

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol 9. No. 57

PRESS

9th October 1929

CORRESPONDENCE

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

Tenth Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

Full Report.

Nineteenth Session.

**Discussion on the Reports of Comrades
Thälmann and Lozovsky.**

Comrade SZANTO (Communist fraction of the R. I. L. U.):

Comrades, I believe that there must be a special chapter in the theses on the leadership of economic struggles and the forms and methods of trade union work in the countries where the movement is illegal or semi-legal. We have so far very little experience in this respect. Of late, however, we are getting some experience. The dissolution of the trade unions in Yugoslavia and Rumania, and the economic struggles in Bulgaria give us ample material which the Plenum can make good use of in the further development of trade union activity and the leadership of economic struggles in the Balkan countries, as well as in the other Sections of the Comintern.

We find that the state enjoys tremendous authority amongst the trade union leaders of the Balkan countries. In Yugoslavia, the trade union executive negotiated with the Government authorities after the outlawing of the independent unions concerning the reinstatement of the organisations. Such negotiations foster illusions among the masses to the effect that it is possible to restore the unions by negotiating with the government without conducting an energetic struggle against the fascist dictatorship.

The same thing happened in the recent economic struggles in Bulgaria. With the outbreak of the strike in Chaskovo, the strike leadership officially notified the police inspector about it. The leaders appeared also before the district chief who sharply announced that he is informed on the matter and that he knows from reports from the employers that the strike was called by the Communist Party and threatened the leaders that unless the strike is called off in 24 hours, they would be arrested. After this, a delegation of the strike leaders went to the Prime Minister Liapchev. The delegation emphasised that

the strike was purely economic and asked the Premier to instruct the police not to interfere.

A delegation came also from Plovdiv. A part of the delegation went over to the side of Liapchev and issued an appeal stating that the strike has nothing to do with the independent unions. However, the independent unions managed to replace these leaders after the strikers protested against their betrayal.

These and similar instances show that the authority of the State and the democratic illusions are still very strong in the Balkan countries.

In Yugoslavia they laid much hope on the negotiations of the Government after the dissolution of the unions. They went so far as to declare that under certain conditions, the trade union executive is ready to expel the Communists from the unions. The executive submitted a proposal to that effect to the Government and hoped thereby to bait the government. But the Government did not fall for that and gained time through the negotiations to prevent the mobilisation of the masses against the dissolution of the union. They wanted to fool the Government, but they themselves were fooled.

In Bulgaria, too much hope was based on "public opinion" during the strike. They wanted to convince the public of the justice of the strikers' demands instead of starting from the outset along the clear class against class policy. The bourgeoisie agitated against the independent unions, but the leaders believe that they can win the sympathy of the bourgeoisie if they deny their role and the role of the independent trade unions in the strike. The executive did not officially participate at the strikers' meeting in Chaskovo and even the fact that the executive of the independent unions took the initiative in

ganising a central strike committee was concealed. They allowed the fascists to get the best of them. The strike committee, on the persuasion of the fascists, reduced the demands from 30—40% to 15%, which caused great excitement among the strikers. The trade union leaders did their utmost to convince the strikers of the necessity to reduce the demands. It was with great difficulty that the unity of the strikers could be maintained.

The terror was indescribable in Bulgaria during the strike. The strike districts were in a state of siege. Martial law was declared. More than two persons had no right to walk the street together. There was an orgy of money fines. Arrests and persecution assumed unusual dimensions. A strike bulletin of Sliven reported that there is not a worker in Sliven who did not taste the brutality of the police, and yet the strike was not used in the struggle against the terror and the fascist dictatorship.

There was a fissure between the masses and the leaders in the struggle against the terror.

In Rumania, no differentiation was made between the avowed Right wingers and liquidators (Dascal, Goldstein, Nix., etc.) and the centrists. Both tendencies were fought in the same way. There was no distinction made between the centrists in the trade union movement, between those within and those outside the Party. The Party used the same methods of struggle against the centrist trade unionists who are not members of the Party as against those belonging to the Party.

In Bulgaria, the struggle was also neglected against opportunism and the liquidators during the strike.

No line was drawn even during the strike in Bulgaria, between the Communists and the reformists and Social-Democrats. Money was taken from the reformists and their co-operative in support of the strike. They have not gone so far yet in Bulgaria as to refuse such money. The Bulgarian comrades do not seem to know yet that the reformists of other countries have quite indignantly rejected material aid from Moscow.

There is a long distance between the leaders and the masses in all Balkan countries without exception. The unions do not know what is happening in the factories.

The General Council of the Unitary Unions of Rumania recently sent out a circular to the locals. In that circular, certain organisational instructions are given. There is not a word in the circular concerning the organisation of independent struggles. Only in one point it is stated that if strikes break out in the factories the local organisations must try to lead them.

In Bulgaria no strike has been called independently by the independent unions since the great defeat of 1923. They took the lead of strikes that broke out spontaneously. Even the recent tobacco workers' strike broke out spontaneously and the independent unions were simply taken by surprise. Throughout the strike there was a big distance between the unions and the activity of the masses. The under-estimation of the Leftward development by the Bulgarian comrades is expressed in their under-estimation of the role of the women in strikes. The female tobacco workers of Bulgaria fought splendidly in the strike. They displayed wonderful heroism. In spite of the terror, arrests and abuses, they did their duty and stood at their posts. They had to dress in war clothes so as to be able to stand at their posts.

In the Bulgarian strikes the following defects could be observed in the leadership:

- a) There were no broad strike committees, with one exception.
- b) Strike committees were not elected, but delegated by the factories on strike.
- c) There was no national strike committee and in each city the strike was led separately.
- d) Each strike committee negotiated at its own risk with the employers and there was no united front.
- e) The strike was called off in Chaskovo when it was still in progress in the other locals.

f) The strike was also called off in Plovdiv and thus the two most important tobacco centres withdrew from the struggle with the result that the front was broken.

g) The call for the organisation of an international strike committee was issued when Chaskovo already withdrew from the strike.

h) Only with difficulty was the strike extended and given a political character, the tobacco workers were isolated for weeks; very few and only unimportant factories joined the strike in Sofia. After the strike was called off in Chaskovo and Plovdiv, a new strike wave broke out in Sliven and Varna.

i) There were no demonstrations during the strike; efforts were made to keep the strike within economic limits; no struggle was carried on against fascism and the fascist dictatorship.

What should be particularly noted, however, is that the strike in Chaskovo ended with the arbitration decision of the Minister of Trade, himself a tobacco manufacturer. The acceptance of the decision was the logical outcome of the numerous computations organised at the beginning of the strike. With the acceptance of the decision the Bulgarian comrades contributed a good deal towards the institution of compulsory arbitration. It should be observed that some strike locals protested against arbitration. In Sliven a strikers' meeting even decided that the strike committee must not concede any of the original demands without the consent of the strikers.

Neither in the press nor in agitation or even in the decisions of the unions of the various Balkan countries is there any indication of the new strike tactics. The masses are not being prepared for the forthcoming struggles. The work done in the Balkan countries does not correspond to the third period. The activity of the masses has gone far beyond the initiative of the trade union leaders.

In spite of the many mistakes and difficulties, there are many favourable sides to be recorded in the Bulgarian economic strikes. In spite of their great losses the Bulgarian comrades have managed to re-establish their movement. At the outbreak of the tobacco strike it seemed that the fascists would succeed in controlling the strike. Our Bulgarian comrades, however, managed to throw the fascists out of the leadership and to take full control of the movement. In the course of the strike a good many mistakes, though not all, were made good. Although late, a national strike committee was set up. In the new strike in Sliven a new and correct line of leadership can be observed. Recent strikes which broke out after the strike in Chaskovo and Plovdiv was called off show a strong and good leadership. The Bulgarian comrades have quickly learned from their own mistakes. During the strike many corrections were made in the leadership which raised its prestige. The removal of the traitors in Plovdiv at the very outset of the strike was a great aid. It rarely happens in the history of strikes that leaders are removed by the masses. The fact that the executive of the independent leaders appealed to the masses and that the old strike committee was replaced by a new one, shows that the executive is influential and authoritative among the masses.

The economic struggles in Bulgaria indicate a powerful leftward trend among the masses, and if we take into account the fact that similar big economic struggles are being waged in Greece and Rumania, we realise that in spite of the terror, suppression and fascist dictatorship, the proletariat of the Balkan countries too has begun its counter-offensive.

A few more words concerning the methods and forms of illegal trade union work. This question is quite concrete because of the dissolution of the unions in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, and especially since the unions in other countries are threatened with being driven underground. Some comrades have quite a wrong notion concerning illegal trade unions. Many of them believe that illegal unions can be mass organisations. But it must be made quite clear that illegal mass trade unions are out of the question. Illegal trade unions are underground executive bodies which guide the mass movement through the instrumentality of underground cadres. These illegal cadres can perform their functions only if they know how to lead the masses. Naturally, the sphere of activity of the illegal cadres lies in the factories, where all legal and semi-legal possibilities must be used in order to gain influence among the masses.

At the same time they must wage an energetic struggle to restore their legal status. In this respect all kinds of methods must be used and the legal and semi-legal possibilities skillfully combined. The most important methods to be used are:

a) Initiative in mobilising and attracting the organised and unorganised workers in the economic struggles, fighting for independent leadership.

b) Energetic struggle against fascism and the fascisation of the labour movement.

c) Fights against the reformists as the agents of fascism in the ranks of the working class.

d) Mass campaigns (protest resolutions, demonstrations, etc.) for a recovery of the legal status of the revolutionary unions, linking up the struggle with the struggle against fascist dictatorship and an exposure of the reformists.

e) Creation of provisional committees in the factories for the organisation of campaigns.

f) Stimulation of activity among the unemployed, drawing them into the general struggle; organisation of demonstrations and protest meetings of unemployed.

g) Issuance of legal, semi-legal and illegal trade union papers, publications, journals, appeals, factory papers, circulars, pamphlets, etc.

Experience has shown that the trade union movement can be developed also under illegal and semi-legal conditions as a mass movement. A condition for that is, however, the establishment of contact with the masses by organising and leading their struggles. In future the Comintern will have to devote greater attention than hitherto to the trade union movement in countries where that movement is illegal or semi-legal. The experience acquired in this sphere must become the property of all Sections, because the Parties, still on a legal footing, but threatened to be driven underground, will have to make use of it in the future.

Comrade GEY (Com. Fraction of R. I. L. U.):

The development of the events in Czechoslovakia during the last two years shows that we have in that country a process of fusion going on between the lower apparatus of the reformist trade unions in the factories and the apparatus of the employers. No doubt the same process is going on in Germany too. The functionaries of the reformist trade unions receive appointments as foremen, as administration officials in the factories: they become the authority in the factory not only on trade union lines, but also on industrial lines, becoming the assistants of the employers.

To act against this reformist apparatus in the factory means at the same time to be discharged, to lose one's job. We have seen the same structure also even among our former friends, among the liquidators of the Hais Company. Wherever they entrenched themselves in a given factory, they had their lower trade union official who was actually a tool of the administration, if not an administration official in that factory.

This development of the lower trade union apparatus, and its fusion with the employers' apparatus directly in the factory, compels us to revise those views which have partly found their expression even in the resolutions of the VI. Congress, and perhaps to formulate somewhat more precisely the resolution submitted to the Plenum in which it is said that "there are now frequent cases when the lower links of the reformist trade unions are compelled to stand up against the trade union bureaucrats." I believe the lower links of the reformist trade unions as a whole are going to remain loyal to the end to the employers and the bourgeoisie. This development is associated with the development of Social Democracy in the direction of Fascism and with the fascisation process in the trade unions, and this should cause us to tackle differently the question of capturing the trade unions. The question of capturing the trade unions constitutes part of the problem of winning the majority of the working class, but these tasks, of course, are not to be co-ordinated in the manner that this is done by the Rights, for instance, in Germany. They believe that to raise the question

of working among the unorganised is to abandon the idea of winning the majority of the working class. On the contrary, just because by limiting our work to the trade unions we cannot achieve decisive success in view of the fact that the situation and circumstances have changed; just because of this, we should rely in our work upon the unorganised and upon the organs which represent the working class as a whole, such as the strike committees and the factory councils. These organs should be put in opposition to the reformist apparatus in order to undermine the influence of this apparatus directly in the factory. For this reason the problem of the unorganised acquires tremendous importance. Even more characteristic than the views of the Brandler group in Germany are those of the "non-Right" and "non-conciliator" people in England. Comrade Lozovsky has quoted here from a letter by Gossip in which the latter writes:

"I must express my utter amazement and indignation at the idea of aiding non-members of trade unions in time of strikes. The idea of putting non-trade union members on the strike committees is simply absurd, and I do not believe that even the most reactionary among our Right friends would agree to such a reactionary and treacherous proposal."

Comrades, the trouble is not that Gossip was able to write such a letter, but rather that the views expressed by Gossip do not meet with proper repudiation either in the C. P. G. B. or in the Minority Movement, but on the contrary, they are even defended.

The tactics of the **Minority Movement** in the question of the unorganised are modelled after the worst reformist samples. I have in mind the slogan of 100% organisation in that distorted shape in which it is applied in England. The Minority Movement, while sometimes exercising quite efficient leadership during strikes, sticks to the same old demands of engaging workers only through the union, and only union men. This is what they call 100% trade unionism. In the history of the trade union movement this has led to the formation of company unions, because it furnishes the ground for collaboration between the trade unions and the employers. On our part it is entirely inexpedient to raise such a slogan in the revolutionary movement, because it widens the cleavage between the organised and the unorganised, because it sows the seed of mistrust towards the unorganised. If you raise this slogan in the clothing industry, as it was done in England, in which the percentage of organised workers is below the average percentage of organised workers in England generally, you cannot go on to invite the unorganised to joint action, you cannot put them on the strike committees, you cannot anticipate their full support. This demand is directed against 70% of the workers in this branch of industry.

In the theses, as well as in the reports, the problem of new trade unions was not treated in a manner in which it should have been treated. Although politically the question was correctly stated; nevertheless if we should proceed to work on the formation of the new trade unions in a number of countries, we should not limit ourselves to the general political statement of the question, but should also say how the new trade unions should be built. We have sufficient experience in the building of trade unions, and from this experience we ought to draw some lessons. For instance, our unions have failed to carry out such elementary trade union activity as the formation of strike funds. Strike benefits are raised by means of chance collections from time to time. Both in England and in America, where they are now forming new Red trade unions, the latter never mention the task of raising funds to aid the strikers. If we wish to form real mass and fighting organisations, it should be our common task to create strike funds to support strikers. Of course, this does not mean going to extremes, as this was done by Hais.

Our Red trade unions do not reveal their political face with sufficient clearness and distinctness, concealing it behind sundry vague and evasive formulae, unmindful of the fact that we can only gain by stating our position quite definitely. The English Miners Union in its rules, in the basic document of that organisation, has failed even to mention about the class struggle. Judging by the fact that our new unions in America are sho-

wing lack of vigour and decision, we may conclude that they are also insufficiently laying stress on the difference between the revolutionary and the reformist trade unions. Of course, this is connected with passiveness, and at times also with the fact that in the ranks of these Red trade unions we have no real Communist leaders and the work is done by miscellaneous elements.

On looking at the organisational structure of the new unions, one realises with amazement that these are not industrial unions, but the devil knows what. We simply take the organisational scheme of structure in the nearest reformist trade union and build our union accordingly.

Add to this the lack of practice, the factional strife within the trade unions as is particularly observed in America, that people are chosen haphazard, that it even happens that there are at the head of the trade unions perfect outsiders, e. g. dental surgeons, and it will become clear why in building the new unions we have not yet reached the stage of forming real mass trade unions.

In connection with the question of strike committees the question was raised here whether they should exist as permanent or temporary organs. My answer to this question is that in Germany there is no sense and no need to retain the existing strike committees after the conclusion of the fight; yet in France, where the task of forming factory councils is now on the other of the day, it is necessary to emphasise more sharply the idea that the factory councils are historically born of the strike committees, and that in France the strike committees should be turned into factory councils after the termination of the strike.

(Piatnitsky: But then they ought to assume quite a different form. This is the main thing.)

I believe it to be necessary to emphasise the idea more sharply, because in France there is vacillation on the question of the formation of the factory councils, and I believe it is necessary to overcome this vacillation.

I should now like to express but one more wish in connection with self-criticism. We are interested in the development of self-criticism in our Sections. The trade unions are those organs which should take the initiative in the development of self-criticism. Particularly backward in this respect are our comrades in Great Britain, where there has been almost no self-criticism. The mistakes of the leaders in Great Britain are almost exclusively of a Right character. These mistakes of the leadership have been far from sufficiently criticised. So far there is no Right Wing in England, precisely because the Right mistakes of the leadership have not been sufficiently criticised and corrected. I should further like to express the wish that self-criticism should be extended to the Profintern itself, so that in our Profintern here in Moscow, at the top, there should also be a firm course taken for the development of self-criticism.

Comrade REIMANN (Czechoslovakia):

Comrades, the question of the development in Czechoslovakia during the last year since the World Congress, especially in the domain of the trade union struggle, is one in which a tremendous interest has been taken by this Plenum; nevertheless I must observe that some of the remarks were not sufficiently to the point.

I should like to refer to the features which characterise the situation in Czechoslovakia. The most important feature since the VI. World Congress is the fact that the Czechoslovakian proletariat has taken up new, superior forms of the class struggle under the deliberate leadership of the Communist Party and the Red trade unions. This adoption of new, superior forms of the struggle under the leadership of the Communist Party was revealed in Czechoslovakia in the fights of the textile workers and of the agricultural labourers. Another feature consists in the development of the determined fight against the liquidators and for overcoming them. A third feature consists, however, in the persistence of strong opportunistic tendencies in Czechoslovakia, both in the Communist

Party and in the ranks of the Red trade unions which have cleared out the avowed liquidators. In my opinion, these are the central features of the situation which should be examined here.

Next I am going to refer to the turning which we have effected in the course of the economic fights. In connection with the textile workers' strike in February of the current year there were various wrong conceptions revealed in the ranks of the C. I., to the effect that the textile workers' fight did not really constitute a turning point in the development of the fights in Czechoslovakia, so that the tactics of the Party have not been correct. In order to get the right view of the textile workers' fight, one must understand under what difficulties the fight was waged in Czechoslovakia; we had to carry on the fight in a situation when not only the reformists intervened as an active force of the bourgeoisie and played openly the role of strikebreakers, but also the greater part of the trade union militants and of the Party membership tried to restrict the development of the class struggle of the textile workers while strikebreaking developed within the ranks of the Communist Party and of the Red trade unions. Comrade Thalman has already referred to the fact that in one factory the functionaries of the Red trade union organised strikebreaking under the protection of the gendarmerie. What was the task of the Party in such a situation? The task of the Party arose from the fact that for years we had pursued in Czechoslovakia a false policy, an entirely opportunistic line in the economic fight. This false policy was expressed in the fact that the Party has totally neglected to organise the masses independently, that the leadership of the Red trade unions had consistently pursued in every fight the policy of top alliances with the reformist leaders. Having carried on this practice for years, it was naturally a good deal more difficult for the Party and the Red trade unions to develop in the ranks of the Czechoslovakian proletariat the recognition of the necessity for independent leadership of the economic fights. Under such circumstances it was the task of the textile workers' strike to demonstrate practically to the proletariat the possibility of organising mass fights upon an independent basis and in defiance of the reformists. Owing to the resistance to this policy in our own ranks, we were not in a position to mobilise the whole of the textile workers for the fight. During the preparations for the struggle we witnessed such phenomena when the major part of our functionaries in the Party and in the trade unions persisted in the wrong policy of 'Zwingt die Bonzen' (compel the bureaucrats). This policy during the textile workers' strike was connected with a legalistic attitude on the question of wage agreements.

The result was that in the development of the strike there were two lines: one line represented by the Red trade unions and another line which the Left opposition of the Communist Party tried to carry out. The consequence of these two lines in the revolutionary front was that it was possible only to embrace 8000 of the textile workers involved in the fight, and that the fight had to be given up within a few days. Can it therefore be said that the textile workers' fight was a defeat? This would be a wrong appraisal of the fact. It ought to be pointed out that the textile workers' fight in Czechoslovakia has signified that for the first time the Czech proletariat has taken up the new way of organising the economic fights. The result of the textile workers' fight in Czechoslovakia was that we have been able to carry out new economic fights upon a wider basis. The consistent conduct of the textile workers' strike has enabled us to get the large masses of the Czech workers to take up new fights upon the basis of independent leadership. In recent months a fresh wave of economic fights has set in against capitalist rationalisation fights which were waged against the open resistance of the employers, reformists, and also the liquidators.

During this period we have effected the mobilisation of the agricultural workers in Slovakia for the fight. 25,000 agricultural labourers have taken part in this fight, in a situation when the other organisations, the reformists as well as the liquidators, organised blacklegging. The agricultural labourers' strike in Slovakia has shown that there is a tremendous amount of fighting energy stored up in the masses of the proletariat and it is only a question of the practical application of the new line by the Communists and the Red trade unions.

What phenomena do we see in the agricultural labourers' strike? The outstanding feature is the political accentuation of the fight. In a situation when the strike was declared illegal by the authorities on the ground of a collective agreement signed by the reformists, and the appeals for the strike and the strike meetings were forbidden, the agricultural labourers took up for the first time the fight not only in defiance of the gendarmerie, but also of the military.

In the course of the agricultural labourers' strike there was a mutiny in the army involving two companies who refused to do strike-breaking work. The agricultural labourers defied also the state authorities. We have seen how the agricultural labourers have put up a proper resistance to the application of fascist methods by the bourgeoisie. Thus, the agricultural labourers' fight in Czechoslovakia has also been the expression of the recognition of the present political development by the masses.

Comrades, I can describe only briefly the development of the economic fights in Czechoslovakia. I should like, above all, to summarise here the general results and lessons of these fights. The outstanding feature in these fights is that the bourgeoisie has resorted to the methods of fascist terror, while the social-fascists have shown themselves in Czechoslovakia as a force working for the defeat of the proletarian masses. A characteristic of social fascism is the general line pursued by the reformist trade unions in our country. The German reformist trade unions have held a national conference at which the only item of the agenda was: "the fight against the Communist putsch tactics".

The general rule issued by the reformists at that conference was that when a strike was carried on by the Communists the workers should continue to work under all circumstances, i. e. to act as blacklegs. I believe these decisions are a clear expression of the social-fascist evolution of reformist blacklegging in Czechoslovakia. Moreover, we have had economic fights in which the central committees of the reformist trade unions acted as agencies for the employers in securing strikebreakers. To this treacherous role of the social-democracy should be added that the liquidators, who have been expelled from our ranks, are now taking over the role of the social democracy. This was shown during the agricultural labourers' strike when Hais declared that his organisation (the A. V.) has nothing to do with this fight, that it was a political fight organised by the Communist Party. The liquidators have openly stabbed the strikers in the back during the economic fights. The outcome is quite clear. We now find that in Czechoslovakia the question of independent leadership of the economic fights is not only the question of the fight against the reformists, but also the question of the fight against the liquidators. This should be pointed out in particular, because lately we have seen definite tendencies towards leaving the strike leadership, if not to the reformists, at least to the liquidators. It has already been mentioned by Comrade Gey that our strike coffers in Czechoslovakia are fairly empty. This has led to the tendency of leaving the strike leadership to the Hais crowd on purely financial grounds. Hais has also taken up the strike leadership in some cases, naturally for the express purpose of throttling the strikes as quickly as possible. Such facts go to show that in our ranks there are still very strong Right dangers among a section of the leaders and functionaries of the Red trade unions who formally subscribe to the Party's line, but are not capable of carrying out this line in practice.

As in Germany, these wrong tendencies are reflected in a wrong position on the question of strike funds, as well as in the notion that without official recognition of the Red trade unions by the authorities it will not be possible to carry out constant trade union activity. Leading comrades do not raise the question of the fight for the legalisation of the Red trade unions, but rather the question that without legal recognition the Red trade unions cannot carry on the fight. These tendencies show how still strong are the ideas of legalism, the opportunist tendencies within the Red trade unions. The example of the textile workers' strike has shown that these opportunist tendencies exist not only among the heads, but among fairly large masses, down to the cadres of functionaries in the Red trade unions. During the textile workers' strike we have seen

that generally the unorganised women and youths were far more active than the majority of the workers organised in the Red trade unions, especially the functionaries. How should we account for this? This was due to the fact that even in the Red trade unions the opportunist leadership in the course of years has brought about a situation that the Red trade unions primarily rely upon the highly skilled workers while the role of the unskilled workers is rather slighted. It is not merely a problem of removing a few opportunist functionaries at the head, but we are primarily confronted with the problem of changing the social basis of the Red trade unions among the masses of workers, of invigorating the Red trade unions by forces drawn from the ranks of the unorganised and semi-skilled workers.

Comrades, I should like to deal here with one more problem which confronts us in the Red trade unions in connection with some opportunist phenomena lately revealed. This problem relates to the application of the new tactics in the factory council elections in Czechoslovakia. A change is indispensable in this matter, because the lists of candidates put up by the Red trade unions were drawn up by a few functionaries at the head without consulting the workers in the factories, because in some cases the comrades refused to include unorganised workers in these lists, or oppositional workers from the reformist trade unions. As against this, it ought to be pointed out that in connection with factory council elections the Red trade unions, while retaining the leadership, should rely upon a broader basis and apply the tactics of the united front from below. This is one of the most important problems in Czechoslovakia. I regret that this question has not been sufficiently dealt with in the trade union theses when the question of the factory councils was under discussion.

I only wish to say a few words about the contents of the theses. I believe in these theses the problem of the trade union movement in countries with dual trade unions has not been adequately treated. Especially, I believe, the question of the factory council elections, and of our activity within the reformist trade unions in such countries, should have been stated more strongly. Further, the Czechoslovakian delegation finds no elaboration of the problem of the unemployed in these theses. Finally, we do not find in the theses an adequate concretisation of the question of the effect of fascism and fascistisation upon the development of the economic fights themselves. The Trade Union Commission will introduce a series of motions on these questions. I may say, however, that we generally agree with the theses that have been submitted and approve the policy outlined in them.

Comrade BELA KUN (Hungary):

Comrades, on the whole I agree with Comrade Lozovsky's criticism of the Communist Party of Hungary, especially with regard to the elections to the social insurance bodies. To be brief I will say the following: the greatest mistake of the Party in the sphere of trade union work was the absence of mass tactics, inadequate work in the factories on the one hand, and insufficient popularisation of the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U., the vacillations since the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. and the VI. Congress of the Comintern on the other. The Party engaged in self-criticism after the defeat in the social insurance elections and also on the question of the tactics in the miners' strike. But that self-criticism was inadequate. Some comrades of the Central Committee thought that mistakes were made not only in the lower Party organisations. It was my opinion that also the leaders made some blunders.

It must be made clear here that the great struggle of the Hungarian miners conducted under our leadership was not given a political character. But here, too, there was mere formal criticism. An admission was made that the leaders committed blunders but no conclusions were drawn from that as to the future. The self-criticism remained on paper. I have the same impression with regard to the self-criticism on the question of the social insurance elections.

It is true, that the Party made the mistake of applying the united front tactics at the top, and in some cases only at

the top so that a joint committee was set up with the social-fascists without taking any steps to insure revolutionary influence. It is true, that the Party leaders busied themselves with making alliances at the top instead of trying to mobilise the masses. But what is bad is that many Party members still think it possible to bring under the pressure of the masses the leaders who brought about a united front of our Party with a social-fascist group in opposition to another group of social-fascists, the social-democrats. This is a relic of the old tactics which were applied prior to the VI. World Congress, tactics internationally known as the tactics of bringing pressure to bear on the bureaucrats.

The chief fallacy of our trade union tactic was for a long time the tactic of trade union legalism. This trade union legalism was adhered to not only in the social-democratic trade unions but also in the new unions in which there are many good radical workers but which have leaders whose "non-politicalism" is just as much social-fascist as the tendencies of the social-democratic trade union leaders. Nothing was said about this in our Party's self-criticism. Self-criticism is a good thing but when it is applied after a defeat it must deal also with substantial matters. In the social insurance elections it was seen that about 13,000 workers instinctively followed the Right tactics and handed in white ballot papers although the Party's appeal issued 3 days before the elections and directed against the fascists did hardly reach the workers.

Another mistake in the self-criticism of our Party is that in the thesis on the elections it is not yet emphatically stated that work in the factories is the chief method of winning over the masses and that this work must be greatly increased. This question should have given greatest prominence in the self-criticism.

Various Right errors were made from various directions in our Party also on the trade union question. The latest big mistake was made in the social insurance elections which has only strengthened the Right tendencies. I think that the mistakes to be observed in the work of the Party known as "Left" are also Right mistakes which will be rooted out in the immediate future. I hope that with the assistance of the C. I. and the R. I. L. U. a correct policy will be pursued in our trade union and general work.

Comrade CAMPBELL (England):

At a meeting of the Profintern Executive just before this Plenum, the complaint was made that at the last conference of the Minority Movement in England, the Minority Movement had not placed on its agenda the important question of the independent organisation of economic strikes. The English comrades who were present at this meeting of the Profintern were able to show that, if the Minority Movement had made a mistake, a certain amount of responsibility fell on the shoulders of the Profintern, because the Profintern at its last Congress had edited a resolution on the tasks of the Minority Movement in England, in which there is not a word about the independent organisation of economic struggles. When we brought forward this at the Profintern, the reply was that the independent organisation of economic struggles is in the general resolution! So you have the peculiar argument developed that there is a Chinese wall separating the general resolution from the resolutions applying to any sections; that you lay down general principles in your general resolution, but when you come to apply those principles to any sections you forget them.

You have the peculiar dualism of an international resolution laying down general principles, whereas in the English resolution those principles are not applied; on the contrary, what it still shows is the old line which was the practice of the English Party previous to the 9th Plenum and previous to the 4th Congress of the R. I. L. U. So much does this dualism exist that Comrade Gey comes on to the platform this morning and makes a criticism of the English Party which is really a criticism of the Profintern. What, says Comrade Gey, you are still talking about 100% trade unionism? In the third period, in the era of Mondism and the fusion of the trade

union apparatus with the capitalist state, you are still talking in England of a 100% trade unionism?

I turn to the Profintern resolution on the tasks of the Minority Movement in Great Britain, and there I find the programme of action of the Minority Movement. The first point of that programme of action is: to campaign for 100% trade unionism and the formation wherever possible workshop committees.

Therefore, our complaint at the Profintern was that the general principles of the new trade union tactics stressed in the International Resolution were forgotten when it came to drawing up the specific English resolution, and therefore some of the defects in the Minority Movement the Profintern must bear its share of the responsibility.

I want to deal here with three questions: the question of new unionism, the question of the capture of the apparatus, and the question of the organisation of the expelled.

It was the proud boast of the English unions up to recently that they alone had been able to maintain unity because they had allowed complete freedom of expression to all sections of the working class. Today it is no longer possible to retain that proud boast, because we have within the Scottish coalfield and in the tailors and garment workers union, new unions being formed.

In Scotland there were roughly 110,000 miners, and of those miners 90,000 were more or less in continuous employment. Of the total number employed and unemployed, roughly 300,000 were organised in a series of district unions combined in a federation. In the entire Scottish coalfield the Party had members and with those 350 members we went out to fight for the control of the reformist unions in Scotland.

We succeeded in the early stages in capturing a number of positions in Fife and Lanarkshire; but whereas in Fife we had a Left Wing and Communist majority combined, in Lanarkshire, although we had Communists selected to union positions we were in a minority. In Lanarkshire, because our Party members did not pursue correct tactics, those Communist officials were to a considerable extent the prisoners of the bureaucracy and found it very difficult to operate in a proper fashion. Then after we had won those district unions we went out to capture the official positions in the federation itself — in the Scottish Miners Union. Ballot votes were taken throughout the Scottish coalfields, and the members of Lanarkshire and Fife, the two strongest unions in the federation, elected the Communist officials. If the conference of the Scottish Union had been held, and those unions had gone to that conference to vote in favour of the Communist officials as they were demanded to do by their membership, there would have been Communist control in the Scottish union. Here the bureaucracy commenced to sabotage. They postponed the conference first on the technical question of finance. Then after two or three months, they abandoned the technical question of finance and came out with the direct political question of the Communists were unfit for the leadership of a miners union because they could not represent the miners but were represent orders from Moscow.

Immediately the bureaucracy refused to call the conference we undertook to take a new line. Our line was to get complete control of the Lanarkshire and Fifeshire Miners' Unions, and with those two unions as our base, to call a conference of the heads of the Scottish bureaucracy at which we would set up our new officials in their positions. This tactic was only partially successful. In Fife we had got control of the union, we had dismissed the General Secretary of the union — a small man, but a man who had been a Labour Party Minister in 1924, and is a Labour Cabinet Minister today. In Lanarkshire we met with a certain check, which was due to certain political mistakes, but was above all due to the weakness and the poor quality of the Party members who were operating in that particular district.

By the end of August it became perfectly clear that what had gone as far as we could within the reformist apparatus that the Party had to decide to submit to the tactics of the apparatus, and allow the old leadership to remain, or if it had to prepare its members and the Left wing workers in association

h them for breaking up that apparatus and forming a v United Mine Workers' Union in Scotland, I am surprised the suggestion in Comrade Lozovsky's speech that the Proern had been crying out for a whole year that we ought form a new union in Scotland, and that slowly and reluctantly had come over to the opinion of the Profintern. At the narity Movement Conference last August, there was no estion raised of forming a new union in Scotland, and y the question was raised of beginning the preparations forming a new union for seamen. The first time this question s raised was in September of last year, in the Political Bureau the British Party, and then it was agreed that preparations ould be made to form a new union in Scotland. For that pose we called a conference in Falkirk last October, a nference which aimed to set up a net-work of "Save the ion" Committees all over Scotland. These committees were rganise the independent struggle of the workers against the reaurcary apparatus. They were set up in districts where reformists had control of the local branch of the union in ler to function as a parallel apparatus preparing the ground the formation of a new union.

We do not agree with the criticism subsequently expressed the Profintern that we ought to have formed a new union this conference. A new union, comrades, is a serious business, has got to be well prepared. The membership have got to derstand it and got to be mobilised to carry it through. The ft wing workers who had been co-operating with us in the l union have got to be brought over to the idea of breaking th the old union apparatus. It was necessary to spend several onths preparing the mass of our members, selecting the most ourable opportunity, and the favourable opportunity we ected was when the M. F. G. B. bureaucracy, through its nmission, had turned down the demand of the Scottish rank d file for the new officials to be allowed to hold office. tis was the point to break, and when that point came, the mbership in Scotland were ready, there was no hesitation. fortnight after the M. F. G. B. decision the new union cards ere out in Lanarkshire, and we were driving steadily ahead wards a new union.

It is true, that in the preparatory stages many weaknesses ere evident. For instance, in Lanarkshire in the early stages Communist activity in that union, a reconstruction report as passed making the union more democratic, reducing the aries of the higher paid officials and so on. One of the ess failures of our comrades in Lanarkshire was that they led to fight for the adoption of this report when it was botaged by the bureaucracy. Secondly, when the elections were ld in 1928 and we were not a Left wing majority, the Left ing in the Lanarkshire Union adhered to the old custom that e new Executive which was elected in June should only take lice at its prescribed time on August 1st. As a consequence adhering to this constitutional custom two months were st, and with that two months we might have rallied the embership of that union against the law courts and against e old bureaucracy. Our failure to do so hampered us very uch.

Our greatest failure in Lanarkshire was that we did not e the necessity of the Party conducting independent economic ruggles in that coalfield and bringing the Communist secretary the official union into line heading those economic struggles. ecause of that, the fight in Lanarkshire, in the opinion of the eat majority of the workers, degenerated into a fight between omunists and reformists over the question of union jobs, d thousands of workers, some of them because they were oluntary, others because they saw the union doing hting, left the union in disgust and increased our difficulties.

On the other hand, in the Fife coalfield, where we had ntrol of the union right from the start, we were able to rry on a constant series of economic struggles which preserved e membership of that union to a greater extent.

I think from the experience in Scotland we could draw rtain principles with regard to the formation of new unions. t a country where the union movement has hitherto been ited, the first principle is that we must exhaust the possibili- es of working within the old apparatus, combining that work th the organisation of independent economic struggles. Se-

condly, we must work for the leadership of the masses of the workers in strikes and in lockouts, so that we are known not to the handful of active workers who attend their trade union branches, but to the wide masses of the workers through our open leadership of economic and political struggles. Thirdly, we must be well dug in in the enterprises and have an influence over the masses in the factories. At the same time we consider it absolutely necessary to safeguard ourselves against ad- venturism with regard to new unions. It is not enough that a Communist official should be expelled; it is not enough that the bureaucracy shall destroy their own rules; it is not enough that the Communists shall be presented with documents before we should split the union. We may have all these things and still it may be the height of stupidity to drive to a new union if the Communists have not previously, by their independent leadership and by their activity in the union, won a substantial proportion of workers to make a new union right from the start a proposition not of adventure, but a proposition based on the support of workers in important sections of the industry under dispute.

This brings us to the allied question of the apparatus; Comrade Lozovsky made a statement in his speech which I believe requires a certain amount of clarification. Comrade Lozovsky stated that the trade union apparatus had now been so fused with the capitalist State that it was no more possible to talk of the capture of the trade union apparatus than it was to talk of the capture of the capitalist State. Perhaps Comrade Lozovsky has a different definition of apparatus from the one I am going to put forward. I take the apparatus to mean not only the Executive Committee of the Union, but the whole network of trade union branches, district committees, shop delegates, and organisers of the union who do the detailed daily work of carrying out the union business. If apparatus is accepted in this sense, then we cannot possibly believe that it is possible to capture the whole trade union apparatus by constitutional means. As our experience in England has shown us, long before we are able to do that, the bureaucracy will have split the union.

However, we can to a considerable extent still capture the lower official positions, and therefore in every economic struggle we must still continue, even if we know we cannot capture the apparatus as a whole, to direct the attention of the trade union membership to fight to expel the reactionary bureaucracy, and to direct the attention of those new workers whom we pull into the union also to fight against the reactionary bureaucracy. I think the best formulation of this question is that given in the German resolution of the Profintern in which we read as follows:

"The struggle for gaining the trade union official positions in the lower units of the trade unions, in the factories, and in the trade union organisations, and for their transformation into organs of the class struggle, should be waged with particular persistence and in accordance with set plans, particularly in the large factories and in the essential branches of industry. In this manner the opposition strengthens its influence among the masses and creates favourable conditions for the combat of the splitting policy of the reformists."

Therefore on this question of the apparatus, I think that the formulation of Comrade Lozovsky was too simplified and too schematic.

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

Comrades, it seems to me that the question of illegal trade unions was correctly put by Comrade Lozovsky. This question is of enormous importance, and yet it is conspicuous by its absence in the theses. It is an important question because the number of illegal trade union organisations is growing from day to day, i. e. organisations deprived of a legal basis and legal positions. On the other hand, as repression against the revolutionary trade union movement grows, Right, legalist tendencies are naturally increasing within the revolutionary trade unions, that is to say, tendencies to limit the scope of the revolutionary trade union movement.

The opportunist argument against illegal trade unions is — that underground existence means **isolation** of the revolutionary vanguard from the masses. Under illegal conditions it is of course impossible to have a mass trade union **organisation** with an apparatus, premises, funds, etc. But it is possible to have **illegal cadres** of revolutionary trade unions capable of **leading strikes** in the present period of strike-movements and of playing a leading political role.

The next question is that of **structural changes** in the trade unions. This question is of enormous importance to our tactic, because if we do not take into consideration what is going on in the trade union movement, in the correlation of forces of the **organised** and the **unorganised**, we will not be able to explain the remarkable fact that although the number of unorganised workers is so enormous (90—95%), the whole question turned for all these years round the trade unions. I think that we must differentiate between separate branches of industry, we must find out the state of affairs in the decisive branches of industry. We must take engineers, miners and transport workers, if we want to understand what is going on. We will find that these branches of industry are the best organised: in Britain one million miners, 60—70% of whom are organised, — even now about 625,000 organised miners. In Germany 60 to 65% of the miners are organised. In Czechoslovakia, no less than 60% are organised in trade unions. In Germany where the approximate number of workers employed in the engineering industry is 3,600,000, about one million are organised in the A. D. G. B., to be exact, 850—900,000.

This shows that side by side with the most important problem of the "third period" (the problem of the unorganised), we have the acute problem of **capturing the workers organised in the reformist trade unions**.

It seems to me, that the figures given here by Comrade Thälmann to show the structural changes in the A. D. G. B. between 1923 and 1925, are inadequate, because the years 23, 24 and 25 in Germany were marked by an enormous wage rise after the catastrophic wage reduction during inflation, when wages constituted only 20—25% of the pre-war level. I think that this is not only a question of structural changes, but also of increase of the real wage. Otherwise, it would be impossible to explain the number of workers in the reformist trade unions.

Finally, the third question is that brought up by Comrade Lozovsky. After settling correctly and successfully his differences with the Right, the opportunists, Comrade Lozovsky unexpectedly named me and then, instead of quoting what I have written, began to quote **himself**. Those who heard him got the impression that Smoliansky too is affected by some opportunist deviation. And yet, the contrary is the case. Let us take the article in the "Bolshevik" which Comrade Lozovsky modestly omitted to quote. The article contains the following statement:

"No provocation on the part of the trade union apparatus can be strong enough to compel the Communists to give up working for the capture of the reformist unions through the capture of their rank and file."

This is, by the by, also contained in the theses laid before the X. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. Where is the capture of the reformist trade union apparatus mentioned here? I want also to draw your attention to the resolution of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. drawn up by Comrade Lozovsky. This resolution contains the following statement:

"The central task of the followers of the R. I. L. U. is capture of reformist trade unions",

i. e. including, evidently, the reformist trade union apparatus. You will not find this in my statement. My statement says clearly: "Capture of reformist trade unions through capture of their rank and file".

The next sentence which relates to another thought, is as follows:

"The ever-growing association of the reformist trade union apparatus with the bourgeois State tempts one to compare the reformist trade union apparatus with the bourgeois State apparatus."

The article speaks of prevention of mistakes made at the II. Congress of the Comintern by Gallacher against which the

whole Congress got up in arms at the time. Gallacher then that the reformist trade unions consist of **deliberate reactionary elements**. By the by, the same thing was said in 1929 by Comrade Lozovsky in the trade union commission. This was published in one of the numbers of the "Communist International". Hence, Gallacher's inference that we need to work there. I intended to emphasise the necessity of working in the reformist trade unions, and this was my only reason for saying that one cannot compare mechanically the trade union apparatus with the State apparatus. In the State apparatus of the bourgeoisie we do not seek to be elected to official positions whereas in the reformist trade unions we do. We know that the reformists will not give us the trade union apparatus and we will not get it till the proletarian revolution, but we are endeavouring to have our comrades elected. When they are expelled, we use such expulsion for agitation among the masses in order to expose the reformists before them.

By the bye, the resolution of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. on this subject, also sanctioned by Comrade Lozovsky, contains the following statement: "Revolutionary minorities must put up an energetic fight for the capture of elective organs of the reformist trade unions."

(Piatnitsky: "And now?")

I said that we are struggling for this. Comrade Lozovsky did not read the article carefully enough, which placed him in a rather awkward position. Comrade Lozovsky was very emphatic in declaring that neither in the third period (a lesson to Smoliansky!) can one give definite formulations. But I would like to say to Comrade Lozovsky that neither in the third, nor in the second period, can one give one week a very definite formulation in one direction and repudiate it the next week just as emphatically, which happened in a recent number of the "Communist International", in an article on deliberately reactionary members of reformist trade unions.

As to the second accusation levelled at me by Comrade Lozovsky concerning strike committees — that they can be set against trade unions (namely reformist unions) — I merely brought forward what is said in the economic theses proposed by the Presidium to the X. Plenum. Moreover, that is an explanation to it: "In the sense of creating a series of transitional forms towards a new trade union organisation. As far as I remember, you were yourself in favour of this formulation in the trade union commission.

In conclusion, I would like to say to Comrade Lozovsky that in his hunt for vague formulations which might be interpreted as opportunist deviations, in order to make his resolution fuller and more picturesque, he missed the mark and followed a wrong clue. If he wants to find a vague formulation which offers a way out in any direction, he would do best to look for it in his own collected works. (Applause.)

Comrade DENG (China):

Since the time of the defeat of the great Chinese Revolution the Chinese Trade Union Movement has gone through three stages. The first started with the crushing of the Canton Revolution and went on from December 1927 till May 1928. During this period there was a general mood of depression among the working class.

The second stage, ushered in by the Japanese massacre at Tsinang, went on from May till October 1928. During this period the working class had already recovered from the mood of depression caused by the defeat and was ready to put up defence.

The third phase started with the postmen's strike in October 1928 and is still going on. The strike of postmen and railway officials exercised a tremendous influence over the labour movement throughout the country. The depressed atmosphere of depression was completely gone; there was a general spirit of militancy which extended to artisans, commercial employees, and industrial workers. Shanghai was the starting point and the whole country became involved. The class struggle in China began to gain again in scope and intensity.

There are no statistics of the strikes for the whole country, there are data for Shanghai. In 1928, in the year which showed the great defeat, there were 239,000 people on strike in Shanghai. In comparison with 1926, when 202,000 people were on strike, this means an increase of more than 37,000, and in comparison with 1927 when 230,000 were on strike, it means a further increase of 9,000. (Of course, the strikes which occurred during the revolts in 1926 and 1927 are not included in these figures.) These figures show that in spite of the defeat in the great revolution, the struggle of the working class has not ceased; it has only assumed a more economic character.

Towards the end of the year the struggle of the Shanghai workers developed in stormy fashion. The wave of fighting spread through the whole country, particularly through North China. Even in reactionary Canton subdued by the worst regime error, small labour fights and strikes are now starting.

A breach has been made in the ruling bloc composed of the bourgeoisie and the feudal landowners. The war between Chiang Kai-shek and the Kwangsi group is at an end; the fight between Chiang Kai-shek and Feng Yu-hsiang has begun. As during the time of the Pejang militarists, a permanent war of generals is now going on. The disintegration of the reactionary ruling bloc will afford new possibilities to the working class for the development of the class struggle.

Ever since the betrayal of the revolution, the white terror in the centre of the labour policies of Kuomintang. The Kuomintang has repeatedly suppressed the revolutionary trade unions and has established the white trade unions in their place.

In connection with the Tsinang massacre in May of last year, the resisting power of the working class has gradually weakened to a perceptible degree. Even the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang realises full well that it is not going to manage to work with the white trade unions alone. In order to avoid the intensification of the contradictions between the white trade unions and the revolutionary workers, the yellow trade unions were formed which were meant to achieve what the white trade unions have failed to achieve. Thus the yellow trade unions constitute a new weapon of the Kuomintang against the working class. Naturally, this does not mean to say that the former part of the white trade unions have ceased to exist.

When the Kuomintang went over into the counter-revolutionary camp, it immediately abolished the gains of the working class that were achieved in blood during the "Communist riot". The foreign and Chinese capitalists are still carrying on their united offensive against the workers. The living conditions of the workers have grown incredibly worse: there has been a general reduction in wages and a lengthening of the working hours; the conditions of labour have grown more strenuous, the treatment of the workers has become worse, and there has been a tremendous intensification of the unemployment crisis. The Labour Legislation Draft worked out by the Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Kuomintang government pursued only one purpose, to show it to Albert Thomas, the head of the Labour Office of Geneva (the watchdog of the imperialists), during his journey of "inspection" through China, and also to publish the draft in the press in order to nurture the illusions of a section of the workers in regard to the Kuomintang. This legislation has not yet been officially promulgated (since no amendments have been introduced, I take it for certain that it is never going to be promulgated). The Kuomintang has failed to carry out a single reform, but is only temporarily pursuing a "policy of charity" in order to have some good deeds to show. For instance, Chiang Kai-shek when travelling on the railway has now and then donated from ten thousand to twenty thousand yens to the railwaymen, or Feng Yu-hsiang has established some baths for the workers. Such petty charitable deeds are calculated to commend the Kuomintang generals to the workers, to render them personally popular. Naturally, those Kuomintang groups that are not in the Government, e. g., the reorganisation group of Wan Tsin-wei, Cheng Kung-bo, etc., are carrying on vigorous propaganda for their reform policies. They resort to revolutionary phraseology in order to sow illusions among the backward elements of the working class.

The Kuomintang has pursued no policy of social-reform, but a policy of national reform. Let us examine the following

propaganda slogans: "The class interests ought to be sacrificed for the national interests"; "Vigorous increase in production for the sake of the fatherland"; "No strikes and sabotage during the reconstruction period"; "We must work untiringly and patiently for the wealth and strength of China and for the welfare of posterity", and so on. A policy of iron and blood is employed to force the workers to accept this creed. Nevertheless, the influence of national reformism is steadily weakening.

First, we ought to get a clear picture as to whether there is an economic basis for reformism in China. To this question we ought to answer with an emphatic no. With 100% of caution we must declare that such a basis is exceedingly slight. For China is a semi-colonial country:

a) The imperialists are anxious to extract ever-larger profits and will certainly allow no amelioration in the economic conditions of the workers.

b) The economic services of the national bourgeoisie are too slight; only by ruthless exploitation of the workers would they be able to hold their own against the foreign capitalists.

c) The slight number of workers classed among the labour aristocracy will not allow the bourgeoisie to depend upon the labour aristocracy as a group.

Therefore, reformism in China cannot strike deep roots as it did in Europe and America. The opportunists refuse to understand this truth.

Therefore, the basis of the yellow trade unions is very weak. There were already yellow trade unions in China in the past. For instance, in 1925 there existed in Shanghai a "Federation of Trade Unions". One attack by the Communists sufficed to wipe out that institution. The Mechanics Union of Kwantung is a federation of the engineering trades. In view of the fact that there is feeble industrial development in Kwantung and there are many unemployed mechanics, the workers are compelled to join this union in order to secure work and to earn their living. (The upkeepers of the Mechanics Union are old foremen and proprietors of small workshops.) It is only on account of these conditions that this union exists. Although for many years it had worn a cloak of reformism, it was subsequently compelled to resort to armed force (there were organised armed squads of 5-600 people) to keep the members under control and to curb their resistance. In reality, this Mechanics' Union is a semi-reformist, semi-fascist organisation.

The yellow trade unions which were suddenly formed in May of last year unquestionably owe their existence to political, and not economic reasons. It is equally clear that they are utilised by the counter-revolutionaries as an aid to the white trade unions. Originally, they were composed of representatives of the labour aristocracy, such as clerks and foremen (during the revolutionary period these people belonged also to the Red trade unions, but they had no right to be elected, so that the power in the trade unions was in the hands of the lower paid categories of workers and of Communists); but soon they became transformed into an appendage of the Kuomintang.

To-day the chief task of the so-called yellow trade unions is to help the Kuomintang in doing away with the strike as the fighting weapon of the workers. When the workers demand a strike, they do their utmost to prevent a strike or to urge arbitration instead of it. If a strike becomes unavoidable owing to pressure by our Party, or if a strike breaks out spontaneously, they promptly assume the leadership in order to keep off the Communists. For this reason, every strike manifesto invariably contains a passage full of abuses against the Communists. If they discover any active elements in the course of a strike, they brand them immediately as Communists and thereby threaten their freedom of action. They reject any support by other trade unions on the plea that "the Communists want to do disruptive work in our union". If a strike cannot be settled within a few days, they begin to spread all sorts of rumours, e. g., that the capitalists are stubborn, that the strike funds are exhausted, any kind of story likely to dishearten the workers. In this manner they direct the strike to the road of compromise and defeat. Frequently enough they have utilised a strike in collusion with the Kuomintang committee in order to extort money from the capitalists. If they fail in this, they incite the workers to go on with the strike while bargaining with the capitalists behind their backs. As soon as they get the amount

of money from the capitalists which they have asked for, they bother no more about the interests of the workers and compel them to return to work. If the workers refuse to give up the strike, they convene a general member meeting, and when the workers come to the meeting place, there are already soldiers and police to grab them and drive them to the factory by force.

We should not imagine that the so-called yellow trade unions in China, although they describe themselves as yellow, are the same as the reformist trade unions in Europe and America. We should not imagine the attitude of the masses to the yellow trade unions to be the same as it is to the reformist trade unions in Europe and America. We ought to know that the so-called yellow trade unions are made up of the collective membership of entire factories, that the union fees are deducted by the capitalists from the wages, and that the workers are thus compelled to be members of the organisation whether they like it or not. If we fail to take note of these peculiar circumstances, we shall make a big mistake in the appraisal of our movement.

We have as yet no exact statistics as to the present numerical strength of our Red trade unions. We have a relative stronghold only in Shanghai and Hongkong. The reasons for the weakness of the Red trade unions in China are: objectively, the brutality of the white terror, subjectively, the insufficient activity of our Party in the trade unions. If we take a glance back, we find that the membership of our revolutionary trade unions during the high tide of the great revolution reached 2.7 million. Yet organisationally the ties between the members and the unions were not sufficiently strong. When we had to go over from legality to illegality, combined with the reign of white terror, many of our trade unions collapsed completely. In this emergency our Party did not quickly enough, nor ably enough, find out the proper line for a new organisation. When this was finally found out, we did not possess sufficient determination and patience to carry it out, and thus the red trade unions have not yet been reconstructed.

Under the conditions of the white terror the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang will rather make some concessions to the workers' demands than allow a single active worker to remain in the factory. Such a worker is either immediately discharged or arrested. Such workers are not allowed to stay if they have but once taken part in a fight. Hence, the Red trade unions are in a very precarious condition.

As regards the yellow trade unions, there are two tendencies in our Party: one tendency, that of the infantile disease of leftism, rejects generally all activity in the yellow trade unions; the other tendency, that of Right opportunism, is absolutely in favour of working in the yellow trade unions and forming no Red trade unions. The first tendency has already entirely disappeared; the second tendency is now developing full activity.

Now as to the problem of the formation of factory councils. The role of the factory councils in China would be different not only from that in the Soviet Union, but also from that of Central Europe. The present political situation in China and the fierce white terror make it inexpedient to lay down definite formalities and statutes for the factory councils or to establish bureaux and receive contributions. The main thing is that the factory councils be elected by the whole of the workers in a given factory. The central aim of the factory councils should be to take up the everyday demands of the workers. They should represent before the employers the interests of individual workers while waging the struggle for the general amelioration of the workers' conditions. The introduction of the factory councils should take place through the transformation of the fighting committees. The fighting committees (strike committees, wage committees, etc.) should be set up for a short period, and should be dissolved after the termination of the fight. The factory councils have the character of permanent organisations. Our most essential task is to have in our hands the leadership in the factory councils in order to set them up against the yellow trade unions. Although our Party Congress has already taken up the formation of factory councils as the new policy, no results are yet to be recorded, because in many localities

the significance and importance of the factory councils not yet been grasped.

It may be said that in our Party the tendency towards putschism (such as compulsory strikes, red terror by the masses, etc.) has already been eliminated. On the other hand, a tendency of waiting and of legalism has come into vogue. This tendency has come as a result of the lack of sufficient patience and resolve in carrying out our new tactics, and on the ground of incessant persecution which seemed to lead us away out. Our Party has also conducted many fights without wisdom and courage, e. g. the water and electricity strikes, the French concession in Shanghai at the close of last year. Our Party activity proved highly effective in the strike

While working in the yellow trade unions, it is our task to win the rank and file, the large masses, and the upper strata of the apparatus. The whole apparatus has been captured by us only under definite conditions (e. g. in localities where the reactionary leadership is either weak or declining, or where the revolutionary masses are sufficiently powerful and self-sacrificing to protect their own organisations). Since the Kuomintang compels the trade union officials and members of the Kuomintang, I think it proper to remain to be an official, rather than to join the Kuomintang. In this manner we shall retain the confidence of the masses. In the event of a fight they will come to us again.

Our Party has still committed a number of mistakes in its tactics in the trade union movement. Owing to insufficient resolve and accuracy in the application of the new tactics, activity in the Red trade unions has met with no great success.

The weakness of the basis of reformism and of the Yellow trade unions should not cause us to refrain from active work in the Yellow trade unions. On the contrary, we must work more energetically in the Yellow trade unions in order to win the masses which follow them.

Nevertheless we should not decide to work unconditionally in the Yellow trade unions and give up our own activity, such as the formation of illegal trade union nuclei as the basis of revolutionary opposition within the Yellow trade unions. We should concentrate the whole of our attention on the work in the Yellow trade unions, neglecting to be active among the large masses of unorganised workers. We should pursue our endeavour to embrace as quickly as possible the industrial workers (railwaymen, seamen, miners, textile workers, municipal employees, etc.) in order to secure and consolidate the hegemony of the proletariat. We must also take steps to delay or to organise the rural proletariat, as a strong ally for the industrial proletariat.

On these grounds I appeal to the Communist International and to the Red International of Labour Unions to address this Plenum a special letter to the Chinese Party concerning these instructions on the trade union question.

In conclusion, I can impart to you the pleasing information that our Party and our Red trade unions have great political influence among the masses of the workers. Our only point is that we have not yet organisationally stabilised our political influence. Although our Party is still young, we do all in our power to overcome this serious weakness. There is every indication of a second big revolutionary wave coming. We are under the proper guidance of the Communist International; we have Bolshevik tactics; we believe we will be able quickly to put right our mistakes. Our trade union movement is not going to repeat the organisational mistakes of the last great revolution. This we believe to be the assurance of our victory in the coming wave of revolution!

Comrades, I should like to say a word or two on the draft resolution on the "Economic Struggle and the Tasks of the Communist Parties". I am fully in agreement with the draft, but I should like to propose only a few amendments.

First, there is nothing said about the activities of the trade union agents of social-imperialism in Eastern policies. It is generally known that the All-Chinese Federation of Trade Unions, in connection with the Shanghai massacre of May 1925 addressed a telegraphic appeal for aid to the Yellow Trade Union International which was never answered. Today

tion is quite different. The betrayers of labour and the hounds of imperialism have suddenly conceived a great idea in the East. It is sufficiently known from the newspapers that Albert Thomas, the head of the Labour Office of Geneva, has lately been doing his foul deeds in the Far East. In China he met the leaders of the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang and the labour-traitors of the so-called Yellow trade unions and fraternised with them. He declared himself in complete agreement with the policy of the Kuomintang in the liquidation and execution of the Communists. Pains were taken to secure a Chinese labour representative for this year's Congress of the Labour Office at Geneva. This "labour representative" is naturally a labour-traitor appointed by the Kuomintang. Albert Thomas has also negotiated with the Kuomintang about establishing a branch of the Geneva Labour Office at Shanghai. In this manner the date was fixed for the convening of a Pan-Asiatic Labour Congress as planned by the agents of Japanese imperialism, Suzuki (to be held in India in April 1930, as now arranged by Albert Thomas). All this goes to show that the reformists are out to get into their hands the leaders of the colonial countries in order to deliver them to the enslavement by the imperialists. On the other hand, they want to utilise the colonial countries as the base for a new imperialist war, especially for a war against the Soviet Union.

The economic basis for reformism in the colonial countries is extraordinarily weak. The so-called Yellow trade unions were from the very outset under the leadership of labour-traitors (agents of the bourgeoisie). There is no difference whatsoever between them and the White trade unions, the tools of the reactionary ruling class. Hence it is unquestionable that the Communists will have to fight independently for winning the masses in the colonies. Next, it is necessary to expose the treacherous deeds of the treacherous labour leaders and urge the masses of ousting them from the organisation. For people who are opportunistic ideology who are ready to co-operate with the yellow trade union leaders there can be no longer any place in our ranks (for instance, in India).

The imperialists have always taken advantage of the confusion between the trade unions and the national bourgeoisie (the latter). On the other hand, the feudal landlords have utilised the strikes against the national bourgeoisie (e. g. the anti-imperialist strike at Hankow this year). The Red trade unions must apply full vigour to further the anti-imperialist movement, the agrarian revolution, and the fight against the bourgeoisie, in order to emancipate the masses from the influence of reactionaries of every kind.

Finally, we should pay the greatest attention to the organisation of the masses that are rising spontaneously. During the recent strike in India the membership of the Left trade unions suddenly increased by many hundreds or thousands, the same as it happened in the Chinese trade unions after the Shanghai massacre of May 30, 1925. At that time there were from 20,000 to 30,000 members enrolled in one week. Were these new members firmly tied to the organisation? No, they were not. They put their names on the trade union lists only in connection with the strike. When the counter-revolutionary came, and the Shanghai trade unions were prohibited, the membership dropped at once from 300,000 to 50,000, and fell on to 20,000. Such a spontaneous mass enrolment, if not promptly secured by firm organisation, is sure to vanish after the first defeat. The past errors of the movement in China could not be repeated in India. The most essential task in the revolutionary fight waged by the revolutionary trade union movement in the colonies is organisation. The organisation of the unorganised workers, and the construction of revolutionary trade unions in the colonies, must be pursued with full vigour. Also the rural workers must be promptly embraced by organisation, in order to render them the ally of the proletariat.

Comrade BSHKOVITCH (Yugoslavia):

Comrades, at the beginning of the military-fascist dictatorship in Yugoslavia, we witnessed dissolution of independent trade unions, arrests of trade union workers, confiscation of the property of independent trade unions, suppression of the

trade union newspapers, prohibition of factory committee and labour chamber elections. January 6th, 1929, the day of the establishment of dictatorship, did not take our Party unawares. Immediately after the proclamation of the dictatorship, the capitalists and employers took up the offensive, declaring to the workers: now we shall talk differently with you. The employers together with the fascist dictators took such drastic measures that even bourgeois newspapers had to warn them that dictatorship had not been established only for the benefit of the employers.

Let us consider what went on among the reformists after January 6th. The **Social-Democratic Party** was also dissolved, but its organ "**Radnitchke Novine**" was not suppressed. The Government intended to proceed, with the help of the renegade Stankevitch, an ex-Communist, with the establishment of its own fascist trade unions. When **G. Topalovitch**, the leader of the social-democrats, got wind of this, he immediately started negotiations with **General Zhivkovitch** with regard to co-operation between the reformist trade unions and the military-fascist dictatorship.

As soon as an agreement was arrived at with Topalovitch, i. e. between the reformists and the dictatorship, the government gave up its idea of establishing its own fascist trade unions. After this agreement, the government began even to appoint social-democratic leaders as members of municipalities, including the chairman of the labour Chamber **N. Ilich** and the General Secretary of the Metal Workers' Union, **B. Bratichinats**. Thus, the social-democrats entered openly and officially into an alliance with the Government.

Having come to an agreement with the reformists, the Government started a more energetic offensive against the working class by means of a new organ "**The Supreme Legislative Council**". Elections to the factory committees were prohibited; the 8-hour day was abolished, other workers' gains were abolished; labour legislation deteriorated all along the line; wages were lowered. The first strikes took place in Subotica and Zagreb, in the railway shops. Strikes are proceeding now in Spalato. The strike in Zagreb was in connection with wages, and Subotica in connection with the heating of the workshops. The Government immediately climbed down, and the two first strikes ended in success for the workers. The third strike is going on now in Spalato, Dalmatia, in a big cement works. The results are not yet known.

The Right took advantage of the new difficulties for an attack on the leadership of our Party. To start with, they objected to the instructions of the Party in regard to the trade unions. In their circulars, they did not call the workers to a mass mobilisation. The Party acted very energetically against these capitulatory and liquidatory tendencies. Comrade Santo is wrong when he says that our Party did nothing against the Right danger in the trade union sphere. To prove this, we will place the necessary Party documents before the Trade Union Commission. Our Party proceeded very energetically against the Right, but it did not get the necessary support from the R. I. L. U. Only 5 months later the Comintern sent a telegram to our Party confirming our Party line. This dilatoriness was taken advantage of by the Right in its struggle against our Party. The lack of clarity in the leading international organs with regard to illegal trade unions was also utilised by the Right in the struggle against the leadership of the Party. Comrade Lozovsky asserted here yesterday that our unions are semi-legal. They are in fact quite illegal. The semi-legal unions are the neutral unions, the bank employees, shop assistants and printers' unions. The unitarian unions are quite illegal. True, the Government is taking measures to compel the Party and the Unitarian Federation to capitulate in the struggle for the legalisation of the independent trade unions. In what sense? For instance, the chief of the Political Police of Belgrade, Achemovitch, said that he will legalise the independent trade unions provided they expel their Communist members. When the trade union workers said that they did not know which of the members were Communists, the police said: "We shall tell you who the Communists are".

In conclusion, I am convinced that we shall have to work out here a concrete plan for illegal trade unions, a plan which will enable us to improve our mass work in regard to the conquest of the majority of the working class.

Comrade JACQUEMOTTE (Belgium):

We express our agreement with the general line of the resolution placed before us which will be fully discussed in the special commission.

Unemployment is unknown in Belgium. For two years we witness a "marvellous industrial prosperity". The number of unemployed is insignificant. Big new enterprises are being established under the control of finance capital. It is proposed to construct in Borinage works which will employ 3000 workers and will be adapted to the utilisation of the by-products of coal. The Belgian Government had drawn up a big plan of public works. According to government and reformist statistics, wages are at least the same as in 1914, and generally higher, the working day has been shortened and the general guarantees concerning hygiene and safety have been greatly developed. To judge by this analysis, the Belgian working class should be living in "ideal" conditions, if one is to believe official figures.

But in reality, many and very important strikes have taken place in Belgium in that period: two strikes (one of them a general strike) in the Antwerp port, and a strike of 6000 workers which lasted several weeks in the National Munition Factory in Herstal; a general builders' strike in Brussels, a general strike in Verviere, apart from hundreds of strikes throughout the country.

There must be an important reason for these strikes. This important reason is the unsatisfactory position of the working class of Belgium. In spite of apparent prosperity — real prosperity no doubt for the capitalists — which is based on increased exploitation of the working class, the latter is more and more inclined to react by direct action.

In this struggle, reformism and social democracy are decidedly on the side of the bourgeoisie and the government. Vandervelde said at a Congress of the Labour Party: "We must now crush the Communist movement in the trade unions". We draw from this the conclusion that the Belgian bourgeoisie and reformism can see that the consistent Communist activity in the reformist organisations which have in Belgium still over half a million workers in their ranks, constitutes a real danger. Naturally, the social democracy are offering energetic opposition to the application, or any attempt at application of the resolutions of the VI. Congress of the C. I. and of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. in regard to independent leadership of industrial struggles by the revolutionary opposition, by the strikers themselves.

But we have noticed in Belgium that the Trotskyites who are carrying on a so-called "Left" struggle against the Communist International, have taken up an exactly similar attitude, identifying themselves thereby with the attitude of the Brandlerites in Germany.

In the strike of the night shifts in the Antwerp port, when we applied for the first time the decisions of the C. I. and the R. I. L. U., we succeeded in forming a strike committee. Two Trotskyites were elected to this committee. They declared that the object of the strike committee was — to bring pressure to bear on the reformist leaders in order to make them conduct the strike properly, that the tactic proposed by the Communists which was in keeping with the decisions of the VI. Congress of the Communist International and of the IV. Congress of

the R. I. L. U., would lead to the failure of the strike, the destruction of the trade union movement. In their opinion the Trotskyites have frequently asserted that these important resolutions of the two congresses were bound to destroy union unity, to weaken the labour movement and to deliver workers, tied hand and foot, to the bourgeoisie and employers.

The comrades know that 5000 Belgian workers were involved in the strike in the North of France. In spite of the difficulties and shortcomings during the first attempts seriously to carry out the new line, we succeeded with the assistance of the French comrades, and with the aid of the members of the unitary trade unions, to get to our side the workers organised in the reformist, social-democratic and Christian trade unions. Committees of action were formed, in which reformist, Communist and unorganised workers were represented, for the struggle with the workers organised in the unitary trade union of Halluin. The fact that we were able for many days, nay, months, to fight the reformist leaders when they made proposals which meant sabotaging the strike, the fact that we were able to keep the Belgian workers in the strike under these conditions, is entirely due to the application of the decisions of the VI. Congress of the C. I. and of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. Any other tactic would have led to the Belgian workers giving in to the Halluin employers and the treacherous tactic of the reformists would have resulted in dividing in the Halluin factories the Belgian and the French workers, whereas in spite of the difficult conditions under which the strike was conducted and the conditions which it ended, the unity of the Halluin workers remains.

This is a guarantee for future struggles.

We are in Belgium no doubt on the eve of another important strike wave. According to information received by us, there is considerable ferment, especially in the Charleroi region, among the miners, and our Party has come forward with the proposal to form committees in order to make preparations for the miners' strike. The foremost task of these committees consists in drawing up uniform miners' demands. If left to themselves, the miners of the various pits would forward different demands.

This action of our Party for the organisation of the strike in the Charleroi region, meets with the opposition of the employers, the State, the reformist leaders and the Trotskyites who have split the Federation des Chevaliers du Travail (Federation of the Knights of Labour) and are on the side of the reformists against the workers and the Communist Party regard to the preparations for this struggle.

I would like to say in conclusion that the Belgian Communist Party, which is in an extremely difficult position regard to the struggle against the powerful Social-Democratic Party, cannot do justice to the tasks incumbent on it if it applies consistently and energetically the decisions of the VI. Congress of the C. I. and of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U., concerning leadership of industrial struggles and trade union work in general. This is not merely lip service to the resolution which was submitted; the experience of the struggle in Belgium, the conduct of strike movements has shown that only on this basis will we be able to make progress in the period of the radicalisation of the masses and the accentuation of the class struggle in Belgium.