

Comrade LOSOVSKY: (Communist Fraction of the R. I. L. U.)

I fully agree with Comrade Bukharin's Theses and should like to call your attention, comrades, chiefly to the trade union question.

Ninth Plenum of Comintern Executive Committee and the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress.

The Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress was an extremely important event in the world trade union movement, not only because of the number of new countries represented, but because of its character, the scope of its work, and the decisions adopted. The keynote of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress was one of merciless self-criticism. We laid bare there, definitely and clearly, all our shortcomings, despite the fact that we were under the bitter fire of our class enemies.

The salient feature of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress lies in the fact that besides the resolutions of a general character covering all the countries, many practical resolutions were taken on the most important countries and most outstanding questions, and, thus, the bulk of the resolutions at our Congress took on an extremely practical, one might almost say, an instructive character.

Opposition to Decisions of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress.

Despite the fact that at the Fourth Congress various Parties were represented and non-Party delegates were present, all the decisions were adopted unanimously. It would appear that with such unanimity on the part of those who participated in the Congress and the organisations they represented, they would really get down to put into execution the decisions adopted at the Fourth Congress. But no sooner had the Fourth Congress closed when it appeared that to some its resolutions had proved distasteful. This opposition to the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress decisions took on an organised character in Germany and the United States. The right elements of the German Communist Party endeavoured to challenge the truth of the decisions adopted at the Fourth Congress, while in all the districts they put forward resolutions which, openly or concealed, were directed against the Congress decisions.

What is it in the decisions of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress that the Rights do not favour? They disapprove precisely of the fact that distinguishes the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress from the Third, and many of them have just in this fashion formulated their attacks on the Fourth Congress: "Its decisions contradict the resolutions of the Third Congress". It would seem that the duty of the International is to repeat the same thing again and again at each congress!

What are the special features of the decisions adopted by the Fourth Congress? What is the new trend that it has introduced in our tactics? This new trend can be formulated in the following points:

1. Intensified struggle against the reformist trade union bureaucrats and their international centre — the Amsterdam International.

2. The carrying out of united front tactics chiefly from the bottom.

3. Leadership of the economic struggle against the reformist trade union apparatus if the latter sabotages the fighting will of the masses.

4. To strengthen the revolutionary trade union federations in countries with divided trade union movements, not only by recruiting the unorganised, but also by capturing the reformist organisations.

5. The organisation of unorganised workers in new unions where no organisations exist in the most important branches of industry. (United States.)

6. To intensify the struggle against expulsions and to combat defeatist tendencies and tactics of unity at any price.

Such are the points that roused the ire of the Right elements in the German Communist Party. From the minutes of the various meetings we observe that those who opposed the decisions of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress put up such arguments against the decisions adopted that one involuntarily asks whether these are the arguments of Communists or of left social-democrats! Let me give you several outstanding examples of this "ideology" that found expression not at social-democratic, but at Communist meetings.

Ideology of Right Muddlers in Germany.

"Such formulas like — 'Amsterdammers are tools of capitalism' — are extremely dangerous in our conditions", complained Comrade Smolka at the Enlarged Plenum of the District Committee in Thuringia. Comrade Poller (Jena) declared: "If it is considered necessary to use such formulas like the 'Amsterdammers are scabs and the allies of capitalism' then we can make no further headway".

Comrade Hammer, the editor of the South German workers' paper, doubts whether it is possible to say that the "Amsterdam International is a weapon of the capitalists". He is of the opinion that the "decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress will handicap our activities in the trade unions".

Comrade Tittel, the political secretary of the Thuringia Committee of the German Communist Party, considers the formula: "The Amsterdammers are tools of capitalism" to be incorrect.

But Comrade Krauss gave clearest expression to his point of view at the Enlarged Plenum of the Stuttgart Town Committee. He considered that to reinforce the struggle against the reformists would mean preparing the ground for a split. It would be a mistake to fight for strike committees and for the formation of strike committees. It would be a mistake to put forward the slogan of "fight" against the reformists, it would be a mistake to put in the forefront the struggle against the system of arbitration. The decision of the R. I. L. U. Congress on the necessity of conducting fractional activities in the Hirsch-Dunker, Christian, and other unions, is likewise a mistake.

For example, Comrade Kern, from Stuttgart opposed the decisions of the Fourth Congress, first, because of the decision to form strike committees, secondly, because of the decision regarding the necessity of organising opposition groups in the Christian and Hirsch-Dunker trade unions, and finally, because of the criticism directed against the Amsterdam International as an organisation in alliance with the imperialists. Furthermore, Comrade Kern opposes our negative attitude to the arbitration system.

I could cite scores of references from articles and speeches of Comrades Enderle, Hausen, Walcher, Melcher, Streber, Stucks, Fränzel, and others, who, instead of actively working for the execution of the decisions adopted by the Fourth Congress, revealed a profound disintegrating pessimism together with a virtual refusal to apply the Congress decisions in Germany. These comrades are dismayed at the power of reformism. They cannot part with their traditions. They are used to the old methods. They are so accustomed to the role of an irresponsible opposition, that the slightest attempt to pull them out of their oppositional discussions into the arena of mass activities, to

compel them to utilise new methods in struggling against our enemies, to make use of the influence gained over the masses, to rouse them against the united front of capitalism and reformism, causes a convulsive resistance on their part. We are confronted with a special variety of Communists alarmed at reformism.

In point of fact, what is the meaning of these objections? We see that these members of the German Communist Party are infected, to put it lightly, with social-democratic poison. If the decisions of the R. I. L. U. Congress are challenged in this direction, the question arises as to where these Party members are at all in agreement with the Comintern and the German Communist Party. I have no intention of repudiating all these muddlers, neither do I intend to convince them. Whoever quarrels on these questions inside the Comintern has very little in common with the Communist movement. What are the root-causes for such an incorrect and obviously anti-Communist approach to this question? Undoubtedly, these causes are due to an incorrect appreciation of social democracy and especially of left-wing social democracy, in the attitude that regards trade union organisations as fetishes, as well as the erroneous tactics of unity at any price.

Is the Social Democratic Party a Workers' Party?

For the Right elements of the German Communist Party, the social-democratic Party is still "one of the workers' parties". Such assertions can also be heard among the Left social democrats: they always speak of two workers parties. But is this true? Does the social composition of the party determine the political outlook of the party? Do not considerable sections of the workers still support the German Centre Party and the German nationalists? Do not millions of workers still vote for the British liberals and conservatives? Do not scores of millions of workers still follow the lead of the American Democratic and Republican parties? Does this mean that they are all workers' parties? Obviously, not. The Right lost sight of an extremely important fact — they have failed to notice the transformation of the social-democratic parties into bourgeois parties, although in great measure they have still retained their former social composition. The closer collaboration between social democracy, the reformist trade union bureaucrats and the bourgeois State, demonstrates clearly that these parties have ceased to be workers' parties, and that we are faced now with a peculiar variety of bourgeois parties, distinguished from other bourgeois parties in that they still retain a workers' composition in part, with Marxist socialist phraseology and connections with considerable sections of the workers, insofar as the officials of the social-democratic parties and reformist trade unions are for the greater part taken from the ranks of the workers. Whoever considers the social-democratic party a workers' party, whoever considers the Amsterdammers as brothers who have erred, and not as enemies of the working class, whoever considers that the existence of the social democratic party and reformist leadership is still an advantage for the working class, he will oppose, of course, the decisions of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress.

But I should like to have the matter thrashed out here completely. I do not like at all the shameful diplomacy of these comrades in Germany. This unworthy diplomacy is to be seen in the fact that in opposing the R. I. L. U. they are thus concealing their opposition to the tactics of the Comintern, and this is precisely the essence of the question. Under the flag of opposition to the R. I. L. U. they are pursuing an anti-Communist policy, believing evidently that no one will realise their shrewd game at politics. In reality we are confronted with an opposition not only to the R. I. L. U. but also to the Comintern. One must have the courage to make this assertion, but it is precisely this that the Right elements in the German Communist Party lack. They are beating about the bush and in their attacks on the R. I. L. U. Congress decisions are making use of all kinds of astute comparisons, endeavouring to show that in my speeches I differ from the decisions of the R. I. L. U., while in its decisions, the R. I. L. U. differs from the Comintern resolutions, and so on. But all this is weak and rotten, and to use a Russian proverb: "Where it's weak, it Breaks."

A Muddle on an American Scale.

Whereas the German opposition to the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress decisions was formed of individual elements, some comrades coming out openly, others in a concealed manner, some saying that they do not agree, others expressing doubts, but jointly sabotaging the execution of the resolutions adopted, the Central Committee, however, supported the Congress decisions and came out definitely against the Rights, against their opportunist reservations, against their pessimism and passivity. Things, however, are different in the United States. Here the Central Committee instigated the Opposition against the Fourth R.I.L.U. decision on the American question. Even previous to the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress there was much dissatisfaction in the Central Committee of the American Party with my sharp criticism of the erroneous attitude of the Party leadership to the Trade Union Educational League, its passivity in the question of organising the unorganised workers, its incorrect attitude to the Negro workers, and the way it regarded the reactionary American Federation of Labour as a fetish. This dissatisfaction was expressed in the protest of the American Communist Party C.C. against the R.I.L.U. appeal to the T.U.E.L. conference, held in December 1927, because in this appeal the necessity of organising the unorganised in the trade unions was stressed. This was further expressed in several articles among which Comrade Pepper's articles occupy a special place in this muddle. In "The Communist" Comrade Pepper published an article to prove that American capitalism is extremely strong, that the American working class is very poorly organised, that the Party is weak, and that there are many difficulties in general in America. This is what he said also at the Congress. Comrade Pepper sees nothing but the power of American capitalism, and discovering America anew although this discovery was made long ago, completely passed over those vital problems raised in my articles on the eve of the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress by means of self-criticism. To befuddle the question still more, Comrade Pepper launched the "theory" of the possible growth of the American Federation of Labour. Why did he do this? This was done in order to divert the attention of the Party from the immediate problem that faces us today, of organising the unorganised, to the future problems that will arise if the American Federation of Labour begins to grow again. All this tea-cup guessing had only one political meaning: to dispel the attention of the Party instead of concentrating it upon the most urgent task. I do not intend now to investigate in detail Pepper's "theory" as outlined in his nine points, but will merely say that whereas Comrade Pepper previously frequently lost his bearings in European affairs, today, as you have been able to convince yourselves from his speech here, he is all at sea in American affairs. He could be truly named: the muddler of the two hemispheres. (Laughter.)

Let us leave Comrade Pepper and take up the C.C. of the American Party. The American Communist Party C.C. declared itself to be against the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress resolution on the American question? Why did they come out against this resolution? This the C.C. is concealing. When the members of the C.C. arrived in Moscow and saw that to oppose the decisions of the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress would not be very expedient, they declared here in Moscow that they had long ago expressed support for the Fourth Congress decisions.

Now I ask you: What is the matter? Of course, every Central Committee has the right to declare its disagreement with decisions adopted by the R.I.L.U., but there must be the courage to declare this, there is no use hiding your head in the sand, neither will befuddling the question help, or to make out that everything is all right. You cannot change a negative attitude to the Fourth Congress decisions into a positive one on the way from New York to Moscow. One thing is plain that on this question a very peculiar united front has been set up between the right elements in the German Communist Party and the majority of the C.C. of the American Communist Party. Do not our American comrades consider that this kind of a united front will never serve to increase the prestige of the American Communist Party C.E.C.?

Decisions of Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress in France and Czechoslovakia.

The decisions of the Fourth Congress were put into practice most of all in France and Czechoslovakia, but even here, things are moving slowly. Meanwhile, let it be observed, no less than 90% of the workers in France are unorganised. Some comrades are prone to explain this by the innate qualities of the French worker, but this, of course, is rubbish. Is it not true that there are no less than 3,000,000 Frenchmen in all kinds of mutual aid societies? It is not a question of the innate qualities of the French worker but of certain shortcomings, likewise innate of our trade union work in France. It is precisely in France that organisational activities have been displaced by agitational and propaganda work. A luminous example in this respect is the Paris District of the French Communist Party. Comrade Pillot accused the Central Committee of the French Communist Party of opportunism. These accusations are based only on one thing, the great temperamental qualities of Comrade Pillot. Of course, there were mistakes. The C.C. makes no claim to be without sin — only the Lord God, as we know, is sinless, and then only because he does not exist. But Comrade Pillot should have told us why it is that in the Paris district, where he claims there was not even a trace of opportunism, that things are so unsatisfactory with the Metal Workers' Union. Why is it that the Paris organisation of the Party, having many hundreds of Communist metal workers, cannot find a group of workers to undertake the organisation of the hundreds of thousands of metal workers in the Paris district? Comrade Pillot, who is inclined to come forward as a commander in regard to the trade unions, forgets, first, that you cannot command the unions, secondly, that trade union leadership means — to get the masses into the trade unions and to educate these masses; thirdly that the Party must be able to rouse new sections of workers, to attract new elements to the leadership, to awaken the initiative of the masses and not be preoccupied with petty tutelage and, finally, that the Communists must be foremost in all the struggles of the proletariat, skillfully guiding the everyday struggle of the masses. In carrying this out new hundred of thousands of workers could be drawn into these activities in the Paris district alone. Let Comrade Pillot try to act in this way. I assure you that there is no opportunism here. The mistakes in the organisational resolution were quickly rectified, not in spite of the C.C. but with the aid of the C.C., still, unfortunately, there are shortcomings in our practical work. The French Communist Party and the Unitarian Confederation of Labour have a vast field of activity before them in getting the millions of workers into the C.G.T.U. Every effort must be made to carry out this work, for only in this way shall we be able to consolidate our growing political influence in France.

With regard to Czechoslovakia, here again the question of getting the many hundreds of thousands of workers into the **One Big Union** is the most important problem of the day. Whoever does not go forward is marking time and will inevitably be thrown aside — such is the logic of the struggle.

Questions of Strike Strategy.

On this question of strike tactics the right elements of the German Communist Party have again come out against the decisions of the Fourth Congress. But why did they not oppose the special resolution on the economic struggle of the workers and the tasks of the Communists adopted by the Ninth Plenum? What was the basic problem confronting the whole Communist movement? The problem was that the growing dissatisfaction of the masses against the capitalist offensive and the intensified rationalisation measures, etc., were forced by the reformists into the framework of obligatory arbitration and agreement with the employers' association at the cost of working class interests. The trade union apparatus, at least its basic leading section, is merely an appendage of the employers' associations in the working class, and hence we have the open or concealed sabotage of the reformists when a movement arises among the masses.

What was the slogan that several of our comrades in Germany launched? The slogan was: "Compel the trade union bureaucrats to lead the strike!" It would appear that by bringing pressure to bear it was possible to turn the social demo-

crats into real fighters. The slogan of "Compel the bureaucrats" merely spreads illusions among the masses. It results from the view that the Social Democratic Party is a workers' party, that the trade unions are being led by people who defend working class interests although poorly and that only pressure is needed to turn them into staunch defenders of the workers. This view is no Communist view, it is harmful for our Party, and consequently this kind of "tactics" must be strongly condemned by the Comintern. The trade union apparatus is now a means of oppressing the masses, a means of smothering the initiative of the workers at large, and our problem, therefore, is to oust these reformist leaders, and replace them by real revolutionary proletarians, to lead the strikes that arise spontaneously, to direct them against the bourgeoisie and the reformist trade union apparatus, since the latter is sabotaging the elementary interests of the toiling masses.

I ask you, therefore; in present-day conditions is it wrong to put the question in this light? The experience of the general strike and the miners' struggle in Great Britain, of the recent conflicts in the Ruhr, the Metal workers' strike in Central Germany and the many strikes in France and other countries, must be taken into account. The right elements of the German Communist Party do not favour our strike strategy. But what do they propose? What line of action do they propose instead of the one outlined by the Comintern and the R.I.L.U.? Their tactics are very simple indeed: nothing is to be done against the will of the reformist trade union apparatus. We must wait until that apparatus is captured. These comrades furthermore regard the capturing of the trade unions not in the light of replacing the reformist apparatus by a revolutionary apparatus, but as a result of the transformation brought about by education of the reformist trade union bureaucrats, a transformation of these bad reformists into staunch fighters for the proletarian cause.

I believe that such a passive policy would prove suicidal for the Comintern and all its Sections.

From the decisions of the Ninth Comintern Plenum and the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress the following must be noted: We must always be with the masses, we must take careful cognisance of the growing dissatisfaction of the masses, the masses must be organised and led if necessary without the trade union apparatus and against it, no fetish must be made of the trade unions, the reformist organisations must not be transformed into objects of worship, whilst it must always be kept in mind that the reformist organisations are tools in the hands of the bourgeois state and the employers' organisations to crush the revolutionary wing of the labour movement and to enslave the broad proletarian masses.

For Unity not at any Price. Struggle against Expulsions.

For many years past the R.I.L.U. and the Comintern have decidedly advocated trade union unity on a national and international scale, but neither the Comintern nor the R.I.L.U. have ever made a fetish of unity. Unity is no end in itself but only a means to an end, and therefore the question of the existence and formation of the opposition, the question of our Communist tactics in the trade unions cannot be made dependent upon unity. Meanwhile, we have Communists, in Germany in particular, who regard unity above everything else. Have we not seen Communists who together with the social democrats have signed resolutions condemning the tactics of the Communist Party in Germany? Have we not seen Communists who in the name of unity were ready to renounce their own line of action?

I shall not cite here all the numerous references with regard to this. But let me refer to a couple of examples of recent activities of those who want unity at any price in Germany. At the Congress of the **Leather Workers' Union** held in Germany in June, 1928, the members of the Communist Party put forward the standpoints that "it was possible to be a good Communist while not sharing the Communist point of view on 'purely trade union questions'." At the Congress of the **Boot and Shoe Operatives' Union** of Germany held in July, 1927, Communist Schiffer from Cleve declared that he "disagreed with several slandering articles of the Communists". The Communists at this Congress asserted that the "trade unions acted correctly when they expressed their support for rationalisation".

Without quoting any further examples I ask you, why did the Communists at these Congresses express themselves in this manner? Simply because they placed unity in their union above all else. The German comrades can cite here scores of similar examples, but I believe this will suffice. I assert that this is not a Communist way of acting, and that such an outlook has nothing in common with the theory and practice of the Comintern. It is therefore quite natural that comrades who advocate unity at any price, who place unity of the trade unions above all else, that such comrades remain passive when Communists are expelled from the trade unions. One very frequently hears among these elements the assertion that one should not allow oneself to be provoked. In the main this is undoubtedly true, but this correct standpoint is being literally used by the right elements to conceal their own passivity. It is well known that the German Social Democratic Party in its tactics in regard to the bourgeois state and Hohenzollern Germany for a long time put up the slogan of "Don't let yourself be provoked". Of course one must be a perfect idiot to allow oneself to be provoked, but we should remember what the German Social Democratic Party did with this slogan. This formula was used not only to conceal their passivity, but to renounce the struggle, while afterwards it served to cover its conciliation with the Hohenzollerns and later with the bourgeois state.

The struggle against expulsions is a question of life or death for the Party. And here we find the Right, instead of reinforcing the struggle against the splits and mobilising the masses against the crimes of the trade union bureaucrats, pouring out all kinds of theories to conceal their passivity and defeatist tendencies. Not desiring to struggle against expulsions, they are beginning to look in our own midst for the guilty ones for the split. All the Right assert that the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress is now out for a split, thus justifying with these assertions the reformist policy of expulsions. Those who bring forward the accusation that the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress is out to bring about a split, really should be put into an asylum. The Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress said never a word about the necessity of a split. On the contrary it demanded that disruption be combated. In England we find that revolutionary workers elected by referendum in Scotland cannot get down to work because the trade union bureaucrats, with the support of the bourgeois State, are ousting the representatives of the majority. The **Swiss Trade Union Federation** expelled the Basle trade union cartel because it came out against fascism, because it urged support for the Chinese revolution and in general supported the class struggle. Thus according to the adherents of unity at any price the British comrades must bow down to the will of the trade union bureaucrats because otherwise a split will be brought about. Our Swiss comrades must comply with the wishes of their trade union bureaucrats. Our American comrades must give way to the agents of Wall Street only for the sake of unity! The Comintern will never agree to this kind of capitulation. If the Comintern and the R.I.L.U. upheld this point of view then all the Parties and both the Internationals should be disbanded. We must struggle against the disrupters, but even more we must struggle against the capitulators, who regard unity as an end in itself, that in the name of unity we must renounce our duty, indeed our very right to win over the masses for the class struggle.

Our Immediate Task is the Organisation of the Unorganised.

In this connection there rises before us in all its importance the problem of the organisation of the unorganised. It is most important for the United States and for such countries as Japan, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Mexico, Yugoslavia, Greece, Bulgaria, Roumania etc.

If the question of the organisation of the unorganised is very clear in those countries with a split trade union movement (Japan, France, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Yugoslavia, Greece, and others), i. e., where it is necessary to draw the masses into the revolutionary trade unions, the question with regard to America, where there is no parallel trade union federation, must be discussed from another angle. The overwhelming majority of the American workers are not organised. There are millions of workers in the steel, textile, rubber industries, water transport, etc., not organised. Many years were needed to dispel the

illusions entertained by our American comrades with regard to unity. Many years were needed to get the formation of new unions amongst the unorganised. There are 24—25 million unorganised workers and employees, civil servants; there are millions of Negroes, who present a great potential revolutionary power. And up to the present we have not succeeded in getting Negro unions organised in America in those industries where the white unions do not accept Negroes. It needs no saying that in the new unions the workers of all races and countries will have equal rights.

But if the question with regard to the United States is now quite clear, it is not quite clear for several other countries. Let us take, for instance, **Poland**. In the Dombrow Basin several years ago there were tens of thousands of unorganised miners. For the least 3 or 4 years an insignificant P. P. S. union with a few hundred members has managed to keep going there. I ask myself: why do not our comrades, who have colossal influence in this district, attempt to organise these 95% of the miners who are not members of the P. P. S. Union? Are we supposed to dance round the P. P. S. skeleton in the Dombrow district? It is time all Parties ponder this, for otherwise we will renounce to organise the masses, for the sake of unity at any cost, we are not going to rally tens of thousands of proletarians around the militant banner of the class struggle. Of course, the supporters of the tactics of "unity at any price" are going to kick up a row over this. They will say that this is splitting, it is better that these tens of thousands of miners remain unorganised than organise them in a new union. But as you and I are not amongst the supporters of unity at any price, this row will not alarm us. We are for unity, but not at any price. That we are for unity we have proven by all our decisions, by all our actions; we replied to the **Finnish and Norwegian unions** that we agreed to an international conference. The Amsterdam International rejected the proposal because the leaders of the Amsterdam International think that even now they are the salt of the earth. Let them console themselves with such illusions — we will continue the struggle for the establishment of a united all-embracing International founded on the basis of the class struggle.

On Unity Groups.

On this point I would like to dwell shortly on the question of unity groups and in general on the movement for unity. You all know that the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern are for unity. You know that a considerable number of left reformist elements gathered a short time ago under the slogan of unity, whilst the greatest development of this movement was during the period of the existence of the **Anglo-Russian Committee**. With the break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee a differentiation between these groups took place. Some of the groups, which were founded on the platform of the Anglo-Russian Committee, broke up (Holland), some split (Belgium), some still show very weak signs of life (France, Austria, Czechoslovakia), while some groups (in Germany) if they do exert any activity, exert it only in the sphere of literature. But on the other hand, the movement for unity was joined by the trade unions of **Norway and Finland**, and the **Soviet-Finnish-Norwegian trade union conference** was one of the stages in the struggle for unity.

Putting aside the question with regard to the **Norwegian-Finnish-Soviet trade union conference**, I would like to dwell upon the unity groups only. There is no need to hide the fact that these groups are at present very weak.

Let us take **Germany**. The weakness of this Unity group consists in the fact that it is a purely literary group, it has no practical programme of action, all its work is built on talks of unity only.

In the first place, things in this group are not quite right on the question of the struggle against expulsions. It would seem that a unity group should come out with the greatest energy against the expulsion of Communists from the trade unions. But this is not to be noticed. This question does not seem to concern the editors of "Unity". It does not find a serious response on the pages of this organ. But if a unity group, which has no definite platform on other questions, does not even fight against expulsions, then it is permissible to ask, what is the task of this

group? Can this group count upon the growth of its influence? It is very doubtful. Influence can only grow in the day-to-day struggle. Its influence can only grow if the unity group will occupy a position of class struggle on all the most important current questions. Its influence can only increase if it will conduct a ruthless struggle against every expulsion and split, otherwise its influence is going to decrease. The unity groups have become weak, and some of them in a whole series of countries have broken up, because they have no concrete programme of action, and when matters reached the struggle for unity, the struggle against splits, they limit themselves, in the best instance, to a few protests only. Such a danger threatens the German unity group also.

Further I would like to point out a few peculiarities of the "Unity" journal. "Unity" is published by Communists and social-democrats. We are unable, of course, to demand from the social-democrats writing for "Unity" that they express our point of view of the struggle. But we are in the right in demanding from the Communists who work there that they defend the point of view of the Party, the point of view of the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern in those questions which are disputed by our social-democratic partners. We are in the right in demanding from the members of our Party that while struggling together with the social democratic workers in the unity group, they do not furl up their banner and that they do not surrender their right to criticise mistakes, obscurities, hesitancy of those social democrats who write in the same organs. I think that in this regard the workers in the editing offices of "Unity" do not manifest sufficient activity and firmness.

I could give several quotations from "Unity", but owing to lack of time, I will only remind the comrades that on the pages of "Unity" such articles are published which speak of the "ridiculous boasting of some Communist leaders, who seem to think that they are called upon and capable of being leaders of the working class". There are also to be found words of the "childish mania of the Communists for first place", phrases such as "the Communists are infected with narrow-minded Party egoism", that "they are unable to think of anything better than intensified libel of the left leaders and social democracy", and so on (see "Unity" No. 14, July 9th, 1927). Of course, we cannot demand of the social democrats to have a good opinion of the Communist Party, but we must demand from those Communists who work for the "Unity" that they give a worthy reply to such unworthy attacks upon the Communist Party under the flag of the united front.

We work together with social-democratic workers in the Unity Groups in order, jointly with the best workers of the social democratic parties, to fight against class collaboration, for trade union unity, in order to transform the trade unions into democratic organisations, etc. But if this is so — and undoubtedly it is — then the question crops up, why does not "Unity" bring up the question of a united front with the trade union opposition of Germany, but writes: "We do not in the least support all the actions of the oppositionals" ("Unity", March 3rd, 1928), without stating exactly what it does not support. Why does not "Unity", — even though only as information — make any statement on the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress and its decisions? Is it possible to remain outside of the most burning problems of the German Labour movement? What sort of an organ is it which desires to keep outside of the struggle and above everything? In my opinion it is precisely this lack of contact with real life, which is the chief reason for the weakness of the German Unity group.

From the aforesaid the following is clear: In order that the unity groups exist, develop, win over new strata of workers, it is insufficient to repeat "Unity" day and night and to defend inadequately this unity when expulsions take place. It is necessary to have a practical platform of actions, to organise the masses against the splitting policy of the reformist leaders, to take note of the everyday needs of the workers, and to go into the struggle hand-in-hand with the Communists when the Communists lead the masses against the treachery of the reformist leaders. Otherwise, the Unity groups will remain small literary groups, and will never become serious factors for the unification of the working class on the basis of the class struggle.

Should the Communist Parties Carry through Decisions of the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress?

We cannot say that the Communist press is conducting a systematic campaign for the R. I. L. U. decisions. Many comrades think that if they publish one or two articles, three or four informational notes, and the contents of this or that resolution — they have carried out the campaign. I must point out that this is no campaign, but getting rid of the question in a bureaucratic manner. It is high time that you knew that a passive attitude with regard to the popularisation of the Fourth Congress decisions can only be to the advantage of the right defeatist tendencies, which we have, true, to a very small extent; in our own ranks. In general, not all Communist Parties have yet learned to organise real campaigns, especially of an international character. In the theses there is pointed out quite correctly the lack of internationalism, and a certain provincialism, of several Parties. This defect was especially vividly manifested during the Chinese events. Take for instance the **international fortnight of aid for the Chinese labour movement** organised by the R. I. L. U. The International Fortnight has not been carried through with such enthusiasm and to such an extent as the heroic Chinese proletariat deserves. If we add to the inability to organise long campaigns, an insufficient understanding of the real meaning of the international experience summed up by the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress, it becomes quite clear why the Communist Parties in many countries have not yet taken up the serious popularisation of the Fourth Congress decisions. Such a passive attitude in the first place may harm these Communist Parties and the whole international Communist movement.

Conclusions.

We have now sufficient experience to be able to say which methods are useful and which are no good. We have sufficient forces to develop mass activities, to penetrate everywhere where there are working masses and to direct the day-to-day struggle. We have not sufficient forces in all countries, not everywhere are we able to direct strikes and struggles against the will of the reformist leaders. But only in the struggle for the leadership of the masses, only in the persistent and careful day-to-day work, with a careful consideration of the mood of the masses, can we transform all our Parties into mass organisations.

We have against us the united front of the employers, the bourgeois State, and international reformism. International reformism accuses us of splitting, but you well know what this accusation is worth. I will only give a couple of facts. When the **Pan Pacific T. U. Secretariat** was formed, instead of supporting this federation of workers of the Pacific coast and its struggle against American and Japanese imperialism and against new wars, the Amsterdamites came out against it, accusing the Pan Pacific T. U. conference of being Moscow's child. When thanks to our initiative the foundations of the **Latin American Trade Union secretariat** were laid, the Amsterdam International, instead of calling upon all labour organisations of Latin America to join this organisation, is making attempts to set up its own organisation for Latin America. For this purpose they gathered a few people from Latin America in Geneva, who under the protection of the Amsterdamites set up a Bureau of Connections of the Argentine Trade Union Confederation. A Bureau of connection, which only connects a few Argentine reformists with a few swindlers of Venezuela, Uruguay and Cuba.

The united front of the bourgeois States, the employers and the reformists still represents a potential power. The revolutionary wing of the labour movement has suffered defeats in many struggles, but we learn from these defeats. The theses and discussion on the first point of the agenda are imbued with deep faith in our victory. This faith in our victory is based on a sober Marxist analyses of the situation of international capitalism and the correlation of forces between the working class and the bourgeoisie and within the working class itself.

International reformism is still strong, for capitalism is still strong. But compare our forces during the Fifth Congress and at present. Compare the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern four years ago — in 1924 and now in 1928. In 1924 the Chinese proletariat

had not yet come out upon the arena of history. In 1924 the Chinese proletariat had not yet shaken the still powerful imperialism of England, Japan and the U. S. A. In 1924 there were not yet hundreds of thousands of strikers who have now come forward in the industrial centres of India. At that time the labour movement of Latin America was still for the greater part under the power of anarcho-syndicalist and reformist ideologies, while now most of the workers of Latin America are coming nearer to the R. I. L. U. and the Comintern. Our forces are growing — this is why we are convinced of our victory over capitalism and over its reformist lackeys.

(Applause.)

Comrade LI KYANG (China):

Comrades, the betrayal of the Chinese Revolution by the bourgeoisie was no accident. Chiang Kai-Shek had already previously, namely on March 20th 1926, carried out a treacherous manoeuvre of this kind in Canton. Our Party gave warning at the time, unfortunately only in words, about the impending counter-revolution. In reality, it did not take any practical steps to counteract it. The Pol. Bureau of the Party was in a state of wavering and indecision. The then responsible leader of our Party, **Chang Tu-Sao**, has not yet openly admitted his grave mistakes, and the Comintern has therefore advised all the members of the Chinese Party to be on their guard against opportunism.

At the meeting held in August 1927 a resolution was finally passed upon this question, as well as upon the agrarian revolution, the armed insurrection, and the capture of power.

The political line adopted since the August Conference of last year was essentially correct, but a number of crude mistakes were committed in carrying it out. In the **Wuhan Province** there was already a desire for an insurrection at the close of August 1927. The Central Committee of the Chinese Party urged the need of better preparation before starting the insurrection, nevertheless there were no preparations made until the 10th. of September. Similar mistakes were committed also in **Hupei**. The **Nan-Chang revolt** ended in a defeat, because it had no agrarian programme and because the peasants were not drawn into the insurrection.

In the **Kwantung Province**, too, the peasant army was mobilised for an insurrection in the Autumn, but the large masses of the peasants were not attracted. After the Swatow defeat came a series of risings in **Haifang, Lufeng, Haiman** and other places in the Kwantung Province.

After this period the Kuomintang intensified its repressive measures, closing down the trade unions and cancelling the agreements between workers and employers, whilst workers were imprisoned and shot with greater brutality than ever. **Wan Tin-Wei** drove from Hong-Kong; the workers who had been fighting against imperialism for a period of 16 months.

The Canton workers could now plainly see that the Left Wing Kuomintang people were the same hangmen as the militarists.

Between April and December 1927 numerous political mass demonstrations took place in Canton. The revolutionary mood reached a high pitch. At the same time a war broke out between the militarist **Cheng Fak-Kwai**, believed to adhere to the Left Wing Kuomintang, and **Li Chi-Sen**. The workers realised that now the time was come to overthrow this reactionary leadership. Thus the Canton workers seized power on December 11th. of last year by means of a revolt. The thundering of that revolt reverberated throughout the East and found its echo among workers throughout the world. After the Canton revolt it was realised by the Chinese working class that the armed revolt was the only way to lead the workers, peasants and soldiers to power.

After the Canton revolt the peasants rose in arms in various parts throughout China. The agrarian revolution was now to become intensified. Mistakes were committed by many comrades in the course of the Canton revolt; nevertheless the Canton revolt can by no means be described as a patch.