasants Government". It has today already become an entirely superfluous quibble which interests no one, whenever the so-called argument is tossed about whether or not the workers' and peasants' government is a pseudonym or synonym for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

A few words with regard to what Comrades Smeral and Kreibich call the "mechanical application of discipline". We have heard this argument for years from those who had any serious differences with the Comintern and who were tending to drift away from it — discipline for these comrades is apparently a beautiful conception as long as there are no difficulties in exercising discipline. Comrade Kreibich even went so far as to say in the so-called Turkestan style about the "commissaries and agents of the Comintern", who, as Paul Levi has long ago told us, bring unrest into the Sections of the Comintern. With this argument Comrade Kreibich reached the lowest level in the polemic against the Comintern and against the CC of the CP of Czechoslovakia. It seems that the commissaries, agents and Turkestans of the Comintern were agreeable as far as he was concerned only as long as he could be united and allied with them. More than two years ago Comrade Kreibich fought with me in close alliance with the "Commissaries of the CI", as for instance with Comrade Bela Kun against Comrade Smeral and his policy, and he conducted a passionate struggle against the silly argument which was used at that time by Smeral and others against the "commissaries of the C.I.". Now Comrade Kreibich is using the same worn-out arguments of the Turkestans. What happened to make this transformation possible? It is very simple: more than two years ago Comrade Kreibich was in the Left Wing of the Comintern and fought resolutely against opportunism and against Smeralism, and today Kreibich is in the Right Wing of the Comintern and is fighting arm in arm with Comrade Smeral against the Comintern. It was not the Comintern which changed its policy or, as one likes to say, "the methods and forms"; but it is Comrade Kreibich who has transferred his position and his standpoint a little — that is, from the extreme Left to pretty near the extreme Right — that is all.

Kreibich spoke here about the conditions in the German Party and the fact that the German Section had lost supporters lately. He mentioned rather ironically that it might have been a good thing though if the German Party had not announced at the Fifth Congress, through its representatives, that it is ready any day to "make" the revolution. No one actually used this silly phrase at the Fifth Congress. What the German Party said, and rightly too, and what it can confidently repeat today, is that it is ready and capable at any moment when a revolutionary situation arises, to lead the masses of the workers of Germany into battle. Nothing has changed or will change in these facts, even in a period of the ebb of the revolutionary wave, as this seems always to strengthen temporarily not only the bourgeoisie, but also its best ally, the social democrats. It is a pity, says Kreibich, and not only for the Right, but also for the Left, that the revolutionary wave was not used. Perfectly true. But why does not Comrade Kreibich apply to the correct address? Why was not

the German October utilised. Simply because the leaders of the CPG at that time were not capable of taking advantage of the situation and of leading the masses into the revolutionary fight, and this failure of the Brandler leadership of the CPG at that time resulted in that unexampled defeat of the German proletariat.

The comrades speak here of a revolutionary wave which had not been utilised, of the Turkestans, and all sorts of other fine things like that. But what was actually the duty of the comrades of the minority of the CC of the CP of Czechoslovakia, of the minority of the CC of the CP of Czechoslovakia. They ought to come here and say openly and clearly what does not suit them in the politics of the new leadership of the CP of Czechoslovakia, and what we did not do correctly in the sphere of trade union or parliamentary activity, in political activity, etc. The comrades have done nothing of the kind. They did not bring forth the smallest argument in the Enlarged Executive, or in the Czechoslovakian Commission against the policy of the new leadership of the CP of Czechoslovakia.

In conclusion I wish to say expressly that the majority of the CC of the CP of Czechoslovakia does not count on any "mechanical measures" of the Comintern in the Czechoslovakian question, and absolutely does not need such measures. We are completely satisfied if the Executive, after a thorough investigation of the work and the policy of the CC of the CP of Czechoslovakia, candidly expresses its opinion.

The new leadership is of the opinion that after the negotiations of the Enlarged Executive on our tactic, no doubt may remain, either in the question of the trade unions, or in the question of the reorganisation of the Party on the basis of factory nuclei, or in any other sphere. After the Enlarged Executive, the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia and above all its leaders, should be given the unimpeded opportunity by the Right, to continue working resolutely, especially for the Bolshevisation of the Party, that is, to work in such a way that in the near future the Communist Party will really get in close touch with the masses and can have the leadership of the masses in the social conflicts.

## Comrade Clara Zetkin:

I sincerely greet the theses on Bolshevisation laid before us. In the main, as far as the essentials, the goals are concerned, I warmly greet them as they are. Comrade Zinoviev is entirely right. Unfortunately, the objective world situation is not immediately revolutionary at this moment. However, that by no means signifies a lessening of the obligation to be active resting upon the Communist Party, rather an increase, a tremendous test of their maturity and strength. Without looking at the development of the Communist Parties in a pessimistic light, I find that the difference between the great and difficult struggles of the proletariat which are approaching and the maturity, the strength of our sections is still very great. This of course does not apply to the Communist Party of Russia. I therefore consider the theses on the Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties absolutely urgent and necessary.

Comrade Ruth Fischer protested sharply against elements of the "Right" placing themselves upon the platform of the Bolshevisation theses. From her statements it could be seen very clearly that she considers such declarations a dishonest manoeuvre of certain shelved leaders to regain the leadership of the German Party. Such a charge is all the less justified, as even the Left held a point of view on vital Party questions, questions of trade union policy, which differed sharply from the standpoint of the Executive, and resisted energetically and passionately against a change of their viewpoint up to a short time ago. What would the Left say of the statement that the rather sudden shift of their standpoint was a dishonest manoeuvre to obtain the leadership of the Party? Therefore, when elements such as the so-called "Right" declare that they stand wholeheartedly on the platform of the Bolshevisation theses, in agreement with the latter's estimate of the entire situation and of the tasks and the role of the Party, we must let this statement stand, if we do not want turn the spirit and the letter of the Bolshevisation theses into empty phrases. I accept comprehensive declarations as the expression of sincere agreement with the theses, and as the expression of the sincere desire to cooperate and collaborate in the Party on the

basis of these theses, guided by them, and respecting them with the completest loyalty. But I attach another objective, political significance to such statements of well known, so-called "Right" comrades, I judge them as the summons to very many comrades, who are considered "Right", who have been disciplined or expelled, or who have sullenly stood aside: "Do not feel resentment, do not be disgusted with the Party. The Bolshevisation theses give you the fundamental basis, that it is not only your right to work within the Party, but it is your duty and obligation."

Comrades, I myself have always defended the right of the younger generation to participate in the leadership as a vital interest of the Party. I should be the last one to conceal the great organisational and ideological defects of the Spartakus Bund. But nevertheless I recognise the tremendous historical service of the Spartakus Bund. Spartakus was the only organisation which fought illegally during the war to end the imperialist massacre by revolutionary class struggle, to turn imperialist war for booty into the civil war. The Spartakus Bund was the only organisation which fought in a revolutionary manner in October 1918 to intensify the collapse of the old regime into the proletarian revolution, it was the only organisation which fought against the parliamentary state for the Soviet system, and against bourgeois democracy for the proletarian dictatorship. It fought even fully armed and at the risk of the life of every single one of its members. I should be the last one to use these facts as the basis for the claim upon any sort of monopoly of leadership for the old Spartakus. But I must decidedly protest against the presence of a powerful tendency in the German Party to call all the old Spartakus "Right" and accuse the Central Committee of not having fought resolutely enough against this tendency.

Comrade Fischer has pointed to the circumstance that many "left" comrades were expelled or resigned as a proof or the determination and energy with which the Central Committee carried out the trade union policy. She emphasised that amongst them there were many excellent revolutionary elements who had fought for our goal for years. She added that we must endeavour to regain these good revolutionary elements for the Party. I agree with here completely on this.

But I demand the same right for these "right" comrades who were expelled, who are good revolutionary workers, who have stood in the forefront of the battle for years, and who are amongst the founders and most active fighters of the Communist Party.

Comrade Lenin wrote in his pamphlet "Questions of Organisation: Unity of action, Freedom of discussion and criticism". That is our definition. That is why the proletariat does not recognise any unity of action without freedom of discussion and criticism. In our organisation statutes the same is said in substance.

I believe that the interests of the Party require that just the critical elements in the Party be allowed to speak. That does not exclude the possibility that despite their diverging opinion, the life of the Party and the decisions of the Party be fecundated by discipline. It is a matter of course that criticism must cease when the Party goes into action, if organisational life, the discipline and the leadership of the Party is not to become child's play. But it is a question whether the comrades in question actually did this. And it is primarily a question as to whether in the future expulsions and disciplinary measures of a mechanical nature should be continued as before. Or should not the overcoming of false opinion and deviations rather be done through the Bolshevisation of the spirit, the Bolshevisation of the ideological, political point of view?

In my opinion, the state of the Party, sufficient facts, show that the Party requires criticism. It would, however, be entirely unjustifiable to condemn the Party leadership in the aggregate. I recognise that the Left Party leadership has done very good work in many respects under very trying external conditions and inner difficulties, in consequence of the discussion within the Party. I recognise that the remarks of Comrade Fischer as a representative of the Central Committee definitely represent a step forward in the attitude to the historical situation and to the tasks of the Party. But nevertheless I believe that what we heard was very far removed from the necessary self-criticism. The position of the Party in the trade unions is extremely bad. The number of our trade union fractions has fallen catastrophically. But other

facts call for criticism of the trade union work of the Party. Thus, for instance, the reformists, the social democratic trade union bureaucracy held the leadership in all labour disputes in autumn, 1924. The Communist Party did not even exercise influence upon the purely economic demands of the workers, not to speak of its having been able to widen these movements, to link up the individual movements with one another, and most important of all, to give them political significance.

I do not for a moment want to blame the Central Committee alone for the poor state of our work in the trade unions. What is more, I give full recognition to all the minor factors through which she has attempted to explain this state of affairs. But they are not the entire explanation. I believe that there are other reasons for this. In our work in the trade unions we have not been able to apply the tactics of the United Front as called for by the decisions of the Fifth World Congress. Our policy has been too rigid and therefore was not strong enough to separate the masses of workers from the leadership of social democracy and of the trade union bureaucrats. No doubt our general policy has also contributed to this result. This is especially true of the inadequate and mechanical kind of policy we have followed in the sphere of municipal work. I find that the policy of the Party has not brought us into sufficiently firm and thorough contact with the masses. We received payment for this in the December elections. The May elections were a great success. In the May 20th issue of "Die Internationale", A. M. declared that what was most significant was that we defeated the Social Democrats in the greatest, most important industrial centres. Then there came the elections in December, where the Party lost a million votes and the SPG gained two million votes. This was without doubt a great defeat. The ratio of the Social Democratic vote to the Communist has shifted to a calamitous degree in favour of the Social Democratic Party.

Of course, I subscribe to what was said upon the influence of the terror of the employers, the police and the judiciary, what was said upon the influence upon the general situation, reawakened illusions of stabilisation, of the miraculous effects of the Dawes Plan, etc.

However, these factors were in part existent in May as well. The result of the election has not been sufficiently elucidated by them. That there are other, as yet unexplained causes is proved by the results of the presidential election, where the Communist vote decreased again by over one million. I do not deny that the figures must be judged differently from those at the Reichstag elections, because other factors enter, but nevertheless, a minus remains. I consider one of the causes of this retrograde development of our influence upon the masses to be the inadequately active policy of our Party. It did not always enter the struggle at the right time with the correct slogans. In this connection I, by no means, subscribe to everything said by the so-called "Right" opposition. I consider it entirely correct for the Communist Party to have begun the struggle against the Dawes Plan with the slogan: "Down with the Dawes Plan." I consider this a happy slogan, for the Communist Party to have set up the Workers' Report against the Expert's Report. Socialisation and control of production by the proletariat. But I cannot consider it the essence of political wisdom for the Party not to have replied at once to the acceptance of the Dawes Plan with a programme of action which would have appealed to the masses. The "Gotha Programm" is not bad in its way, but it is not complete enough. It has no answer to the question now upon the lips of millions: "Who is Going to pay"? We have now an answer of the Party to this question in the shape of the draft tax programme of the Reichstag fraction, but I ask, comrades, why is such a draft tax programme an opportunist sin at a moment when the question is a current one within the masses, and a radical virtue at the moment when the government begins to take up the realisation of the reactionary taxation plans?

Of course, nothing would be false than to overestimate the importance of tax reform. Marx justifiably emphasised that even the most radical tax reforms within capitalist society do not change in any way the conditions of ownership which are the basis of proletarian wage slavery. But, will you tell me whether the eight-hour day and a wage increase makes a change in this foundation? It is true that in the "Bolshevistischer Kurs", the organ of the functionaries of Halle-Merseburg, we find a queer point of view. We read that "through depriving capitalist economy of so much profit by regaining the eight-hour day and humanly sufficient wages, that in consequence of the participation of foreign capitalists not enough profits remain to make technical improvements in the factories, that is, to reproduce and to accumulate capital, we deprive the Expert's Plan of the basis upon which they are built."

Really, I cannot imagine any shallower opportunist deviation. A number of other details prove in my opinion that the policy of the CPG requires conscientious self-criticism, and I have the impression that the "Left" are already on the way thereto.

Comrade Ruth Fischer said that the "Left" was never against the partial demands on principle. I will not refute this statement with quotations. But I must object to the statement that partial demands were looked at by the so-called "right" and especially by Comrade Brandler as transition demands which could take the place of the revolutionary struggle. Partial demands can never supplant struggle or eliminate it, but they must and will on the contrary hasten the revolutionary struggle for the conquest of power. They must rally and organise the masses for it, the masses who will seize state power for the proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party. We must employ our maximum energy to obtain close contact between the Communist Party and the proletarian masses, the exploited and the non-possessors, through partial struggle for partial demands. I do not consider that as an act of self-defence in an emergency in order to repel the general offensive of capitalism but demand it for another reason. An important part of the general offensive of world capitalism is the policy of encirclement, the policy of open or concealed armament, of open or concealed alliance to attack the Soviet Union. The proletariat must at this moment at least do its minimum class duty. The proletariat must at every moment be strong enough to force through the demands: "Hands off the Soviet Union!", "Recognise the Soviet Union de jure, where this has not yet been done", "We demand 'good', 'normal' political, economic and commercial relations", "Good and normal", of course, as are possible in the capitalist world. The Communist Parties face the task of successfully leading the proletariat in such a movement. They cannot do that if they degenerate to small "pure" sects. They can only do so as Bolshevist mass parties which are the thinking brain, the organisational backbone and the directing arm of the mass movement.

I consider the Bolshevisation theses excellently suited to develop the Communist Parties into Bolshevist mass parties. I consider them admirably adapted to give our sections the qualities, which up to now have only distinguished the Communist Party of Russia, to lend them the latter's invincible confidence of victory, endurance and staunchness. Through these theses let us learn **Real Politics**, revolutionary policy, which observes and exploits the most insignificant objective circumstances to unite them with the demand for the conquest of state power and the establishment of the proletariat.

When we have the Bolshevisation of the Party then we will also obtain the necessary Bolshevisation of the masses. Bolshevisation of the masses through the Bolshevist Party — the theses on Bolshevisation will lead us forward to this goal.



## Seventh Session, Moscow, 1<sup>th</sup>, April 1925.

Chairman: Dorsey

opened the session and granted the floor to Comrade **Vilkovsky**, who said a few words in memory of the two Polish comrades who were murdered.

### Comrade Vilkovsky :

Comrades, two comrades, **Baginsky** and **Vetcherkevitch**, were barbarously murdered the other day on the Soviet frontier. The Polish court had condemned them to death, but subsequently Baginsky's sentence was changed to life imprisonment, and that of Vetcherkevitch, to 55 years imprisonment. They languished for a long time under the most difficult conditions in unheated cells in the Polish prisons and were exposed to maltreatment by the White Guards. Thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Government, Baginsky and Vetcherkevitch were to have been exchanged for two criminals whom the Soviet Government was to have surrendered to the Polish Government for Baginsky and Vetcherkevitch. And now, on the threshold of the Soviet Union, where they expected freedom, they were barbarously murdered by the chief of the escort. This new deed of horror of the White Guards was undoubtedly committed with the knowledge and will of the Polish Government.

In the course of the session of the Enlarged Executive, it was three times compelled to divert its attention, and raise its voice of protest against the White Terror raging in Poland. At the opening of the Plenum the Chairman devoted a few words in memory of Comrades Piliartchi and Heitchik, who were suffocated by poison gas in the Dombrovsk Basin. These comrades had risen in defence of the Party organisation and got rid of a provocateur. The bourgeoisie has cruelly revenged the death of its infamous servant. The second time the Enlarged Executive was compelled to voice its protest against

the trial of Comrade **Lantsutski**. The splendid campaign organised under the leadership of the Comintern on an international scale in defence of Lantsutski, forced the bourgeoisie to retreat and free him. But the Polish Government had harboured a revenge. It decided to murder Baginsky and Vetcherkevitch, to revenge itself for the defeat in the Lantsutski trial. Although the White Guard Polish Government carries complete responsibility for this deed of horror, one cannot help but note the vile role played by the PPS, member of the Second International, in this affair. Jointly with the bourgeois press, it raised a great cry against the exchange of Baginsky and Vetcherkevitch, since they were of the opinion that morality and justice were being trampled under foot. The speeches of the representative of the PPS in Parliament, and the articles and news published in its central organ, created the atmosphere which prepared the way for this horrible crime. Thus the PPS is actually the initiator and spiritual creator of the crime of that inhuman White Guardist who raised his hand against Baginsky and Vetcherkevitch. In the course of the Lantsutski trial, the international proletariat developed an extended campaign which saved Lantsutski from the death sentence. In reply to this new deed of horror of the White Guard, the Polish and international proletariat must also react energetically; and this "victory" of the Government must be paid for dearly. These horrible persecutions will not break us Polish communists. For us they are merely the stimulus to fight more resolutely for Soviet Poland, for the victory of the proletarian revolution.

Long live Soviet Poland!  
Down with the White Guard Courts!  
Down with White Guard Poland!

Comrade Dorsey:

We now come to the next point on the agenda,

## the Report upon the Fight for Trade Union-Unity.

Comrade Lozovsky has the floor.

### Comrade Lozovsky :

The line laid down on the trade-union question by the Fifth World Congress has been strikingly confirmed by the course of events. The unity of the trade union movement has become the most popular and the most vital fighting slogan, which appeals to all the masses.

Since the Fifth World Congress, rather important changes have taken place in the political picture of the world trade union movement, which must be taken into consideration if the future line of our work is to be laid down correctly. The new events in the course of this period have been: 1) **the trip of the British Delegation to the Soviet Union**; 2) **the Sixth Trade Union Congress of the Soviet Union** and the conclusion of a **fundamental agreement between the British trade unions and the Soviet unions**; 3) the action of the Second International and of the Right Wing of the Amsterdam International (Brussels, January 1-6 1925) against the British Delegation and the new tendencies in the world trade union movement; 4) the coming to a head of the differences of opinion in the Executive Bureau of the Amsterdam International on the question of the attitude towards the Russian trade unions (Session of the Executive Bureau on February 6-9); 5) the endorsement by a large number of reformist trade unions and trades councils in France, Germany, Belgium and other countries of unity and of the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee; 6) the decision of the General Council of the British Trade Unions to call a conference of representatives of the All Russian Central Trade Union Council and of the British General Council of Trade Unions for the discussion of the **difficulties** which have arisen in consequence of the Session of the Executive Bureau of the Amsterdam International; 7) the Conference of representatives of the Soviet Trade Unions and the British trade unions which begins in London on April 2nd; 8) the publication of the report of the British Delegation upon its trip through the Soviet Union; 9) the campaign for unity which has been developed in all countries, and into which millions of workers have been drawn; and 10) the evidence of the relations of German and inter-

national Social Democracy with the profiteers, through which our often expressed opinion that the enemies of trade union unity are direct agents of the bourgeoisie, is confirmed.

The most interesting aspects of these events are as follows:

1) That the ideological differences of opinion within the Amsterdam International have come to such a head that they not only paralyse the activity — or putting it better, the inactivity — of this organisation, but also compel the individual sections of the Amsterdam International to come in the open against one another;

2) that the slogan of unity and of the united front are beginning to take on practical organisational forms despite the obstinate sabotage of international Social Democracy.

**The fight within the Amsterdam International** has been going on for a long time already; up to recently, this struggle has been going on horizontally, between the upper strata and the lower strata. The opposition in the Amsterdam International consists of two groups, a crystallised one and an amorphous (loosely knit) one. The former has been organised by the Communist Parties upon the platform of the **R. I. L. U.** and bears the name: **Minority Movement, Opposition Bloc, Fraction**, etc. The other section reflects the discontent of the masses, but it does not touch the fundamental kernel of the tactics and politics of the Amsterdam International. The dissatisfaction of the masses grew more intense after the occupation of the Ruhr as a result of the inactivity of the Amsterdam International. It rose during the whole of 1923 and was most clearly expressed in 1924, when the British trade union movement, as a result of the continuing economic crisis and the lessons of the MacDonald period, went over to the Left Wing of the Amsterdam International. The **entire** trade union movement of Great Britain entered the opposition to the traditional policy on a very essential and extremely important question of the world labour movement: **whether the united front with the Soviet Trade Unions should be established, or the hostile acts against the revolutionary trade unions in general and the Soviet Union in particular should be continued.**

The action of the British delegation displeased the reformists to such a degree that the entire international Social Democracy and the reformist trade union bureaucracy attacked

the British delegation and requested assistance from their colleagues in the Labour Party and in the Right Wing of the Trade Union Movement in Great Britain itself, in order to divert the British trade union movement from its "pernicious role". This entire campaign came to an end at the last session of the Executive Bureau of the Amsterdam International (February 6th—8th) with the acceptance of the allegedly "compromise resolution" of Steenhuis, against which the British delegation voted. Even the most lenient critics had to admit that this revolution was nothing but a very stupid and clumsy manoeuvre. Politically, this resolution signifies the victory of the Right Wing over the Left, which was well understood by the General Council of the British Trade Unions, when it decided to hold a Conference with the Russian Trade Unions for a discussion "of the difficulties, which have arisen in consequence of the Session of the Executive Bureau of the Amsterdam International". The state of excitement of the Social Democrats over the British Trade Unions is demonstrated by the unashamed attacks of the Russian Mensheviks (in "Sozialistichesky Vestnik" of March 19th) upon the report of the British Delegation. The Mensheviks write in an article headed "A Dishonest Book", that this report "is a deliberate concealment of the truth and a leading astray of the reader", etc., etc. That is the tone employed by the Russian Mensheviks in speaking of their colleagues of the Second International.

The leaders of the British Trade Union Movement could not let such attacks go unanswered. In the first number of the monthly "International Trade Union Unity", which is published by the Labour Research Department, Purcell writes as follows: "The so-called socialist press of the continental countries cannot serve as a reliable source of information at present . . . it does not give an unprejudiced account of the facts." And later on "Oudegeest, as well as Jouhaux (not to mention the 'Vorwärts') have shown beyond all doubt that they consider the so-called 'compromise motion' a cunning step which is intended to thwart our 9 months of effort for the establishment of international unity". He calls the methods of the Right Amsterdamers "trickery".

In the official organ of the Amsterdam International, Oudegeest (the secretary) ridicules the statements of the president and states that the Bureau of the Amsterdam International gave no instructions for the writing of such an article. This entire polemic shows that the differences of opinion in the Amsterdam International are much more serious than many people believe.

**The world trade union movement was never entirely united**, neither ideologically, nor from the point of view of organisation. At present the trade unions are differentiated along political, national, religious and racial lines. The largest numbers of workers are organised in the reformist and revolutionary trade unions. But, the problem of unity posed by the Fifth Congress of the CI, set the Communists before the question of uniting, not only the revolutionary and reformist unions, but of drawing into the united trade union movement the unorganised workers as well as the members of the Catholic, Protestant and similar trade union organisations.

The most serious obstacle on this road is the line of tactics of the Right Wing of the Amsterdam International, which want to choke off the initiative campaign for unity at any price; the methods of sabotage employed to this end are extremely varied. The organisational and political focus of the campaigns against unity is however, the Second International, and this for a very simple reason: **Whoever advocates the united front of the bourgeoisie must be against the united front of the workers.**

The complexity of the situation, the difficulty of the struggle, old habits and traditions, insufficient flexibility, and the inability to make the necessary organisational changes have also given rise to several deviations in our own ranks. The more openly we speak of these deviations, the sooner will we succeed in overcoming them.

These deviations are as follows:

a) Organisational conservatism; b) the interpretation of the slogan of unity as a manoeuvre; c) unity at any price; d) the blunting of the struggle against the Social Democracy in trade unions; e) tendencies for the dissolution of the revolutionary trade unions and even of the RILU.

**The fight against organisational conservatism** must be carried on by us in the most decisive manner. If the dissolution of any independent union may be of service in the conquering

of a mass organisation, this dissolution must take place, for organisation is not an end in itself but a means towards an end. Everything depends upon the situation and the ratio of the strength of the Communists and the reformists in the labour movement.

On the other hand comrades are of the opinion that **our slogan is only a manoeuvre**. This entirely incorrect point of view must be combatted most energetically. We demand a serious, self sacrificing and sincere struggle for the unity of the trade union movement. Every Communist, every Party member, must take note of this once and for all.

The obstinate resistance of the Social Democrats to unity has led several sincere adherents of unity to the following considerations. Since Social Democracy bitterly opposes any endeavour for unity because of fear of communist propaganda and agitation, it may happen that the communist struggle against reformism will be **blunted** for the sake of the unity of the trade union movement. This is the most dangerous tendency in our campaign for unity. If it should chance to happen that in our struggle for unity the intensity of our communist criticism against reformism should be blunted, then the unity which we might have attained would be turned against us. We must fight any such tendencies in a most decisive manner.

Further, we should notice that the desire for unity with some comrades takes on the form of stormy impatience. This impatience serves as an explanation also for those tendencies which consider the liquidation of the entire trade union movement as the only right solution. The Communist International was and remains decidedly against any such tendencies. The struggle for unity does **not** signify liquidation. The liquidation of the RILU is proposed as liquidation in order to bring about a united international, **it presupposes the liquidation of the Amsterdam International**. The situation is similar in the various countries (France, Czechoslovakia), where we have a serious mass movement of revolutionary trade unionists.

Hegel says that truth is concrete. Therefore, there is no such thing as a unity schablone in accordance with which every country is to carry on its struggle for unity. The methods and forms of the struggle change according to the situation, time and place. Therefore, in this connection it is possible to group together a number of countries.

1) Countries with a unified revolutionary trade union movement (The Soviet Union), 2) Countries with a unified trade union movement, containing strong revolutionary minorities and where there exist small parallel revolutionary or reactionary trade union organisations (Germany, Great Britain, Italy), 3) Countries where the trade union movement is split, where the reformists are in the majority (Czechoslovakia, Holland etc.), 4) Countries where the trade union movement is split and where the reformists have a majority due to the police terror of the bourgeois state (Yugoslavia, Roumania), 5) Countries where the trade union movement is unified, but where because of the political and police conditions the trade unions are affiliated to no international (Norway, Finland), 6) Countries where in addition to the central organisations independent, reactionary and revolutionary trade unions exist, thus causing the trade unions to be without any international affiliation (United States), 7) Countries where the trade union movement is split and the revolutionary workers have the majority (France), 8) Countries where in addition to the big organisations small syndicalist and anarcho-syndicalist organisations exist. In accordance with this we can formulate our tactics for the struggle for unity on broad outlines.

1) In **England** the struggle for unity must be conducted on the following lines: a) further consolidation of the Minority Movement, b) struggle against groups and guild tendencies, c) struggle to bring about the affiliation of all Trade Unions to the Trade Union Council, d) struggle for the creation of industrial unions on the basis of factory council, e) transformation of the General Council into a leading organ, f) participation of the Trade Council in the National Union Congresses and development of its role in local organisation, g) definite support of the Left Wing in all its endeavours to attain unity, h) decisive struggle against the Right Wing, i) struggle against the influence of imperialism on the working class, j) struggle against the labour aristocracy in the Labour Party which is intent on stemming the onward march of the workers.

2) In **Germany** the struggle for unity must be on the following lines: the creation and organisation of an oppositional of revolutionary minority, intense struggle against the policy

of expulsion and an endeavour to reunite the independent unions with the reformist unions. The Party's chief endeavour should be in the direction of **organising the revolutionary opposition** and the crystallisation of a real Left Wing in the trade unions. The centre of the struggle for unity must be in the factories and factory councils. The struggle for the factory councils signifies the struggle for unity.

3) In **Czechoslovakia**. The struggle in the factories must be our chief aim where unity organs must be created and mixed committees must be established for the conduct of the common struggle. Following on these, unity conferences must be convened of the factory councils and the trade unions according to districts and finally the **National Congress of Trade Unions** must be initiated, to which Social Democrats, national socialists and revolutionaries in the trade unions should be invited, including both Czechs and Germans; there exists no danger that at this congress we will be in a minority. What is necessary for an actual and not merely pretended fight for unity is the establishment of fractions in all trade unions in this country as well as in all others, as well as the formation and consolidation of groups sympathising with us in the reformist and National Socialist trade unions.

In **France**: a) The establishment of committees or commissions for unity in the factories and workshops; b) the establishment of committees based on equal representation for the fight against the high cost of living, against fascism, etc.; c) the convocation of district and industrial conferences under the banner of unity; d) the convening of a congress of the revolutionary trade unions parallel to the reformist trade union congress and a proposal for the fusion of both congresses on the basis of proportional representation according to the number of members represented; e) no individual fusions with the reformist trade unions, isolated in districts or trades; f) a fight against the autonomist aims of the anarcho-syndicalists; g) the fight for the unity of the trade union movement is to be carried on by the GGTU; and the Party is to offer the latter its fullest assistance. The demagogic slogan of the reformists — entrance of the revolutionary unions into the reformist unions — must be replied to with the slogan of unity from below.

In the **United States** the fight must be carried on for the consolidation and strengthening of the Trade Union Educational League, and for the creation of the necessary press and the fusion of the independent union with the main trade unions. What is necessary here is an especially vigorous fight against the corrupt bureaucracy, furthermore, the establishment of fractions and revolutionary minorities, and active participation in all elections to the local and central organs, to the conferences and congresses. When the bureaucrats expel entire local organisations care must be taken that the organisations do not disintegrate; they must be maintained intact and must fight for the re-admission of all unionists without exception.

Special attention to be paid to the unity of the different races, and where the unions of the whites admit no Negroes, special Negro unions must be established. Since the workers in America never participated in the international trade union movement, the **international character of the class struggle** should be particularly emphasised, as well as the necessity for the entry of all independent unions into the American Federation of Labour and for the creation of a unified Trade Union International, etc.

The sabotage of unity organised by the Second International and the Right Wing of the Amsterdam International can only be broken if we succeed in drawing the masses of workers into the struggle. The focal point of the fight for unity must be the factories. To this end the factory councils should be conquered where they exist, and committees or commissions for unity created where non-existent. At the same time mixed commissions can be established for the joint struggle, composed of workers belonging to different unions. On the other hand it is important to establish contact between the factory councils and committees for unity according to district and industry. We must let no conflict, no strike pass without creating a unity organ elected by the working masses. The **fight for unity from below** in the factories not only does not exclude the simultaneous fight for unity from above, but presupposes it — in the forms corresponding to the specific peculiarities of the country in question.

In Moscow a basic understanding was arrived at between the British and Soviet Russian comrades to create a bloc in

the fight for the unity of the international trade union movement. In the negotiations for joint action neither party was blind to the existing differences of opinion, but both realised that if the all-Russian Trade Union Council, affiliated to the RILU, and the General Council of the British Trade Unions, which is affiliated to the Amsterdam Trade Union Federation, form a bloc, nobody in the world will be able to prevent unity. The representatives of the British Trade Unions endeavoured to induce the Amsterdam International to enter into negotiations, but in vain. This made necessary a **conference of the Russian and British Trade Unions**. This conference, which begins on April 2nd, must be energetically supported by all Communist Parties no matter what its practical results may be. We must realise that the rapprochement of the Soviet and British trade unions is a circumstance of extraordinary historical importance. The move of the British proletariat to the Left changes the ratio of forces in the struggle between imperialism and Communism.

Of course, in order to unite the trade union movement, which is now divided along innumerable lines, into a homogeneous fighting battalion. The slogan: **"Convocation of an International Unity Congress and dissolution of the Amsterdam International and the RILU into a unified international"** remains in force. The idea of the international unity congress must be spread amongst the masses. The Left elements in Amsterdam, who are already beginning to realise that there is no other way out of this condition of split, must be won for this struggle and for the fusion of both internationals at this congress.

The trade union movement in the **Near, Middle and Far East** has made enormous progress in the last few years. One only need mention the trade union movement in **Japan, China, the East Indies, India and Egypt** to understand the entire significance of a union of the trade union movements of the East and West. The trade union movements in the Near, Middle and Far East are to a considerable extent linked up with the RILU. But there is a number of trade union organisations which belong to no international. It is necessary to bring the trade unions of Japan as well as of the colonial and semi-colonial countries into the united proletarian trade union family. In order to obtain the active participation of the trade unions in these countries in the united international, the Communist Parties and the trade unions of the mother countries maintain close contact with those in the colonies. In the course of the past year something has been done in this direction. This task must be followed as before, and we must set ourselves the practical daily task of drawing the labour movement of the Near, Middle and Far East into the fight for the united international. The unity of the trade union movement is directed against the bourgeoisie and their social democratic lackeys. The fight for the united front and for trade union unity will bring the revolutionary workers closer to the workers still in the reformist and other organisations and will transfer our struggle against Social Democracy to the very depths of the labouring masses. The fight for unity will only then be successful, if the Communist Parties in every country become a mass force to be reckoned with. To this end it is necessary that more and more nuclei and fractions be built up in all existing trade union organisations, that the entire opposition within these organisations be united, that we gain every foot of ground from the reformists and that our fight against international reformism be increased to the utmost.

**The organisational unity of the trade union movement does not signify an ideological rapprochement or an armistice with the reformists; it signifies the hundredfold intensification of the fight against reformism.**

At present the international labour movement is going through a peculiar period of quiet and of the consolidation of its forces. Of course this is only a conditional quiet, for the intensified class-struggles are continuing, but an immediate struggle for power is not going on. This present stage of the class struggle requires new, more perfect and more modern forms and methods of trade union tactics. The "Leninist link", which must now be grasped with all our strength "in order to hold the entire chain", is the slogan of unity, of genuine, sincere, honest unity. And for this it is necessary that the slogan of unity from below be made our battle-cry in the factories and workshops, that committees for proletarian unity be created, that factory councils be fought for, that fractions and

nuclei be established in all trade union organisations, that a sincere coalition be entered into with the Left elements in the reformist trade unions, that an opposition of the revolutionary minority be created and organised, that the Anglo-Russian trade union bloc be supported to our utmost, that the fight against the Second International and the Right Wing of the Amsterdam trade union International be intensified, that a fight be carried on for the convocation of an international unity congress, that the trade unions of the Near, Middle and Far East be drawn into the fight for unity, and that the Red International of Labour Unions be supported and consolidated. If we do all this the masses will be with us.

The more successful our fight for unity will be, the shorter will the period be still separating us from the immediate struggle for power. **The fight for unity brings us near to the social revolution.** That is the historical significance and the importance of the slogan of the fight for the unity of the international trade union movement.

## Comrade Haken

read the following declaration in the name of the Czechoslovakian Delegation:

The Delegation of the C.P. of Czechoslovakia to the session of the Enlarged Executive of the C.I. in Moscow, has received information that the strike of the proletariat in Moravian Ostrau has broken out.

The whole Delegation unanimously backs the struggle and greets the fact with enthusiasm that the Ostrau proletariat entered the struggle unanimously, with the unbending will jointly to fight and to triumph.

This is to be hailed with all the more enthusiasm because the Ostrau working class did not allow itself for a single moment to be diverted from this common struggle by the fresh betrayal of the social-democratic patriotic Amsterdam leaders.

The leaders of the social patriots and of the Amsterdamers have proved again that they are nothing more nor less than the servants of capital. The decision of the national conference of coalition miners unions not to participate in the strike is an open act of strike-breaking and of treachery.

We are convinced, nevertheless, that the fighting front of the workers in the Mährish-Ostrau District will become an example for the entire working class of the Czechoslovakian Republic, and that this example will result in the formation of a united front of the proletariat of the whole country for strengthening the fight in the Mährish-Ostrau District.

Long live the united front of the fight of the proletariat of the whole Republic!

Victory and success to this great struggle!

This declaration was unanimously adopted by the Plenum.

## Comrade Dorsy :

We will now proceed to the discussion on the report of Comrade Lozovsky. Comrade Gallacher will be the first speaker.

## Comrade Gallacher :

The **trade union situation in Britain** is very favourable now. Much valuable propaganda work has been done in the past two years by the RILU Bureau and many sympathising groups formed. The **South Wales Miners' Federation** passed a resolution in favour of affiliation to the RILU. They tried to get the Miners' Federation to endorse it, but failed, and therefore had to remain within Amsterdam. In many districts there was mass sentiment for the RILU, but it was difficult to give this sentiment organised expression. Without the organisation of the **Left Wing in the labour movement** it is impossible to fight the bureaucrats. Independent affiliation is blocked by the fact that the union doing so would put itself outside the British labour movement. This explains the contradiction between the existence of strong mass sentiment for Soviet Russia and the Russian workers on the one hand and the absence of affiliations to the RILU on the other.

In 1923, however, the **minority movement** took shape. The CP took an interest in it from the beginning: it paid great

attention to it and results have justified its doing so. There was a conference of the movement in September 1924, which was attended by 270 delegates and was very successful. At this conference, **National Committees** were established for different important industries in Britain. Following the conference, district conferences of the minority movement were held in various cities, such as London, Glasgow, Leeds, Sheffield, Birmingham, etc.

A **Unity Conference** took place at short notice in January. 613 delegates were present. The conference would have been bigger if more time had been available. No branches have funds, but still from 270 in September to 613 in January is a rapid growth. **The minority movement has become a definite factor in the British labour movement.** We are concentrating upon the miners, but also have sections specialising in the metal workers, railway men and transport workers. A vigorous campaign is being carried on for individual membership in the minority movement, for the establishment of factory committees, and for taking root in the factories.

The **economic situation of Great Britain** remains unsatisfactory. No matter how active British imperialism may be in Central Europe, in the Far East, in its colonies, stabilisation always evades it. British industry is threatened by the growing competition of Germany, America and the Dominions. **The shadow of unemployment** is still hovering over British industry.

The working class was antagonistic to Capitalism following the defeats of 1921/22 and as a result the Labour Party made great gains in 1923. British capitalism was therefore compelled to use the Labour Party as an instrument to attain stabilisation and therefore permitted MacDonald to take over the reins. When MacDonald, however, was forced by the workers to make a stand, the capitalists summarily turned him out, and told him that he could not come back to power until he had kicked out all the extremists from his Party. The workers expected great things from the Labour Government. But the threats of military intervention in labour disputes, as in the dockers' strike and the London tramways' dispute, soon opened their eyes. Then came the **Dawes report**. Its results were soon felt and the miners attacked MacDonald. The minority movement carried on a campaign, and by the time of the Hull Congress all the active men in the trade unions gave up all hope of obtaining anything from the Labour Government. The Hull Congress concentrated its attention on the trade union movement. The General Council was given greater power. The Trades Councils are beginning to assume more importance. An important conference of Trades Councils was held recently in London. This is the first time that this has happened in the history of British labour.

The sentiment within the British working class for unity with the Russian workers forced MacDonald to **partial recognition of Soviet Russia**. This opened the door to a fraternal delegation of the Russian Trade Unions appearing at the Hull Congress. The enthusiasm was great, unbounded. Then this sentiment was crystallised in the sending of a delegation to Russia. Purcell and Tillet, who were at the head of the delegation, realised that Amsterdam was wholly reactionary, was merely trying to stabilise capitalism in Central Europe. We must work in the CP and the Minority Movement to strengthen these relations. We must try to prevent delay. Delay has always been the weapon of conservatives in the British labour movement. Delay killed the Chartist movement, as it has killed many movements since, delay killed the movement in 1919.

It is for this reason that the British Delegation requests that the Enlarged Executive institute a thorough investigation of the British labour movement after the war.

There are strong forces against unity but even stronger forces are mobilising in favour of it. The Minority Movement sent out a circular calling for a bloc of the metal workers, miners, railway men and transport workers, and the Miners' Federation of Great Britain has already taken the initiative in calling a conference for the establishment of this bloc. At this Conference J. H. Thomas asked the following question: "Was the Miners Federation run by the Minority Movement?" It is certain that Thomas, Cramp Clynes, and all the other leaders will fight against unity. They want the consolidation, the enlargement of the Empire. The other leaders, however, see the hopelessness of the disintegrating Empire.

The reactionary leaders will oppose unity but not openly. The more the workers go to the Left, the more Thomas,

Clynes and Co. will go to the Right, to the bourgeoisie. This is a big opportunity for the Minority Movement to strike a wedge between the masses and the reformist leaders.

One of the most important recent happenings is the establishment of the "Sunday Worker". This will draw the Left trade union leaders and the Minority Movement together. We must keep on until the Left trade union officials have become a definite part of the Minority Movement. The "Sunday Worker" will be very useful in this, and will assist the crystallisation of the Left Wing in the labour movement. The character of the movement is such that the Left Wing in the Labour Party will have to come out with a political platform. **We must ally this Left Wing with the Minority Movement.**

We see the growing sentiment for unity. We see the rapid growth of the Minority Movement. We see the move toward the Left of the Left trade union officials, and the growth of a Left Wing in the Labour Party. These are all for unity; these are all in the "Sunday Worker". The Party is in touch with all these movements, which are coalescing into a mighty weapon against British imperialism.

It is necessary that every Party pay close attention to the British situation. You must all help the British Party in its work, you must help it to become a mass party, in order to break British capitalism, the backbone of international imperialism. The policy of the British Party, started in 1923, is leading to the consolidation of the trade unions, to the growth of a Left Wing in the British labour movement and to the strengthening of the Party which will weld the British working class into a mighty hammer which will sound the knell of British imperialism.

### **Comrade Harus (Czechoslovakia) :**

After the war a strong trade union movement developed in Czechoslovakia. There were practically no indifferent workers in the various branches of industry for example among the glass workers. But this situation did not last long. After the overthrow the bourgeoisie quickly regained its influence and the trade unions began to capitulate.

When the Russian Revolution began to have its affect on Czechoslovakia, the reformist unions also sympathised with it. But that also did not last long. The workers themselves continued to support the Russian Revolution, but the reformist leaders began to take up the fight against it, since they feared that revolutionary tactics might develop in Czechoslovakia as a result of the Russian Revolution.

The slogan of unity has deep roots in Czechoslovakia, especially because the Czech workers have a revolutionary perspective beyond the daily events, beyond the bitter struggles against high prices, etc., and because they understand the slogan not from the reformist, but from the communist point of view. They don't want merely an organisational unity; for they refuse to give up the revolutionary tactics of the Red unions.

The resistance of the workers against the bourgeoisie and against the tactics of the reformists increased periodically and parallel with the development of the Communist Party. It is absolutely impossible for the Communist Party to surrender its influence on the Red Trade Unions. On the contrary, the greater the struggle, the greater is its influence on the Red trade unions. That is why the question of fractions is one of the most important questions.

The opportunists have issued the slogan "extrication from Moscow". The phrase for the independence of the Red unions means practically the same thing.

The Communist Party must also understand in Czechoslovakia to fight in the trade union question with all the weapons at its command. It will not do for various secretaries of the Party to agree in theory with the decisions, and to sabotage them in practice.

Comrade Hais is playing a dual role, on the one hand as member of the PolBureau, and on the other as secretary of the Red Unions. An end must also be put to that. The Communist Party must have the decisive influence in these questions.

### **Comrade Viola (Italy) :**

From the time of the foundation of our Communist Party in 1920, we have devoted much attention to trade union unity

and to the fight against the Social Democratic leaders of the G.C.L. We have witnessed the defeat of the trade union movement in Italy under fascist terror, and it is only at the beginning of 1924 that we have been able to commence our work of reorganisation.

After the assassination of Matteotti, this work has become even more necessary, as the masses of workers and peasants are showing themselves favourably inclined to return to the class organisation. But the Social Democratic and Maximilist leaders of the Italian CGT, instead of putting themselves at the head of the masses of workers and peasants for carrying on the struggle against fascism and the employers, have allied themselves with the bourgeoisie and with fascism and have formed the parliamentary opposition committee.

We have worked among the **peasants** and have founded, with the assistance of the Agrarian Department of the Party, an association for the defence of poor peasants, an association affiliated to the International Peasant Council.

The fusion of the group of peasants in Lombardy, who had always followed the organisation of Millions's Popular Party, is one of the results of our work for trade union unity.

Despite all difficulties, and the sabotage of the Social Democracy, the recent strike of the metal workers in Lombardy is a sign of the fighting spirit of the Italian proletariat. This very important movement gives us the hope that this is only the beginning of great class struggles of workers and peasants.

Our Communist comrades must work and carry their activity into the factories and workshops. We have begun to create **committees of agitation** and we hope that we will soon be able to give each factory such a committee. We will continue our work to prevent Communists from being systematically expelled.

We are also working in the organisations which have not yet joined the General Confederation of Labour. We must win these organisations and cause them to affiliate to the GCL. Thus we will be able to win the masses and lead them into the Communist Party.

The Communist Party in fighting for international trade union unity and for the goals we have set ourselves: the establishment of Workers and Peasants Committees, the fight against fascism, the conquest of power, and the Workers and Peasants Bloc, will carry the fight on to the revolutionary field.

### **Comrade Vilkovsky (Poland) :**

Our delegates at the Fifth Congress of the Comintern as well as at the Third Congress of the Profintern have supported wholeheartedly the tactics of a struggle for the unity of the trade union movement on an international scale.

The successes of the Comintern and Profintern in connection with trade union unity achieved during the last few months are a complete vindication of these tactics.

The Profintern has not received very much help from our Party in this work. **The trade union movement in Poland is going through a crisis**, not only because of the white terror which is raging in Poland, but mainly because of the treacherous work of the reformists. The central managing committees of the most important trade unions are in the hands of the PPS. The attitude of the reformist trade union leaders, at the time of the economic struggles in Upper Silesia, in Lodz, etc., shows to the masses that in the hands of these gentry the trade unions are not an instrument of the working class but or the bourgeoisie.

Naturally the Communist Party is not indifferent to the tactics of the social-reformists.

Our efforts go in two directions: firstly, to **capture the trade unions** and secondly, to proceed with the **formation of fighting organs** capable of leading the mass movement of the workers.

Wherever we have been able to capture the trade unions the reformist bureaucrats have taken very stringent measures against our comrades. They expel our best comrades and in this connection it has come to light that the reformists and the political police work hand in hand. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that the workers become disillusioned and turn their backs on the trade unions. It happens that wherever

the collisions between us and the reformists were most violent that the unions are now going through a severe crisis'. The **Metal Workers' Union** for instance has now only very few members; whilst many local branches which were expelled from the central union exist outside of it carrying on an energetic struggle for reunion, for trade union unity.

The same is the case with the **miners**,

We never ceased working for the slogan: **back to the trade unions**. Our last Party Congress has minutely elaborated the fighting tactics of the trade union movement. We came to the conclusion that we must first of all form organs capable of bringing us into contact with the masses. Factory Councils are such organs'.

We do not of course intend to play off the factory councils **against** the trade unions. Factory Councils are trade union organs. But as the upper strata of the trade union movement are at present in the hands of the reformists we must capture the masses, we must draw their attention to the necessity of forming in their places of employment fighting organisations, capable of taking the lead in mass struggles and of serving as a jumping off ground in the fight for the trade unions. Our

Party has captured many positions in the trade union movement which we are forced to give up through police and bureaucratic measures. Without any compunction, the reformists break up whole district trade union federations, in order to force us out of every position. But comrades when we are expelled from any of the unions the masses follow us in spite of our remonstrances.

1. Apart from the so-called class trade unions there are also trade unions in Poland managed by the "National Workers' Party" and the Christian Socialists. Besides these we have also in Poland separate Jewish and German trade unions. Our Party works for the amalgamation of all these trade unions and is met by the fierce resistance of the reformists.

You know that the Central Commission of the Polish trade unions joined the German trade union upper strata in their protest against the British Delegation in the Amsterdam International. The Polish reformists form in Amsterdam a United Front with the German reformists against the Left wing.

Although police terror is raging now more than ever, we think that we will be able to achieve palpable successes in the near future.

# Discussion on the Report upon Trade Union Unity.

**Eighth Session, April 1<sup>st</sup>, 1925.**

## **Comrade Semard (France):**

Comrades, at the Fifth Congress Comrade Zinoviev said that in the theses the statement should be made that 75 % of the activity of the Communist Parties should be devoted to Trade Union Unity. The Third Congress of the RILU outlined these tactics from the tactical point of view by adopting a resolution containing a proposal of the Congress to the two Internationals, Moscow and Amsterdam, for the creation of a united International.

The realisation of unity on an international scale is a slogan which has met with a resounding echo in the various countries, especially in France. In fact, this is a manifestation of the United Front which has had a great response within the working class. At workers meetings whenever unity was discussed, our militants have always been certain to obtain the applause of the entire meeting. It is certain that this is an effective method to separate the reformist workers from their leaders, and I believe that on the whole, after reading the reports which have been made to us here, that not enough activity has been employed in support of this slogan of Trade Union Unity, and that in certain countries it has been badly misinterpreted. It has been the object of Right as well as Left deviations.

At this Enlarged Executive we must re-examine these slogans of Trade Union Unity, not to adopt a new line of tactics, but to outline more precisely if possible the tactics laid down by the Fifth Congress, to bring them "up to date" and to see to it that the same tactics should be employed in the different countries. At first, there are certain militants in the revolutionary movement who, now that the Red organisation have been created, have a tendency to defend their organisations a little too openly, as was done, for example, by our Comrade Hais, who spoke of the trade union halls and treasuries, as if these halls and funds were endangered in consequence of the tactics of Trade Union Unity. I believe that we are not yet in a period of the development of unity in which we must discuss the disappearance of the union funds and of the houses which have been bought by these Red unions!

The question of unity is not progressing so rapidly that one can already foresee the disappearance of the revolutionary organisation and that use may be made of this Bugaboo to fight the slogan of Trade Union Unity. It is indispensable that in all countries a little more should be said upon unity and

the proposals made on an international scale to develop the Left Unity Wing in the reformist and autonomous trade union organisation. Our tactics and our slogan of trade union unity will only be of value in so far as we have a Left in the reformist trade unions upon which we shall be able to depend for its development.

The principal task at present is for the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade union organisations belonging to the RILU in all countries to manifest the greatest activity for the establishment of their "fractions" within the reformist unions and for them to give these fractions clear slogans and a programme of joint demands which will permit, even before the realisation of unity, the realisation of the United Front. It is certain that if the Communists in every factory come forward with a concrete fighting programme including the slogan of unity, if they can base themselves upon their unity fractions within the reformist unions for the development of their propaganda and to assure the acceptance of their programme by the entire factory staff, they will exert great influence upon the reformist leaders. The workers will feel that it is the Communist and revolutionary trade unionists who come forward inside the factory with a programme of concrete demands, which truly responds to their desires. In consequence, in the resolution we must outline the work of the "fractions" and must demand that they should be established and that they should not be only on paper but that all the Communist Parties should concentrate upon the formation of fractions within the reformist unions. I insist that this agitation should be carried on particularly in countries like France, Great Britain, Germany and Czechoslovakia. More especially in these countries, where we sense very well that crises are impending, and that great labour struggles will break out in consequence of the Dawes Plan. In these countries there are great possibilities for the development of trade union unity, it is there that we find most of the prominent reformist leaders of the labour movement. We absolutely must concentrate our efforts upon these countries and defeat these reformist officials.

I do not want to retrace entirely the work accomplished in France. Since the Fifth Congress we have done a great deal of work in the reformist unions and we have put Jouhaux and his friends into an embarrassing position in the eyes of the French working class by means of definite proposals made to them and which we have agitated for amongst the rank and file. We have compelled them to take a stand on concrete propositions, of course, they refused, and we exploited their

refusal by explaining to the workers that the only opponents of unity were the reformist leaders. It is certain that in a country like Germany where Social Democracy has considerable influence, a large amount of propaganda and agitation has to be done on the question of unity.

The propaganda which has been carried on by the Social Democrats for years has consisted of pointing to the Communists as people who are for the revolution, but who do not want to defend the immediate interests of the workers. We must make these workers understand that we, the Communists, are for the defence of their demands and that in this defence we are in the forefront of all the struggles undertaken against the employers.

When I examine the situation in Czechoslovakia, with its multiplicity of trade union organisations, I see two powerful federations belonging to Amsterdam: A German federation and a Czech, and I ask myself why we have not yet succeeded in sowing dissension between these two federations and in getting workers away from them. I do not understand why this division along racial lines into two federations has not been exploited. We must fight for a unified trade union federation. Why is there a Czechoslovakian federation, a German federation, and a nationalist federation? It must be said that we, the Reds, stand for the existence of a single federation and we must carry on incessant propaganda within the factories to establish this unified trade union federation.

We must exploit the rapprochement of the British to the Russian trade unions. Some say that the Constitution of the Anglo-Russian Committee will present certain difficulties. Let us see. For the moment, this is a proposition of fact, we must support this proposal, and even if its constitution turns out impossible, is none the less true that using this as a starting point we can develop in all countries a great campaign around the Anglo-Russian Committee and will be able to make the reformist unions sympathetic to the unity vote in favour of this committee. That seems to me indispensable because the workers attach great importance to the rapprochement of the Russian and British Trade Unions. There is not a single capitalist newspaper which has not combated or criticised the idea of a rapprochement of the Russian and British Trade Unions. If the bourgeois press attaches so much importance to this rapprochement, it is indispensable for us to attach to it the same importance and for us to make the working class understand why capitalism is against it, and capitalism in all countries is fighting against trade union unity. We must point out the bitterness with which capitalism combats the unity proposals which we have made in France, as well as all the proposals of the International in respect to unity. We must carry on a struggle just as bitter as that of capitalism and we must make use of the arguments of the capitalists to prove to the working class the necessity for the realisation of trade union unity. In the months to come more widespread agitation will have to be carried on than has hitherto been the case.

We must also point out to the workers the joint offensive carried on against unity by the capitalists on the one hand and the reformists on the other. This is an excellent method of exposing the complicity of the reformists and the capitalists both of whom are fighting trade union unity with the same arguments.

Our Czechoslovakian comrades have told us horrifying things. They have said that the Left of the Communist Party has made mistakes, that it advocates the liquidation of the Red Trade Union, but a mistake by the Left must not be used as a pretext for inactivity in propaganda and agitation for unity. We must fight the Leftist deviations, but at the same time we must carry on the struggle for unity in conformity with the decisions of the Fifth Congress.

There are some comrades in our ranks with opportunist tendencies who believe that in order to realise unity we should no longer carry on a polemic against nor attack the reformist leaders. A comrade came to see me and said, "When you treat the reformist leaders as social traitors, it is extremely difficult to propose to them on the following day that a united front or Trade Union Unity be established". It is not a question of attacking this or that reformist leader but of fighting against a tendency: evidently we must sharply define the character of our attacks. If we content ourselves with saying in an article that so-and-so has sold himself, that so-and-so

is a social traitor, if we do not give the reasons for this and they are numerous — the manifold betrayals of the Social Democrats, it is useless to employ the epithet. I want to see the reasons given for calling this or that reformist leader a social traitor, but I cannot follow the comrades who say that the reformist leaders must no longer be attacked in order to realise trade union unity.

I believe that it is an entirely opportunist deviation, entirely Social Democratic language, to demand that personal attacks upon reformist leaders cease. I do not believe that this point of view will gain the day in the International and I believe that these are wholly isolated cases.

Comrades, if I insist on this point, it is because in France these proposals to cease these polemics have been made, and because we have had a heated discussion on this point. The International must state definitely just how the struggle must be carried on against the reformist leaders during the period when the propaganda for trade union unity enters a much more decisive phase.

These are the points to which I want to call the attention of the comrades. I believe that the resolution which will be adopted will outline in more detail the resolution of the Fifth World Congress, and will define the character of propaganda and agitation for trade union unity.

## Comrade Geschke :

Comrades, the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the Communist International and of the Third Congress of the Red International of Labour Unions roused fears in the German Delegation and the Communist Party in the question of trade union unity, and in the campaign to be conducted in its behalf. To-day we can say that in spite of all our fears which to a great extent were justified, the campaign for trade union unity has made great progress. In the factories we conducted thorough enlightenment activity on the political necessity of trade union unity. We very quickly felt the counter-activity of the Social Democratic Party, which used every means in its power, with the most unscrupulous lies and calumny, against the Communist Party of Germany and against the RILU. I have a letter here of the Social-Democratic Party of the Eastern Union of Hanover of February, 1, addressed to the trade unions, which says:

"Should the struggle against the principal opponents from the Right be successful, then the first thing we must do is to weaken the CPG as much as possible".

The whole force of the Social Democrats and the reformist trade union bureaucracy therefore is directed against the Communists. As everyone knows, we still have some very strong fractions in the reformist unions, and on the other hand a large percentage of those who have been expelled from the reformist unions. These formed the independent oppositional unions under the old Brandler Central Committee. Our fight was directed against the independent oppositional unions, incorporated by the Schumacher, Kaiser, and Weyer crowd, whose representatives opposed the unity of the trade unions here at the Fifth World Congress. A great number of workers had to be excluded from the Communist Party, because they could not obey the slogans of the Party and because they worked against them. We were ruthless towards these comrades, some of whom were good revolutionaries. All this must be taken into consideration in the fights and the whole campaign which the Party conducted.

The campaign for trade union unity really limited us in our movement from without, but it strengthened the Party from within. The masses of members notice that there is an iron fist which is leading them to a definite goal. The confidence in the Party leadership is growing; the policy in the trade union movement is unswerving.

But outside the Party itself, we, as the German Section of the Communist International, have to put up with a beating. We are strong enough, and he whom the Lord loveth, he chastiseth. Comrade Clara Zetkin is one of these chastisers, who believes it her duty to point out that our trade union fractions have gone to the dogs, and that as good as no fractions exist. I can demonstrate, and with some thought on the subject no material is needed to show that the statement that we have only 6 fractions in the transport workers union does

not even apply to the West District, which is evidently the source of this material. For this union has so many fractions that the honourable leader of the transport workers' union, the Social Democrat Schumann, is conducting the most bitter struggle against the fractions. If there were no fractions there, he would not need to fight.

We also show, furthermore, that, as a result of the intensive work of the Communists in the trade unions, the old mine workers' union in Halle, which had 6,500 members on December 1, 1924, increased to 23,500 members by February 15, 1925, under the pressure of the communists and the activity of the communist fractions. That is an example; on request I can give a mass of similar material any time.

The Social Democratic Party, after having been driven out of the ministerial posts in the national and various provincial governments, conducted a very clever apparent opposition, supposedly on behalf of the interests of the workers. Thus it was in a position to rally a mass of workers round its flags; with demagoguery, with clever manoeuvring, it actually created a feeling among the working class of Germany against the Communist Party. An example of this is the article in "Vorwärts" on Comrade Zinoviev's speech. "Vorwärts" here states that the revolutionary perspectives are dead; that the whole C.I. is dead.

We know that the workers to-day are no longer so easily taken in by the "Vorwärts" and the SPG as before. Delegations from the factories are already evincing a desire to convince themselves, by personally investigating Soviet Russia, its factories and trade unions, whether the "Vorwärts" or Purcell and Ben Tillett or the Communist Party is right in the last analysis. The situation in Germany is difficult for the campaign of trade union unity. The Party, nevertheless, strengthened by the energetic way in which this campaign has been taken hold of, will march forward along the line which has been laid down. We hope that the Anglo-Russian negotiations which are taking place in London just now, will give us still wider opportunities to extend our agitation among the masses. The present situation of the presidential elections, the attitude of the Luther Government toward the masses, the whole political situation of economic pressure, are helping us in this campaign. But the tremendous limitations, the handicaps which must be overcome in this fight, must also be taken into consideration.

### Comrade Dorsy (America):

I want to call the attention of the Enlarged Executive to an American factor which is of increasing importance in the international trade union situation. The American Federation of Labour, although not very large numerically, is of strategic importance because of location in the dominating country of the capitalist world. We see American capitalism reentering the European stage and we see the American Federation of Labour, following its master, also beginning again to take an interest in the European labour movement.

The A.F. of L. is one of the weapons of American capitalism for the imperialist penetration of Central and South America. At the last convention of the A.F. of L., Matthew Woll, one of the members of the Gompers machine, said: "The outstanding feature of the convention has been the establishment of closer relations between the Labour Federation of the U.S.A. and Latin America. Better relations between the respective governments will follow in due course. This is a sort of Monroe Doctrine of Labour. This signifies that neither European capital nor European labour may get a foothold on the American continent."

This is very characteristic for the role of the A.F. of L. the same holds true of Canada. The A.F. of L. is a powerful instrument of American capitalism for binding Canada more closely to the United States.

When it was in the interest of American capitalism to take part in the League of Nations, the A.F. of L. supported the League. Samuel Gompers himself went to Europe and spent a few months there campaigning for the League and getting the workers of Europe to accept it. When American capitalism veered about the A.F. of L. dropped the League and withdrew from the Amsterdam International. Now American capitalism thinks the time is ripe to re-enter the European arena,

as we see in the Dawes Plan, and the A.F. of L. is again interested in the Amsterdam International. At its last convention steps were taken in that direction; negotiations are under way and within the space of two or three years we may expect to see the A.F. of L. back in Amsterdam.

This is of prime importance to the European labour movement, especially in view of the movement for the convening of an international trade union unity congress. We may depend upon it that the A.F. of L. will lay down conditions which will be a real support of the opposition in Amsterdam to the Russian Trade Unions. The C.I. and the RILU cannot ignore this. —

This is a difficult problem. I believe that the big thing for us is the development of a Left Wing in the A.F. of L. Something can be done in this direction. We have so-called "progressive", elements friendly to Russia and not entirely subscribing to the reactionary policy of the Gompers machine, within the Federation, whom we must try to organise.

As I said in the Trade Union Commission, the Left Wing leaders in England must pay close attention to this. They can develop strong resistance to the Gompers machine within the A.F. of L. This will also air their fight against the Amsterdam International. I am not naive enough to believe that the A.F. of L. will go on record in favour of International trade union unity. The best we can hope for is to neutralise the efforts of the reactionary officialdom. They are the tools of the Amsterdam leaders as well as of the American capitalist class.

I only wanted to call this one problem to the attention of the Enlarged Executive as I believe that it is important enough to be recognised. I am certain that the American labour movement will in the future play a big part in the international labour movement.

### Comrades Treint (France):

Comrades, we heard our Polish comrades denounce the new crime committed by the White Terror Government. I mean our two comrades **Bacinsky** and **Vetcherkevitch**, Polish officers who had embraced the Communist cause. Both of them were condemned to death on the testimony of a provocateur, in the absence of all other proofs against them.

These two comrades have spent a year in prison, under conditions which I could not describe better than calling them Polish conditions, that is to say, a regime of tortures and starvation, in fact a regime under which the prisoners were spared no sufferings.

The Soviet Government proposed to exchange these two prisoners for two others.

The exchange was to take place a few days ago. I should like to draw your attention to the circumstances under which the assassination of our two comrades was perpetrated. They were assassinated in the train, the act was premeditated and committed by the chief of the police detachment under whose charge our two comrades were being conveyed to the place where the exchange was to take place. It was committed in the presence of the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I must point out that the crime committed in an atmosphere made hostile to the exchange of prisoners by a campaign carried on in the press, as well as in Parliament, not only by the Polish bourgeoisie but also by the social-democratic press, and by the PPS. Therefore, we now charge the Second International and its Polish Party with having contributed to the crime by stirring up public opinion against the exchange of prisoners.

We ask you on behalf of the Executive to address to the workers of all countries a **proclamation denouncing** once more the crimes of the Polish Government and encouraging all our comrades to arouse the proletariat in all countries against the White Terror in Poland.

**To the workers and peasants of all countries and to the soldiers of all armies.**

Comrades,

The brutal Polish Government has perpetrated another crime. After the death of two workers of Dombrowa by asphyxiating gas, after the sentence of death passed against **Segal** in **Cracow** for distributing Communist pamphlets among the soldiers, we have now to record the assassination of two com-



rades: **Baginsky** and **Vetcherkevitch**. They were struck down by the Polish police when they were on the point of crossing the Soviet frontier to be exchanged for two Polish criminals, one of them the Polish Consul the priest **Ussas**, charged in Leningrad with debauchery.

Our comrades were killed even contrary to bourgeois law after the Polish Government had been deprived of the opportunity of getting rid of them in a "legal" manner. Two years ago these comrades, both of them officers in the army, were charged in Warsaw with having dared to repudiate the capitalist government and to place themselves under the banner of the working class. On the strength of lying charges concocted by the spies of the secret police, they were condemned to death. But even the hangmen of the bourgeoisie had not the courage to carry out a verdict based on the trumped-up charges of the agents provocateurs. The sentence was commuted to penal servitude for life.

The crew of gaolers of the Polish Republic have subjected their victim to death by slow torture, keeping them for two years in irons in damp and dark cells, starving them to make them die of exhaustion.

The Soviet Government compelled them to liberate their victims, and then the bourgeoisie hatched out a new plot. Police who were escorting our two comrades killed them on the journey in order not to set free these officers who had been bold enough to stand up for the workers cause.

Comrades, the responsibility for this cowardly misdeed of the Polish bourgeoisie has to be laid at the door of the Polish Social Democrats. Determined to help the police they instigated in the press and in Parliament a frantic campaign against the liberation and exchange of these revolutionary fighters, and provoked by their criminal attitude the abominable assassination of Comrades **Baginsky** and **Vetcherkevitch**. The death of these two Communists must be laid at the door of this party of the Second International!

Comrades, the world proletariat has just frustrated the first attempt — and it is not going to be the last — of the Polish government to have Comrade **Lantsutsky** condemned to death. This new crime of the Polish bourgeoisie is an answer to the demonstrations in which the world proletariat expressed its solidarity with **Lantsutsky**. It is an answer to the protest meetings organised by the workers against the assassination by asphyxiating gas of our comrades **Piliarchik** and **Khaichik** in **Dombrowo**. It is a defiant challenge to the Union of Soviet Republics — the citadel of the workers and peasants. The gang of brigands at the head of the bourgeois State of Poland trample under foot their own agreements only to give vent to their hatred of these two revolutionaries.

Let the proletariat of all countries express once more and with tenfold vigour its indignation and disgust for the abominable deed of the Polish hangmen. May a flood of protests shake all the countries to their foundations! May this gang of assassins and torturers, who call themselves Polish socialists be judged by all the workers, including those who still adhere to the Second International. May the Polish workers and peasants protest more vehemently than ever before against the felony and the turpitude of this government of capitalists and country gentry. The workers and peasants of Poland can reckon in their struggle on the help and the solidarity of the workers of the world.

Down with White Terror!

Long live the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants of Poland!

Long live the international solidarity of the proletariat!

Honour and glory to the fighters who laid down their lives for the Revolution!

## **Comrade Lozovsky (Closing Speech):**

Our discussion demonstrates the absolute unanimity of views of the representatives of all the Communist Parties. I only want to deal with some questions which were either not treated at all or treated very briefly in my report and to which the representatives of various Parties referred in their speeches.

The first question, a very important one, concerns the manner in which all the Communist Parties should conduct

their propaganda and agitation in relation to the International Trade Union Movement. I must record that not all parties took advantage of the extremely favourable situation which arose in the Amsterdam International in order to press our views before the masses regarding unity and the role of the Second International. In our propaganda for unity we must declare what it is we want when the trade union movement is united and in what manner we shall fight. We must put a picture of the activities of the Amsterdam International before the masses, so as to make it clear to them whether that international is a real and substantial international or not. Why do our parties devote so little attention to that point?

When we examine the internal contradictions which are disrupting the Amsterdam International no less than the League of Nations, we find that the International Trade Union Federation, which is called the Amsterdam International, is no international at all, since within that association there are many things which are not international but national. It has never conducted a single international campaign, a single great strike, or any single action in several countries at one time, and yet it calls itself an international organisation. This fact deserves our attention.

The more we intensify our fight for unity the more vigorously do our enemies pursue their propaganda and agitation and reactionary measures. The more our influence over the trade union movement in the reformist federation grows, the greater is the number of expulsions. And the expulsions are followed by splits organised by the reformists, as we had foreseen. In our propaganda and agitation among the masses the most stubborn resistance must be offered to the expulsions.

The weakness of our fight for unity has hitherto been that in certain countries it has been given an abstract character. It is not enough to repeat early and late that we are in favour of unity. Only when we associate the problem of unity with the day-to-day struggle will the campaign embrace tens of millions of workers and we shall be in a position to tear out of the hands of the reformists the millions who are at present under their influence.

Every Communist Party will therefore in the immediate future be faced with the practical problem as to how to participate in the every day economic struggles.

Our task in the fight for unity is to rally as large a number of the workers as possible in the process of the struggle. Should we succeed in creating a united fight, the logic of the workers will drive them over to our side. The Amsterdam reformists do not want unity. They want to make the workers believe that it is a manoeuvre on our part. They do not want to allow the Communists to approach the masses, nor to allow them the opportunity of creating an organised association. For that reason we must fight not only against the reformist leaders, but also against the whole reformist machine, since the reformist leaders formulate the work which is being done by the Social Democratic trade union machine. When we say that we are prepared to join a united organisation and to fight, it does not mean that we want to pursue a middle course. No compromise, no combination between the reformists and the communists, but a life and death struggle to the bitter end.

The question has been asked as to the methods by which we are to conduct the fight against the reformists. The reformists do not like us to attack them; they insist upon courtesy and gentle treatment; they insist upon being regarded as honest men and good socialists. But comrades, this is not a question of courtesy. It is a reformism from the masses. We declare that the reformists are the agents of capitalism within the working class movement and we shall prove it by a number of historical examples.

As I have already said, comrades, we are faced by the very important fact of a rapprochement between the British trade unions and the trade unions of the Soviet Union. Tomorrow, or the day after, the **Anglo-Russian Trade Union Conference opens**, at which the question will be discussed as to how the struggle for unity is to be conducted. That is a factor of tremendous historical importance. One cannot say that our agreement will be a final agreement based upon the Communist programme. No comrades, the Communist platform is still not shared by a great section of the British working class and our agreement with it will be based upon concrete questions. We are not moving forward with great strides

but with small strides. Marx has said that a single practical step forward in the Labour Movement is worth a dozen programmes. The rapprochement between the British and Russian Trade Unions is worth a hundred resolutions. It demonstrates that a move forward has taken place in the British Labour Movement.

That is a cardinal question for all Parties. We must bring it home to the masses; we must compare the leaders of the British trade union movement with the leaders of the French, Czechoslovakian and other trade union movements. The workers in Germany, France, etc., must ask their trade union leaders why they are not following the example of their English colleagues who have concluded a bloc and an agreement with the Soviet Unions. That is necessary and has to be done. The important task of the Communist Parties of all countries in the immediate future is to support that bloc. It must be understood that it is not merely an agreement between the British and Russian trade unions, but an agreement between the revolutionary movement of the workers of all countries and the best sections of the reformist labour movement.

When we say that a calm has supervened between two storms, we record that a certain success has been achieved in stabilisation, even though it be an uncertain stabilisation, or rather a stable uncertainty. "Vorwärts" prints endless articles on the "End of the Revolution"; it even talks of the end of Soviet Russia. It is rejoicing too prematurely. The more Marxian our attitude toward events is, the more objectively we estimate our successes and defeats, the greater will be the strength of the Communist International. For the strength of the Communist Parties consists in the fact that they have the courage and boldness to admit that they have suffered a defeat. We openly say that a period of calm has begun. We must gather our forces and redouble our energies.

We shall be able to defeat the hopes of the social democrats only if we are able intimately and organically to associate the unity campaign with the concrete practical day-to-day struggle and with the prose of the workers existence which will lead to the poetry of the social revolution. We must take advantage of the brief period of calm, the period of temporary stabilisation and consolidation of the bourgeoisie, — which cannot be compared with the pre-war period, since general uncertainty reigns and the slightest incident may render the situation critical and lead to war — in order to bring millions into the fight, and with the aid of the slogan of the unity of the labour movement forge the armies which we are to lead into the final struggle. It is a preparatory work of extreme importance. Therefore, the question of unity must be bound up with the policy we have to carry out. The question of the bolshevisation of the Parties does not concern only one side of the question. Bolshevisation of the Parties means to **act bolshevistically in all spheres of the labour movement**, and especially in the trade unions resolutely and Marxistically, to conquer the masses with the help of the slogan of unity, and to lead the masses into the final struggle.

## Comrade Sauvage (France):

The Comintern has not considered it necessary to reproduce in full the paragraphs of the resolution of the Fifth Congress. It has merely confirmed them.

The resolution places on record the development of the campaign for trade union unity. It also mentions the rapprochement between the British and the Soviet trade unions.

The resolution does not deal, as demanded by **Semard** with the establishment of fractions in the trade unions, nor with their tasks and the instructions to be issued to them. The conference on organisation held before the Enlarged Executive discussed at great length the question of fractions.

The constitution, the role and the propaganda to be carried on by the fractions are fully dealt with and must serve as directions to all the Parties.

And now I will read the resolution which was adopted:

**Struggle for the unity of the international trade Union movement.**

(Resolution on A. Lozovsky's report.)

The unity campaign which met with great response among proletarian masses confirms in an unmistakable manner the correctness of the political lines laid down by the Fifth Congress of the CI.

The development of the class struggle in the present situation increases the desire for unity and at the same time arouses the interest of the masses, not under communist influence, in the organisations which carry on a sincere and stubborn fight for the establishment of unity in the international trade union movement. Therefore, the Enlarged Executive of the CI deems it necessary to draw once more attention to the necessity of a systematic and stubborn struggle for unity; for struggle for unity is struggle against the bourgeoisie and its lackeys, and for the capture of the workers.

The Enlarged Executive of the CI attaches great importance to the rapprochement between the British and Soviet trade unions. It sees in it a guarantee that the international unity of the trade union movement is beginning to assume practical forms.

The enlarged Executive welcomes the work achieved by the Anglo-Russian trade union conference and calls upon the workers of all countries, regardless of tendencies, to help with all the energy at their disposal in the formation of the Anglo-Russian trade union bloc, and to fight unremittingly for the establishment of international trade union unity.

The commission suggests that the resolution be handed over to the political commission for final editing.

Comrade **Arissov** greets the Plenum in the name of all the oppressed workers and peasants of **Rumania** and begs the Comintern to support the struggle of the oppressed **Bessarabian peoples** against the yoke of the Rumanian Boyars.

Stormy Applause!

After Comrade **Semard**, in the name of the Presidium, replied to this greeting, the session was closed.