

throughout the world, the inclusion of the unemployed in the mass front together with employed workers in the factories of enormous importance in this period of mass and permanent unemployment. The fascists, too, are trying their luck among the unemployed, in order to win them for their ideology.

I would like to draw the attention of the Plenum to the fact that factory fascism is making its appearance in many big enterprises. Side by side with the social-fascist organisations of ideology, fascists, and especially the national socialists in many, are experimenting in the enterprises with new political methods of organisation in order to capture the workers. They work very energetically in the sphere of factory fascism, factory sport, factory class collaboration.

In connection with the unemployment problem, we cannot see that organisational and political relations between employed and unemployed workers must become much closer, especially in countries with millions of unemployed.

I would like to say in conclusion that the Plenum has done a big piece of work in regard to the concretisation of revolutionary trade union work. We have made a big stride at the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U., also in respect to application of the decisions made there. Much has been achieved up, many problems seem less difficult than before.

Positive results can be recorded in regard to independent leadership of economic struggles. However, our defects, gaps and errors in regard to our great revolutionary work throughout the world are also enormous. In nearly all the countries, our trade union work has become trade union-political work of the whole Party. In spite of many weak points, the work of the Red trade unions and of the revolutionary trade union opposition has improved. It has been a school for us, an elementary Leninist school for the application of our new tactic. It has been an extension of our revolutionary work, an intensification of the application of our Leninist tactic in regard to new methods of work and forms of organisation in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and social-fascism. It is in this sense that we must attack social-fascism more ruthlessly than ever, and must accentuate our struggle against the bourgeoisie in all the spheres of political life. If we know how to make use of the strike wave, how to impart to it a higher political character, adding new columns and new reserves to the revolutionary class front which is marching onwards under our leadership, our present victories will be the premise for the acceleration of the revolutionary development which is bound to lead to the victory of the proletarian dictatorship in a number of countries. Let us go on in this spirit towards our great aim. (Loud Applause).

## Comrade Lozovsky's Concluding Speech.

### NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE EXPERIENCE OF STRIKE TACTICS.

Comrades, the debates in the Plenum, and then in the U. Commission, have revealed full unanimity on fundamental questions, and the existence of some divergent views on concrete practical questions of our tactics. Upon the fundamental question concerning the methods and means of leading the masses during economic fights there was absolutely no differences of opinion, while in the debate there were revealed certain peculiarities in the methods and means of leadership in the different countries, as well as a whole series of faulty aspects in our tactics which should be noted in order that they might not be repeated and that they might not weaken our influence over the masses.

As you are aware, in the domain of strike tactics there is both positive and negative experience.

In those fights which are now waged throughout the world, in fights where our Parties should take upon themselves the leadership, they may and should carry out this leadership, as we have already established, through the strike committees. But, if you take the question about the role of the revolutionary trade unions in the course of the economic struggle — whether in France, Czechoslovakia, the United States, or other countries with a revolutionary T. U. movement, where the trade unions are under our leadership — I believe it is the most difficult and the most important matter to establish between the revolutionary trade unions and the strike committees such mutual relations under which the strike committees should actually embrace the whole mass of the workers and lead the strike movement while the revolutionary trade union, and the Communist fraction, should be the driving force of the whole strike movement.

Hence, it is the task of our Parties during a strike, and immediately afterwards, to strengthen the revolutionary trade unions, and in the event of victory in one strike or another, to endeavour to have the agreement with the employers signed by the strike committee and the revolutionary trade union.

(Martinov: The revolutionary?)

Yes, by the revolutionary trade union. There should be different tactics — and this is quite natural — when the strike

committee elected by the mass of the workers has to face the employers on the one hand, and the reformist trade unions on the other. Here the task consists in contrasting the strike committees to the reformist trade unions, in seeing to it that the strike committee should sign the agreement, while the strike committee should endeavour, on its part, that after the termination of the strike there shall be formed the necessary organ in the enterprise to enforce the fulfilment of the terms of the agreement, whether in the shape of wage commissions, special vigilance committees (as these commissions are called in some cases), or internal commissions, and so forth. The name of such organ does not matter in the least. It is important that the strike committee should see to it that after the termination of the strike the workers might form, — and this ought to be the chief duty of the strike committee — an organ to look after the agreement that has been concluded, if there is no revolutionary trade union in the enterprise to take upon itself this function. In this respect, it seems to me, we still have little experience in the sense of carrying the fight to a successful end in those countries where we are working within the reformist trade unions. Our experience is small, nevertheless the strikes have shown how, with correct leadership of the strike, it is possible to mobilise both the organised and unorganised workers, and with the help of the unorganised to beat back the attack of the reformist T. U. bureaucrats upon the strike committees. I take it that this constitutes a highly intricate, difficult, and important field of activity, because we lead the strikes in order to strengthen our Party organisations, our T. U. organisations and the revolutionary opposition in the course of the struggle, in order to carry on the struggle to the end. And when the struggle is carried to the end in a country with no independent revolutionary trade unions, it is necessary to think of who will, after all, see to it that the victory shall not be turned into a defeat within a month or two. Hence, of course, in countries with revolutionary factory councils this problem may be solved through the vigilance of these councils in regard to the fulfilment of the agreement. In countries with revolutionary trade unions, this function will be assumed by the latter. And in countries with neither revolutionary factory councils nor revolutionary trade unions, it is necessary to create special organs in the enterprises to look after the agreements that are signed.

## ONCE AGAIN ABOUT ILLEGAL TRADE UNIONS IN THE COUNTRIES OF FASCIST TERROR.

The second group of questions which is of exceptionally great importance relates to our illegal trade unions in countries under Fascist terror. Here we have a situation when in Italy, Yugoslavia, and Rumania, the revolutionary trade unions have been dissolved; yet, while in Italy, by the side of the illegal trade unions there are only fascist unions, the situation is different in Yugoslavia and Rumania. Here we have reformist unions by the side of the dissolved revolutionary trade unions, while, as Comrade Boshkovitch has told us here, in Yugoslavia these reformist unions have come to an understanding with the fascist dictatorship and are so liked by the latter that the fascists refrain from forming their own union. Our comrades in Yugoslavia and Rumania, immediately after the suppression, were confronted with the question of what to do, whether to create illegal trade unions and to fight for their open existence, whether to advise the workers to go into the reformist trade unions or try to legalise the unions upon a basis of neutrality, publicly declaring that the trade unions have nothing in common with the Communist Party, with the Comintern, and with the Profintern. There were such tendencies in Yugoslavia after the suppression of the revolutionary trade unions. There were some comrades who proposed to go into the reformist unions, others proposed to follow the line of open neutrality, i. e. the line of open apostasy. But the Party declared, and quite rightly, for the preservation of the suppressed trade unions, for their development and strengthening, and in this manner it repudiated the liquidatory tendencies, all those who tried to surrender to the pressure of the fascist dictatorship and to create a supposedly new trade union movement under the flag of neutrality.

The question of preserving, strengthening and developing the suppressed trade unions, is a question of tremendous importance not only to these countries; it is an exceedingly important question also to those countries which are threatened with the suppression and dissolution of the revolutionary trade unions, and among such countries are Czechoslovakia and France. **The preservation of the illegal apparatus of the revolutionary trade union movement should not limit our activity exclusively to those elements of the militant organisation under our control and to the best revolutionary elements of the working class.** Our task here is, first, to draw the largest number of non-Party workers into these unions, and secondly, to fight with might and main for every position, for every inch of the ground, so as to get out of the illegality. Here it is necessary to resort to any possibility to come out of the underground, in order to gather the largest possible numbers of workers around the revolutionary trade unions and around our Party. Had we followed in these countries the road recommended, say by the liquidatory Right elements in Yugoslavia, i. e. the road of refraining from underground work, this would have meant not only political surrender, and not only virtual support to the Social Democracy, but this would have entirely closed to the Party the possibility of increasing its pressure in the sense of the struggle for an open existence, in the sense of the struggle for emerging from illegality. It should be remembered that in these countries of the fascist dictatorship it is possible to emerge from illegality only upon the crest of a strike wave.

In these countries the question of forming strike committees is of exceptionally great importance, because in these countries the strike committees should be organised on the broadest possible lines in order to attract the largest possible number of workers to the election of these committees. This will secure the widest possible support to the Party and to the illegal trade unions, render it possible upon the least opportunity to transform the strike committees (or other militant organs), formed in one or another country of the fascist dictatorship, into supporting points for the whole activity of the Party and of the illegal revolutionary trade unions. Any concessions to the liquidators would be here exceedingly harmful and dangerous, because they would paralyse our Party's activity, depriving it of one of the weapons which it should use in the struggle for the open existence of the revolutionary trade unions. It is not only a question of being recognised by law, but of emerging from illegality under any conditions, and of carrying out the work openly, without asking for official permission. And this can be achieved only upon the crest of the strike wave which is now rising.

## THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT IN THE COLONIAL AND SEMI-COLONIAL COUNTRIES.

Alongside of the T. U. movement of the capitalist countries, which has reached a fairly respectable age, we have a young T. U. movement in the colonial countries, while the colonial and semi-colonial countries may be divided into several groups. In some of them the T. U. movement arose immediately after the war, in others it arose only two or three years ago.

Finally, the colonial countries may be divided into several groups according to their political and economic conditions.

For instance, we have countries where legal reformist trade unions exist and side by side with them there are also Left revolutionary trade unions, although the latter are persecuted by the police, imperialism, etc. for instance, India, Tunis, Algiers, etc. In other colonial countries there are illegal revolutionary trade unions, e. g. in China, and side by side with them there are governmental, police, yellow trade unions. Here the struggle for the masses is fought between a profoundly illegal party and profoundly illegal trade unions on the one hand, and the governmental, police, yellow trade unions on the other, while this fight in such countries is of an extremely accentuated character, e. g. in China, where the revolutionary T. U. movement and the Communist Party have brought tremendous sacrifices in this struggle. We have a great number of countries where the labour movement has recently entered upon the historic arena, a whole number of countries in Central Africa where there are no trade unions but where in the course of economic fights there are emerging semi-political and semi-economic organisations which carry on the economic struggle, and under imperialist pressure, are being drawn into illegality. There is, finally, a whole number of colonial countries where there are only reformist trade unions but these are of an anti-imperialist character. For instance, in colonies like Sierra Leone on the West coast of Africa there are also colonial countries with reformist trade unions composed of coloured workers, e. g. South Africa. We also have countries where the revolutionary T. U. movement has been smashed by the imperialists and where there are only nationalist and independent unions existing openly on the one hand, and the illegal trade union groups on the other. Such a country is Indonesia. The Philippines may be classed among the first group in which revolutionary and reformist trade unions exist side by side.

In view of such a chequered picture of the T. U. movement in the colonial countries, of such great differences in the political status of the labour movement, it is, of course, of exceptional importance to study the problem of leadership in strike fights, to form our Parties and our trade unions in the course of these fights, for in a whole number of these countries these very economic fights are the right moment for welding together the scattered workers into a class. This we have done in very quick and concentrated form in India, where half a year ago the strikes broke out spontaneously and were afterwards led by the reformist trade unions. In the course of the textile workers' struggle against the reformist trade unions there arose the left trade union, which has enlisted ten times more workers than the reformist trade unions. Just now it is going on a bitter fight for leadership of the strike movement as between reformism, national bourgeoisie, and Communism, which has not yet been definitely shaped, which is organisationally weak, and which has entrenched itself within the ranks of the trade unions.

Exceptionally interesting and worthy of attention in this respect is the experience of the last year in India, where we have seen the growth of our Party and of the Left trade union in a colonial country upon the basis of the strike movement, the growth and consolidation of our supporting points in the struggle against imperialism and the national bourgeoisie.

What then constitutes the immediate task in the colonial countries? Obviously, since the Parties and the trade unions originate in the course of economic fights, it is our task to neglect no opportunity for the creation of real class trade unions under our leadership.

Comrade Deng has recited here some facts showing that among some comrades in the Chinese Party there is a tendency in the sense of reluctance to work inside the yellow trade unions. This is a dangerous, harmful, non-bolshevist tendency.

Along with this there is also another tendency which has sprung upon the basis of the fearful terror, a tendency which that we should only work in the yellow trade unions, in order to become legalised. This is the purest liquidatorship and by weariness, which leads not only to the liquidation of the illegal trade unions, but also to the liquidation of the Communist Party.

On the one hand, there are comrades in the Chinese Communist Party who say (as it was quite properly observed by Comrade Mif in the March number of the "Communist International"): "We should not fight for partial demand"; we have on the other hand comrades who say: "We should work only in the yellow trade unions, in the legal trade unions; we should generally avoid excessive politics in the movement, we should abandon too drastic slogans." In a word, what these comrades are saying is reminiscent of the renunciation of the chief revolutionary slogans by our Russian liquidators in the period of 1908—14. I consider this tendency to be exceedingly dangerous.

#### ONCE MORE ABOUT THE NEW UNIONS.

The next question concerns the new trade unions, and the methods for their development. It was pointed out here by Comrade Browder and others that the new trade unions in America and in England have small memberships. And Comrade Ercoli has made here the sensational statement that the mass character of the revolutionary trade unions is not a principle upon which Lozovsky generally wants to build new trade unions. Although among the stormy Italian temperaments Comrade Ercoli is not the most tempestuous, nevertheless he has also invented something "in a sudden manner" and has presented us here with two inventions, i. e.: 1. that would be like the trade unions to consist only of cadres, and that I want to "create new trade unions everywhere". Of course, this is hard to prove, but at any rate, Comrade Ercoli hurled this "everywhere" at me from the platform of the Comintern. Comrade Ercoli forgot that such statements need proofs. We have had debates in the T. U. commission before the Comintern on the question whether it was necessary to unite the organised workers of Germany and in what form this should be done; but there is a tremendous distance between this and the allegation of a desire to create new trade unions "everywhere", in all countries, and composed exclusively of cadres. We have frequently debated in the Comintern, yet not on this question. Comrade Ercoli, but rather on the question that a small number of Parties are late in forming trade unions where they are necessary. I shall remind you of the controversy which we had in the Comintern on the question of the British miners' union. We differed in our views from the other comrades, about one year before they have eventually resolved it. I raised this question both in the Comintern and in the Profintern at a time when the union still had considerable membership. The British comrades organised the new union but only after the union had lost three-fourths of its membership. Can it be asserted on the grounds of this fact that I had wanted to build new unions "everywhere"? In this particular case it was resolved by the Comintern that our comrades had shown a spirit of capitulation instead of activity.

We also had a quarrel with our Mexican comrades on the question whether it was necessary to unite the revolutionary unions against the reformist Confederation. Eventually they did so after the assassination of Obregon, when the C. R. O. M. began to crumble entirely. We had quarreled with them about the time. They did not wish to do so sooner. We spurred them on. Does this mean "everywhere"? Concretely, this was necessary in Mexico.

We have quarreled over this question also in regard to Hungary. We have debated this question with the comrades in Poland, under definite concrete circumstances, for a definite period, after definite events, when the P. P. S. unions had split into openly fascist and covertly fascist unions. We have debated upon all these questions. Granted that I was wrong in one case or another, but does this mean that I want to create new unions "everywhere"? We have debated this question in regard to every trade union concretely, under a given situation, for a given branch of industry, and under given circumstances. It seems to me, therefore, that Comrade Ercoli has at least indulged in an exaggeration, which I attribute to

his insufficient knowledge of what has taken place during the last year.

It was stated here by Comrade Campbell that the defects of the British Communist Party in leading the strike movement were caused by the fact that the Profintern at its IV. Congress had adopted a resolution on the creation of strike committees, etc., but had forgotten to mention this in the British resolution. It means that we have made a big omission: in the general resolution we had stated the matter firmly and clearly, but in the special British resolution we had not mentioned it. We have so far thought that the general, basic resolutions are obligatory to all. Thus we thought, perhaps it was due to our international limitations? But Comrade Campbell believes that we should state in each general resolution that this particular resolution extends also to Great Britain besides other countries. What are the shortcomings that Comrade Campbell sees in Great Britain? Do you think he sees a shortcoming there in the lack of activity, in that there were Communists there who were too closely tied up with Cook, or that there were moods of surrender in the Party? Well, he forgot to speak about surrendering, but he did say that they had adventurism, a desire to create new unions at all costs. Thus, Comrade Campbell has noticed in Great Britain chiefly these "Left" mistakes. Yet, where is that adventurism in the creation of new trade unions? If two or three comrades have broached this question, is it of decisive significance for Great Britain? No, of decisive significance for Great Britain is the fact that the Party as such has done little, that it has lost a great deal of time in Scotland. This is the crux of the matter, not that there are two or three comrades who had expressed some incorrect thought in an article or in a letter to the editor. As for myself, I energetically insist that in Great Britain the mistakes were chiefly of a Right and not of an ultra-Left character.

#### ABOUT THE TRADE UNION APPARATUS.

In connection with the creation of new trade unions we are confronted, of course, with the question of energetically continuing the activity in the reformist trade unions, and so on. I must point out, comrades, that in nearly all the Parties there is still a subconscious notion that the reformist unions are nevertheless better than the Hirsch-Dunker and Liberal unions. A distinction is still made between the reformist unions and those of other tendencies. This is politically untrue, as well as practically harmful. We should be active in the reformist as well as in the Hirsch-Dunker and Liberal unions, wherever there are workers, irrespective of the political label. This, I repeat, is an elementary bolshevist truth.

Yet, in connection with the political activity in these unions there arises a question which we have discussed also in the Presidium, and on which there was a divergence of opinion, the question as to the possibility of capturing the apparatus of the reformist trade unions. Personally I have voiced and continue to voice the opinion that the capture of the trade union apparatus is an utopia, and an opportunist utopia at that. How is this to be understood? Does it mean that we should refrain from fighting for elected positions in the trade unions? Not at all. If we take part in parliamentary and municipal elections, we would be perfect idiots to refrain from taking a most vigorous part in the elections to any trade union organs in which there are workers. It is quite natural for us to participate in the trade union elections, to nominate our own candidates, to oust this or that candidate. Yet, it must be perfectly realised that to capture the reformist T. U. apparatus as a whole is an utopia. For, the apparatus has become merged with the bourgeois State and the reformist trade unions have become State organs, this affecting not only a few people at the top, but considerable cadres of the reformist trade unions. There is as little chance of capturing the entire apparatus of the reformist trade unions by capturing one local branch or another as there is a chance of capturing the bourgeois State by capturing some ten or twenty municipalities.

The struggle within the reformist trade unions should be carried on most energetically under the slogan of ousting the traitors and the agents of capitalism from the ranks of the working class, never yielding to the offensive of our class enemies (because the reformists are our class enemies), and taking advantage of the least pretext whether legal or semi-

legal, by the trade union rules, to pursue our policy, never retreating a single step from our positions. The question is not how to work within the reformist trade unions, but how to organise and utilise the unorganised to repel the attacks of the reformist trade union apparatus.

If you and I were right when we unanimously established the fact that the unorganised are displaying great activity, that the unorganised are more numerous than the organised, that the number of the unorganised is constantly growing on account of capitalist rationalisation, that in industry there is a constant increase in the number of the less skilled elements, such as women, youth, etc., — then it is quite obvious that we should think of how to utilise these huge masses of proletarian women and youth, the great masses of the unorganised, in the struggle against the trade union apparatus, against the reformists. We must at all costs unite in the struggle the section of the working class which is in the reformist trade unions with the section that is outside of them. We should never forget that the workers who are organised in the reformist trade unions can be wrested from the reformist influence only by stirring up a mass movement, and the unorganised may play a big role in this movement. The victory over reformism can only come as a result of huge mass economic and political fights, and for this very reason the careful preparation and skilful conduct of these fights is the most efficacious method for destroying the reformist influence over the masses.

#### COMRADE SMOLIANSKY'S GRIEVANCES.

In conclusion, I must deal with some polemical questions that have been raised here by some speakers.

The most militant polemist turned out to be our Comrade Smoliansky, who is generally quite peaceably inclined. Comrade Smoliansky, in order to give more brilliant expression to his polemics, wanted to "prove" that I had some very dark intentions, that I had wanted to involve him in Right and conciliatory deviations; in a word that I had the desire of producing an amalgam which was very current at the time of the French revolution, i. e. that I had wanted to amalgamate the pure Comrade Smoliansky with the impure people of the Right-conciliatory camp. I must say that I had never harboured any such dark and ominous intentions. I merely wish to say that there are some very good comrades with the correct point of view who sometimes get muddled, and I have mentioned this case as an example.

Comrade Smoliansky, in an article entitled "On T. U. Problems of the Third Period", wrote:

"Committees of action may neither be subordinated to the trade unions, nor contrasted to them, nor transformed into artificial transitional forms of organisation to trade unions."

What is wrong here, and what is contradictory to the decision which we now take? Wrong is the assertion that the committees of action may not and should not be contrasted to the trade unions. To the reformist trade unions they must be contrasted, but not to the revolutionary unions. I believe my formula to be correct, and Comrade Smoliansky's formula to be wrong. No need to boil about it like a samovar.

At any rate, it seems to me that upon this debatable question Comrade Smoliansky has raised a noise quite for nothing, because both the resolution and the theses here submitted are urging the need of contrasting the committees of action to the reformist trade unions.

#### OUR "SELF-CRITICS".

As you now, some comrades understand self-criticism in the sense that they criticise you, but not themselves. Such, for instance was the way Comrade Piatnitsky understood self-criticism.

(Piatnitsky: Not quite so!).

Instead of speaking about the shortcomings of the Comintern, he spoke vigorously about the shortcomings of the Profintern.

(Piatnitsky: I referred to both!)

I do not in the least deny the tremendous shortcomings of the Profintern, but I believe that all of us are to blame for it, and of course, we shall work together to put right the mistakes of the Profintern.

Another speaker on the subject of self-criticism was Comrade Gey.

As regards the criticisms by Comrade Piatnitsky, I learn that we — that is the Profintern — are guilty inasmuch as we have not taken adequate steps to straighten out the line in Czechoslovakia, in France, in Italy, and so on.

It would certainly be an exaggeration if I said that we did take all the steps; perhaps if all the steps had been taken there would be better results. Nevertheless, Comrade Piatnitsky is aware of the fact that considerable steps were taken in Czechoslovakia, in France, in China, as well as in a number of other countries.

(Piatnitsky: This was not last year, but the year before last, when we criticised, and you covered up the mistakes.)

To take Comrade Piatnitsky's word, there was a division of labour between us: Comrade Piatnitsky criticised, and we covered. (Laughter.) But this assertion of Comrade Piatnitsky has absolutely no foundation. As everybody knows, all the most important decisions upon all questions without exception were passed with the district participation of the Comintern and its leading organs, and I am prepared to bear 60% of the responsibility, on condition that the other comrades bear 40%. But comrade Piatnitsky's story to the effect that we criticised and we covered, is quite untenable. This is no honest self-criticism, but a sort of an attempt to explain away our own shortcomings by the insufficient activity of others. It seems to me that insufficient activity, in France as well as in Czechoslovakia and other countries, has been shown not only by the trade unions, but also by the Communist Parties. Everyone knows that only after successfully accomplishing a turn in the Party, only then we can accomplish a turn also in the trade unions. Did we not pursue the line of rectifying the mistakes of the Communist Parties in Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, and elsewhere? We rectified the shortcomings and defects in the work of the Communist Parties, and only after we had done that and after having eliminated the opportunist elements were we enabled to take up the offensive upon a wider front in the trade unions and in the mass organisations.

From Comrade Piatnitsky's speech one may get the impression that everything remained the same in France, and that everything was bad. I consider wrong such an attitude. During the last twelve or eighteen months we have been making great strides forward in France. You all know that we have eliminated a number of defects and shortcomings in the work of the Communist Party and of the Unitary trade unions in France. In the Unitary Confederation of Labour a Right wing has been formed, but it does not have the majority in the leading organs (this is not Czechoslovakia), and I believe that a certain and no small amount of credit for this is due also to the Profintern. This of course, does not mean that I wish to deny a whole number of our shortcomings and mistakes in France.

By way of self-criticism, Comrades Beyer and Shubin have also cited the resolutions that are being prepared for the Pacific T. U. Congress. Yet, they did not cite those parts which should have been cited. They wanted to show that the draft resolutions forget to mention about the activity in the yellow reformist trade unions. However, as a matter of fact, in the draft itself — which, by the way, has not yet even been passed through the Commission — there is a special Point 8 which I am going to read to you:

"The creation of new unions, when this is urged by the circumstances, should in no case lead to an abandonment by the revolutionary elements of the activity within the reformist unions. On the contrary, the revolutionary elements should increase their activity within the reformist unions, mobilising the rank and file against the bureaucrats and their opportunist politics. In the event of expulsion from the reformist unions, the revolutionary elements should wage an energetic fight for reinstatement. The work in the existing reformist unions should be continued at

intensified particularly where these organisations are of a mass character (e. g. the seven big unions of Shanghai, the reformist unions of India and Japan.)”

I should advise Comrades Bewer and Shubin to begin first all by reading the whole of what one wants to cite, and then to start polemising. In this manner they would avoid the awkwardness which is bound to result from an excessive effort to prove that which is hard to prove.

### THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION.

Comrades, we have tremendous shortcomings in our T. U. movement — in the work of the Communist Parties and revolutionary trade unions as well as of revolutionary minorities; when this now, and we have also dealt with this at the IV. Congress of the Profintern. The basic shortcoming of our work in the T. U. movement consists in that in many countries the use of the political influence of the revolutionary trade unions several times in excess over the organisational hold of these unions upon the workers. Of course, on the one hand it is a good thing that the influence of the trade unions extends beyond organisational limits; but I wish to say here that we do not sufficiently utilise each conflict, each strike, each action, at a time when our influence allows us to utilise them in order to get an organisational hold upon fresh elements of the workers, and for this reason the trade unions are frequently of a narrow scope, of insufficient mass character.

For instance, let us take France. In France we may consider trade unions of a mass character if they embrace 15—30% of the workers in a given industry. Yet, bearing in mind that the Unitary Confederation of Labour embraces 5—6% of all workers throughout France, then in view of the imminent and in view of the huge social conflicts and upheavals ahead, the Unitary Confederation of Labour can by no means be considered as really representing a mass organisation. There are many unions which embrace the majority of the workers in one or another enterprise, but on the whole the progress should be ten times quicker than we are making. This tremendous

shortcoming of ours — the discrepancy between organisational and ideological influence — may be seen at least in the fact that the French Communist Party, having a million of voters, has only 45 thousand members. Great mass movements are carried on under the slogans of the Communist Party in France as well as in the colonies; nearly every movement is carried on under the ideological influence of the Communist Party, nevertheless the Party itself is small. This harbours a particular danger for the immediate future when there is going to be tremendous pressure by imperialism in a number of countries, when we are confronted with the fact of the prohibition of our press and our organisations in a number of countries. (It has been reported that 8 out of the 10 Party newspapers in Czechoslovakia have been suppressed). Should our Party have an insufficient connection with the masses in the factories, the bourgeoisie may succeed in driving our organisations underground for some time. These are the shortcomings of the Comintern and Profintern organisations, against which we must wage a vigorous struggle, extending the utmost aid to our comrades in remedying the defects.

### CONCLUSION.

A word in conclusion. It was said by some speakers, notably by Comrades Ercoli and Monmousseau, that the theses are too “Germanised”, that the whole of the multiform experience of the international movement is not felt in these theses. In the T. U. Commission we have removed this shortcoming, and I believe this is going to benefit the entire international revolutionary trade union movement. In their present shape the theses take stock, on the one hand, of the tremendous positive experience of the German Communist movement, and on the other hand, also of the experience of the labour movement in other big capitalist and colonial countries, and general suggestions are given to all Parties, about the policy to be pursued in order to get the lead of economic fights, to carry on successfully economic fights, to lend a political character to the economic fights, and subsequently to consolidate these successes by extending our Party and T. U. organisations. (Applause.)

---

After the concluding Speech of Comrade Lozovsky the reports of the Commissions are delivered. A vote is taken on the draft resolutions which are all unanimously adopted. (The resolutions will be published in other numbers of the *Inprecorr*).

---