

V. b. b.

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 6. No. 24

PRESS

1st April 1926

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, Schliesfach 213, Vienna IX.
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

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

(Detailed Report.)

Fifteenth Session, March 5, 1926.

Continuation of the Discussion on the Trade Union Question.

The Chair was occupied by Comrade Smeral.

Comrade Ognianovich (Yugo Slavia):

The Communist Party of Yugo-Slavia in fighting for trade union unity has to make the greatest efforts and fight under extreme difficulties. The struggle for trade union unity is all the more difficult, as in Yugo-Slavia the Social Democrats are linked up with the military and monarchist reaction and with the Serbian bourgeoisie.

The situation of the labour movement and the Yugo-Slav proletariat is very difficult owing to the splitting methods of the Social Democrats and also in view of the new offensive which the Serbian bourgeoisie has undertaken against our movement and against the whole proletariat.

Twenty-four hours after the capitulation of the leaders of the Croat national-republican and peasant movement, on March 28, the Serbian bourgeoisie, immediately after they had safeguarded their flank a little from the side of the Croat national-peasant movement, launched their offensive against the proletariat.

This attack of the State against wages was followed by an attack by the industrial organisations which, in one industry after another, began to reduce the nominal wages which were already particularly low.

In this offensive, industrial and financial capital gained a partial success owing to the bad situation of the working class.

This situation is indeed more than critical. Out of 1,200,000 workers, there are only 7% organised, and these are split up into a multitude of organisations: Social Democrats, independents, revolutionaries, Croats, nationalists, Serbian nationalists, christians, autonomists, etc. Thus in one branch of industry there are often eight or nine parallel organisations.

The terrible unemployment which had prevailed two years, affected 250,000 workers who do not receive any benefit from the State.

No sooner did the employers demand a decrease in wages, than the Social Democrats agreed to this in principle, asserting that in the first place Yugo Slavian industry must be restored so that it can withstand the competition of foreign industry. This is the most perfect Social-nationalism.

An offensive was also launched against social legislation.

The attack of the employers was assisted by a great strategic move of the Social Democrats. At the time of the attack on wages, the Social Democrats engaged on an extensive splitting manoeuvre by organising a scissionist congress which was termed a "Unity Congress". This manoeuvre for a split was directed against the independent trade unions which stand on the platform of the class struggle. The renegade Communist Zivota Milloikovitch cooperated in this manoeuvre.

At this Unity Congress the Social Democrats on all points imitated the trade union strategy of the R.I.L.U. Although they attack the Communists, they want to work with the "unorganised

bands"; they also invited to their congress the unorganised factory workers. But the workers did not come in as great numbers as the Social Democrats hoped and the success of the congress did not come up to their expectations.

In order to resist the attack on social legislation and on wages, the independent trade unions immediately appealed to the Social Democrats to make a united front with them. The Social Democrats did not reply officially, but in their trade union paper, called "Unitarian" they dealt with this in an editorial entitled: "Don't bother us, you swine!" That was the way they replied to revolutionaries.

Immediately after this Unity Congress, the Amsterdamites wanted to imitate the manoeuvre of the Italian fascists with respect to a legal monopoly of the trade union movement. As the government handed the trade union chambers over to the representatives of the Social Democratic Party without any election whatsoever, these latter by a decree, in certain provinces, struck out the headquarters of the independent trade union minorities from the list and thus assured the monopoly of the Labour Chambers. The lists are reserved for the trade union bureaucracy, and only those who are registered can present lists of candidates. For instance, in the **Serbian province at the Belgrade Labour Chamber**, there will only be the list of the Social Democrats, the workers are not being able to present candidatures.

The Communist Party of Yugo Slavia has also committed faults in the field of trade union policy. First and foremost there was the neglect of work for unity among the masses of factory workers. That is perhaps the greatest sin of the Party. Too much confidence was placed in the tactic of negotiating with the leaders, while we forgot to find appropriate methods for winning the **Croat proletarians** who, perhaps, because of the acuteness of the question of the national struggle were with the **Raditch Party** and his trade union organisation, instead of fighting with the Communist Party which was struggling for the social and national emancipation of the working masses.

Some comrades working in the Party also had a tendency to transform the question of trade union unity into metaphysical unity. Instead of bringing this struggle to the masses in the factories, they demanded unity in the press.

The Party has learned a lesson from this and the trade union work of the Party has improved. It is now understood that without work among the masses there can be no serious struggle for unity.

The scissionist congress of the Social Democrats provoked two tendencies in our Party: the **extreme Left tendency**, which considered the work for unity achieved after the new split. The Party combatted and will combat vigorously this tendency which is very dangerous as it has a revolutionary appearance. The Party considers that the struggle for unity is only just commencing.

Then there is an **extreme Right tendency** which says: we are done for, all we can do is to go down on our knees before Amsterdam and enter into the Social Democratic unions.

The Party combatted and will combat this capitulation tendency also.

There is no doubt that certain points gained by the Social Democrats were obtained through our fault. It is by working in the factories and among the masses that we regain the lost positions.

There was also a tendency on the part of certain comrades to slacken off the work amongst unorganised workers. The Party has put up a most energetic fight to get work done amongst the **unorganised**, who in Yugo Slavia represent the majority of the proletariat, particularly in the industrial branches which are of the greatest importance from the point of view of class struggle strategy: amongst the railwaymen, miners, metal workers, seamen, woodworkers, etc.

At the time of the greatest difficulties, **Amsterdam** conceived a plan for the conquest not only of the Yugo-Slavian proletarians, but for the whole Balkans. It is probable that the manoeuvre of the marauders will fail in view of the scorn of the Balkan proletariat.

Finally, I would like to take up a few words from **Bordiga's** speech. Bordiga reproaches everyone with mechanism, and the absence of a study of objective conditions. But when he says in his own objective analysis that we must abandon the slogan for international trade union unity, because the Amsterdam trade unions are becoming Americanised and because the trade union bureaucracy will not bring about unity, he is forgetting something: in the process of Americanisation of the upper stratum of the International, he has forgotten the masses inside the Amsterdam unions, and one wonders whether his analysis is extreme Left or if it is not rather a centrist analysis. One must have a great lack of respect, a great scepticism towards the mass movement of Amsterdam and towards the perspective of an international trade union movement to perceive an **imminent Americanisation of the masses** at the same time as the Americanisation of the leaders. This extreme Left tendency therefore, is also revealed as a **centrist tendency**.

In concluding comrades, I declare that the Yugo-Slav Party will have to struggle in very difficult conditions. It will have to combat the **white reaction** and also its ally the **Social Democrats**.

But despite the difficulty of this struggle the Yugo-Slav Party will do its work in the trade union movement, in the factories, among the organised and unorganised proletarian masses in the proletarian unity committees. The Communist Party of Yugo-Slavia will fulfil its task for trade union unity despite all the attacks of the police and the endeavours of the Social Democrats.

Comrade Geschke (Germany):

Comrades, in the political theses of Comrade Zinoviev it is stated with complete justification that there is **no thought of a revision of the principles of the Fifth World Congress**. It is precisely in the trade union questions that we begin to get a correct picture of the meaning of the resolutions of the Fifth World Congress. Some comrades regard the contents of these resolutions only as a correction of various opportunist deviations in the fight against brandlerism, as an eradication of mistakes in the application of the tactic of the united front, etc. Undoubtedly these corrections were absolutely necessary, but the **most important resolutions of the Fifth World Congress are those on trade union unity**, and the application of the united front tactic in connection with the trade union question. These are the historically enduring factors characterising the Fifth World Congress.

The resolutions of the Fifth World Congress, are the introduction of a **strategical manoeuvre**. I must openly admit that we, as the German Delegation, only first took active part in the manoeuvre under the pressure of our Russian friends and other comrades. But it has been proved that the resolutions of the Fifth World Congress introduce a decisive stage in the solution of the fundamental problems of winning over the working class.

Comrade **Bordiga** frankly regretted that the Fifth Congress discovered this great policy in the question of the tactic of the united front in connection with the trade union question. Bordiga, like so many other comrades of the Ultra-left, cannot and will not correctly estimate the significance of the Fifth World Congress. Our Ultra-left in Germany, for a long time, coupled the Fifth World Congress along with the Frankfurt Party Congress. But the **Frankfurt Party Congress** directly opposed the policy of the Fifth World Congress. The Fifth World Congress attacked the splitting policy in our own ranks and outlined a clear course for international unity. On this occasion we, the representatives of the German Party, must candidly admit that **we have made serious mistakes. We made concessions, at that time, to the ultra-Left ideology.** The tactic of Comrade **Ruth Fischer** after her return consisted in continuous vacillation, in a conscious double game, between the false policy of Frankfurt and the correct policy of the Fifth World Congress. This double game was still worse than the open split policy of **Schumacher**. I will only mention one of the most important mistakes of Comrade Ruth's group. Immediately after the return from the Fifth Congress, a resolution was adopted in the Central Committee of the Party which expressed itself in favour of international trade union unity, but "**on the basis of the Profintern**".

This resolution was in reality a sabotage. Shortly before, Maslow had written an article in the "International", in which he expressed himself regarding the question of the Left Wing in the British labour movement to the effect "I deny that there is such a wing".

• Another serious mistake was the dissolution of the Trade Union Department in the C. C. That meant the crippling of the Central Organ of our trade union work.

The most serious mistakes of the Ruth Fischer Group in trade union work lay in their general policy. The Ruth Fischer Group abandoned the unity policy, and the collapse of our most important positions in the trade unions was the obvious and most serious expression of these deviations in the general policy. And the general political and innerparty course of the Ruth Fischer Group is also responsible for the fact that the specific gravity of trade union work within the whole policy of our Party, became always smaller. That was shown especially clearly at the Tenth Party Congress. There absolutely nothing was mentioned in the political report of Comrade Ruth Fischer about trade union work. That was left for a special reporter, Comrade Thälmann. A complete change in this state of affairs was not brought about until after the Open Letter of the E. C. C. I. and for the first time for years we can show not defeat, but progress, not reverses but successes in the trade unions.

The strengthening of our trade union policy is making itself felt most strongly at first within the Party itself. The first measure of the Party Executive after the publication of the Open Letter was the reconstruction of the Trade Union Department. At the same time the activity of our fractions was taken up again with greater energy. Everywhere the interest for the trade union work grew, and the comrades who had once done this work, and who had retired, again came forward into the ranks.

A revival of our fractions has taken place practically everywhere. At the same time the first German workers' delegation to Soviet Russia, immediately after its return, developed a lively agitation for trade union unity. Our progress is still weak, it is true, but it is of decisive importance that the curve of our successes is now for the first time beginning to rise again, after years of unbroken decline. Of course the independent policy of our Party is playing a role in this connection. When the Communist Party conducts such mass campaigns as that of the expropriation of the ex-royalty, that must also inevitably have its effect on the trade union movement in our favour. The same holds true of the Saxon policy, of the tenant movement, our fight against taxes and tariffs, etc. And only from this standpoint can the real content of the last Party discussion be grasped.

The nature of our differences in the German Party did not consist in the fact that Ruth Fischer is a bad leader, that Maslow wrote a brochure against Lenin and that he behaved unworthily at his trial — those are secondary phenomena, although they are important and significant phenomena; but the real question in dispute was something bigger; it was the question of the road which the German working class should take. This road was blocked by the policy of Comrade Ruth Fischer, but this road was also obstructed by the policy of the ultra-left Group? The new course of our Party has thrown this road obviously wide open. That is the result of our discussion. Of course we still encounter tremendous obstacles in the trade union work:

1. The economic situation of the working class, the permanent existence of a great army of unemployed, and a great army of short-time workers, low wages, fear of dismissal and also a certain passive mood in parts of the German working class itself.

2. Threats of expulsion, annulment of elections, etc. I remind you only of the fact that the leader of the first German worker's delegation to Soviet Russia, Freiburger, was also expelled from the S. P. D.

The German social democrats and also the German trade union bureaucracy have been possessed since their trip to America by a veritable America-mania. They saw the Ford Plant in America, they even sat on the electric chair, and now they are bringing this back to our workers as the latest

"discovery of America". But the workers are taking these reports very coolly, for the workers are just now under the influence of the reports of the first German workers' delegation to Soviet Russia.

The third difficulty is the inner-Party resistance. Certain ultra-lefts are still continuing their stubborn resistance. I remind you only of their opposition in connection with the amalgamation of election lists for counting the surplus votes in Berlin, of the attempts to form special organisations of the unemployed against the free trade unions, of their resistance to our Saxon policy, etc.

For this reason the Sixth Enlarged Executive must put a stop to the inner-party struggles in the C. P. G. the groupings must be done away with once and for all. In the interests of a broad development of our work in the free trade unions such elements as Ruth Fischer, who embody unrestricted fractional fighting for the sake of fractional fighting, must be rendered harmless.

And now the perspectives of our trade union work in Germany.

The dominating factor of the whole German policy is the Dawes Plan, which has a decisive influence also on the development of the class struggle in Germany. The effects of this Dawes Plan will make stronger activity necessary for all the trade unions in Germany. Against the attempt to lower the standard of living of the German working class, the trade unions must defend themselves if they do not wish to be ruined. The employers are the absolute agents of the Dawes Regime, and even a great section, perhaps the majority of the Right trade union leaders, will accompany them to the very end. But the German wage workers, the 5 million proletarian members of the free trade unions of Germany, will conduct a number of economic and, I believe, also a number of political struggles in defence of their standard of living.

Our perspectives are therefore directed toward an increase in all trade union struggles. Undoubtedly we will, under these conditions, achieve greater results in the German trade union movement, in the period confronting us. Our tactic must be adjusted accordingly.

In this connection I wish to dwell upon two tactical questions.

The first is our attitude toward that trade union tendency in Germany which is to some extent, in opposition to the reformists, but which cannot yet make up its mind to join the Communists in a united front. If we really want to create the Left Wing in the German trade union movement according to the example of the British experiences, we must find a correct relation with this tendency. The most important leader of this tendency is Robert Dissmann, the leader of the German metal workers' union. We will have to continue our fight against Dissmann in a still sharper form if he does not cease his attacks against the Communists, but we will support him and the trade unionists near him against the Right leaders, when he fights for the maintenance of the eight-hour day, and when he advocates an increase in wages. We will support him when he advocates an increase of the unemployment benefits. We will support the fight for the formation of industrial unions which he, Schumann and others are conducting in Germany, against the Right leaders of the A. D. G. B. We will support Dissmann, Schumann and the others unconditionally, when they advocate trade union unity for Soviet Russia.

The second tactical question I wish to touch upon is the question of the independent unions. Comrade Lozovsky is right when he says that in order to achieve unity, we must increase our own strength. But this principle must be applied in various forms in the various countries. Our own strength is not only the Red trade union organisations, the parallel organisations; our own strength is also chiefly our ideological and organisational influence in the reformist unions. This fact applies to all capitalist countries, not only for Germany, but also for France, and for Czechoslovakia. But this principle applies most of all to Germany. It is the only big industrial country where we have practically an unsplit trade union movement. The independent unions play an absolutely

minimum role in Germany. Insofar, the situation is different from that in France and in Czechoslovakia. Therefore the strengthening of the few existing unions is an entirely subordinate question in Germany. An over-estimation would inevitably lead to splitting deviations in our trade union policy.

Therefore, we propose that changes be made in the theses in conformity with this situation.

The question of expulsion is also somewhat different for us. We must on no account relapse again into the errors of 1924, and organise the expelled into parallel organisations, into special organisations. Our fundamental policy, our main policy toward the expelled must be: **fight for the reinstatement of the expelled in the free unions.** On no account must there be fresh formation of special organisations of the expelled.

Here I must also go into the question of the unemployed. It is stated in the theses that organisations of unemployed should be formed. Were we to form such unemployed organisations, then we would get into the same situation which we had in Germany several years ago, the fight of the unemployed against those remaining in the factories, the splitting up of the working class into employed and unemployed. We consider it just now a particular success of the German Party and of the German C. C. that it was possible for us, in spite of the army of 3½ million unemployed, to rally this army of unemployed round the Communist Party, and to hold it not by the K. A. P. (Communist Labour Party) or the syndicalist slogans, but by the slogans of the Communist Party. We approve of the formation of unemployed committees, but not the formation of unemployed organisations.

Comrade Lozovsky opposed the slogan: "Unity at any price". This warning is absolutely justified. It would amount to capitulation were we to buy it at any price which the Right trade union leaders dictate. But there is also another danger and that is the policy which advocates in words, but which, affected by its own warnings and ponderings, and in part by its acts, in reality acts according to the slogan: Unity at no price.

This danger must be specially emphasised and combatted. In some Parties it is much greater today than the other deviations. Of special significance and importance is the development of more well-trained active cadres of trade union functionaries. The development of such cadres represents the most urgent task of the German Party. A number of suitable measures have already been undertaken.

Now I must come to a point which escaped Comrade Lozovsky — the factory council movement, which in Germany certainly does not play the same role as it did in 1919/20 or 1923, when the factory councils were plainly the bearers of great mass movements. During that time there were factory councils which, with the support of the employees, frankly swept directors aside. Now the factory councils have been condemned to great impotency. But even there we are finding a slow revival under the economic pressure, under the "rationalisation" being introduced in the factories. Thus it is possible to develop new life in them. Then there are new tasks arising for the factory councils out of the great army of the unemployed, the short-time workers, and those employed in the factories. The factory councils in Germany will again before long be the bearers of a mass movement. They will become one of the most important organs in Germany.

Summing up, one can say that the perspectives for our trade union work are favourable. The crystallisation of a Left Wing is progressing and this crystallisation has been able to progress all the better because of the great asset of the international fight for trade union unity. The international unity campaign since the Fifth World Congress had developed chiefly in two directions:

1. The Anglo-Russian Committee;
2. The Workers' Delegations.

The programme of the Anglo-Russian Committee was the struggle against war, the struggle against the offensive of capital, the struggle for the unity of the whole trade union

movement. These slogans, which immediately found a ready ear among the working class, caused great confusion among the reactionary sections of the trade union leaders. And especially in Germany, where we have the most reactionary trade union leaders.

Our slogan: — convince yourselves of the situation in Soviet Russia — was accepted more willingly and the second effect was the sending of workers' delegation to Soviet Russia.

These reports of the workers' delegations contributed tremendously to the growth of the united front movement in Germany. The social democratic workers unanimously said they had noticed the building up of socialism in Soviet Russia, that they have seen that the working class rules in Russia, etc. . . . (Interjection: hear, hear!!). It will be of great importance for us if in future the trade unions send official delegations to the Soviet Union. The first delegation to Russia was a delegation of factory councils. And now trade unionists or trade union delegations ought to be sent to Russia and in this connection I say — not only trade union delegations of the A. D. D. B., but also of the Christian organisations, and the Hirsch-Dunker organisations. The value of a workers' delegation to Soviet Russia increases with the number and organisation extent of the radius of workers whom these delegations represent. If today a factory council of the Siemens Concern or of the A. E. G. Concern (Electricity Works) is sent here by 20,000 to 40,000 workers, that is very nice, but if a trade unionist should come who commands the ear of 100,000 workers, then that is all the better.

Delegations of working women should also be invited. The working women should be given the opportunity to see Soviet Russia, in order to be able to tell the German working women in what a miserable state of slavery she is in Germany.

Our tasks will thus be to continue the international campaign for unity with all our strength, and we must avoid creating the impression in this work that it is nothing but an unmasking manoeuvre. Whoever has that conception, that the campaign for the united front is nothing but an unmasking manoeuvre, supports the Ultra-Left sentiments, and at the same time the efforts of the Amsterdam leaders. As Marxists we are profoundly convinced that a united trade union international would be the greatest achievement for the international labour movement. We want to organise all the workers into a world-embracing trade union international. All vacillation in this question must be combatted. Therefore it would be wrong if we were to exclude any form for trade union unity absolutely and forever. We agree with Comrade Tomsky's opinion: in great questions we must not tie our hands. At the present moment it would not be correct to raise the question of the isolated entrance of the Russian trade unions into the Amsterdam International. The question of the Profintern is something entirely different. There are comrades who consider the liquidation of the Profintern as tantamount to the liquidation of the Communist International. Such comrades confuse the role of the Party with that of the trade union. The existence of an independent Communist world Party is for us the prerequisite for the revolutionary class struggle and the victory of the working class. We refuse even to speak of amalgamating with the Second International. But the case is different in the trade union question. By the very fact that we are raising the question of calling a world conference for the amalgamation of the two trade union internationals, we are proposing the liquidation of the Amsterdam-International as well as of the Profintern — the amalgamation of the two separated internationals into one. In the struggle for the formation of a united front, the economic pressure and the deprivation of the workers of social rights which the bourgeoisie and the employers are exercising, will help us. This very pressure of the sinking standard of living of the German workers will inevitably lead also to a worsening of the situation of the British workers. Comrade Tomsky pointed out that this will be a long drawn-out struggle. We can best avoid these dangers by mobilising all our forces for the complete carrying out of the resolutions of the Fifth World Congress, of the resolutions on the question of the tactic of the united front in connection with the trade union question. It is along these lines that the German Party will work.

Comrade Clara Zetkin:

Comrades, it has been said quite rightly that our work must be 80% trade union work. Quite rightly we concentrated our attention on the question of trade union unity tactics and the trade union united front. But I am sorry to say that neither in the resolution on this question placed before us nor in all the speeches which have been made was anything said concerning a very important factor in the realisation of the trade union united front and unity tactics. Not a word has been vouchsafed with respect to the necessity to extend our entire trade union work with the utmost energy also to the working women. It would seem that as far as we are concerned, working women do not exist. Comrades is this merely by chance?

No, I am sorry to say, it is not by chance, it is rather a reflex of the fact that in the sections of the C. I. — except in the A. U. C. P. — the revolutionisation of women, of working women in particular, does not receive the attention which it deserves, and that therefore our Communist work among women employed in factories, offices and various other enterprises is very inadequate indeed.

There is just one section apart from the Russian Section which has taken this work earnestly in hand, I mean our British Communist Party which in connection with the Minority Movement and with its campaign for the formation of a Left Wing has also paid due attention to the trade union organisation of working women. I am, of course, prepared to admit that the Italian Party, in spite of its very difficult position, created by fascism, has endeavoured to get into touch with enterprises employing large numbers of women and to organise these women in trade unions. I also admit that in the course of the year repeated efforts were made in France to organise working women in trade unions and to enlighten them. But according to news received by us all these efforts failed pitifully and did not develop into energetic systematic work among large sections of working women. In Germany affairs in connection with this work are also in a miserable state. Practically the same can be said of the other sections.

Comrades, this attitude of the Communist Parties is in flagrant contradiction to all the facts which point to the importance and necessity of the trade union organisation of working women and of their systematic enlightenment and education. According to the 1922 statistics in Germany women industrial workers constitute almost one-fifth of all the industrial workers. According to some statistics, women industrial workers in France were supposed, as far back as 1906, to constitute 34% of all industrial workers. I am not going to compare these figures with one another and I do not believe in them as in the Communist Evangel. These statistics are incomplete and the conditions under which they were drawn up are not stated. But one thing is certain — that in the industrial countries working women constitute about one-fifth to one-fourth of all industrial workers. We must bear in mind that the entire technical and organisational development of capitalist economy is continually providing new openings for women's activity and is assigning to professional women more and more important positions in industry. The same may be said concerning trade and commerce. The growing mechanisation in trade and in office work is drawing more and more women into this kind of activity. This development is also making itself felt in the transport services and in the State and municipal bodies, etc. If we set against the number of professional women in industry, trade, the transport services and in the administrative services of private capitalists, municipalities and of the State the number of women organised in trade unions, we will find that the latter is very small.

Another fact to which I should like to draw your attention: insofar as working women and professional women outside the Soviet Union are organised in trade unions, they are almost exclusively in pure bourgeois organisations. What does this mean? It means that insofar as professional women organised in trade unions are a power, they are a power in the hands of our opponents, in the hands of our enemies, a power directed against us and our efforts.

Comrades, can we tolerate this any longer without showing our will to energetic action? I think not! Those who do not show such will for action are enemies of Communism. I want to say most emphatically: Those who do not do their utmost for the trade union organisation of working women and of professional

women prove themselves to be, in the last resort, enemies of the revolutionisation and mobilisation of the entire proletariat against bourgeois society. It is self-evident that in many branches of industry economic struggles cannot be carried out without an understanding and self-sacrificing collaboration of the working women. Whole branches of industry are in the hands of women. I will merely mention the textile industry, the clothing industry, the food and the tobacco industry. I want also to remind you of the large number of women employed in the telephone and telegraph services, as shorthand-typists and in other posts in the transport service of the capitalist state. There is much talk about big economic struggles which are imminent, and this talk is well-founded. It is said most emphatically that Communists must take the lead in these struggles. Quite so. But comrades, if we are convinced that we are faced with such a development of affairs we must also do our utmost to obtain the best possible guarantees for our victory and success and to prove the superiority of Communist leadership. One of the best opportunities to do this is our activity for the enlightenment and trade union organisation of women employed in industry and in the various professions. How do you picture to yourself a strike which goes beyond the economic enterprises and spreads to the municipal and state administrative bodies, if you have not with you the army of women shorthand typists, telegraphists and telephonists? All these questions which I have pointed out to you are of the utmost practical importance.

There is another matter. When dealing with trade union questions and when organising and utilising our trade union activity we cannot limit ourselves to getting only at the working women and the women engaged in the various professions. We must apart from this turn our attention to the women working in their homes and to the proletarian housewives.

The frame of mind and the attitude of these women is of the utmost importance in all wage movements, strikes and other struggles. In some industries which are of particular importance for the battles of the revolutionary class struggle, the attitude of working men's wives is a matter which deserves consideration. Experience has shown that in the struggle of the metal workers and the miners in the Ruhr basin, in the great strike movement of the upper Silesian miners and in the miners' struggles in Belgium, Great Britain, the U. S. A. and last summer, in Canada, working men's wives played an important role as strike pickets and organisers of relief actions for the children of the strikers and of other forms of support for the strikers. The 25,000 miners' wives who came forward last summer in Great Britain to support the demands of the miners is a phenomenon which is food for thought and which should spur us to maximum activity.

Comrades, I should like to rouse your conscience in order that you should attach more importance to this great question of the trade union organisation and trade union training of women engaged in industry and in the various professions. And I have another very important reason for this. How do you picture to yourself a successful united front and the revolutionisation and capture of the trade unions, their purging of reformist leaders and misleaders if you do not have the organised working women with you who hitherto, unfortunately have been preponderantly on the side of the most insipid reformists. Much to the detriment of working women, for in all compromises under the auspices of class collaboration it is generally the working women and the women in general who have to bear the cost of the peace with the bourgeoisie.

Therefore comrades, I implore you not to imagine that everything has been done by the adoption of the resolution, to which, it is hoped, a few words about the importance of trade union work among women will be added. This is not enough, and everyone of you must feel himself under the obligation to do his utmost for the enlightenment and organisation of working women, for their development and education. There is so much talk about Leninism and Bolshevism. I tell you, you are bad Bolsheviks, you are not proper followers of our Lenin if you do not also attach the greatest importance to this question and if you do not work actively for its solution. Away with your inactivity, your indifference and laxity in this question! What is the meaning of it all! That you have not yet realised the necessity of truly revolutionary "Realpolitik", that you have not yet even an inkling of the magnitude, the glory and the all-embracing importance of the Communist ideal. Accept from me, who am an old woman the counsel:

Mend your ways! Recognise your errors, and set to work!
(Loud applause.)

Comrade Bracco (Italy):

Lozovsky remarked that the Italian Communists have not maintained continued contact with the International and have not kept the latter informed as to the position of the reformists with regard to fascism and the fascist unions in particular. It is for this reason that I shall deal particularly with the trade union situation in Italy.

What is the position of the trade unions in Italy?

We have a trade union tradition. All the organised Parties have a tendency to have their own trade unions; the Socialist, the syndicalists, the nationalists, even the Catholics and the anarchists have their unions.

At the commencement of its political development fascism created its own trade unions.

In 1919-20 these fascist trade unions, under the impetus of the masses, had at times to take up a position of open class struggle. At that time they supported a great mass movement.

The trade union is a sign of development of the class consciousness of the proletariat. The fight between the Communists and the fascists to win the trade unions is a fight to win the proletariat for the revolution or for reaction. This fight is linked up with the fight for the conquest of the trade union apparatus.

At the time when the fascist trade unions arose side by side with the class trade unions, i. e. when fascism had not yet the State apparatus, the fascists saw that even by this means the masses did not follow them. Later, fascism entertained the idea of capturing all the class trade unions and taking over the leadership of them. That is the second period.

When Fascism saw that, despite the political pressure against the toiling classes, despite the destruction of all working class associations, the proletariat maintained a hostile attitude towards fascism, it commenced enacting its fascist trade union legislation which became a support of the fascist political regime.

The fascist legislation on the trade unions is based on the following principle: trade unions which include one tenth part of the workers engaged in a definite category and who accept a trade union programme which is not in contradiction with the general political programme of the regime, — these trade unions are juridically recognised by the State. The workers may adhere to a trade union organisation (de factum) but they are obliged to pay their dues to an organisation juridically recognised.

The fascists say that they have a million and a half supporters in their trade unions and are approaching two millions, but it is to be observed how recruiting is carried on. Fascist registration is a form of compulsory recruiting. There are two forms of adherents: those whom we may call the "prisoners" and the others who are neither proletarian nor peasants. The "prisoners" are for the most part agricultural labourers. Fascism holds the countryside under an almost permanent state of martial law. Moreover, owing to their being in possession of the Employment Bureaux, the whole control and engagement of labour in the countryside is in the hands of the fascists. These peasant "prisoners" belong to the general fascist agricultural corporation, in which the proprietors and agricultural technicians are also united.

The other categories which adhere to the fascist trade unions are the artists, doctors, lawyers, writers, poets without poetry. There is also a "corporation of intellectuals" which includes all those who do mental work; this organisation is a typical organisation of petty bourgeois cretinism.

How do the fascist corporations work? They hardly ever hold any meetings, and in those meetings which are held, if workers take the floor against the leaders, they are accused of being Bolsheviks and are sometimes assaulted.

The directing organs of the fascist unions are nominated by the minorities of the Party and controlled by the political authority of the Government.

What are the objects of fascist trade unionism? They may be summed up in two points:

1. The fight between the classes is a reality; we should endeavour to reconcile class contradictions.

2. Capital and labour are two indispensable elements of production, they should remain unified and solid in the higher interests of the nation.

That is the Social Democratic programme. Fascism has two sides to it: the Social Democratic side and a reactionary side of a classical kind. With these two faces fascism can conduct the most modern reactionary policy against the proletariat.

What has been the attitude of all the other trade unions towards fascist trade unionism? The more feeble organisations became bankrupt in face of the fascist trade unions. The republican organisations entered a few months previously into the general federation of labour. The anarchist-syndicalist organisations no longer exist. A Syndicalist Propaganda Committee, subsidized particularly by the Italian emigration in America, keeps going in Milan. The Railwaymen's Union which was autonomous, has also adhered to the confederation of labour. But in the State enterprises fascism has suppressed the organisations, even those which were Fascist, and a Railwaymen's trade union organisation no longer exists.

The Catholic Confederation of Workers has not yet been dissolved, but the Catholics will not have to wait long before it is dissolved. The defence of Catholic social principles will pass into the hands of the "Catholic Action", which is an old Catholic propaganda organisation among the workers.

The reformists have never accepted the standpoint of an effective struggle against fascism. Now the C. G. T. which is the traditional organisation of the Italian proletariat, has perhaps 50,000 members, but its influence extends over a large number of workers.

The history of fascist trade unionism which is not long, is at the same time the history of reformist treachery. The trade union policy of capitulation has been at the basis of the reformist trade union policy.

In December, 1922, when fascism began its massacres of the workers in Turin, the confederation dissolved the Labour Exchange in Turin and the Turin section of the Metal Workers Federation, whose leader, Ferrero, was killed by the fascists.

In 1923, the reformists boycotted the reconstruction of the unions by the Communists. The Congress of the Confederation in December 1924 was an anti-Communist congress.

At Turin, on the occasion of the elections for the mutual aid fund in the Fiat factory, and the elections for the internal commissions in which the Communists presented mass lists against fascism and had the majority, the reformists proceeded to carry out numerous exclusions of comrades from the unions.

Later, the Metal workers' strike of 1925, commenced by the fascist trade unions and extended by the reformists under the influence of the Communists, was broken off by the reformists at a moment when it was assuming impressive dimensions.

What is the attitude of the reformists with regard to the new fascist legislation?

On the one hand the reformists say that there must be a struggle on a legal basis, and they call upon the International Labour Office to apply Article 13 of the Versailles Treaty; and as the League of Nations replies that this question will be put down on the agenda in 1927, the reformists will wait until then. But the reformists support legislation at home against the class trade unions and against every possibility of aiding the mass movement to regain strength. The reformists want to dissolve the de factum organisations led by the Communists and certain federations led by the Maximalists.

They are preparing the dissolution of the wood workers' Federation. The reformists, like the fascists, want to organise a trade union minority and to control the working masses by this minority.

The reformists have no political programme and no trade union programme: they are objectively an instrument of reaction.

The Maximalists have practically the same tactics as the apparatus. The Party got down to trade union work the very reformists; they make use of revolutionary language but in their actions they remain at the side of the reformists.

What has been our work in the trade unions?

The Communist Party has always had a trade union apparatus. The Party got down to trade union work the very day after it was constituted. This apparatus has remained closely

connected with the Party, and we are sure that all the successes we have had in our trade union activity is the result of the close contact that the comrades of the trade union apparatus have maintained with the Party.

We think that the fascist legislation presents a favourable prospect for our trade union work. We think that fascist trade unionism is bound to accentuate its Social Democratic character. This will create a conflict between the trade union elements of fascism and the apparatus of the fascist party. The Party will take measures to avert this danger, but in a movement to which there will be a strong urge on the part of the masses, these measures will be insufficient, the masses will be set in motion and at first the fascists will have to follow them. But the reformists and the fascists will be opposed to the ultimate development of mass action which we will favour by our activity. We shall then have a fascist-reformist united front against the Communists and the proletariat.

In the General Confederation of Labour we think that in working in this period we will be able to form the embryo of an apparatus which could also lead us to win the federation. In view of the absence of a democratic regime in the C. G. T. our influence will develop in the action of the masses themselves. We are not in favour of a trade union split; we want to win the confederation. We think that not only in Italy, but in the whole of the International, good trade union work is possible.

At the Congress of our Party we adopted the formula that in this period it is necessary to accentuate trade union work.

The accusations made yesterday by Bordiga are refuted by the whole work of the Italian Party. All the trade union activity of the Party is based on this problem of unity. Naturally, we do not make a fetish of unity. Perhaps tomorrow we might also be in favour of a scission, at a decisive moment in the class struggle, but in order to be scissionists tomorrow without fear of weakening the front in the working class fight, one must today conduct a persistent policy of unity.

Today three views are becoming apparent in the Party on the question of unity and scission. Certain comrades like Serrati, see the danger of scission, but they do not fear it; others see this danger of scission and fear it, like Bordiga and Tasca. We say that this danger exists but we do not perceive it as an immediate danger. The spirit of the working masses today in particular is a spirit of unity.

Last year a joint trade union committee was constituted out of anti-fascist trade union organisations (reformist, anarcho-sindicalist, republican, Catholic). We perform work in order to give this committee a mass basis, to democratise this united front. Naturally, we were furiously combatted in this sphere in Italy, in July 1921, the united front policy was applied by the Communist Party, and if we did not have practical successes this was not our fault. We have evidently made some errors in this field. Today the Italian situation is just as favourable for applying the United Front tactics.

We must present a programme of work in the trade unions, and we must link up the small vanguard of workers who are in the class trade unions with the masses who are outside the trade unions.

On the question of international trade union unity we have developed a certain amount of work and proposed to the Maximalists' adhesion to the Anglo-Russian Committee; they did not accept. The leaders of the confederation voted at Brussels for the Amsterdam majority.

Let us now turn to the agitation committees which were a subject for discussion not only in Italy, but also amongst certain comrades here. We note, however, with interest that in an amendment to Zinoviev's political theses presented by Kuusinen there is a point which contemplates the creation of agitation committees as a means for developing the action of the Parties among the masses. And the document approved yesterday by the first sub-commission on unity clearly states that these agitational committees, constituted in a more or less permanent form, will serve as an example of the methods to be adopted in the work of winning the masses.

What are the objects of these agitation committees?

It must first of all be said to the foreign comrades that Bordiga yesterday made an incorrect statement when he represented the Central Committee of the Italian Party as tending to substitute the agitation committees for the trade unions; the first object of the agitation committee is to defend the trade unions.

The agitation committees should replace the internal commissions which have been suppressed. From this point of view the agitation committees in Italy become mass organs. They must defend the trade unions but they must also defend the unorganised masses. They must try to rally the workers around the trade unions; that is their main object, if we say as Bordiga says, that we must first of all create trade union sections in the factories, and afterwards create agitation committees, whenever necessary but not with a permanent character, one might think that Bordiga considers there are two periods in the action of the working masses: one period for the reconstruction of the trade unions, and a period of mass agitation. We do not share this opinion.

To understand the true conception of agitation committees, it is necessary to recall the Italian tradition of the factory. The differences existing between the C. C. and the various small oppositions in the Party which have opposed this tactic are very important differences.

We must repeat here that the Italian Party has never been in favour of dissolving the trade unions. We say today: the defence of the trade unions is a most important aim, not only for Italy, but for the whole International. We have never intended creating an apparatus which would replace the trade unions; we merely want to find such organs as will reach the widest masses; that is the principal aim of the agitation committee.

What is the programme of struggle which we want to give to these agitation committees? It is a programme of struggle for trade union liberty, for reconstruction of representative organs in the factories; the struggle for the eight-hour day, for real wages, against the high cost of living, etc. The agitation committees give us the possibility of securing contact with the Maximalist, reformist and non-Party workers.

Comrades, we can say that we have never neglected trade union work. We have always mobilised the Party apparatus for work in the trade unions and for supporting the awakening masses.

We say that the maturity of Communist Parties can be measured according to the application of the trade union tactics of the Comintern which they make. We say that we must get used to working in the trade unions in all situations.

The instructions given by the International in its theses for trade union work are correct. We must apply them, but what is above all necessary, is to know how to apply them properly.

Concluding Speech of Comrade Lozovsky in the Discussion on the Trade Union Question.

Is the Slogan of the V Comintern Congress for International Trade Union Unity Correct?

Of all the speakers who have taken part in the debate, only Comrade Bordiga opposed this slogan. He sought to prove that unity within the limits of one country is an acceptable slogan, but international unity of the trade union movement is a slogan that is harmful and dangerous. What proofs did Comrade Bordiga bring forward in order not only to proclaim, but also to prove the real harm of the slogan of international trade union unity? He did not base his conclusions on the work that has been done during the last 18 months, nor on the basis of the facts from the international trade union movement which are known to us all. He formed his conclusions purely abstractly. He argued in the following manner: 1. if we win the majority of the workers in each country, we will then have the majority in the International. 2. The hope that it will be possible to win an International which is nothing more than an apparatus is utopian. Comrade Bordiga's speculations revolve around these two conceptions. Such a presentation of the question on the part of Comrade Bordiga once more proves that he prefers operating with abstract formula than with concrete facts. How does Comrade Bordiga conceive the problem of winning the trade unions? Surely it is not from the point of view of winning the leaders? While agreeing with the slogan of work in the trade unions in order to win them, surely you do not think that you can win over and convince the leading group of the Italian Confederation of Labour which is nearer to fascism than to Communism? The very way and manner of presenting the question is absolutely incorrect. Its incorrectness lies in the fact that Comrade Bordiga approaches the question of winning the trade unions not from the point of winning the masses, but from the point of view of the apparatus of the trade union leaders. And he also approached the slogan for a united international purely from the point of view of the apparatus, which is the origin of all his confusion. There is a fundamental error here. What is the significance of the slogan of the unity of the world trade union movement? Its significance lies in the fact that for the last one and a half to two years, we have been concentrating the attention of the workers of all countries on the problem of the International Leadership of the struggle of the proletariat of each country. The traditions of the old internationals lay in the fact that everyone was master in his own house, everyone did what he liked in his own country, they were all autonomous, independent and so forth. These traditions have been broken by the Communist International. The Communist International is not yet an organisation leading the struggle of the proletariat of the whole world, but it sets itself this problem; and the R.I.L.U. also has set itself this task. It is true there is a great difference between the setting of this task and putting it into force. The unfortunate thing about the international proletariat is that it is extremely slow in freeing itself from the national limitations, which in practice lead to the enfeeblement of its forces. To draw the proletariat out of this restrictedness, to confront the proletariat with the problem of a united leadership of the workers' struggles in all countries, of all races and all continents, the question of direct aid to the workers of other countries — therein lies the most important task of the Communist Parties in the revolutionary trade unions etc.

Furthermore, with this slogan we have emerged from the confines of Europe, contrary to all the Social Democratic traditions which describes as an International an organisation which is not merely European, but in fact only extends over half of Europe. And now, when the workers of Great Britain are beginning to feel that their standard of living depends upon the Indian textile workers and Chinese coolies, the necessity for such a new International becomes strikingly obvious. After one and a half years of intense work and after important successes in this field, when this question, thanks to our efforts, is arousing tens of millions of workers — to come and say, without any hint of an analysis, that this slogan is incorrect, this means forgetting the fundamental conception of Hegel that truth is concrete, it is drawing deductions out of one's finger tips. This incorrect approach, this inability to understand facts, this incapability of estimating what

is being done and lack of desire to become acquainted with life as it is, leads to dangerous and harmful conclusions. Did Comrade Bordiga ask himself the question why the British proletariat in its overwhelming majority is now so eagerly interesting itself in the question of the unity of the international trade union movement? Why it is that within the Amsterdam International important currents in favour of unity have been formed? No, Comrade Bordiga is not interested in all this, but meanwhile, if he were to think just a little bit, he would perceive that the British proletariat whose standard of living is higher than that of the rest of the workers of Europe, is beginning to understand that the fact that the German workers are working for lower wages and longer hours, is influencing their standard of living, and that the only way out is to be found on an international path. Therein lies the origin of the curious fact that the British trade unions, who have always stood aloof from class politics in general and from international proletarian politics in particular, have come to realise the necessity of international unity in order not to lose the gains that have been won during the last few decades. Comrade Bordiga does not understand what a tremendous step forward the Communist International has made by this slogan, he does not perceive how we have succeeded in arousing the workers within the reformist organisations. It is only a blind man that cannot see all this and such blindness corresponds to the metaphysical attitude of Bordiga. In politics he as a mathematician thinks that, just as in geometry, the shortest distance between two points is a straight line. In fact it was this same Comrade Bordiga who accused the Comintern that its tactics were too flexible. Already at the V Congress I had to reply to him that a telegraph pole is very straight, but that it does not represent a model for Communist policy. The absence of sensitivity, and flexibility, incapacity to judge facts as they are, lack of comprehension of the pulse of life — that is characteristic of Bordiga and the origin of his incorrect deductions. It is not true that in politics a straight line is the shortest distance between two points — this is not true! In politics things are sometimes different from what they are in geometry. I have already shown in my report that the visits of delegations to the U.S.S.R. is the commencement of a united front within the respective countries; the path to a united front and unity very often goes through Moscow. Thus, a curve London—Moscow—London or London—Moscow—Berlin does not harm either our trend nor the development of our subsequent policy, nor that policy which we are pursuing. The too geometrical approach of Comrade Bordiga to politics is to be seen in his whole line, which, it is true, is direct, but is undoubtedly non-Bolshevik. The correctness of the policy of the Comintern is proved by the fact that Bordiga is not only isolated at the Enlarged Executive of the E.C.C.I., but in this question he undoubtedly represents a solitary figure in the whole of the Communist International. There are no other such geometrists in politics to be found anywhere else.

Finally, there is another striking proof of the incorrectness of Bordiga's policy. The whole of the German delegation, which at the V Congress had doubts in this respect, thinking that the slogan for unity was opportunism, etc., has now, in view of the experience of the last few years, arrived at the conclusion that the policy of the V Congress was correct. I would advise Comrade Bordiga to become thoroughly acquainted with what is going on around him. Without paying careful regard to facts, without understanding the dynamics of events, no Bolshevik politics whatsoever can be conducted.

I will now turn to the question as to the ways and means of work in certain countries.

Unity at any Cost is not our Slogan.

As you know, I have cited a fairly large number of conditions as to how not to conduct the struggle for unity; there are in all 22 of these, 22 weaknesses, 22 calamities. One of these weaknesses which relates to Belgium, very much offended Comrade Jaquemotte, and in order at once to put the Enlarged Executive and me out of countenance for our sins, he at once began

by saying that Lozovsky's theses are a revision of the policy of the V Congress of the Comintern. Comrade Jaquemotte read in the resolutions of the V Congress, and in particular in the resolution on the trade union movement, which I happened to write, a *carte blanche* for the policy carried out by him in Belgium, and pathetically cries out: "Ought not we to cling on to the slightest possibility for remaining in the trade unions? Ought not we to offer resistance to the reformists, etc.?" We can reply to Comrade Jaquemotte that he is knocking at open doors. It is not about that that we are disputing with Comrade Jaquemotte. We disputed about that with Schumacher at the V Congress of the Comintern. We are now debating with Comrade Jaquemotte on the following question: in our struggle for unity can we employ such means and methods as are employed by our comrades in Belgium, when Communists and other supporters of unity abstained from voting when Communists were being excluded from the trade unions. If we consistently follow the line of Comrade Jaquemotte we will have to vote for our own exclusions in the name of this same unity. This is also metaphysics, but of quite another sort. It is a policy that is unacceptable for the Communist Party; we want unity, not for suicide, but in order to increase our influence. Just imagine for a moment that, first in one union and then in a second and a third we abstain from voting when Communists are being excluded, as was the case at the general meeting of the Bronze Workers' Union. Surely you do not think that in this way the resolution of the V Congress is being fulfilled? No, this is not fulfilling the resolution of the V Congress, it is a deviation from our line. We will remain and will work in the trade unions, we will cling to the slightest legal, constitutional and all other possibilities in order to increase our influence, but nowhere is it said that we will abstain from voting when Communists are excluded or vote for our own exclusion. With such a tactic you are treading on a dangerous path! It is the duty of the Comintern to warn the Belgian Party that this path is slippery and that on this slippery path it is possible to go as far as furling our Communist banner.

Can you doubt that there will be Party members who will say "we are excluded for being Communists, we will not say that we are Communists, we will not maintain our platform, etc." This is a dangerous path, comrades, and it is our duty to warn you. Of course, one must not give way to provocation, it is necessary to seek a thousand and one possibilities in order to oppose the exclusion of Communists. But there is a limit to everything, and I think that in this fact which I have cited and which Jaquemotte with difficulty endeavoured to pass as real 100% Bolshevik strategy — in this fact there is a dangerous deviation, which must be got rid of as soon as possible.

In order to prove an affinity between his deviation and the tactics of the Communist International, Comrade Jaquemotte referred to the speech of Comrade Zinoviev at the V Comintern Congress, at which the latter, in opposing Schumacher, said the following: "Leninism in the field of the trade union movement is the struggle against splits. Whoever thinks seriously of winning the majority of the working class, should not take up a light attitude towards the unity of the trade union movement. Bolshevism is the tactic of the most serious struggle for unity of the trade union movement and for getting Communists into the trade unions." And further there is a phrase which tempted Comrade Jaquemotte: "Leninism demands trade union unity at all costs." This was directed against Schumacher who wanted a split at all costs, and in order to deal a blow at this deviation, Comrade Zinoviev several times emphasised that we must get into the trade unions at all costs, must remain in the trade unions at all costs, etc., but this by no means signifies that a policy must be adopted which leads us to renouncing our principles and excluding ourselves in order not to get excluded. No, comrades, that is not our tactics, it is not Communist tactics!

Tasks of our Party and of the Unitary Trade Unions in France.

I will now turn to France. What are the greatest difficulties in our further work in the trade union movement? 1. The first difficulty consists in the fact that the entire trade union movement of France is split into two portions. We have all frequently stated that France is a classic country of splits, or a country of classic splits, if one can speak of classics in this field. Well, the labour movement in France is divided into halves. What are the

results of this? There results therefrom that in every separate conflict with individual employers or an employers' organisation on any question, the reformist trade unions and Unitary trade unions clash with one another. And if we further take into consideration the historic traditions of the French labour movement, where there is a great deal of individualism, a great deal of anti-union tendencies, we can understand the immediate difficulties existing in France, in our Party and in the C. G. T. U. in their struggle for the unity of the trade union movement. Therein lies the main difficulty. Along what lines should the struggle for unity proceed? And to what should attention be paid in France in view of such a classic type of split? Our attention should everywhere be concentrated on the work shops and factories, to which we must transfer 90% if not the whole 100% of our activity. Our task is to form organs of unity in the localities, in the enterprises, in the districts, in separate areas, etc. And to the extent to which we increase our work in the enterprises, to the extent to which we increase our influence in the districts where the labour movement is concentrated, so will we overcome the difficulties confronting us. Only by the Party and the Unitary trade unions facing round towards the factories will it be possible to overcome the difficulties arising from the classic split and from the connection which exists between the reformist leaders and the governmental apparatus.

2) The second hitherto weak point in the work in France is the insufficient concentration of the attention of the Party and of the trade unions on the most important productive and industrial centres. Comrade Monmousseau cited the example of the Railwaymen's Federation. This Federation is indeed the most powerful and important organisation in France. But the railways are not the only strategic point. What about the metal industry, textile industry and mining? If you take these three main branches of industry, if you take the main industrial districts, such as the North for instance, you will see that we are very weak there, for neither the Party nor the Trade unions have paid sufficient attention to these main branches of industry and the most important districts. I think that it is time that we learned to work in an urgent manner and to concentrate the attention of the entire Party and trade unions on definite tasks. If the Party and trade unions set themselves the following tasks: three months attention to the metal industry and were to throw all their forces into the most important metal centres, or: three months attention to the textile industry or: three months for the mining industry, and the same with regards to the Northern district, the results of such strategy in respect to winning the masses would be better than at the present time. Thus in this respect, it would seem that it is possible and essential to introduce something new into our work in France.

3. There is one fact which is decisive for the labour movement of France: there are altogether only about 10% of the workers organised in both Confederations. The attention of the Party and of the trade unions must be directed to these 90% unorganised workers. Attention to nine-tenths of the French proletariat! Until we have made a breach here, until we overcome the old tradition — the tradition is that it is sufficient to have a conscious minority and this will draw the masses with it — until we do this, we will not have any serious influence. But we must pay attention to winning the 90% unorganised workers.

4. The trade union movement in France is of a very fluid character, so that within two or three years the composition of each trade union is renewed by 90—95%. We may take the example of the Paris Metal Workers' Union. During the last 5 years 50—60 thousand members have passed through it, but there are altogether only 5—6 thousand members in the union. The French trade unions are transit passages. We must devote exceptionally great attention to retaining the workers inside the unions.

5. The united front in France has only recently begun to be applied practically, and one cannot say, comrades, that there have not been successes in this field. I think that the campaign that the French Railwaymen's Federation conducted for creating a united front of railwaymen of all tendencies is one of the most brilliant campaigns, which can serve as an example not only for France. Our trade unions on this occasion showed self-restraint, sangfroid and such a sensitive attitude towards the entire mass of railwaymen, that they emerged from this campaign morally and politically strengthened and increased their influence among

these masses, which was reflected in their increased membership. But so far this is only one example, and we would like to have scores and even hundreds of such examples. It is necessary to go still further along this line which the railwaymen have so successfully pursued, for it is just on this path we can achieve undoubted victory in respect to winning the majority of the working class.

6. The French Communist movement, just as the Communist movement of many other countries, is still young. At the same time the peculiarity of the French Communist Party lies in the fact that it has been built up out of varying ideological forms: one section came from the Socialist Party, what is more, from various fractions of this formally united Socialist Party (Guesdists, Jaurèsists, etc.) another section came from the trade union movement which was soaked through and through with anarcho-syndicalist ideology, and finally a third section is the new generation which has come straight into the Party. It is in this varied ideological origin of the composition of our Party that great difficulties and certain dangers lie. What is the tactic of the Comintern with respect to the French Communist movement? It is to weld all these separate currents and separate ideological forms into one entity and at all costs to bring towards Communism all that is healthy in the syndicalist movement. This tactic has nine-tenths succeeded. Thanks to the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. it has been possible to bring nearer to the Communist Party and into the Communist Party everything that was sound and honest in the anarcho-syndicalist workers' movement, and thus weld and strongly bind these groups and tendencies of varying origin. But, comrades, this process of welding has not yet been completely realised — here there is still a certain danger. I would not say that there is a cleavage in our Party, but there are traces of the different ideological forms, the two main tendencies have not yet finally merged. It is not by chance that at present a return is to be noticed in France to the old anarcho-syndicalist ideology, not only on the part of various elements outside the Party, but also on the part of elements within the Party. The syndicalist digression of Monatte and Rosmer meets with sympathy in certain circles of the Party, and this testifies to the fact that the welding of forces has not been 100% realised.

7. There is yet one more extremely difficult, complicated and important question — this is the mutual relation between the Party and the trade unions. The creation of a united leadership of the labour movement is a complicated and protracted process, and here a maximum of cautious tactics, attention and thoughtfulness is necessary both on the part of the leading circles of the Party and also on the part of the leading group of the Unitary Trade Union Federation. An insufficiently prudent tactic on this question might lead to catastrophic results both for the Party and for the trade unions. The two main currents have not yet finally merged, and we must never forget that. We must create such conditions whereby the welding will be increased. For this it is necessary that the Communists in the trade unions also be engaged on trade union work. These should not be two institutions, two worlds, which only meet at meetings of the Politbureau and of the district committees, they should comprise one whole, although working in different spheres of the labour movement; this deserves serious attention on the part of the whole International.

8. Further, it is necessary to draw attention to the revival of the old anarcho-syndicalist ideology not only outside, but also within the Party itself. In the letter of the Right Wing of the French Party addressed to the Comintern we perceive an underestimation of the role of the Party. In the "Revolution Proletarienne", the organ of Monatte and Rosmer, the central thought that runs through all the 14 numbers that have appeared up to now is that it is not the Party which should play the leading role in the labour movement, but the trade unions. What does this signify? A French proverb says: "On revient toujours aux premiers amours" (one always returns to one's first love). Here also we have a question of returning to the first love i. e. to the pre-war anarcho-syndicalism. In the "Revolution Proletarienne" of March 14, 1925, Monatte writes: "We do not need either a socialist nor a Communist, but a non-political confederation." What sort of a slogan is this — a non-political confederation? It is the slogan of pre-war syndicalism. We would be committing a great mistake if we thought that this opinion is only that of the editorial group. No, it is not. The danger of this tendency, of this ideology, is that it plays on the traditions and on

the heritage of the past and endeavours, with the help of this slogan, to turn upside down the whole basis of the Comintern. Remember the II Congress of the Communist International and its main resolution on the role of the Communist Party in the labour movement — and it will be seen that Monatte and Rosmer are overturning the whole Basis of the Communist International. This return to the old order of things is dangerous for France.

How can we overcome this? There must be a serious ideological struggle against this deviation on the one hand and the establishment of normal mutual relations with the trade unions on the other hand. There should be a more skilful leadership of the trade unions; there is no need to advertise one's leadership, the trade unions and their organs cannot be replaced. The trade unions must be enabled entirely and completely to develop forces and capabilities. The question as to the mutual relations between the Party and the trade unions, of course, does not stand on the same level as 3—4 years ago. In France we have made tremendous steps forward in this field. Anyone who in the slightest degree knows the labour movement of France, must say that a great deal of work has been done, a section of the road has been traversed, but by no means the whole of the path; there will be many difficulties, conflicts, etc. The task of the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. is to follow attentively the policy of our Party and the work of the C. G. T. U. so that on the question of the Party and the trade unions, on this most sore point, there will be no deviations and no errors whatsoever, which would compel us to start everything over again right from the commencement.

On Germany.

Our position in Germany has improved to a considerable degree. I believe however, that Geschke will not say that the position is brilliant; we have only just emerged from the bog in which the Party was submerged with its trade union tactics. I remember how I had to experience the Frankfurt Congress (April 1924) in Germany where I alone of the six delegates of the Comintern endeavoured to prevent the German Communist Party committing incorrigible absurdities. On several occasions, we sat with the leading group from 7 at night to 7 in the morning. After long debates, our delegation declared on behalf of the Comintern that if Maslow's resolution be accepted, this will mean a declaration of war on the Comintern and the creation of a platform for a new International, and only after we presented an ultimatum did we succeed in deleting the most dangerous passages from Maslow's resolution: Where did the danger lie? It lay in the fact that a tremendous majority of the delegates at the Congress were bent on getting a split in the trade union movement: Their idea was "We do not want to have anything in common with these bureaucrats, etc." The Comintern had to apply all forces, both in respect to ideological and political pressure, to ensure that the Frankfurt Party Congress did not proceed any further along this perilous path. Things went so far that the letter from the E. C. of the Comintern the central point of which was that we must remain and work in the trade unions, was refused publication before the Party Congress by the Ruth Fischer group. And we were compelled to print the Letter of the E. C. C. I. independently of this group — and all this was because of the trade union movement.

This tactics was suicidal: on the one hand exits from the trade unions, on the other hand the cultivation of hostile relations between Social Democrats and Communists. There are as many examples as you like. There have been Party organisations in Germany which have made decisions, forbidding their members to hold conversations with Social Democrats. This is monstrous, but it is a fact. But that is not everything. The director of the municipal department of the C. C., Katz, now excluded from the Party and a Left of Lefts, wrote a circular as to how Communists should behave in the town councils. In this letter of instructions we find the following gems: 1. Communists must not greet Social Democrats or shake hands with them, they must wear red gloves when coming to meetings, etc. (laughter). But who are these Social Democratic town counsellors? The greater part are workers. That is the way the C. C. "was capturing" the majority of the working class. If the Comintern had not interfered in all this business, our German Communist Party would have perished, would have followed the path of the so-called Communist Labour Party, would have ceased to exist and would have been turned into a political corpse. The old leadership

of the German Communist Party was not only incapable of winning the Social Democratic workers, but only widened the gulf between the Communist workers and the Social Democratic workers. How could anything be done in Germany with such a Party differentiation, with such a criminal policy!

The partial successes which we have registered of late in Germany in the field of the trade union movement are only the first steps, and I would request the German comrades not to exaggerate these first results of correct tactics. The old traditions have not yet been outlived by a long way; they exist in the psychology of many comrades; in some branches an incorrect approach to the last letter of the Comintern is still to be observed, and there is an under-estimation of the exceptional importance of trade union work on the part of many Party members.

Comrade Geschke said: of course, unity at all costs is bad, it is not a particularly successful slogan, but still worse is the slogan — unity in no case. And therefore he asks: "What is better; unity at all costs, or unity in no case?" This reminds me of a countryman of Comrade Geschke — **Heinrich Heine**. When he was asked what he preferred, to have his hand or his foot cut off, Heine replied that he preferred milk soup (laughter). I prefer not to make a choice between these two incorrect slogans. Neither slogan is our slogan. They are not only capable of leading us to disappointments, but to a whole number of defeats.

I believe the policy of the C. C. of the German Party in the field of the trade union movement to be quite correct, it must only be supplemented in practice in everyday work. Correct policies alone are not sufficient for us, we must concentrate the attention of the whole Party on trade union work, only then will we get serious results. It should not be forgotten that in Germany we have lost a whole number of important points (**Essen, Gelsenkirchen**, etc.) which were all the time in our hands for a period of 5—6 years. All this is a result of the old policy. The results of the new policy should be the reverse: the conquest of all industrial districts of Germany.

As to the question of the unemployed alluded to by Comrade Geschke, it seems to me that on this question he is bending the stick too far. What is our task in this field? To do everything in our power to link up the unemployed with the workers who are employed and with the trade unions. But when there are a million unemployed, and there is systematic sabotage of the struggle against unemployment on the part of the trade union bureaucracy, it would be a great political error not to organise the unemployed. We cannot say, as Comrade Geschke does: "No organisations of the unemployed whatsoever." This would be political suicide, it would be harmful for the Party and its subsequent work. We must endeavour to link up the unemployed with the workers in the factories, through the trade unions wherever we have influence and the possibility. Insofar as we do not succeed in linking up with the trade unions all those unemployed who are a serious force in the struggle, we must devise such an organisational form as will ensure on the one hand unity of the trade union movement, and on the other hand gathering together of all forces of the unemployed into one strong list for the struggle for the immediate demands of the unemployed. The slogan — no organisations whatsoever except the trade unions (voice: no independent ones whatsoever outside the trade unions!) — is incorrect. If the leaders of the trade unions are against the organising of the unemployed, this will not deter us for we cannot leave the unemployed scattered. We had the same thing in **England**. For more than 2 years, the unemployed formed their own organisation, tried to get recognised by the General Council and finally achieved this. The organisation of unemployed in **England** not only does not collide with the general policy of the Party, but is one of the forces aiding the struggle of the Communist Party in the **Minority Movement**. That is why it would be incorrect to oppose decisively and categorically any kind of unemployed organisations whatsoever.

And now to the last question — **the factory committees**. Comrade Geschke is right: we must pay serious attention to the factory committees. Their influence depends upon our activity: If the Communists are able to increase their influence, then the factory and workshop committees will also play a great rôle. In this respect the **Czechoslovakian Communist Party** also

must be a little more careful in its attitude towards the factory committees. The role and significance of factory committees is directly proportionate to the sharpening of social relations in the country. Their importance has declined during the time of lull, but they soon will again commence to play a role in the struggle of the working class. For example, the proletarian unity committees in **France** are an embryonic form of the factory committees. We must work at turning these committees into factory committees. I am in agreement with the demand for paying more attention to the factory committees — I would sign this demand with both hands...

Objective and Subjective Difficulties in America.

Comrade Dorsey in his short speech pointed out the peculiarities of the **American Labour movement** and alluded to the number of errors that have been made in our trade union policy. But above all, it must be remembered that there are about 30 million workers and employees in America, who can be organised, of whom only 2,300,000 are in the **American Federation of Labour**. In addition there are a few hundred thousand more in various independent unions and thus only 10—11% are organised. The correlation between the organised and the unorganised in the **United States** and in **France** is almost identical. What a gigantic field of activity! What a lot there is to be done and how little has yet been done!

All heavy basic industry, metallurgy, transport, electricity, etc. are embraced by a peculiar type of mixed organisations (**company unions**) about which I spoke in my report. The situation is complicated and difficult. The power of **American capitalism**, the new forms and methods of exploitation, the new forms and methods of economic corruption of the workers, the exceptional pressure on the part of **American capitalism** with regard to productivity — demand from us special forms and methods of struggle. We must apply our organisational forms to the political and social-economic peculiarities of the **United States** and to the peculiarities of its trade union movement.

As to what is this renowned democracy of the millionaires and what is this trade union movement, which, in the words of the **President of the American Federation of Labour, William Green** "maintains the sound, healthy symptoms of democracy, or right, justice and human freedom", we may judge from the article of the **President of the Amsterdam International**. — **A. Purcell**. "All this talks about 'American Democracy', he writes 'is, in my modest opinion, absolute deception. 'Democracy' in a country of frames-up by the police, of armed protection of the bosses, of spies? Democracy — in the country of **Rockefeller** and **Morgan**, **Pinkerton** and **Baldwin-Felts**? Democracy in a country where negroes are lynched, where workers are beaten up and killed when they strike for their rights, and where this has all been the usual thing for many years? Democracy in a country where all forces of the law, the State and the police, the entire **Governmental mechanism**, legal and illegal, open and unashamed is in the service of the existing plutocracy for the exploitation of the working people. I think that we ought not to be confused by forms of government. If we get at the facts behind these forms, we will see that in America there is the dictatorship of the capitalists. America represents a finished example of new Czarism. — **The Czarism of monopolist capitalism, the capitalism of the financial oligarchy.**"

This fine "democracy", has a worthy trade union movement. We only have to listen to Comrade **Purcell** who had to come up against these "fat boys" of the **American Federation of Labour** at the **Atlantic City Congress**. This is what he writes in the same article:

"The **American Federation** does not pretend to be anything more than an organisation of the skilled white labour aristocracy, it is a 'minority movement' in the literal sense of this word, organising only an insignificant minority of the industrial workers of the **United States**."

"Both in the **American Federation of Labour** and in the **American trade union movement**, a non-democratic spirit prevails. An oligarchy wielding absolute power directs the trade union movement. I noticed at the **Atlantic City Congress** that all important committees and delegations were appointed by the chairman, being automatically approved by the congress. In this manner the chairman actually determined the decisions of the congress in advance, as the reports of the various committees were

accepted by the congress without any objection. This is entirely the result of the official character of the congress."

"The 'graft system' which is characteristic of the entire American official life, is also applied in the American Federation of Labour and, as it seems to me, in many trade unions also. For instance, when Green was elected in the place of the late President Gompers, he gave orders for the mass dismissal of all organisers, etc., from the American Federation of Labour, irrespective as to their term of office, trade union experience, etc. They were informed that they could once more occupy their former posts, but only after their applications had been reviewed."

"A characteristic feature of the Congress which would be unthinkable in England was the reception of a 'fraternal' delegate of the well known patriotic and non-working class organisation the 'American Legion'. The delegate from this organisation was a prominent trade union leader, Major George Berry of the Printers Union. Many good militant trade union workers whom I met have already been thrown out of the American Federation of Labour to the great detriment of the entire trade union movement. Neither a person nor a group of persons dares oppose the official mechanism of the A. F. of L. which is upheld by the law and the police. But if you are outside the American Federation of Labour you are finished: They will close your mouth, hinder your activity, and if necessary suppress it."

"The Negro worker represents a tremendous problem for the American labour movement which it has to solve. But instead of that, this problem is not even brought up — the doors of the majority of trade unions are closed to the Negro worker and he can only get into a trade union with great difficulty."

"Meanwhile, the Negro workers are a source of tremendous potential power for the American trade union movement." *)

This striking characterisation of the "Czarism of monopolist capitalism" and the "graft system" leave nothing more to be desired.

Our estimation of the leading clique of the American trade union movement is shared by such people as the President of the Amsterdam International who are outside the ranks of the Comintern, which only strengthens our position. And when we have such democracy and such trade unions, the work of our still small Communist Party of America is truly colossal and difficult. Of course, a certain amount of work has already been done. There is serious influence among the miners, railwaymen, metal workers, in the needle trades, etc. But all this is but a drop in the ocean. The Trade Union Educational League in America has still enormous work to do which is rendered more difficult by the internal friction and fractional struggle within the Party itself.

But to what must particular attention be directed in America? Great attention must be paid to the formation and development of a Left Wing. If it is very difficult to crystallise the Left Wing in the European trade union movement, it is still more difficult, to create and form a Left Wing in America, because the machine-like apparatus — such are the traditions of the A. F. of L. — immediately pushes out of the organisations all those who oppose the official policy. But nevertheless, the formation of a real mass Left Wing is possible, for the ground has been prepared by the work of the Trade Union Educational League. The T. U. E. L., with all its wide political influence, has not yet an adequate organisationally consolidated influence, and this discrepancy between the political and organisational influence must inevitably lead to the weakening of our influence, to the scattering of our forces and to our not always being able to lead with us those elements who support our policy in principle.

I do not intend dealing here with the differences of view in the American Communist Party concerning our tactics in the trade union movement. I will only say that an ultra-Left deviation exists, which reveals an underestimation of trade union work and a manifest incapacity to utilise the mass movement (for example, the anthracite strike) for organisation of the Left Wing. There is a certain anti-trade union aristocratism, and the trade unions are looked down upon from above. I am a Communist, these people say, and have nothing to do with

these heretical trade unions. Only 32% of the Party members are members of the trade unions. That is an unprecedented scandal! Until all Party members, to the very last man, are in the trade unions we cannot move forward a single pace. I would also point out that the Party and the League do not pay sufficient attention to work among the Negroes. The first modest steps have been made in this direction, but this is only a little, in fact too little. Comrade Purcell was a thousand times right when he wrote that "the Negro workers are a source of tremendous potential power for the American trade union movement". We will never forget this.

With that I can finish with America. I will only remark that I entirely and completely share the estimation given by Comrade Dorsey on the new orientation of the American trade union movement, and also think his terminology, trade union capitalism, to be correct; this terminology corresponds essentially to the new orientation of American trade union bureaucracy.

On Czechoslovakia.

A few words about Czechoslovakia. From the words of Comrade Kohn we see that the main difficulty lies along the old lines so well known to us: the Communists in the trade unions are not sufficiently connected with the Party. What was the weakness of our Party in Czechoslovakia in the field of the trade union movement? It lay in that the Party did not have any fractions in the trade unions — neither in the Red nor in the reformist. In the reformist unions, it had no fractions because it was very difficult to have them, and in the Red unions because it was very easy to have them. Certain trade union Communists argue in this manner: They are all good fellows, we are all for the Comintern and they are all for the R. I. L. U. What is the use of our forming fractions?" Yet when we came down to business we were convinced that recognition of the Comintern policy and execution of this policy in practice are different things. In the Builders' Union, where the conflict is the sharpest, there are 8,000 Communists out of a membership of 18,000. A whole revolution could be made with such a number of Communists, but they cannot even get the union into their own hands. Why? Because these Communists themselves do not conduct a Communist policy. The Communists, instead of conducting a Comintern policy, conduct their own special policy. We also have these tendencies in our united union which represents a strong organisation: "We are Communists and therefore we need not form any fractions, etc." But this policy only weakens the union at the head of which the Communists stand. The organisation of Communist fractions in the trade unions does not weaken the trade union movement, but makes it firmer, stabler and stronger, and many Czech Communist trade unionists do not understand this. This is the origin of the difficulties.

Nevertheless, our Party has had considerable successes in Czechoslovakia. The last elections proved that we have great influence within the reformist trade unions. Where do the million votes come from with only 200,000 workers organised in the Red unions? But this political influence is not reinforced; no fractions are built up. Comrade Kohn, says that the influence of the Communist Party in the reformist unions extends over 150,000 trade unionists. How can we verify this assertion? There are no fractions in the reformist unions, no organisation and recording of opposition forces.

It is time we got down to building up fractions in all the unions — in the Red, reformist and National Socialist unions, for there are several hundred thousand workers even in the latter. We must outlive the old tendencies that we should not work in the liberal National Socialist unions; wherever there are workers there should also be Communists, there should be fractions.

Poland.

This last remark concerns also the Polish comrades. In Poland we had tendencies according to which we should only have business with the P. P. S. unions, while with the People's Unions, Catholic Unions, etc. we should not concern ourselves, although there are more than a hundred thousand workers in them. In Poland, more than anywhere else, we must devote serious attention to those trade unions which, under the national

*) The above quotations from Purcell's article have been re-translated from the Russian — Trans.

or democratic flag, organise the working masses against Communism. Without work within these unions considerable strata of the proletariat will remain outside our influence and will be utilised as a counter-revolutionary force in the period of acute social struggle: Such a policy is very dangerous. We must make it a general rule to be wherever there are working class masses. Wherever there are trade unions, whether they be protestant, Catholic, liberal, evangelical, etc., the Communist Party must work, everywhere form fractions, for only in this way can unity be obtained and the majority of the working class won over.

Certain Lessons of the Italian Movement.

The situation in Italy is, I think, characteristic not only from the point of view that I expounded in my report, but also because the Communist Party in Italy is the only force organising the masses against fascism. What has become of the noisy anarchists and stormy syndicalists? They have disappeared from the scene of the Italian labour movement. The fascist regime has compelled the workers of Italy to re-estimate the value of the reformists, anarchists and syndicalists... They have seen these people at work. It is clear to the workers that only the Communist Party is fighting against fascism and represents a force, and this is an accomplishment of no small value.

It seems to me that the dispute that took place at the Congress of the Italian Communist Party around the question of propaganda committees was rather abstract. If we agree that the attention of the Italian Party should be chiefly devoted to work in the enterprises and factories, the name of the organs which we will form only plays a secondary role: in one place they may be called by one name and in another place by another. I hesitate to say what form of organisation is the best and most expedient at the present moment — experience should show this.

I will now deal with a few questions which were brought up in the discussion.

On Bringing the Women and Youth into the Trade Unions.

Comrade Clara Zetkin appealed here for the women to be brought into the trade unions. This was a useful and opportune demand, a very useful reminder, but here also there should be no exaggeration. When we write in our theses about the struggle for unity, we have in view not only workers, but working women and the youth also. We are talking of the unity of the working class as a whole. While there exists the slightest doubt as to the possibility of forgetting such elementary things as bringing in the women and the youth, we must speak of this. We must devote two-fold attention to the drawing of working women into the trade unions, to the drawing of working women into participation in all trade union campaigns, and we must say the same thing in regard to the youth. Comrades Zetkin and Schuller who have referred here to important strata of the proletariat, are formulating their proposals and they will be introduced into the theses.

Is Unity a Manoeuvre? Yes, only not against the Proletariat but against the Bourgeoisie.

The last group of questions is connected with our campaign for unity. Of what do the reformists accuse the Comintern and the Communist Parties? They accuse us that our slogan for a United Front and for unity is a manoeuvre. On this question we have already frequently given explanations as to what is this manoeuvre and against whom the manoeuvre is directed: but insofar as we have to deal with an opponent who catches on to every word and utilises every opportunity for confusing the question, the explanation which Comrade Tomsky made here is entirely appropriate.

During the last Congress of the C. G. T. U. (August 1925) the entire Bourgeois and reformist press raised the hue and cry that the C. G. T. U. was making a manoeuvre, as it had called its Congress at the same time as the Reformist Congress. I said in my speech at that Congress: "Yes, the united front and unity is a manoeuvre, only not against the working class, but against the bourgeoisie." We openly acknowledge before the whole world: it is a manoeuvre against the bourgeoisie, but not by any means against the working class. The whole of our tactics of the United Front, the tactics of unity is a manoeuvre,

whose task it is to unite all sections of the proletariat in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, but this manoeuvre is not directed against any section of the proletariat, nor against the proletariat as a whole. It is directed only against our class enemies. In this respect there must be the maximum of clarity, and this clarity must be created by our Communist and Trade Union press.

The Nature of our Struggle with Social Democracy.

Sometimes certain incorrect formulas creep into our struggle for the united front and unity, such, for example, as the following: we are conducting a class struggle with the reformists and the leaders of the Amsterdam International. I should say that such a definition is incorrect. The class struggle, the struggle for power, we are waging against the bourgeoisie. With the Social Democrats and with the Trade Union bureaucrats we are waging a struggle for the working class. Such a formula is undoubtedly more correct than the formula — class struggle against Social Democracy.

What International do we Need?

Now we come to the last question. During the last year and a half we have been conducting a struggle for the Unity of the International Trade Union movement. It seems to me (perhaps some comrades have a different impression) that in our agitation and propaganda, and in the presentation of this question not only have we failed to connect the struggle for unity with the concrete tasks of the current moment, but we have not explained for what and why we want the formation of a united international. Meanwhile, that is the whole substance of the matter. The first shortcoming is in that we were not able to link up the struggle for international unity with the situation of the working class in each separate country. Why is the British proletariat now coming out under the flag of unity of the world T. U. movement? I have already spoken of this. Would you like the figures? They are as follows: I have before me a table which shows how much the skilled workers in England, India, and Egypt receive per day in cents: in England — from 210 to 290 cents per 8-hour working day; in India — from 38 to 60 cents for a 10—12 hour day; in Egypt — 40 cents for a 10—12 hour day. Therein lies the root of the swing round towards International Trade Union Unity. Capitalism has created such conditions whereby all countries, in their entirety represent one organic whole. A higher living standard has a tendency, under the pressure of the bourgeoisie to be levelled down. This threat of the lowering of the standard of living of the European proletariat by the growing industry of the East lies at the basis of this swing round towards unity on the part of the wide trade union organised masses. To explain all this to the workers is the task of all our parties, otherwise our slogan of international unity will hang in the air and will not be connected with the concrete situation.

And finally, as to the tasks of the single international. What international do we want to form? We have certain facts which are not adequately utilised, which escape our attention, but which could play a role in the struggle for a united international. In 1921 a gigantic strike of 1,200,000 British miners took place. The British miners were on strike, the American, French, German and Belgian miners were at work, coal was sent from these countries to England and after 13 weeks the strike was smashed. A year later 500,000 American miners struck work, and British coal was imported to smash the American strike. The same thing happened during the fight of the Belgian, French and German miners. Meanwhile the miners of all these countries all belong to the same international, and the Transport workers carrying the coal during these strikes also belong, together with the miners, to the Amsterdam International. What more tangible, and more popular proof could there be of the necessity of forming an organisation the members of which would not be engaged in mutual blacklegging? What could be more clear and comprehensible for the masses than these shattering facts? Meanwhile, in our propaganda and agitation, and in our press, we do not devote sufficient attention to that side of the question. I think that is one of the greatest shortcomings in our work. We must turn our attention in this direction. We must connect up the problem of unity with these most important problems of the every-day struggle, and link up the problem of the united front with these concrete

tasks. Only in this manner can we reinforce this tremendous historic task with the sympathy and support of scores of millions of workers. We need an international which would put an end to international blacklegging, we need an international which would conduct a simultaneous struggle in all countries, we need an international which would regard any struggle on a separate sector of the social front as its own direct struggle. This must be explained to the wide masses, this is our most immediate task.

I know, comrades, that we have passed a great number of excellent resolutions. Before coming along here, I glanced through all the resolutions on the trade union movement which we have passed at Congresses of the Comintern and R.I.L.U. Everything is there — winning of the masses, connection of partial slogans with final aims, attention is paid to the autonomy and independence of the T. U. movement, etc. It would seem that everything has been said, meanwhile it would seem that we must start everything over again. Nevertheless, I am not pessimistic, for we are not commencing from the start, but everything is going further and further ahead. If we regard everything that we would like as being 100%, then of course we have not even achieved 10%. but all the same, things are moving.

The immediate, important political task is to explain to all Communists the role of the Trade Unions. So long as the

whole Comintern, and every separate section of it do not understand the most elementary things, that the Trade Union movement is the decisive strategic point, that work in the Trade Unions is the most important political work of each Party, that work in the Trades Unions is a daily and hourly task, the work of every Communist Party as a whole and of every Communist separately, we will only be marking time in one spot.*

Before coming to a close I want to make one correction. The British Delegation has officially informed me that the resolution of the Enlarged Central Committee of the Party, on the question of Unity, to which I referred in my report, does not contain the question of the entry of the A. U. C. T. U. into Amsterdam. This was in the draft, but the Enlarged Meeting deleted this point. This misunderstanding arose because by an error the press received a copy of the Draft resolution and not the final text. I make this rectification with the greatest of pleasure.

At the conclusion of my report I express the hope that we would realise by 100% the decisions taken here, but this is a programme maximum, and speaking between ourselves, if you realise them to an extent of 50% this will be a very, very great victory of Communism over International Reformism. (Applause.)