

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 10 No. 42

11th Septemb. 1930

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berlin SW 68, Lindenstraße 71-72. Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered post: International Press Correspondence, Berlin SW 68, Lindenstraße 71-72. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Berlin. Telephone: Dönhoff 2856 and 2867.

CONTENTS

Politics	
Gabriel Peri: The Meeting of the League of Nations	878
Schasch: The 1st of September — A Turning Point in the Class Struggle of the Hungarian Proletariat.	879
J. Lenski: From Slavek to Pilsudski	880
Bratin: The Results of the Warsaw Agrarian Conference	881
The Labour Movement	
J. Berlioz: The Strikes in North France Still Going on	881
Proletarian Defence	
Arvid Wretling: Red Front League in Sweden	882
Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union	
Appeal of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. for the Third Year of the Five-Year Plan	883
Against the Campaign of Lies against the Soviet Union	
The Soviet-German "Conspiracy"	884
Proletarian Commemoration Days	
A. Komjat: The Tenth Anniversary of the Occupation of the Factories in Italy	885
The White Terror	
J. Louis Engdahl: "American Workers Should Work and Live on Bread and Water"	886
In the International	
O. Piatnitzky: All Sections of the C. I. Can and Must Become Real Mass Parties (Continued)	887
The Co-operative Movement	
Otto Schröder: The 13th Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance	888
In the Camp of our Enemies	
Karl Radek: A New World which they Could not Strangle	889
V. Congress of the R. I. L. U.	
A. Losovsky: The World Crisis, Economic Struggles and the Tasks of the Revolutionary Trade Union Movement	891
Discussion on the Report of Comrade Losovsky	898

What is the National-Socialist Party of Germany?

By Werner Hirsch (Berlin).

According to its social structure the **Hitler (National-Socialist) Party** is based in the first place on the small peasant strata, but it also has a considerable number of supporters among the working class, chiefly among those workers who hitherto voted for the bourgeois parties. The profound disappointment of the masses caused by the treacherous policy of the social democracy creates the preconditions enabling the Hitler party, with its unbounded social and national demagoguery, to recruit large bodies of followers. Thus the growth of national socialism possesses a double importance: It reflects the crisis of the capitalist system, insofar as the striking forces of the bourgeoisie gather together in the camp of extreme fascism, with the result that the class antagonisms become more glaring and threatening than ever before. It reflects this crisis, however, at the same time in that the masses whom the Hitler Party is able, for the time being, to draw in its train, follow National Socialism only because it bears an allegedly anti-capitalist character.

This unscrupulous demagoguery of the national socialists stands in glaring contradiction to the actual content of its policy.

What is the attitude of the National Socialist Party to capitalism? In its agitation it designates itself a workers'

party which is fighting against capitalism. But Hitler himself has given the following programmatic formula:

"There does not exist a capitalist system. The employers have worked their way up to the top by their industry and efficiency. And by virtue of this selection, which shows that they belong to a higher type, they have the right to lead. Every leader of industry will forbid any interference by a factory council".

And in the brochure issued by the Berlin national socialist leader **Göbbels** entitled "The Little A. B. C. of the National Socialists", it is stated, referring to the Communists:

"Their economic aim, the socialisation of all the means of production, is absolutely unachievable, particularly in an industrial State; their methods are Russian-Jewish".

The sham anti-capitalism paraded in the mass agitation of the Hitler party, which stands in glaring contradiction to its actual acceptance of capitalism, serves only to confuse the masses. In confidential writings the national socialist leaders plainly admit this. Thus a few months ago the German Communist press was able to publish a begging letter sent by

a national socialist leader to an employer in Weimar, in which he stated:

"With reference to your remarks regarding the Socialist Labour movement, anti-capitalism etc., I will only say: Do not always allow yourself to be misled by the text of our placards. The end justifies the means. What party does not seek to lure its followers? Be assured, most esteemed Herr Director, if you are anxious about your future (regarding your business which is rather shaky at the present time) you are nowhere better protected than in our party".

The case is no different with regard to the alleged national policy of the Hitler party. In the programmatic declaration written by its Reichstag member, Herr Feder, which has been published in various editions since 1919, there is a sentence directed against the suppression of those Germans who by the peace treaty of Versailles and St. Germain are made the subjects of other States:

"We do not abandon any German in Bohemia, in Southern Tyrol, in Poland or in Austria, this colony of the League of Nations".

In the new edition of this pamphlet, issued in 1929, the words, "in South Tyrol" are, strange to say, deleted. At about this time the National Socialist Party fully adopted an Anglo-Italian orientation in foreign policy. Thus a national socialist party secretary declared on the 12th of April 1929:

"Against an alliance with Italy the objection is raised that Mussolini is oppressing South Tyrol. This, however, is only a lie invented by the Free Masons. Moreover, we are not concerned with the fate of a few miserable South Tyrolese".

The National Socialist Party has for years been completely in the front of the war inciters against the Soviet Union. There is not an anti-Bolshevist lie which is not at once eagerly seized upon by the national socialists. It is clear that a party which outwardly claims to be fighting against the robber slave dictates of the Young Plan, while at the same time working for the participation of Germany in the war plans against the Soviet Union, thereby in practice adopts a policy which is bound to lead to the perpetuation of the Young Plan slavery of Germany and the complete dependence of Germany on the victor States in the world war.

Put briefly, the real aim of national socialism is nothing but the maintenance of the present capitalist conditions, but aggravated and worsened by the fascist terror. Hitler himself declared:

"We want a selection of the new ruling stratum which realises that, by virtue of its racial superiority, it has the right to rule and ruthlessly to maintain and secure with all means, its rule over the broad masses."

That under this term "ruling stratum" Hitler means the captains of industry and the employers, we have already been able to prove by another quotation from the statements of the national socialist leaders. With what forms the national socialists intend that this "rule of the upper strata over the broad masses" is to be maintained, has been announced by the national socialists themselves in a number of motions brought forward by their Reichstag fraction. These motions demanded the death penalty not only for high treason but also for refusal to perform military service. Prison or death penalty was also demanded for economic treason, which would include every strike. The same severe punishments are also to be imposed in the case of simple propaganda of birth control.

This whole policy, aiming at the most brutal counter-revolution and unbridled fascist dictatorship in the service of German and international finance capital, which in itself, of course, would have no attraction for the masses of workers and for the toiling population in town and country, is therefore, in the open agitation and propaganda of the Hitler Party, covered up by a demagoguery of such unscrupulousness and such cynicism as could be hardly matched by any other bourgeois party, not even by the social fascists.

Only thus is it possible to explain how a party, at the head of which there stand political adventurers, bankrupt generals and Hohenzollern princes, along with factory owners, superannuated parsons, — in short a mixture of reactionary

elements, nevertheless, for the time being, is drawing recruits from those masses which are only first beginning to kick against the capitalist system and against the bourgeois order.

The development of the class struggle in Germany, and therewith the decision of the question whether the capitalists will once again succeed in rescuing the capitalist system from the growing crisis at the cost of plunging the working class into boundless misery and starvation, or whether the crisis will be solved by the proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party by the overthrow of capitalism — this historical decision depends to a great extent upon how far the Communist Party of Germany will succeed in defeating national socialism.

Following the split in the camp of the so-called revolutionary socialists (Strasser group), in the last few days it has come to a fresh rebellion in the Berlin national socialist organisation. This is the first result of the fight of the Communist Party against national socialism.

The mass fight of the German proletariat under the leadership of the Communists against fascism is increasing in strength precisely at the present time in connection with the election campaign of the C. P. G. The national socialists are being increasingly driven to the defensive. The anti-fascist fight of the German Communists, however, is at the same time a part of the struggle for the setting up of the proletarian united front with the social democratic workers. Thus the German shock troops of world Bolshevism are preparing for the historic hour in which the hammer of the proletarian revolution will shatter and destroy the capitalist system and with it its fascist supports.

POLITICS

The Meeting of the League of Nations.

By Gabriel Péri.

Geneva, 6th September, 1930.

The League of Nations is meeting at a time when the working population of Germany is groaning under the burden of the Young Plan, when unemployment has increased by 100 per cent, at a time when in Great Britain there are 2½ million unemployed, when the international agrarian crisis is developing at a terrific rate, when, finally, even in countries such as France there is a general decline of production. To this picture there must be added the results of the civil war in China, of the revolution in India and of socialist construction in the Soviet Union.

These facts quite obviously dominated the minds of the authors of the Draft of the European Federation. "The proposal examined by 27 States finds its justification in the feeling of general responsibility in face of the danger threatening the peace of Europe, both from the political standpoint and from the economic and social standpoint as a result of the disorder in which the whole economy of Europe finds itself". These words are contained in Briand's Memorandum of 1st of May. The market crisis, the price drop, restriction of production, the unproductivity of the market are the conditions which explain the manoeuvre of French imperialism. The propaganda in favour of a European federation can, therefore, be designated as an alarm signal given to capitalist Europe by the bourgeoisie of France.

Never were the conflicts of interest so bitter and the rivalries so sharp in Europe as they are at the present time. The step taken by Briand, even though it was in the nature of a warning to the bourgeoisie of Europe, was in the first place in accordance with a special plan of French imperialism. French imperialism, by seeking to make the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles and of other peace treaties the foundation of the organisation of Europe, wishes to make the Europe of 1919, which is so calculated to maintain the hegemony of France, into a permanent structure. On the other hand, France, by making the conception of security the main point of the draft of a Pan-European Federation, wishes to protect its military hegemony against any attack. In other words, the French government, when it published its memorandum, wished to combat the movement which had already arisen for a revision of the Treaties of 1919.

The replies to Briand's memorandum can be divided into two main categories. Those powers which derive advantages from the treaties announce that the organisation of Europe must in no circumstances violate the provisions of 1919, but must consolidate them. In general these replies were accompanied by very significant declarations, such as those which followed the speech by Treviranus in Poland, or the proclamations of the Ministers of the Little Entente, in which they declared that the restoration of a Hapsburg in Budapest would be regarded by them as an act of war.

On the other hand, those Powers which feel themselves to be harmed by the Treaties assert—the one with reserve and ambiguity (Germany), the other with greater clearness (Italy)—that the Federal organisation of Europe must make good the injustices of 1919; they have at the same time protested against the conception of security which formed the basis of the draft submitted by France.

But Briand's memorandum not only shows the severity of the crisis of capitalism and indicates the diverging efforts of the various imperialist Powers in Europe; it also reveals a new relation of power in Europe. It is exceedingly noteworthy in this respect that French imperialism, which really dominates the League of Nations, has made an attempt to satisfy its ambitious aspirations outside of the League of Nations. This is the reason for the very cool reception accorded Briand's memorandum by leading circles in the League of Nations. A high functionary of Geneva has fiercely criticised the French draft in a confidential Note which will undoubtedly arouse much discussion in the next few days.

The discussion of the plan of a Pan-European Federation represents one of the greatest efforts which has been attempted for ten years against the revolutionary proletariat and against the Soviet Union; there is already plenty of evidence for this. In particular the articles by Sauerwein in the "Prager Presse", which express the ideas of Briand, clearly prove that the organisation of Pan-Europe is, in the mind of its initiators, a war apparatus against the Soviet Union. A further proof is furnished by the campaign which France is conducting against the foreign trade monopoly of the Soviet Union. The campaign for Pan-Europe was launched at the same time as the campaign of incitement against the Soviet Union and the Five-Year Plan. This campaign will find an echo in Geneva. This is what renders the present meeting of the League of Nations of interest.

The 1st of September — A Turning Point in the Class Struggle of the Hungarian Proletariat.

By Schaschi (Budapest).

The street fights which took place in Budapest on September 1st signify a turning point in the class struggle of the Hungarian proletariat. They mean that the proletariat, the great masses, are not only dissatisfied with the existing fascist dictatorship, but have taken up an active fight against it.

The 1st of September was a magnificent victory for the revolutionary proletariat and its advance-guard, the Communist Party of Hungary, and a shameful defeat for the fascist bourgeoisie and its supporters, the social-fascist class traitors. The social fascists intended to have a repetition of the manoeuvre of 1st of May, a "silent and peaceful march", in order by this means to blunt the fighting spirit of the masses. The Communists, who are working in strict illegality, issued the slogan: "September 1st shall not be a day of peaceful promenade, but a day of revolutionary street demonstrations!"

The Communist slogan won the day. A revolutionary mass numbering tens of thousands opposed the fascist bayonets and the social fascist manoeuvre and followed the fighting slogan of the Party.

The 1st of September was to have been mainly an economic action, but the Hungarian proletariat converted it into a magnificent political fight. It was a powerful fight against the fascist bourgeoisie in the streets of Budapest, and at the same time a fight between social fascists and Communists for the hegemony of the leadership of the working masses demonstrating in the streets.

When the social democracy learned that the C. P. of

Hungary intended to lead the unemployed in an action embracing the whole country, they attempted to meet it by an incredibly sounding "left" manoeuvre. They proclaimed a general strike for September 1st and organised a peaceful demonstration in order to divert the discontent of the masses.

But the manoeuvre of the social fascists was frustrated and the C. P. of Hungary showed itself capable of fulfilling its mission. The masses turned against social fascism and followed the Communists.

That is how even the bourgeoisie has estimated September 1st. On September 2, the bourgeois newspapers wrote:

"The social democratic tactics have suffered a horrible and scandalous defeat, for in the course of the events of Monday the radical elements seized the leadership, . . . the spectacle of shameful revolutionary street fighting, which had long disappeared from our streets, was again to be seen." ("Magyarság").

Already before September 1st the bourgeoisie had estimated the relation of forces much more correctly than the conceited social fascists. The bourgeoisie perceived that the situation had become stronger and its mass influence had considerably increased. The bourgeoisie made use of every means of terror of the social fascists had declined; that the C. P. of Hungary had become stronger and its mass influence had considerably increased. The bourgeoisie made use of every means of terror and intimidation; they concentrated enormous armed forces in Budapest and the provincial towns, and reckoned that in the event of the social democracy really proving to be too weak, they would be in a position rapidly, even if bloodily, to suppress the movement. But the bourgeoisie made a mistake. The workers displayed a tenacity, a determination and courage such as fascism had never expected. They not only did not waver before the sabres and bullets of the police, but even went over to the attack. This time not only workers' blood flowed but also that of the police hounds.

And even if this political collision has been "ended" for the time being by the masses being driven back with the aid of the police bayonets, the fact that tens of thousands of workers stood up against the bloodiest terror for half a day, that in the midst of this fight the illegal Communist Party held an open meeting, that barricades were erected, means that the fascist bayonets have but won a Phryrus victory. In the last resort it was a wonderful victory of the revolutionary workers.

Now, when the bourgeoisie and the social fascists have recovered somewhat from the nightmare of revolution, they are attempting to depreciate the importance of the events so that it shall not become obvious to the whole world, and especially to the toilers of Hungary, how very shaky the foundations of the fascist hunger-dictatorship in Hungary are. At the same time, however, there has set in since September 1st an incitement against the Communist Party such as has been hardly known in the eleven years history of the Party.

On the day following the 1st of September the social fascists spread what lies they could in order to cover up their defeat. They divided the events of September 1st into two parts: On the one side there was a splendid, powerful demonstration, disciplined and peaceful — that was held by the social democrats. On the other side there was an uncurbed, senseless bloodshed by the "mob", the "scum", the "slum proletariat", who attacked innocent and harmless policemen and provoked them to make use of their weapons, committed robbery and plunder, and smashed and plundered the shops of small trades people — this was the work of the Communists, or, as the social democrats are wont to say, the police spies.

In this way social fascism dissociates itself at the outset from the "slum proletariat" led on by "police spies"; it dissociate itself from the revolutionary demonstration, from the fight, from the barricades. But the trouble is that not only the whole of the Hungarian press, but also the foreign press has unanimously recorded that the demonstration on September 1st, the streets fights, were conducted by revolutionary workers under the leadership of the Communists, that this took place over the heads of the social fascist bureaucracy, and all that the latter had to do with the whole affair was, when "peaceful persuasion" was of no avail, to make use of the aid of the police in order to throttle the demonstration.

Today the social democrats say quite openly that they

organised the 1st September demonstration in order to frustrate the Hunger March planned by the C.P. of Hungary for 1st November. Payer, who has been called to account by the bourgeoisie for the events, declared:

"This demonstration was absolutely necessary, for unrest and bitterness had increased to the utmost limits in the ranks of the workers. Had we not taken the leadership of this march into our hands, in one or two months the discontent would have found quite another expression. The leadership of the workers would have got into the hands of subjects (i. e., the C. P. of Hungary), who would have made use of this tension for their own political purposes."

How far the social democrats, in spite of all their talk, are forced to admit that the leadership of the masses slipped entirely out of their hands, is shown very clearly by the circumstance that they refrained from any participation in the funeral of the workers fallen in the fight, giving as a reason that "the social democratic party must not expose itself to the danger of the funeral being again made use of by the Communists for the purpose of a demonstration."

With the 1st of September there commenced a magnificent chapter of the heroic fights of the Hungarian proletariat. Not only fascism, but social fascism in particular will do everything in order to frustrate the revolutionary fights of the working class. Precisely therefore we must not underestimate the strength of social fascism, but must increase the fight against it. That is an indispensable precondition for an appropriate continuation of the fights which have begun.

The C.P. of Hungary will remain at its post and ever broader masses will follow it into the fight.

From Slavek to Pilsudski.

By J. Lenski.

The taking over of the government by Marshal Pilsudski in place of Slavek, whereby Pilsudski has again become Prime Minister of the fascist government of Poland, has undoubtedly a more serious importance than the usual change of colonels. The fact alone that Pilsudski, who has long preferred to work behind the scenes, has been compelled openly to enter the arena, bears witness to the serious situation of the fascist dictatorship in Poland.

The five months during which the Slavek government was in office were marked by a further deterioration of the economic position of the country. The industrial and agricultural crises assumed a chronic character. Industry continued to restrict its production; the factory owners threw fresh thousands of workers onto the street (in the Dombrova district, in Upper Silesia, in Ziravdov etc.); the prices of agricultural products continued to fall below the level of world market prices.

In the "fight against the crisis" the Slavek government clung frantically to the programme of the capitalists and big landowners' organisations, to whom were granted all possible privileges for export and in the matter of taxation. The Polish bourgeoisie conducted a furious attack on the broadest front upon the toiling masses. Nearly everywhere the employers carried out wage cuts of from 10 to 30 per cent and demanded that the working day be increased to 10 and 12 hours. In the rural districts the wages of agricultural workers were cut by 50 per cent. In most works and factories the ten-hour day has been introduced. Many enterprises are working 12 to 14 hours a day. The Slavek government liquidated the remnants of the social insurance and reduced the grants to the unemployment fund from 15 million to 6 million Zloty a month. It deprived the short-time workers of all relief and allowed the employers to postpone the payment of their contributions to the health insurance fund. The pressure of taxation upon the broad masses was increased. The indebtedness of the peasant masses grew.

The Slavek government set the whole apparatus of suppression in motion in order to compel the working class to submit to the programme of finance capital. Wholesale attacks upon revolutionary workers and peasants, systematic attacks with fire arms on street demonstrations, mishandling of workers by the police, by the fascists and social fascists, prohibition of Left trade unions (in Warsaw itself 16 trade unions were prohibited), punitive expeditions into the villages, gas attacks, death sentences,—these are the "achievements"

of the Slavek government in the fight against the revolutionary movement.

All these terrorist measures, bordering on methods of civil war, were unable however to check the revolutionary upsurge in Poland. The wave of stormy demonstrations, which developed into fierce fights with the police, swept the whole of Poland. In spite of the raging terror, the anti-fascist block achieved a number of successes at bye elections to the Polish Diet. Broad masses of the exploited peasantry, not only in Ukraine and White Russia but also in Poland itself, began to stir. The fight against the taxes and the fascist division of the land broke out in many districts.

At the same time the discontent of broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie and part of the middle bourgeoisie, who are being ruined by the economic crisis, increased. The tension in the fascist camp became more acute; the dispute between the Pilsudski people and the Left Centre, which is supported by the National Democrats, assumed the character of a furious family squabble. Splits and defections weakened the government block.

Finally, in the sphere of foreign politics, the forced preparations for war against the Soviet Union coincided with the accentuation of the antagonism between Polish and German imperialism. It was in such a situation that Marshal Pilsudski succeeded Colonel Slavek as Prime Minister. This change indicates in the first place the further sharpening of the fascist terror which is to be expected. The first days of the Pilsudski government were characterised by wholesale arrests in the towns and villages and also by the arrest of most of the revolutionary Sejm deputies. The Polish Ochrana is employing every means in order to destroy the Communist Party. Sniping at demonstrations is becoming a regular system.

Polish domestic policy, which combined a maximum concentration of power with unchecked budget expenditure, is subordinated to Pilsudski's anti-Soviet plans. The budget difficulties are today the sorest spot of the fascist government. During the last seven months the State reserves in the Polish bank declined from 269 million to 65 million Zloty. It is impossible to balance the budget. The pressure of taxation is no longer capable of squeezing out of the middle classes and the toiling masses the means required by the fascist dictatorship. The "rationalisation" of the budget is being undertaken at the cost of the outgoings for the unemployed, for educational purposes etc. In two or three months' time the financial reserves will be exhausted. Therefore Pilsudski is losing his mental balance and is heaping the vilest abuse on the social fascist lackeys.

Pilsudski wishes with the aid of the Sejm elections to secure a firm majority for the government block, after the Rumanian pattern. There exists no doubt that every means of violence, of bribery and deception will be used in order to achieve this object.

The demand again brought forward by Pilsudski of a revision of the Constitution, accords entirely with the declaration of the "Leviathan" (Union of the financial world, of industry and commerce) on the necessity of "solving the questions bound up with the political system".

Pilsudski would like to maintain something in the nature of the Sejm as a fig leaf to cover the fascist dictatorship, which is losing the last appearance of "democracy". The "opposition", whose programme aims at the retention of the "outer forms of Parliamentarism" for the purpose of duping the working masses, also has the same opinion regarding the Sejm. Behind different phrases there is concealed the same aim: to strengthen the shaken foundation of the fascist dictatorship. That is the actual meaning of the declaration adopted at the Cracow Conference of the Left Centre. The "opposition" is also in favour of a revision of the Constitution in the sense of the most important demands of the government block (extension of the powers of the President, consolidation of the fascist government etc.). The Cracow Congress had to convince the bourgeoisie that the "Left Centre" enjoyed sufficient support among the masses in order to realise its programme for rescuing capitalist stabilisation and maintaining the fascist dictatorship.

In the fight against the revolutionary upsurge the Sejm must, in the opinion of the Left Centre, play the part of a lightning conductor. Precisely therein lies the danger of the counter-revolutionary role of the Left Centre.

The Communist Party of Poland is meeting the Sejm elections by mobilising the masses round the anti-fascist workers' and peasants' block. It is showing the masses the way out of the crisis by means of the fight for a workers' and peasants' government, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, upon the ruins of the fascist dictatorship. The C.P. of Poland will submit to the masses a concrete programme of its fight and connect it with the urgent requirements of the working class and the exploited peasantry. The C.P. of Poland will concentrate all its forces on organising the united electoral front from below against fascism and social fascism, against counter-revolutionary imperialist war, for the defence of the Soviet Union, for the right to self-determination of Western Ukraine and White Russia and their inclusion in the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, and the White Russian Soviet Republic respectively, against the anti-German incitement of the Polish fascists and social fascists, for the right to self-determination of Upper Silesia and the Polish coast district up to their separation from Poland, and for the fighting solidarity of the Polish and German proletariat.

The Results of the Warsaw Agrarian Conference.

By Bratin (Warsaw).

The results of the conference of the agrarian countries which was concluded in Warsaw on August 30 can be summed up as follows:

In the theoretical field a programme is to be drawn up the realisation of which extends beyond the possibilities of the countries which have taken part in the conference. The question of exports, imports, through transit of goods as well as the main questions of credits, encountered almost insuperable difficulties. There exists not the least doubt that the first attempts at realisation of the proposed plans will reveal their utter impracticability having regard to existing possibilities, with the result that all the antagonisms, which were artificially patched up at the Warsaw conference will again become glaringly evident.

The Warsaw conference wanted obviously to represent the Polish government crisis as a political success for Poland. The Polish Minister for Agriculture solemnly announced the "inception of a Balkan and Baltic Agrarian Co-operative". The spectre of an agrarian block is to be that weapon which Poland will make use of in the League of Nations. This weapon will obviously be employed by Poland in the question of the commercial treaty and various agreements with Germany.

Such a political pressure exerted by Poland accords with the interest of France, which wishes to draw Germany more and more into the block against the Soviet Union. The periodical conferences of Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, the formation of a permanent economic committee, which creates the appearance of concrete forms of an "Agrarian Block" and an "entente cordiale" of the Baltic and the Balkan countries, have in addition a very important aspect. Even if such conferences and committees should prove perfectly impotent to solve question of European economy, they could work out freely and without hindrance the measures for "combating the unfair competition of the Soviet Union", that is to say, the campaign against the foreign trade monopoly of the Soviet Union will undoubtedly form the chief subject of concrete study.

The participation of delegates from Latvia and Esthonia lend a special character to the future Committee, as it creates a fresh foundation for the old plans for organising a Polish-Baltic block against the Soviet Union.

The Agrarian Conference recorded in a detailed resolution that the agrarian countries can avoid the advancing misery and poverty only if their exports remain on a level with their imports of goods from the industrial countries. All the efforts of individual countries can but achieve inadequate results. It is necessary for the agrarian countries to defend their interests jointly and at the same time to do away with mutual competition. Agreements covering certain regions must form stages to the general unification of the whole of European economy.

In connection therewith the representatives of the countries taking part in the conference submit to their governments for discussion the following proposals:

Proceeding from the desire to avoid as far as possible mutual competition, the participators in the conference must explore every means for promoting the export of agricultural produce. Those States whose export apparatus permit this must endeavour to conclude bilateral and multilateral agreements in the sphere of exports. The conference expresses the desire that delegates from the export institute of each country shall meet periodically for the purpose of drawing up a joint information-report. The resolution further points to the necessity of uniform agricultural statistics.

Upon the proposal of Poland a point was included in the resolution according to which the delegates attending the conference shall at the first suitable opportunity introduce in the League of Nations a joint motion for the abolition of direct or indirect export premiums on agricultural products. A special Economic Commission is to meet as soon as possible for the purpose of drawing up appropriate suggestions and a draft agreement. The participators in the conference shall also explore the possibilities of concluding bilateral or multilateral veterinary agreements.

For the purpose of drawing up the draft of uniform forms of agricultural credit, the conference is setting up a Technical-Financial Commission which shall meet before November 30, 1930. Finally, the Conference proposes that the leaders of the economic policy of the countries taking part in the Conference shall, if possible, come together once a year. The permanent Committee for Economic Investigation, to which representatives of the countries taking part in the Conference shall belong, is to be set up before October 1, and to centralise all work for the carrying out of the resolutions of the Warsaw Conference and of the further conferences.

After the conclusion of the Conference the delegates were solemnly decorated with Polish Orders.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Strikes in North France Still Going On.

By J. Berlioz (Paris).

The socialists and reformist leaders in North France have so far only succeeded in betraying the textile workers and the metal workers of Lille, who resumed work on the 25th of August. The textile workers of Roubaix-Turcoing, Armentières and Lys-Tales are continuing the fight with greater energy than at the beginning of the movement. This means that in this district there are still more than 50,000 strikers.

On the 22nd and 23rd of August M. Laval, the Minister for Labour, after the award regarding Lille pronounced by the government arbitrator had been accepted, attempted to bring about a compromise between the reformist trade unions and the textile consortium of Roubaix-Tourcoing. The last named had made only trifling concessions. The Minister for Labour ascertained that both the workers' delegation and the employers' delegation "had a firm determination to put an end to the fight", and returned to Paris, reckoning that the social fascist leaders would manage to get a compromise accepted by a carefully selected meeting of their followers, being helped in this by the discouraging effects which the resumption of work in Lille would be bound to produce.

But the workers of Roubaix-Tourcoing have frustrated this manoeuvre. They spoke so openly against capitulation that the social fascist leaders did not venture to propose it to the trade union meetings on 25th of August, and were compelled, in order to preserve contact with their militant followers, themselves to recommend the continuation of the fight.

But they continue to confine the aim of the movement to a simple question of the regulation of the stability premium and the personal fight against the "dictatorial" methods of the head of the Consortium, M. Ley. The resolution which they had adopted on 25th of August does not mention anything about wage increases. Writing in the "Populaire", Leon Blum, after laying great stress on the importance of the concessions

on the part of the employers, seeks finally to show that the question of Ley is not so very important and that "his personality could not be any obstacle to an agreement".

The reformist leaders do not reckon on the actions of the workers, but exclusively on the intervention of the government in order to put an end to the struggle. And with this object in view appeal daily to M. Laval and Tardieu. Jouhaux writes in his newspaper:

"Cannot the government obtain recognition of legality and the principles of freedom and justice underlying democracy?"

They continually insist that the strikers return to work at those firms which have promised wage increases; that they shall not engage in chasing blacklegs nor gather together in the streets. As, however, the methods of direct action advocated by the revolutionary trade unions are being employed by an increasing number of workers, who attack the motor lorries conveying strike-breakers to work and prevent them from proceeding farther, they find it necessary themselves to organise street demonstrations in Armentières and Roubaix in order to side-track this excitement. Naturally they wish these demonstrations to be "peaceful and dignified" affairs; and when the revolutionary workers wished to impart to them another character they are arrested by the police as a result of denunciations by the socialist leaders.

Thus the social democrats are showing a great capacity for manoeuvring in order not to lose touch with the working masses and in order to create in them the illusion that they, the social democrats, are determined to carry on the fight.

As the militancy of the strikers is growing and as workers in numerous factories in Roubaix-Tourcoing are again going on strike after having resumed work on the orders of their leaders, the government has decided to proceed with greater brutality against the revolutionary workers. Under the pretext that a placard has been issued praising the methods of direct action, the government is having the revolutionary strike leaders persecuted and arrested. In this action they are fully supported by the "Populaire" which writes:

"With regard to the Communists they are now proceeding, in their desire to serve the Consortium and to bring about disturbances which would render possible severe reprisals and deprive the strike of its admirably peaceful character, to demand direct action, which is the system of all spies and provocateurs."

New detachments of mobile guards have arrived in the strike area in order to intimidate the courageous strikers. It is certain that great efforts are to be made in order to break the strike, for, as the "Temps" writes, it now seems difficult to find a compromise as the question of prestige between the Consortium and the Socialist leaders appears to have been raised.

The Consortium has at any rate formally declared that it will not make any further concessions as the whole question is dominated by a single question, i. e., the possibilities of the industry. The socialist leaders must therefore reduce their claims still further, and it is undoubtedly with this object in view that they are beginning to praise certain employers who have been shrewd enough to "render the fidelity premium more elastic".

The Lille metal workers are already realising the essential results of the "tremendous victory" which their leaders have won. The experts agreed to by the trade unions and the employers to investigate the effects of high prices have now pronounced their findings: Daily wages are to be increased by one franc, with which sum one can purchase 400 grammes of bread! The textile employers are declaring again and again that they are in the midst of a crisis and that all the fine calculations of coefficients come up against the question of the reduction of overhead charges or unemployment, which is bound to become general.

At its last meeting the C. C. of the C. P. of France discussed at great length the conclusions to be drawn from the recent strike. The most important are as follows:

1. Its considerable extent: 200,000 strikers, a number which had never been reached since 1921;

2. Its character: it is a powerful commencement of the counter-offensive of the workers against the fascist plan of

the bourgeoisie to make the toilers pay the cost of the crisis which is rapidly seizing France;

3. These movements have broken out against a law which was adopted and praised by the social democratic leaders; thousands of workers, who were still under the influence of the reformists, immediately entered the fight. There exists a firm basis for disintegrating reformist influence in one of its strongholds;

4. All these facts indicate the accentuation of class antagonisms and the considerable development of the radicalisation of the masses and betoken a considerable growth of the militant advance-guard of the workers of France. The analyses and the policy of the C. P. of France thereby receive striking confirmation.

In conclusion, the resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. of France calls upon the whole party to carry out a broad scale campaign of the revolutionary trade union federation in order to prepare and organise the approaching fights, which will be conducted on the following basis: against the fascist and social-fascist social insurance law, against workers' contributions, against the government of high prices, for increase of wages and against unemployment.

PROLETARIAN DEFENCE

Red Front League in Sweden.

By Arvid Wretling (Stockholm).

The Scandinavian-Finnish Anti-Fascist Conference which took place in Stockholm on 10th of August, designated as its most important task to establish in the Scandinavian countries anti-fascist organisations for the struggle against fascism and the imperialist war danger. The anti-fascist committees in Stockholm immediately set to work and convened a Conference, at which it was decided to found an anti-fascist fighting organisation, the Swedish Red Front League.

The events in Finland, and before all the advance of the Lappo bandits, revealed the fascist danger in a striking manner to the Swedish workers. The Lappo bandits have many followers also in Sweden and a portion of the bourgeois press openly favoured the "patriotic struggle" of the Lappo movement. The fascist elements in Sweden scent the morning air, and, following the example of the Lappo bandits, they kidnapped one of the Communist Leaders of Sweden, whom they seriously ill-treated. In the industrial district of Odalen the fascist big peasants attempted to punish the revolutionary workers on account of a long protracted strike, by refusing to supply the industrial towns with food. The front of the big peasants was, however soon, shattered thanks to the enlightenment work of the Communist Party among the small peasants. The latter decided to supply the industrial workers with food, whereupon they were attacked by the armed big peasants. Thereupon the revolutionary workers organised special defence guards which escorted the food transports of the small peasants.

This conflict, which aroused great excitement in the whole of Sweden, shows that the Finnish Lappo bandits have found eager followers in the neighbouring country of Sweden. The leadership of the fascist big peasants' organisation in Odalen received telegrams of greeting from their comrades in arms in the various parts of the country, and also Kosola, the leader of the Lappo Bandits, sent them a letter of greeting. The government had to intervene in order to settle the conflict, as in view of the approaching municipal elections it is in the interest of the bourgeois and of the social democrats to maintain the "prestige of the democratic State".

But it is necessary for the workers to realise that the events in Odalen are no chance expression of fascist development but the outcome of the serious crisis which is preparing the ground for the fascist propaganda in Sweden. Therefore, the anti-fascist Conference on 10th of August was of great importance; but of still greater importance is the founding of the Red Front league which will take over the organisational leadership of the struggle against fascism.

It is now the task of the C. P. of Sweden to exert all its forces in order to develop the Red Front League into a revolutionary mass organisation against fascism and war

danger. It is typical of the renegade party that in its paper it warned the workers against participating in the Scandinavian-Finnish Anti-Fascist Conference and did not mention a single word about the results of this Conference. Nor did they report anything about the founding of the Red Front League. Instead, in their organ they are defending the Finnish renegades, who in alliance with the social fascists have split the Finnish Trade Union Federation and founded a new strike-

breaking organisation which is affiliated to the Amsterdam International. It must be mentioned however that this attitude of the renegades aroused great indignation among their own followers.

The Red Front League of Sweden will undoubtedly in a very short time develop into a powerful fighting organisation for the international struggle against fascism and the danger of imperialist war.

Socialist Construction in the Soviet Union

Appeal of C. C. of C. P. S. U. for the Third Year of the Five-Year Plan.

Moscow, 3rd September 1930.

In connection with the approaching beginning of the new economic year on the 1st October which will be the third year of the Five-Year Plan, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has issued the following appeal to the Party, economic, labour union and young communist organisations:

"The third year of the Five-Year Plan will be a new and tremendous step forward to the industrialisation of the country. In the year 1930/31 the planned increase of industrial production will equal the sum total of industrial production before the war. Apart from works like the Stalin-grad tractor factory and the Rostov on the Don agricultural machinery factory which are already operating, such industrial giants as the Magnitostroi (for which over 200 million rubles will be expended in one year), the Kusnetzstroi, the Nizhni-Novgorod automobile works, the Charkov and Chelyabinsk tractor works, the engineering works in the Urals, the Saratov works for the production of combination reapers and threshers and the chemical combinations in Beresniakov and Bobrikov must be fully developed.

In the coming year a start will be made with the building of the foundry in Nizhnitagilsk and the foundry in Mariopol, the Dnieper combination etc. The programme of the coming year will contain the following figures: Pig-iron production 7.5 million tons, coal production 74.5 million tons, engineering production to the value of 2,500 million roubles, agricultural machinery to the value of 845 million rubles and tractors with a total haulage of 745,000 h.p.

The successful development of heavy industry and the increase of agricultural production will permit a much greater increase of production in the manufacturing industries and this will mean, inter alia, an improvement in the supply of daily necessities.

In the coming year the Soviet farms and collective agricultural undertakings must be rapidly developed. The carrying out of this gigantic economic programme depends on the mobilisation of all the forces of the working class, the Party, labour unions, economic and young communist organisations.

The preliminary condition for the carrying out of this great economic programme however, is the fulfilment of the industrial and finance programme of the current year. In the first 10 months of the second year of the Five-Year Plan socialist large-scale industry has increased its total production by 27 per cent and thus reached a record growth for the whole period of reconstruction. In this same period the heavy industries which are the basis of socialism, have increased their production by 39.5 per cent.

All these successes however, must not conceal the fact that industry has not quite carried out the original plan. Industry lags behind the envisaged figure of 32 per cent. Particularly unsatisfactory is the fulfilment of the building programme which was carried out by only 50 per cent in the first three-quarters of the current year. The most important reason for the failure to carry out the plan was the lack of energy and initiative in the mobilisation of the resources of the country, an insufficient utilisation of the existing factory equipment, stoppages as a result of bad organisation of the raw material supply, a lack of systematic rationalisation, insufficient working out of the factory plans, etc. The many cases of exaggerated orders for equipment to be imported

from abroad without first attempting to obtain the equipment from soviet industry, offer proof of the bureaucratic ideology of some of our economic leaders and often represent the expression of opportunist disbelief in the possibilities of socialist industry.

The changes which showed themselves in the economic situation also played a large role, particularly with regard to the question of labour power and its tendency to frequently change its position. The tremendous development of socialist industry, the demand for new masses of workers, particularly those from the countryside, the development of the soviet farms and collective agricultural undertakings and the increased harvests have caused great changes in comparison with the time when there were permanently a considerable number of unemployed workers in the towns, and the peasants had more than enough outside labour power at their disposal. In this connection the economic, labour union and even Party organisations have adopted a passive attitude and tolerated the development of the fluctuation of labour power. The organs of the Labour Commissariat continued to publish bureaucratic statistics concerning hundreds of thousands of unemployed and continued to pay millions and millions of rubles in unemployment support although all industrial districts were crying for workers, and totally failed to take any action against those who did not want to work.

The fundamental failure of the economic work was seen in the incapacity to organise and direct the rapidly growing activity of the working class. The socialist competitive scheme has now entered on a new phase. The plans of production drawn up by the higher economic organs for the factories are now being examined, corrected and extended by the workers themselves. This practice draws the masses of the workers into the work for the building up of socialism and represents an important weapon in the struggle against the saboteurs. In many cases however the initiative of the workers has not been sufficiently supported by the Party organisations and other factory organisations.

From this situation arise the following fundamental tasks for the Party and the whole working class:

1. All the forces of the Party, the economic, the labour union and the young communist organisations must be mobilised for the development of the socialist competitive scheme and for the all-round support of the initiative of the workers. The initiative of the Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions for the organisation of a trade union campaign in September for the improvement of the financial and industrial plans from below by the workers and for the organisation of a "Day of shock brigade Labour" throughout the whole of the Soviet Union on the 1st October.

2. Measures must immediately be taken to consolidate the discipline of labour.

3. The productive and technical initiative of the engineers must be supported and all care taken to speed up the training of new cadres of engineers and technicians from the ranks of the working class.

4. A system of measures must be introduced to fight against the fluctuation of labour power, to hold the workers to their factories, to cause them to undertake before proletarian public opinion not to leave their jobs before a certain period and at the same time to introduce premiums, etc., which will

spur on the workers to permanent work in the factories. The statutes of the labour exchanges shall be altered in accordance with the changed situation.

5. The co-operatives must arrange the distribution of articles of consumption in such a way that the interests of the factory workers are taken into consideration. In industrial areas, dairy farms, vegetable gardens on a large scale, cattle breeding undertakings etc., must be organised within reach of the big towns.

6. The press which has performed great work on the basis of self-criticism for the mobilisation of the masses for the carrying out of the industrial and finance programme, must direct its attention in particular to a struggle against the chief practical deficiencies of our economic work.

7. A struggle must be organised against the drop in labour tempo as the result of the summer holidays.

These are the most important tasks at the moment. It depends on our own work whether we are able to overcome the difficulties with which we are faced. We must fight tirelessly against bureaucracy and against slacking in our organisations. We must mobilise the working class in the struggle for communism.

Let us concentrate all our forces, all the strength of the Party and of the working class for the carrying out of the industrial and finance plans, for the fulfilment of the programme of the third year of the Five-Year-Plan!"

AGAINST THE CAMPAIGN OF LIES AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION

The Soviet-German Conspiracy.

(Leading article of "Isvestia" of 4th September 1930.)

Changes are contemplated in the command of the German Reichswehr. General Heye, who succeeded General Seeckt as commander-in-chief of the Reichswehr, has handed in his resignation and, according to newspaper reports, his place is to be taken by General Hammerstein. This change has very naturally aroused interest in the German and in the international press. For, as in all similar cases, such changes have not only a personal character but also point to changes which are taking place in the political field. Whether this change has been called forth by inner political or outer political questions, and, if the latter should be the case, by which foreign political questions, is very difficult to ascertain by those who have followed political life in Germany from the outside. Even if it should not be a question of any fight between various tendencies in German home and foreign politics but only a fight between personal groupings in the Reichswehr, it is not to be expected that the bourgeois press would be content to report the mere fact without commenting thereon, the less so as the changes are taking place at a time of accentuation of the class struggle in the country during the election campaign, which bears anything but a usual character. Therefore, we are not surprised to find interpretations in the German press which completely contradict one another.

The Communist press reports that General Hammerstein is the exponent of the most outspoken fascist tendencies in the German army. His appointment means a warlike preparation of the Reichswehr for the event of an approaching fascist upheaval in Germany. The Communist press calls attention in this connection to a letter published last year from the German Conservative big landowner von Gaza, in which he pointed out to General Hammerstein that the time was approaching in order to have resort to dictatorial measures. Gaza asked Hammerstein whom he thought the most suitable person to occupy the position of dictator. When this letter appeared in the Communist Press—it is hardly necessary to say that this occurred without the knowledge and approval of General Hammerstein—Hammerstein did not deny having received such a letter but declared that he did not attach the slightest importance to it and had not replied to it. There is no need for us to say that we should not be at all surprised if it should prove that General Hammerstein is not so utterly indifferent to the idea of a fascist dictatorship as to throw unanswered into the wastepaper-basket a letter dealing with

this question, and sent by a person who is obviously not unknown to Hammerstein. But we shall not subject the declarations of General Hammerstein to any criticism here, as we are not sufficiently familiar with the political and personal groupings among the leaders of the Reichswehr.

A part of the bourgeois press maintains that General Hammerstein belongs to that tendency in the German Reichswehr which, allegedly, is seeking a close connection with the Soviet Union. General Hammerstein and General Schleicher, the representative of the Reichswehr Ministry, it is asserted, are aiming at proceeding against Poland in alliance with the Red Army. It must remain unintelligible to anybody with sound sense, how the commander of the Reichswehr could, without the knowledge of the German Government, carry on a policy which actually proceeds from a war alliance with the Soviet Union.

If therefore even the press which is spreading this legend should really believe that the Soviet Union desires a war—and the Soviet Union has given no cause whatever for such an assumption—then it must name those actions of Generals Hammerstein and Schleicher which give them grounds for their conclusions regarding the importance of the changes which are taking place in the Reichswehr. But it is not necessary to say that it possesses no facts whatever which could serve to confirm that which it has concocted. Its whole outcry about a "conspiracy" of the Reichswehr Generals with the Soviet Union is a new version of the well-known tale of the sea serpent which the cheap press serves up in the silly season, when there is a lack of sensational news.

As is known, the leading politicians of the State Party, which is connected with the Chemical Trust and the Potash Trust, and through the latter with France, have been proclaiming since 1926 the necessity of a Franco-German rapprochement, as well as its extension to Poland—in the last resort for war against the Soviet Union. The notorious Reckberg is the chief promulgator of this idea. The present revival of the legend of a conspiracy on the part of the Reichswehr Generals with the Soviet Union is only the refrain of the old melody which is intended to show that the leaders of the State Party are ever ready to serve the Entente.

The Soviet press, which is almost tired of replying to all the fairy tales of the bourgeois European press, has therefore not paid any attention to the latest campaign of lies:

If we now turn our attention to it, it is because we are induced to do so by an article in the "Germania", the organ of the Centre Party, which is at the head of the German government. The "Germania" does not believe in such a "conspiracy" but, raising a warning finger, calls attention to the fact that German officers who studied the Red Army and its organisation, "not only praised the defensive capacity of the Red Army, but went further and recognised the importance of the Soviet Union as a factor of world politics and accorded it their sympathy".

Does the Catholic Centre, perchance, demand that German officers shall ignore facts in order to benefit the anti-Soviet campaign of the Vatican and not tell the truth about the Red Army? or does it demand of German officers that they shall regard the existence of a great Power, which refused to recognise the Versailles Treaty and concluded with Germany a treaty in which each party had equal rights, at a time when the Entente spoke with the bayonet of the occupation army, as a factor harmful to Germany? It suffices to put this question in order to say that the organ of the Centre, which by indirect methods raises such demands, causes us to think that the ruling party in Germany, which supplied the government with its leaders, does not take its own diplomatic assurances seriously, as it suffices to compare this standpoint of the "Germania" with the Soviet-German communique of 12th of July last in order to see a glaring contradiction between the official point of view adopted by the Brüning government, and the standpoint represented by Brüning's paper. Such contradictions do not benefit German policy.

We can demand that the official German press, in the heat of its inner-party polemics, shall not by fairy tales, which are out of place, injure the friendly relations existing between the Soviet Union and Germany. These relations have nothing in common with "conspiracy"; they are based upon published treaties and serve the cause of peace as well as the consolidation of the international situation of Germany and the Soviet Union.

Proletarian Commemoration Days

The Tenth Anniversary of the Occupation of the Factories in Italy.

By A. Komjat.

Ten years have passed since the revolutionary Italian workers in Turin, Milan and numerous other towns in northern Italy took possession of the factories. At the same time the land workers and poor peasants in Sicily, southern Italy and in several places in north Italy occupied the big landed estates.

The imperialist world war plunged Italy into a severe economic and financial crisis. After the conclusion of the war the crisis increased in severity at a tremendously rapid rate. Heavy industry, which is lacking any firm foundation in Italy, collapsed as a result of the cessation of further government orders, while other branches of industry which during the war were mainly engaged in the production of war supplies, were compelled greatly to restrict operations. This was the case especially with those undertakings which had been set up during the war. In such circumstances unemployment increased very rapidly. In addition a shortage of food made itself felt and forced up the prices of the most necessary articles of food to such a height as to render them unattainable even by workers who were in full employment. These are the reasons why a prolonged revolutionary fight set in in Italy after the conclusion of the war.

The class rule of the bourgeoisie emerged from the world war in a thoroughly shaken condition. Disorganisation, demoralisation and impotency had seized all organs of the State apparatus. At the same time there arose an uncheckable wave of popular indignation which swept the whole country. At the head of this movement, which had taken over the slogans of the Russian revolution and which was a powerful revolutionary movement, there stood the Italian proletariat. This revolutionary movement assumed a very sharp form and had a very wide extent.

The revolutionary situation gave a powerful impetus to the development of the Socialist Party. At the end of 1919 the party had 1981 organisations with 91,469 members and 47 parliamentary deputies and 350 municipal councillors; scarcely a year later it already had 4,367 organisations with 219,327 members, and 156 deputies and 2,200 municipal councillors. This tremendous growth of the Socialist Party was a sign of the great upsurge of the revolutionary movement in Italy. In the Summer of 1920 the fight against high prices extended over almost the whole country. At the same time a strike movement set in which continually spread. This movement, which had already assumed large proportions at the beginning of 1920, reached its highest point in September of the same year in powerful revolutionary outbreaks and in the occupation of the factories by the proletariat.

The proletariat undertook this revolutionary attack with an irresistible élan and on a rapidly widening front. Several hundred industrial undertakings in North Italy fell into the hands of the workers. The red flag of the proletarian revolution waved over hundreds of factories. The red workers' guards defended the factories and the workers' quarters. At the gate of every occupied factory machine guns were posted and in the courts of many big factories even big guns with full technical equipment were placed in readiness to defend the factory. The whole of the Italian workers felt and realised that this great fight concerned the whole interests of the Italian proletariat against the bourgeoisie. The movement originated with the metal workers, but it rapidly spread to other categories of workers. Thus the chemical factories were occupied and the transport companies taken possession of. The whole of the Italian workers placed themselves at the disposal of the defence and support of the fighting metal workers. The whole of the working class of different towns were organised for defence in the event of an attack on the

part of the government against the metal workers and the occupied factories. It was an indescribable picture how, in response to the signal for help sounding from a factory, thousands of workers would run in the direction from which the signal was heard, whilst the bourgeoisie, frightened to death, fled into their houses.

At the same time there broke out the revolt of the rural proletariat and the small peasants in Sicily, South Italy and many districts of Northern Italy. This movement aimed at the occupation of the Latifundias and the distribution of the land among the peasants possessing no or very little land. In many places this movement ended with the actual seizure of the land of the big landowners.

The government, implored by the bourgeoisie to come to its assistance, declared through the mouth of the Prime Minister Giolitti: We are without any forces which we could employ against the workers.

At this moment the reformists and centrists came to the aid of the government and extricated it from its helpless situation. At the National Council of the Confederation of Labour, which consisted of representatives of the socialist parties and of the trade unions and which was convened in the middle of the fight, the reformists succeeded in getting the view adopted, that the fight had only purely trade union aims and that only the trade unions should have the leadership of this fight. The proposal of the Communist majority in the Central Committee of the Socialist Party to recognise the political character of the movement and to take over the leadership of the struggle by the Party, was rejected. In this way the movement was driven into a cul de sac and doomed to defeat. The leaders of the reformists — Turati in the Socialist Party and D'Aragona in the trade unions — triumphed. The centrists justified their attitude and Serrati even went so far as to deny the revolutionary character of the fight of the workers for the occupation of the factories and to call it a peaceful trade union action, whilst he designated the fight of the peasants for possession of the land as a "reactionary movement". Serrati and the rest of the centrists took refuge behind the "Marxist" sentence: "Revolution is not made, the revolution comes by itself!" and did nothing. Negotiations with the government were initiated on the basis of "workers' control" and other demands. These negotiations ended with the workers handing back the factories, and after the capitalists were again masters of their factories and the government had succeeded in arming itself again and preparing for bloody procedure against the workers, all the demands of the workers were left unfulfilled. Not only that: the evacuation of the factories was immediately followed by the disarming of the workers. A few weeks later thousands and thousands of workers sat behind prison walls.

After this, its first victory, the Italian bourgeoisie took up the offensive against the proletariat along the whole line. By this defeat the door was first opened to fascism, the most terrible scourge of the proletariat. Under the given conditions, the logical consequence of the non-accomplished revolution was the victory of fascism.

The mass of the workers, who were once so conscious of victory, were discouraged and possessed by the deepest pessimism. They considered it useless to continue the fight further. The social democrats fostered this mood by preaching capitulation as a "weapon" against the attacks of the bourgeoisie and fascism. The fascist movement grew like an avalanche, and on the 29th of October, 1923, Mussolini was able to undertake his march on Rome.

"Without a Communist Party there can be no proletarian revolution." That was the lesson which the Italian working

class had to draw and has drawn from its defeat in the year 1920. The Communist Party of Italy was founded, it conducted heroic fights against fascism and is more and more winning the confidence of the Italian toilers. The traitors of the year 1920, however, are working hand in hand with Mussolini or endeavouring in emigration to create fresh illusions in the masses as to a "democratic" transformation in Italy. The Italian workers, however, as well as the workers of other countries, have already learnt through ten years of the most fearful sufferings and deprivations where their enemies and their friends stand and how they must act in order to emerge as victors from the fight against the bourgeoisie.

THE WHITE TERROR

"American Workers Should Work and Live on Bread and Water."

By J. Louis Engdahl (New York).

The North Carolina State Supreme Court has upheld the savage conviction and vicious sentences to 117 years in prison of the seven Gastonia strikers and organisers — Fred Erwin Beal, William M. McGinnis, Louis McLaughlin, George Carter, Joseph Harrison, K. Y. Hendricks and Clarence Miller.

Exactly on the same day that the black robed persecutors of rebels against the "new industrialism" and its slavery in the South were putting the finishing touches on their bloody edict, Frank Goldberg, president of the American Cotton Mills, Inc., was telling the committee of striking workers at Bessemer City that the workers should

"Work and live on bread and water. Work like hell for production!"

The boss class theory of "Work like the devil but believe in god almighty" is not new but it is strikingly brought to the front by the latest events in North Carolina.

It was this month a year ago that 23 textile strikers and organisers were held in Gastonia jails because they fought to win a better life for the "mountain folks" who had been drawn down into the mill towns of the Piedmont district to a serfdom of endless toil, condemned to the horrible death of slow starvation called pellagra, because their meager wages could not provide the barest food diet necessary to life. World labour rallied to the defence of the 23. Seven were freed but 16 were held for death in the electric chair. The appeal of the International Labour Defence roused workers in every land. Bestial "Southern chivalry", cornered, shrieked, "We do not fry women in North Carolina!" and three of the women strike leaders indicted and six more of them escaped the shadow of the electric chair. Then the prejudiced, petty bourgeois minded, church going jurors, in alliance with the bosses' court lackey, Judge Barnhill, prepared the verdict and the judgement that sought to consign the remaining seven to the tombs of the living death.

At the same time capitalist class justice has carefully, energetically defended its own. Let every worker study these facts:

First:—North Carolina "capitalist justice" has not sentenced to one single day in prison the murderers of the six Marion textile strikers, massacred in cold blood by assassins wearing deputy sheriff's badges, while a score more were wounded. Instead Marion strikers are ordered to jail.

Second:—The assassins of Ella May on Sept. 14th, 1929, remain at liberty, free to commit or join in new lynchings or killings of workers.

Third:—The kidnappers and floggers of Lell, Saylor, Wells and others, who were bent on lynchings, are all still at large. Major A. L. Bulwinkle, the mob leader, later one of the prosecutors at the Gastonia trial, has now been nominated by the democratic party to go to congress. His chief aid, Solicitor Carpenter, church leader of the Manville-Jenckes mob called "The Committee of 100", helps plot new violence in the days just past against the Bessemer City strikers.

Fourth:—Headquarters of the National Textile Worker's Union and the Workers' International Relief have been smashed and destroyed with no one called to account.

Fifth:—North Carolina provides the latest of the 21 lynchings of Negro workers during the last eight months. The 29-year-old Negro farm labourer, Oliver Moore, was taken by a mob from the Edgecombe County Jail, at Tarboro, strung up to a tree in front of his home, and his body riddled with hundreds of bullets. The sheriff and his deputies, as usual "didn't recognise" any of the mob. Lynch law is capitalist class law, the law of the boss class against the working class. The lynchers do not fear punishment from their own laws.

Thus capitalism's harlot "Class Justice" stalks through city and country-side in North Carolina, the same ugly spawn of the profit social system that seeks the lives of the six workers in Atlanta—H. M. Powers, Joe Carr, Ann Burlak, Henry Story, Herbert Newton and Mary Dalton.

It was the Bessemer City strike that again blew the lid off the barbarous conditions under which Southern labour toils. Here was a rebellion voted "practically unanimously" between two and three o'clock, the early morning hours of Monday, August 18th, after an almost all-Sunday night discussion of miseries unbearable.

The outraged workers had refused to accept the third successive wage cut since Christmas, declaring that they could not live and pay their grocery bills under the old scale, and that, "It's better to perish at home than on the job." Even the first day of the strike saw the ghost of starvation stalking the mill villages.

But it is not only food that is lacking. Winter is coming on and there is no money for clothes. The so-called schools are soon to open but there are no pennies for books. The mere mention of free school books is denounced as "revolutionary" and "Bolshevism" in North Carolina. One landlord laments that he tried to collect rent at 14 shacks called "homes" that he owned, but could not get a penny from any one of them. The future of "American youth" in the Southern textile mills is told in the story of the boy employed in Mill No. 2, of the American Cotton Mills, Inc., at Bessemer City, since he was 14 years old. He is now 21 and has been in the same job all the time. His wages under the different cuts has brought pay down from dollar 18 to dollar 12 per week. The earnings of many Bessemer City strikers for the week preceding the walkout totalled only dollar 6 or dollar 8 according to the showing on their pay envelopes. Some declared they toiled the 12-hour day but that they were being openly robbed of one hour's wages and being paid for only eleven.

The reply of the working class was clearly registered in the mass demonstrations organised and carried out under the banners of the International Labour Defence on the third anniversary of the ruling class murder of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti.

In more than three-score cities many scores of thousands of workers pledged themselves to revenge the burning alive in the electric chair of Sacco and Vanzetti. This revenge is being registered through greater struggles in defence and for the liberation of the increasing number of political prisoners of today, demanding the immediate and unconditional release of the New York and Milwaukee Unemployed Delegations; against the electric chair and for the release of the Atlanta prisoners — **no death sentences, no prison sentences!** — immediate release of the Imperial Valley prisoners; defeat of the infamous Gastonia verdict; release for Money and Billings, and for the Centralia, Washington, prisoners; repeal of the sedition and insurrection laws; dissolution of the so-called Fish Commission, instrument of the United States government in its attack on the working class, especially foreign-born workers threatened with registration, fingerprinting and photographing by the police bloodhounds of Wall Street oppression, accompanied by an increasing wave of deportations, especially to the fascist countries of Europe where firing squads and the gallows await all militant workers.

Fight against all ruling class efforts to put the American working class on a "Bread and Water Diet"! For the Bessemer City textile baron speaks with the voice of capitalist class greed against which increasing masses of the working class rebel and struggle.

In the International

All Sections of the C.I. Can and Must Become Real Mass Parties.

By O. Piatnitzky.

(Continued.)

5. It is only due to such abnormalities in the work of the local Party organisations that in all Sections of the C.I. cases occur in which the Party Committees are informed of economic conflicts in the factories only after their conclusion, as in most cases the Communists who are working in these factories either do not pay any attention at all to what is going on in the factories or work on their own initiative without any leadership on the part of the respective Party organisations, a state of affairs which often leads to various forms of opportunism in practice.

I adduce some facts from the practice of our Sections in order to illustrate this assertion. On 26th of January 1930 the Marx nucleus of a provincial organisation of the C.P. of Poland adopted a resolution in which it was declared:

"We members of the C.P.P. express our regret at the indifference of our leaders, who for some months have totally neglected our nucleus. We categorically demand that some leaders appear before us, else we shall be compelled to abandon our fighting position for the workers' and peasants' government.

We demand that this resolution be submitted to the C.C. . . ."

"On the occasion of the Lenin-Liebknecht-Luxemburg campaign a member of the district Committee, Comrade H. visited our nucleus and instructed us to hang out flags during the campaign and to paint our slogans on the houses, which instructions we carried out."

"... When however we called upon Comrade H. to tell us what ought to be done and to deliver a speech to us, he declared that he would like to help us, but he had nothing new to say to us, as the district committee had not met for three years. Therefore for the second time we request that more attention be given to the development of our class consciousness, in order that we may be able to stand up for our Party . . ."

"... You must teach us to steel ourselves and to render ourselves capable of fighting. We know how to place flags on telegraph poles and to paint the walls with our slogans all right, but we are unable to fight against our enemies at the meetings, not only because we are ignorant of the principles of their parties, but also because we do not even know the principles of our own Party . . ."

"... We demand a systematic leadership and that the leaders shall give an eye to us not merely once in a month or even once in three months as has been the case, up to now."

The above-quoted resolution is, I am sorry to say, not a peculiarity of the provincial organisation of the C.P.P. in question. The same negligence towards the Party nuclei, the same lack of leadership of the lower Party organisations, in particular of the factory nuclei, is a frequent phenomenon both in the legal and the illegal Communist Parties in all capitalist countries.

Many Party organisations of the C.P. of France learned only from the Party papers how many workers' groups, from which factories and in which cities of France had sent money to the funds of "Humanité", and in which factories the workers had formed committees for the defence of "Humanité".

What is still worse is that many Party organisations of the C.P. of France saw in the Committee for the Defence of "Humanité" the danger of the formation of a Labour Party which might be made use of by the renegade groups (the "Workers and Peasants Party", the Trotskyists etc., who had been expelled from the C.P.). Instead of taking such a remarkable and broad mass movement into their own hands, organising it, giving it direction, establishing connection with it, basing themselves on it in the works and factories (with which the C.P. has as yet very feeble connection)

by converting this Committee into a permanent organ which could keep the "Humanité" informed on events and happenings in the factories, instead of organising the spread of our press by means of this organ and finally, to draw the best elements of this Committee into the Party and into the Red Trade Unions—instead of doing this many Party organisations have not devoted the necessary attention to the Committee for the Defence of "Humanité" although directives in regard thereto were given out in good time. As a result these Committees began to disappear as elementarily as they arose. And instead of enlarging the circle of its readers among the working class after such a powerful mass movement, "Humanité" lost many readers which it had possessed before the campaign. Not only the number of readers of "Humanité", but also the number of Party members has declined owing to this passive attitude and lack of understanding in face of such a mass movement.

The Central organ of the C.P.F., "Humanité", is again passing through financial difficulties. We are convinced that the workers of France will respond to the appeal of the C.C. of the C.P. of France and of "Humanité" to support the paper. It is necessary to set up permanent auxiliary committees, defence committees and information committees of "Humanité" in the factories; it is necessary to instruct the local Party organisations and the red trade unions to establish and guide such committees.

In Unterreichenau and in Bleistadt in the district of Teplitz (Czechoslovakia) the owners of two glass factories, employing 2400 workers, declared to the factory councils that they wished to dismiss a part of the workers because the baths had to be repaired. One of the factory councils approved of the dismissal of workers who are not members of the red trade unions. (In these two factories 1600 workers were members of the red trade unions.) The leadership of the local branch of the red glass workers' union, had, without preparing for a strike, started negotiations with the employers for—the purpose of settling the conflict, and by this means disorganised the workers. When it became clear that the employers did not intend to make any concessions, the red glass workers' union declared a strike without any preparation and, without even consulting the strikers, instructed the strike leaders to have the furnaces put out, which just suited the employers, who wished to lay the factories idle for a time. The strike lasted for six weeks and ended in a defeat.

As a result of this strike all the workers of these factories, who were members of the red trade union, left the union: 700 of them went over to the fascists and 120 joined the Catholic union.

The German social democrats and the reformist trade unions have betrayed the interests of the working class during the war of 1914–1919 and after the war up to the present day. They shot down the revolutionary workers during the years of 1919 up to 1921, and this on a larger scale than they did in 1929. At that time they fought against the advance-guard of the German proletariat, its Party (the murder of Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and other Communists and revolutionary workers). The social democrats and the reformists nevertheless retained their influence over a large portion of the workers because they hypocritically came forward in the role of defenders of their daily interests, by passing—of course under the pressure of the masses and in order not to lose their influence over them—the law on the eight hour day, the factory councils law, the law on the improvement of social insurance and the trade unions, even sometimes declaring strikes (general strike of the railwaymen at the beginning of 1920 etc.). In the last two years, however, the social democrats have exposed themselves as open traitors to the working class, as direct agents of the bourgeoisie, and the social democracy which was in power and with it the reformist trade union bureaucracy have worsened the whole social legislation,

in particular the law for unemployment insurance, and thereby lowered the standard of living of the proletariat. In the year 1930 they have lightened the taxation of the bourgeoisie by millions and at the same time imposed a burden of hundreds of millions upon the broadest masses of toilers in the form of direct taxes, heavy customs duties on food. The social democrats and the reformist trade unions support the bourgeoisie in carrying out rationalisation at the cost of the working class not only by means of increased intensity of labour, but also by lengthening the working day, lowering real wages and reducing wages. The social democracy dissolved revolutionary mass organisations and fired on unarmed demonstrators and unemployed. Hence it has been much easier in the years 1929 and 1930 to expose the leaders of the reformist trade unions and of social democracy than in the years 1919 and 1921, for in the last few years the treacherous and counter-revolutionary policy of the latter has assumed a more obvious character, visible to the broadest masses of toilers.

The more unexpected was the result of the factory council elections of 1930 in a number of big undertakings in Germany. In 20 large and very large undertakings employing altogether 200,000 workers, of which formerly 15 undertakings had red factory councils, the C.P. of Germany lost 22,379 votes (in the year 1929 it received 61,122 votes and in 1930 only 38,743) whilst the reformists gained 1930 votes (in 1929 they received 50,954 votes and in the year 1930 52,944 votes).

Of these 20 factories 9 were in Berlin, of which eight had formerly red factory councils; the C.P. of Germany lost 11,599 votes (in 1929 it received 30,066 votes and in 1930 only 18,467 votes) whilst the reformists gained 2,719 votes (in the year 1929 they polled 22,043 votes and in 1930 24,762).

If we examine the causes of the loss of votes sustained by our Party and the gain of the social democrats and reformists in these 20 big undertakings, we shall be able to ascertain why the C.P. of Germany is not increasing its membership and does not put a stop to the fluctuation in its members. What are these causes?

1. In the Opel works, where 7,000 workers are employed, a strike broke out at the beginning of 1930 which was much commented upon, in the German and in the Soviet press. The workers' councils of Opel were in the hands of the Communists. The workers of Opel were very discontented with their wages and indignant at the speeding up system. (The works had passed into American hands and American methods of intensification of work were introduced while at the same time the low German wages were maintained.) The management of the Works dismissed 200 workers and afterwards re-engaged 50 new ones, when the factory council protested against the dismissal of workers and the reinstatement of new workers, the management dismissed the chairman of the factory council. Roused to indignation at this provocation the workers of several departments downed tools and assembled in the courtyard. A meeting began which lasted very long and was gradually joined by workers of other departments. There was no leadership, neither the nucleus nor the factory council put in an appearance. The speakers said many and in general perfectly correct things regarding the Young Plan, the international and inner position of Germany etc., but they did not answer the question urgently confronting the workers of the factory: what is to be done now, immediately? Instead of taking the leadership into its hands, and giving concrete slogans for the actions of the masses, who were expecting this leadership, the factory council entered on negotiations with the factory management. Can it then be wondered at that the management succeeded in deceiving the factory council by delaying negotiations under different excuses until permission was obtained from the French and English occupation commissions for the German police to occupy the works. The meeting went on even after police had entered the works, surrounded the gathering and began to pick out some active workers from the among the mass. The workers were in a fighting mood but the leadership and slogans which could be understood by the masses were lacking. A worker suggested that the police be driven out of the courtyard, and his proposal was taken up by the masses who at once began to eject the police from the courtyard where they stood among the workers. On the arrival of the police the works management broke off negotiations with the factory council. The latter, instead of giving direction to the indignation of the workers and con-

verting it into action, began to persuade the workers "not to let themselves be provoked". The majority of the workers went to dinner without having received any instructions what to do. On the next day they came to work. When the factory council called upon them to strike they replied that they did not reckon upon this strike getting a leadership. Six weeks after this "strike" the factory council elections took place at Opel and resulted in a loss of 1804 votes for the G.P.G., whilst the social democrats and reformists gained 419 votes compared with 1929.

2. In the Berlin Verkehrs A.G., where 24,922 workers and employees are engaged, the C.P.G. obtained the absolute majority at the factory council elections of 1929 (it received 10,747 votes whilst the social democrats and reformists polled 5,934 votes). The social democratic management began to dismiss the revolutionary workers and to put in their place their own followers, encountering thereby no protest on the part of the red factory council. As a result, at the factory council elections in 1930 the reformists received 10,147 votes whilst the C.P.G. lost 4,430 votes.

3. For similar reasons the C.P.G. lost a considerable number of votes in the above mentioned 20 big factories. The red factory councils of the undertakings did not carry out the correct Party line; their activity was a clear proof of the Right deviation in practice; they have not only not organised a struggle against dismissals, against wage cuts and lengthening of the work day but, in a number of cases they even approved of the dismissal of workers. The red factory councils of these undertakings did not differ greatly in their work from the reformist factory councils. The reformists who participated in the dismissal of workers endeavoured to have mainly revolutionary workers and unorganised workers dismissed, who, from the standpoint of the trade union bureaucracy, are unreliable. The red factory councils approved of the dismissal of workers with a small family instead of organising the masses for a systematic and determined fight against the dismissal of workers altogether. In particular the red factory councils—by approving of the dismissal of workers and only opposing the dismissal of unorganised workers—drove the organised workers into the arms of the reformist trade union bureaucracy.

(To be concluded.)

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

The 13th Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance.

By Otto Schröder.

The 13th Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance, which was held in Vienna from 25th to 28th of August, thanks to the action of the delegates of the co-operatives of the Soviet Union, saw the exposure of the class treachery of the social-fascist co-operative bureaucracy. The delegations of the national co-operative federations consisted merely of reformists, as in all countries the opposition had been refused representation at the Congress. Nevertheless the reformists did not succeed in keeping the Congress a select affair, as 25 representatives of the Soviet Co-operatives were among the delegates. These representatives completely dominated the discussion, particularly on the report of the Central Council on the activity of the Alliance.

At a time of the greatest extension of the world economic crisis, with all its dire consequences for the working class, the reformists had nothing better to do than to place on the agenda, in addition to the report of the Central Council on the activity of the Alliance, two reports on "the storage, financing and the sale of the agricultural products of the co-operatives", and on "the Rochdale co-operative principles and the modern credit system in commodity exchange".

The representatives of the Soviet co-operatives dealt with the causes and consequences of the ever growing world economic crisis and proved that customs and tax robbery is being carried out even by social democratic coalition

governments. The active solidarity of the consumers' co-operatives is necessary in the economic struggles, which are continually increasing in number. Only by mobilising and interesting the millions of co-operative members is it possible to get strike support granted in the labour struggles. Against mass unemployment political support by the consumers' co-operatives of the struggle of the unemployed for realisation of their demands and material support of the unemployed are necessary. The manoeuvres of the reformists towards the cartels and trusts were exposed and it was proved how the reformists are more and more merging in the capitalist monopoly organisations. The delegation of the Soviet Union also succeeded in showing the enormous political importance of the struggle against the imperialist war danger and exposing the reformist hypocrisy in this connection.

In the discussion on the principles of the Rochdale pioneers, the Soviet delegation was able to prove that the co-operatives of the Soviet Union are working on the basis of the principles laid down 80 years ago and in accordance with the altered conditions. In the discussion on the agricultural co-operatives the delegation was able to show that only after the overthrow of the capitalist rule are the agricultural co-operatives and collective farms a real help to the broad masses of toiling peasants.

The reformists attempted to counteract the effect of the speeches of the Soviet delegation by putting up the white guardist Totomianz to speak. He complained of the bloody proletarian justice and endeavoured to discredit the enormous achievements of the Soviet co-operatives by asserting that precisely in the Soviet Union, where the members take the most active part in the co-operative movement, the membership exists merely on paper. Lorenz, the representative of the German Co-operative Federation, also challenged the Soviet Union by recommending disarmament to it!

In a dispute whether a motion of the French delegates should be dealt with or not, the French delegation threatened to leave Congress immediately if its motion was rejected. In the criticism by the French delegation of the "inadequate practical international work of the Alliance", the imperialist antagonisms between the French and British bourgeoisie played a considerable role.

In Vienna, the reformist leaders proclaimed in the report delivered by Klepzig that equality of members is one of the most important principles of the co-operative movement. This equality of all members was strikingly illustrated in Vienna by the social-fascist Finnish ex-Prime Minister Tanner, who allowed the reformists to speak without any interruption, but interrupted every delegate from the Soviet Union after their time had elapsed. This same chairman Tanner prevented the translation of the speech by Comrade Sedybol, delegate of the Tuva Republic, on war danger and colonial policy. Although a motion of the French delegation which had not been submitted in time was dealt with by the Congress, the resolutions submitted by the Soviet delegation against imperialist war danger and for aid to striking and unemployed members were not dealt with, although they had been submitted in time.

At the Vienna Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance there were again to be seen two world conceptions competing for the 56 million members of the Co-operative Alliance. On the one side the reformists, who betray the proletarian interests of the co-operative members, who subject the co-operatives to the rule of the trusts. In the opinion of these reformists the co-operatives will gradually, in the course of decades and centuries, oust capitalist trade and production and grow into Socialism by evolutionary means.

These reformists were confronted in an irreconcilable struggle by the representatives of the proletariat of the Soviet Union, as the representatives of the class-conscious co-operators of all countries. Capitalism, which is in its epoch of decline, can be removed only by the proletarian revolution. As Lenin proclaimed already 1910, at the International Socialist Congress in Copenhagen, the consumers' co-operatives must therefore actively participate in the economic and political struggles of the proletariat and also render it material assistance.

The speeches of the Soviet Delegation at the Vienna Congress offer us the possibility to reinforce our struggle for winning the millions of co-operators who today are partly under the influence of the reformists.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

A New World Which They Could not Strangle

On Vandervelde's Observations on the Soviet Union.

By Karl Radek.

Moscow recently had the honour of seeing within its walls citizen Emile Vandervelde, the leader of the II. International, who had decided to make use of the interruption in his ministerial work in order to visit a number of "savage" countries in the East. The former and future Minister of the King of Belgium condescended to stay for a week in Moscow in order to see the pictures in the Schuchkin gallery and to learn in passing what was happening in the country "which is groaning under the yoke of Bolshevism".

But to our great astonishment, and to the still greater chagrin of the friends of M. Vandervelde, he occupied himself not only with the study of the works of art in Moscow but also found time to visit our working class suburbs and to study our work of construction. He began to set forth the result of his observations in articles which first appeared in the well-known radical bourgeois newspaper of South France "Dépêche de Toulouse". We have not yet found any articles by him in the social democratic press, although the Berlin "Vorwärts", on the occasion of the announcement of the journey of the leader of the II. International through the land of Bolshevik tyranny, promised to publish his impressions. (In the meantime two "Moscow Letters" from Vandervelde have been published in "Le Peuple" of 4th and 7th September. Ed.)

As he asserts in his article, M. Vandervelde does not believe in drawing hasty conclusions. But in describing the chaos of the Moscow streets, which is caused by the rebuilding of the town, he says that this is the dust of reconstruction, that "a new world is being born".

Thus spake Emile Vandervelde. This is not a slip of the pen on the part of Vandervelde. At the conclusion of his article he tells of "his ever growing conviction" that

"those who are inclined to underestimate the efforts at reconstruction in the Soviet Union easily run the danger of making a mistake in regard to the possibility of the future of the Russian revolution. It is suffering not a few privations: it is suffering them now and will also suffer them in the future; that, however, is the law of all birth pangs".

In public life one must ask oneself as to the social importance of the fact and set personal feelings on one side. Vandervelde's confession that with us a new world is being born and that those privations which our country is bearing are privations which are unavoidable with all births, merits attention precisely because it is made by a man who is hostile to us, by a man who has not abandoned his hostility to us, a man who probably did not find it easy to make this confession.

The barrenness of bourgeois life and the fires which had been kindled on the far heights of Socialism compelled the gifted and cultured Emile Vandervelde, the son of a rich bourgeois family, to go over to the workers' party, in which, thanks to his education and his great gift of eloquence, he soon arrived in the front rank of the leaders.

But Vandervelde never broke with the bourgeoisie. Wealth and cultural refinement bound him with hundreds of visible and invisible threads to the world with which he appeared to have broken. During the fiercest struggles which the Belgian proletariat conducted for its enfranchisement, in which the government mobilised troops and the brave Belgian proletariat resorted to the general strike, whereby it became the pioneer of a new form of revolutionary mass struggle, Vandervelde maintained contact with the bourgeoisie behind the scenes and at the decisive moment came forward with the draft of a compromise concluded with the enemy. How could the proletariat, the "lowest" exploited class, the "cultureless" class, seriously believe in a victory over the bourgeoisie? Vandervelde came forward in the role of a Marxist. In his books he made use of Marxist terminology and never declared himself to be a reformist; but with all his Marxism he evaded all sharp corners, avoided all sharp questions, and precisely this made him the model leader, the chairman of the II. International.

When the imperialist war, long predicted by the Marxists, the war over profits, the war for colonies broke out, Vandervelde, who saw with his own eyes how in the Belgian Congo the blood of Negroes flowed in order to bring profits to the kings of the rubber industry, did not hesitate for a moment as to what his attitude should be. He was not only among the first to summon the proletariat to participate in the war on the side of the Allies, he not only accepted a Ministerial position in the Belgian government, but through the Tsarist Ambassador Kudashev addressed a telegram to the Russian socialists calling upon them not to resist the war but to support the Entente against the Prussian Junkers.

Everything else is only the consequence of this attitude. He was fully and entirely in agreement with himself, when after the February revolution he undertook a journey to Petrograd in order to summon the Russian workers to fight on the side of the Entente. He remained true to himself when, in the year 1917, he resisted with all his force the negotiations of the social imperialists of the Entente with the German social imperialists; for Belgium was not yet free, and in order to free it the final victory over Germany had to be won. Quite in keeping with his former actions was his signature to the Treaty of Versailles, when with the name of the chairman of the II. International the living body of a people was torn to pieces, when millions were enchained, when the foundations for a new world war were created.

A new page of history was turned. The betrayal of the proletariat by reformism was completed. But in spite of all the efforts of the reformists, Socialism was not dead. The fight of the Russian Bolsheviks, 15 years of indefatigable efforts, have yielded their results. The proletariat, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, was victorious and took power into its hands. With an exertion of forces unparalleled in the history of humanity, surrounded by a ring of raging war, the proletariat began to build up its first State. Here begins the second page of the history of the treachery of Emile Vandervelde. The Kautskys and Renaudels aided with words the efforts to strangle the rising new world. They wrote books, articles and appeals against the Bolsheviks. **M. Vandervelde was Foreign Minister of the Belgian Government when he, together with all the other Allies, recognised Koltchak and gave him his blessing in the task of strangling the new world and restoring the old.** But the Russian workers and peasants drove back the Entente troops and shot Koltchak without paying any regard to his recognition by the chairman of the II. International. M. Vandervelde, a few years later, came to Moscow in order to defend the social revolutionaries who had attempted to take the life of Lenin.

The same M. Vandervelde now declares that in the Soviet Union a new life is being born which he was unable to strangle. He even records with the impartiality of a historian the deprivations which our proletariat is undergoing do not differ from all birth pangs. The impartiality of M. Vandervelde obviously goes so far that he is prepared to recognise the historical inevitability of the betrayal of the proletariat by the reformists as one of the factors which increased the sufferings and deprivations during these birth pangs.

One gets sick of this impartiality. When, however, one has overcome this nausea one must ask oneself what it is that compels Vandervelde to make such confessions. He has seen the determination of the workers of the Soviet Union, he has seen that **we have gained the victory**, he has realised that the Five-Year Plan will be carried out, and he will see the day when the miners of Charleroi, the weavers of Ghent will learn the truth regarding the new world which has been born in the Soviet Union. The cunning, sly politician is already making ready for the moment when it will no longer be possible to come before the workers and attack the Soviet Union; but at present he weighs every word. When we carry out the second Five-Year Plan, when the actual triumph of organised work in the Soviet Union sets in, M. Vandervelde will be able to say:

"I recognised without prejudice the birth of the new world, although it was not born according to the recipes contained in my book on obstetrics. You, however, you Belgian workers, stick to democracy in order not to undergo such sufferings at the birth of the new world as were experienced by our brothers, the Russian workers!"

The proletariat of the Soviet Union is overcoming with

arduous labour all the obstacles standing in its way. If M. Vandervelde had stayed a few days longer in the Soviet Union he would have read the appeal of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., which speaks openly of our difficulties, not however in order to shrink from them, but in order to mobilise the forces of the proletariat to overcome them.

The Belgian and European workers were surprised when they heard the new tone in the speech of M. Vandervelde. We hope that the enforced recognition of the birth of a new world in the Soviet Union will help the Belgian proletariat to free themselves from the influence of M. Vandervelde, who has remained what he was — an enemy of the class of which he calls himself a leader. For were he a real participant in the labour movement, then he would have had to draw from the recognition of the birth of a new world the conclusion that his whole policy against this world was a crime.

Disintegration in the Swedish Renegade Party.

By S. m.

The renegade group which has been expelled from the Communist Party of Sweden is rapidly disintegrating. Its greatest pessimism prevails in its ranks, and many workers who hitherto followed the renegades have found their way back to the Communist Party. Now a heavier blow has fallen upon it which will result in the complete disruption of the hitherto strongest party of international opportunism. Oscar Samuelsson, who up to now was secretary of this party, has suddenly resigned his post in order to take over a leading position in a big insurance company. This company is completely under social democratic influence, and as it is paying to this newly engaged "Communist", who will soon become one of its directors, the handsome commencing salary of 14,000 crowns (£ 775) a year, every party member will realise that its secretary has sold himself to the social democrats (whom he so fanatically opposed for years) because he considers the position of his organisation as absolutely hopeless.

Samuelsson was the best organiser of the renegades in fact its undisputed leader. He was also the leading force at the split from the Comintern which occurred last year. As he had also to resign his Parliamentary seat, which he had stolen from the C. P., in order to be able better to serve his new masters, every worker will understand that it is here the question of a direct sell-out.

This unexpected flight of its most prominent leader has created the greatest consternation among the renegades and completely discouraged the other leaders. They now openly admit the catastrophic position of their party. At a meeting of the staff of the printing works, which they had stolen, they announced that a great many workers will have to be dismissed in order to save the paper at least for a time. Kilbom, the chief editor, openly declared that they have but three courses open to them: to dismiss workers, to cease to print the paper, or to renounce their independence. Kilbom further declared that the paper had never been in such a difficult position and that at least 50,000 crowns must be raised in order to save it. The manager who spoke after him had to admit that the paper had lost no less than 1,100 postal subscribers in a month. Kilbom who is best known as a good agitation speaker of the renegades, has completely lost his head since the desertion of Samuelsson, who was the binding force of the party. He reported himself sick and asked for a three months holiday in order to recover his health.

This rapid decline of the formerly so strong renegade group, which only ten months ago, at the party split, took with it almost half of the Party membership, the central organ "Folkets Dagblad", which has a wide circulation in the country, and the great majority of the most prominent Party and trade union leaders, is, following the recent dissolution of the Wijnkoop group in Holland, a fresh annihilating blow to the international renegade group led by Brandler and Thalheimer. It proves again the inevitable fate of all opportunists who break away from the Comintern; it brilliantly confirms the perspectives and the policy of the Communist world Congresses and shows that nowhere and in no country in the world is there room for a "Communist" Party alongside in opposition to the Comintern.

V. Congress of the R. I. L. U.

The World Crisis, Economic Struggles and the Tasks of the Revolutionary Trade Union Movement.

Report of Comrade Losovsky.

(Continued.)

3. Our Weaknesses and Shortcomings in the Leadership of Economic Struggles.

Our own weaknesses and shortcomings are one of the reasons for the success of the treacherous tactics of the reformists. We very often further their scab policy by our own political and organisational weakness. The social-fascists have quite frequently succeeded in discrediting the supporters of the R. I. L. U. at moments when the struggle was hottest, and, not meeting resolute resistance, they brought disorder and dissensions into the masses, causing the loss of the strike.

It is already an undisputed fact that the R. I. L. U. just in time directed the attention of its organisations to the leadership of economic struggles. The decisions of the Fourth Congress regarding the independent role of the R. I. L. U. Sections in economic struggles has been fully justified. Our experiences during the strikes of the last two and half years (Ruhr, Lodz, the North of France, textile workers and miners strikes in the U.S.A., Shanghai, Bombay, etc.) show that we have made some progress in the leadership of economic struggles. The achievements of the R. I. L. U. sections are: a) they have lost their fear of strikes, from which the opportunists of all countries are suffering. An open criticism of our strike tactics is seldom heard in the R. I. L. U. Sections. All those opposed to us have hurriedly departed for the camp of the reformists. b) We have succeeded in stirring new masses of workers, women and young workers included, and in creating the united front of all interested workers. c) We are cured not only of the fear of strikes, but in many cases have taken the leadership into our own hands, and gone on to the end. d) The R. I. L. U. sections are not unskillfully exposing the strike breaking tactics of the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy in the very thick of economic struggles. e) they succeeded in many cases in breaking down the barriers of trade union legalism, in leading strikes without and against the reformist trade unions, and, lastly, f) Great progress has been made in combating right opportunism and left sectarianism during economic struggles.

We should commit a great blunder if we closed our eyes to the great number of political mistakes and of organisational weaknesses and shortcomings of our strike tactics. Our successes, as compared with those at the period of the Fourth Congress, are considerable; but, comparing them with the number of strikes lost and the sharpening of the economic struggle, we must frankly admit that we have made only the first step on the way pointed out to us by the Fourth R. I. L. U. Congress.

If we enumerate shortly all our weaknesses and shortcomings, we shall come to the following list of our tactical and organisational mistakes:

a) **Organisations Lagging Behind the militant Spirit of the Masses.** This is probably the most common shortcoming of our organisations. There are many cases when the discontent of the workers was not noticed by our rank and file organs, and strikes broke out suddenly, taking the members of the revolutionary trade union opposition in the factories quite unawares. Hundreds of such cases may be found in the strike movements of France, Germany, the U.S.A., Great Britain, etc. This is one of the weakest points in all our activities, and proves that our rank and file organs have not penetrated all enterprises, and frequently lag behind the movement. Not only the rank and file organisations are to blame for it: it is first of all the fault of the leading bodies of the revolutionary trade union movement, and proves that they have been leading on paper but not in practice.

b) **Insufficient preparation of economic struggles and reliance on spontaneity.** Our organisations begin to think of strikes only when events are taking a sharp turn. All the

activities of the revolutionary trade union movement, however, should be directed towards preparing the masses for the struggle. The preparation of the strike should, first of all, consist of discussions by the men and women workers of all questions agitating the working masses, the working out of concrete and definite demands, the election of organs of struggle, the involving of all interested men and women workers in the deciding strike problems, the promotion of the best and most active workers to the leadership of the strike, and the mobilisation of all revolutionary forces of the trade union movement. Was this done in all strikes? Have you always acted thus, comrades? What was done in the Ruhr district in July 1930?

c) **Appointment of strike Committees or elections by small numbers of workers.** We are still dealing with many cases in a very bureaucratic manner. There are comrades who think that a strike committee can be appointed or artificially created. Will the problem be solved if we call a certain group of workers a strike or a militant committee? Can we be surprised if, having done such a thing, our Strike Committee does not enjoy a sufficient influence; and can we wonder why the reformists succeeded in breaking the strike? The strike committee appointed in Bradford during the Woolworkers' strike will serve as an example of the bad kind, and one of the good kind is the Strike Committee elected during the metal workers' strike in Mansfield. In the first case, the strike committee represented the minority of the workers, it was not elected by the shops themselves, the masses were not drawn into the election, the most influential workers remained outside the strike committee, so that it was not standing on firm ground, though its policy was good; in the second case, the strike committee was elected by the overwhelming majority of workers and the whole masses fought under its leadership. Both strikes were defeated, but the struggle in Mansfield will leave a deep impression upon the masses, while our influence in Bradford extended only to a small percentage of workers. We are not for illusions or fiction. We don't need any fake strike committees and unreal militant committees; whoever does not understand this will do much harm to the revolutionary trade union movement.

d) **Underestimation of the role and significance of strike committees and their aloofness from the striking workers for reasons under our control.** Whenever strike committees were appointed they did not feel any responsibilities to the strikers; this is the reason why, in many strikes during recent years, the strike committees issued "orders" not heeding the spirit of the masses. A strike committee is valuable only when it daily reports to the masses and does not lose touch with them for a single moment, when it feels the pulse of the masses, when it knows what agitates them, knows of all weaknesses and shortcomings and can quickly disperse possible doubt, etc. Bureaucrats are wanted least of all during the strike movement, they can only spoil matters. Here again the revolutionary trade union movement is to blame most. Do we carry on day to day preparations among the masses for coming struggles? Have we done everything to get most militant and influential elements from the shops into the shop committees, have the supporters of the R. I. L. U. directed the work of the strike committees in this sense? Not always. If this is the case, who is to blame for the bad and bureaucratic functioning of the strike committees?

e) **Too careless attitude towards strike demands, and the working out of demands within the narrow circle of the leading comrades.** This is one of the most outstanding shortcomings. We often think that it is sufficient to have the demands published and to call the workers out and that they will immediately answer our appeal. While such methods of action might be understood and are often inevitable in countries with an

illegal trade union movement, to serve as the starting point of the movement, they are absolutely wrong and harmful in countries where legal and semi-legal possibilities exist. The most important part of a strike is the serious discussion by the whole mass of workers of the demands; only in this case will every working man and woman consciously join the fight. If, on the activity of the masses if we are deciding their problems strikes out of ten are doomed to failure. We all forget that we are faced by the firmly organised united front of the bourgeois State, the employers, and the reformists, and that we can depend in our struggle only on the class consciousness and activity of the striking masses. But how can we depend on the activity of the masses if we are deciding their problems for them and instead of them? Even in countries where the trade union movement is illegal such methods may be applied only at the very beginning. It is even here necessary to discuss every demand in the shops themselves, and to elect a strike committee that is trusted by the whole mass of workers.

f) **Inability to counteract the demagogic slogans and left phrases of the trade union bureaucrats.** The reformists sometimes use left slogans and put up left demands. These tactics frequently cause confusion among our organisations. In such cases it is the principal task to put every step taken by these gentlemen under the control of the strike committee and the mass of workers, especially, if these gentlemen happen to be members of the strike committee. The Brandlerites say: "We must not criticise the reformists during a strike." The slogan: "Armistice among different tendencies during a strike" may often be heard even now pronounced by the Unitary Trade Unions of France. What do such slogans mean? They mean sowing faith in those who will betray the strike tomorrow. We must of course draw the line between reformist workers who are members of strike committees, and the leaders of reformist trade unions and parties. The first must be drawn into the united front based on the class struggle, but the last must not be granted any armistice, any mercy in exposing their crimes before the working class—only thus shall we be able to expose the left manoeuvres of the reformists and to prepare the masses for their hidden and open strike-breaking.

g) **Violent Measures applied to the backward groups of the proletariat. Peremptory commands instead of methods of persuasion.** We must fight strike-breakers with all our might, etc., but that is not the point now. During our preparations for strike we very often meet resistance from the politically backward workers. The conscious purveyors of social-fascist and fascist ideas and tactics in the enterprises are one thing, but the backward worker, wavering and misled by our enemies is quite another thing. Violent measures are extremely dangerous in this case. The principal method that must be applied to these workers is the method of conviction; we must never think that this class of workers is quite hopeless and lost to the cause of revolution, only because he often follows social-fascism and fascism. Such an interpretation is radically wrong. Untiring explanatory work must be carried on among the masses; linked up with experience it will be successful.

h) **Theoretical recognition of the revolutionary line and the failure to apply it in practice.** There are many comrades who quite willingly vote for revolutionary resolutions: at the same time they think that these resolutions have nothing to do with their own country or at any case with their factories and mills. They approve of everything in theory, but as soon as they are faced by practice they advocate submission to the reformist trade union discipline, set their hopes on the reformist trade union apparatus, consider the collective agreements a prerogative of the reformist unions, look askance at the independent election lists for the shop committees, etc. etc. We have in this case opportunism in practice, the opportunism that exceedingly weakens our ranks in our struggle with the enemy. All undercurrents are brought to light in times of struggle; therefore special attention must be paid, in periods of strike movements, to the struggle against opportunism in practice.

i) **Inability to conclude strikes in an organised fashion at the right moment and dragging out of strikes to the point of complete exhaustion and disorganisation of the strikers.** Strikes are one of the sharpest weapons and therefore we should realise the limit of their efficacy, and reckon with the limits of endurance of the strikers. We know of cases where

workers won strikes after 3—6 months of struggle—but such cases are rare: each of us knows strikes that are continued on principle even though the workers have returned to their jobs. In most strikes, the situation becomes clear already after the first weeks, and therefore it is not necessary to protract the strike for too long a period, if the situation is not favourable to the strikers. The principal task to be kept in mind in such cases is to prevent the strikers from dispersing; therefore it is better to terminate the strike in an organised manner than to return to work in disorder. Tremendous tact and capability are necessary to choose the right moment and to be firm enough to resist the defeatist tendencies of a part of the strikers. A timely retreat is better than a serious defeat. It is important to retreat in good order, to maintain influence among the masses and to prepare for a new struggle.

j) **Confusion in the presence of the employers and incapability to organise negotiations.** Every strike has, first of all, some definite aim: wages, working hours, etc. It is a difficult task to skilfully carry on negotiations during a strike. The bourgeoisie applies two methods, either prompt refusal to carry on any negotiations or attempts to drag out negotiations, giving empty promises, etc. It is extremely dangerous to take the word of the employers or their agents. We must be firm. We must not let ourselves be fooled, never use diplomatic dillydallying, but demand plain answers to plain questions. The most important thing is not to become enmeshed in behind the scenes negotiations; therefore it is necessary to report immediately to the strikers on everything that took place during the meeting with the employers. It is extremely important in such cases to expose unasked for representatives and meddlers, that are crowding the doorsteps of the employers. The wrath of the working masses must be directed against them. Only then will the reformist go-betweens fail to harm the movement.

4. Economics and Politics in the Strike Struggle.

Reformist theories about the impossibility of strikes during a crisis are penetrating into our ranks as well. The same tendencies quite recently existed among the trade union functionaries in Germany, Britain, etc. It is true that a crisis gives birth to an additional number of difficulties (considerable stocks of goods, fear of unemployment, tremendous reserves of labour, etc.). But economic struggles, nevertheless, continue and will continue in a period of crisis. The present crisis is accompanied by a violent attack on wages, and if we support the theory of the impossibility of struggles, we should have to submit uncomplainingly to the inevitable. This is just what the reformist trade unions want us to do. But can the revolutionary trade union movement agree to this? If it professed the same views, it would cease to be a revolutionary movement. We are not blind to the difficulties, but we are not willing to surrender. Experience proves that strikes are possible during a crisis: take for instance, the wool-workers strike in England and the metal workers strike in Mansfeld. The sharper a crisis becomes, the more it undermines the already tottering capitalist stabilisation, the more rapid the succession of political crises, the more they will be accompanied by an ever-increasing number of economic and political strikes. Even now the wave of discontent and workers' protests is rising. Even now hundreds of thousands of workers are demonstrating their discontent and despair by mass demonstrations and strikes. We must realise that, under present-day conditions, purely economic strikes are a thing of the past, and that economic struggles will show tangible results only if closely linked up with the political struggle.

The last two and half years are remarkable for the considerable number of solidarity strikes. May First, August First 1929/30, and March Sixth, 1930, witnessed numerous demonstrations and strikes all over the world in which economic and political slogans were closely intertwined. It must be noted that, on the international days of struggle against war and unemployment very few of our organisations succeeded in bringing about political strikes. Strikes of a more or less mass character broke out in France, China, Uruguay, Cuba; but even this small number is a great progress as compared with the past.

The revolutionary trade union movement is becoming a serious motive power both in economic and political struggles. The objective situation is extremely favourable for the outbreak of struggles. Take France, for instance: 150,000 workers are striking against the social-insurance law. This strike is

a brilliant example of the intertwining of economics and politics. It has stirred up tremendous masses and agitates the whole country. As far as we know, the movement is led by the Unitary Trade Unions. We see at any rate that strikes, for whatever reasons they might have broken out, are directed against the social-insurance law. They are economic strikes, but they are no less protests and demonstrations, and being directed against a law adopted by Parliament, they acquire a purely political character. Can we really call all the strikes that broke out recently purely economic strikes? Let us consider the strike in Lodz, the wool workers' strike in England, the Mansfield strike, the strikes in Bombay, etc. They are all economic strikes as to their form, but political in their essence, for they are struggling for the achievement of general class aims and tasks. This, however, does not imply that strikes are not divided into economic and political ones, and that we must in every strike immediately put up all the well-known economic and political demands. It means, on the contrary, that every strike, especially at the present time, calls for a definite solution of the basic problem of class relations; raises the issue of whether the bourgeoisie will succeed in burdening the working class with the consequence of the crisis or not. Here we are confronted with a whole number of new features, that have found their clearest expression in the events of the last two years and a half: solidarity strikes, demonstration strikes, political mass strikes. It is our principal task to find out how the different forms of strikes are related to each other. We should commit a serious blunder if we failed to grasp that the close relations of all forms of strikes to each other is the outstanding feature of the strike struggle in the present period. Strikes are mostly economic strikes at the beginning, sometimes they break out in answer to lock-outs, e. g. Ruhr, Lodz, Northern France, etc. But they attract not only the workers that are directly affected by the decisions of the employers, but also other classes of workers who realise the danger of the capitalist attacks on the standard of living of one class of workers threatens their own interest.

During this period we have had strikes for the defence of dismissed workers (communists and members of the revolutionary trade union movement) protest strikes caused by police brutalities, strikes against reaction and for the defence of the demands of the unemployed (Cuba), strikes on August First 1929/30 against the War Danger (Uruguay, France); therefore we must strive for a complete understanding of the internal mechanism of the modern strike movement. The anarcho-reformists, the people with the divided brains put economics on one shelf and politics on the other. It is the trade unions that deal with economics, and if it is necessary to take up politics, let the political parties do so. In several countries anarcho-syndicalist views of this kind are penetrating even the sections of the RILU. Undoubtedly a division of labour exists, and should exist, between the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade unions as to leadership in the economic and political struggles. But whoever thinks that economics may be separated from politics has not the slightest idea of either economics or politics, and wants to drag back the workers' movement to the quarrels between us and the anarcho-syndicalists, to quarrels outlived and thrown to the garbage heap of life.

Economics and politics are so closely intertwined that it is difficult and even impossible to draw the line so much desired by the opportunists and syndicalists. One could hardly find an example of a seemingly more economic strike than that of the Australian miners, but nevertheless clashes with the police took place, the strikers organised their workers' defence corps that were led by former war veterans. The Australian miners adopted the pledge of the Red Army of the U. S. S. R., and each member of the workers' defence corps pledged himself to be faithful to the working class.

I must use the opportunity now to rectify my mistake made in connection with the miners' strike in New South Wales during my lectures in the Lenin School. Basing myself on newspaper information, I stated that neither the Party nor the supporters of the R. I. L. U. were in any way related with the leadership of this strike. On the ground of information received from the Australian delegates, it must be stated that both the Communist Party and the supporters of the R. I. L. U. took a most active part in the strike and in the organisation of the Workers' Self-Defence. It is extremely gratifying to be able to rectify such mistakes.

In France we are witnessing at the present time a certain relapse to anarcho-syndicalism, finding its strongest expression in the views of the neo-syndicalists on the formula of making strikes political. I should not argue the point with them if it was only a question of terminology. If they do not like the word Politics, they will possibly agree to accepting the word revolutionising. But, so far as I am informed, the neo-syndicalists are not arguing on terminology: on the contrary, they dislike the principle involved, they want to separate economics from politics: which means that they radically oppose the line taken by the R. I. L. U. The revolutionising of strikes must not be interpreted mechanically. A mechanical interpretation is, as a rule, especially harmful in tactics; the problem must be considered from a dialectical point of view, from the point of view of the development of the struggle of the working class. When the Australian miners began to organise the Workers' Self Defence Army, it was one of the most important political measures for the defence of their economic demands; when the Shanghai workers during strikes appoint active groups of pickets for the struggle against strike-breakers and police gangs, they combine economics with politics; when the workers of the banana plantations in Columbia fought bloody battles with the hired gangs of the "United Fruit Company", they were also combining economics with politics. The art of leadership, while keeping in mind the starting points of the demands of the workers, popularising them among the masses, mobilising the very last worker for the defence of the demands, at the same time leads the working masses on to putting up demands of a more general character and to the struggle against all and any obstacles obstructing the extension of the strike movement. Examples of this are the struggle against social-fascist gangs, against compulsory arbitration, against arrests, repression, against dismissals of the most class-conscious workers, against administrative and legal prosecution, against misinformation by the yellow press on the strikes, against taxation of wages, fines, eviction of unemployed from their homes, against the dispersion and closing down of revolutionary trade unions and the seizure of their premises, against social-fascist betrayals and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, etc.

To revolutionise the strike movement means to point out to the strikers the relations between their economic demands, and the attacks on their wages and standards of living and the system of bourgeois dictatorship; it means to show the workers the limits of economic struggles and how the social-fascists, under the banner of bourgeois democracy, strive to subordinate the workers' movement to the power of capital; to lead every worker to a full understanding of the strike-breaker role played by the social-democrats and the trade union bureaucracy, to educate every worker into a class conscious fighter in the fundamental interests of the working class.

A great many weaknesses and shortcomings may be noticed with respect to the above; they are all based on the lack of understanding of the organic connection between economics and politics. Therefore we find here both left and right mistakes, frequently mistakes of both kinds combined, strangely reflected in one organisation, and even in one person.

Strikes are one of the sharpest weapons for struggle; it is not only permitted, but sometimes even necessary to be able to manoeuvre. Our enemy is strong, well organised, and possesses tremendous resources; all the power of the bourgeois State, the Social Democrats and the trade union bureaucracy are in the other camp. We must learn how to manoeuvre; we must not think that every struggle is a final and decisive battles, they are only skirmishes, that forge the class solidarity of the proletariat, that oppose class against class, and train the masses for the final struggle.

There are comrades who think, that the longer a strike lasts the better; and they drag it out to the point that the workers, single and in groups, return to work, while the trade union and the trade union opposition keep on asserting that the strike is still going on. In such cases strikes are confounded with boycotts, and are proof of wrong tactics; when struggling we must not only know how to attack, but also how to retreat. I am asking you, which is better: to drag out a strike until the workers utterly exhausted and disorganised, return to work or, if affairs take a turn unfavourable to us, to beat an orderly retreat and return to the enterprise? The main thing is to prevent the smashing of the strike and the demoralising of the strikers. Defeat is not a disgrace.

We can gather a great deal of valuable positive and negative experience by the study of the strike movement of the last two years. The most severe mistakes committed in all economic and political strikes are based first on the failure to build up a united front from below, in trade union legalism, and secondly, on left phraseology which camouflages passivity. These negative experiences must also be studied; but I am asking you, have our sections done anything to seriously study their own mistakes in order to come to the necessary conclusions? Furthermore, when we, in the beginning of 1929, convened a special conference in Strassbourg on problems of strike tactics, and drew up a very detailed resolution on the basis of international experience, our organisations did not utilise it fully. The careful study of this concentrated international experience might be of tremendous service to our comrades in the preparations, conduct, revolutionising and successful termination of strikes.

Thus we have come to the central task of the present Congress—to the organisation of economic struggles. This means that strikes must never be begun lightly and haphazardly, in a haphazard manner as of old, that we must never wait until a strike has begun already, and then begin to improvise—but it means that we have to prepare the masses from day to day for the struggle, and remodel the whole activities of our organisations for this purpose. Both the Strassbourg Conference, and a number of resolutions of the EC on strike tactics in different countries quite clearly define the real essence of the revolutionary preparation of a strike. I want to ask now the comrades present: did the adherents of the R.I.L.U. properly prepare and conduct the woolworkers' strike in Bradford, the miners' strike in Illinois, the street car workers' strike in Tokio, the strike in Latin America, etc. They prepared them badly and conducted them still worse. The worker thinks a great deal before he decides to go on strike; he does so because he is quite serious about defending his own interests. But when strikes are badly prepared, and demands are not clearly formulated, the working masses are split, lose faith in their own power and have not that faith in their own strength and in victory. We very often jump from one demand to another and in the end we forget where the strike began. The workers who go on strike want first of all to achieve what was demanded at the beginning of the strike. Fewer abstract programmes and slogans, more attention to the direct demands of the workers, for this is at the present moment the essence of revolutionary trade union tactics.

To take the leadership of the economic struggle of the proletariat into our own hands, is, under the present circumstances, equal to organising a counter-attack. It means to lead the masses on and on, combining their economic struggle with the common class demands of the proletariat.

Strikes, as I have already said, are one of the sharpest forms of struggle, in which we establish voluntary discipline; strikes are for this very reason schools of solidarity, where a militant class contact among the workers is hammered into shape, where they learn how to fight the triple alliance of the bourgeoisie State, the employers and the social-fascist trade union bureaucracy. But strikes are not the aim—they are only the means to an end. Lenin, who was the greatest strategist and tactician known to mankind, defined this end as follows:

"The final end of the strike struggle in the capitalist State is the destruction of the State apparatus, the overthrow of the particular class state power."

This formula is absolutely clear, and there is nothing to be added to it. If we are struggling for the overthrow of the bourgeois State, we are doing it in order to establish the power of the working class. Thus the strike movement trains the masses for the struggle, for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The revolutionising of the struggles consists just in this. The sharpening of the class struggle still further accentuates the close relation between economic and political struggles and markedly brings out the fundamental aims of the strike movement—the overthrow of bourgeois class rule.

V. Organisation and Ideology of the R.I.L.U. Sections.

1) New Methods and Rates of Work.

The International revolutionary trade union movement has travelled a long way since the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress.

The slogan of the Fourth Congress concerning the independent leadership of economic struggles has become part of the daily practice of our organisations; successes have undoubtedly been achieved in several capitalist and colonial countries with respect to the leadership of the economic movement of the proletariat.

The R.I.L.U. at the same time has considerably extended its influence and penetrated several new countries the labour movement of which had not been linked up with that of the international proletariat. It is sufficient to look at the composition of the present Congress to prove that considerable progress has been made. Let us cite Uruguay, Paraguay, Ecuador, Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Indo-China, India, several African colonies, the labour movement of which has been until recently detached from the international labour movement, and we shall have to admit that the influence of the R.I.L.U. has considerably extended.

When estimating the activities of the R.I.L.U. from this point of view, it will be necessary to take into consideration the extreme difficulties which the R.I.L.U. met in keeping in touch with the labour movement not only of the new but of the old countries. We do not enjoy the immunity of the Amsterdam gentlemen, who are sent at the expense of their governments to the remotest corners of the world to pacify the discontented workers in the capitalist countries and colonies. All forces of the police apparatus, the whole influence of the reactionary trade union bureaucracy are applied to isolate the R.I.L.U. from contact with the labour movement in the capitalist and colonial countries. But we are breaking down the barriers, in spite of all, for which all our activities and the present Congress are ample proof.

However, comrades, we should commit a great crime if we rested on our laurels, if we overestimated these partial successes; it would be the limit of self-conceit and narrow mindedness. We must openly confess that we lost a number of positions. Wherein do these losses find their expression? First of all (a) the membership of a number of revolutionary trade unions has been considerably reduced. Take for instance the Unitary Confederation of Labour in France (C.G.T.U.) the revolutionary trade unions in Czechoslovakia, our trade unions in the U.S.A., the trade unions in Japan. The number of members has become less in all these unions. This is an extremely dangerous sign. It would be stupid and unworthy of a revolutionary if he ignored this fact. b) A number of revolutionary trade union organisations were driven underground and lost their mass base. We must frankly confess, comrades, that the fact alone of the dispersion and smash-up of a trade union is a loss of important positions. Have the revolutionary trade unions of Yugoslavia and Rumania not lost a number of positions lately? Don't forget that the labour movement of these countries has fairly old revolutionary traditions. Nevertheless the adherents of the R.I.L.U. failed to hold their legal positions, to strengthen their organisations underground and to save their base among the masses. c) Several sections affiliated to the R.I.L.U., though growing in numbers, did not keep pace with the rapidity of the progress of the movement in the respective countries. The trade union opposition in Germany, undoubtedly has grown; but it has not yet won the rank and file, its organisations might be still better, it has not yet acquired a mass character. The objective situation in Germany, however demands that all forces should be directed towards organising the growing discontent of the masses. Thus the opposition is confronted by a number of extremely complicated and important tasks in connection with the leadership of the growing economic struggles. Or take China. The Red trade unions have undoubtedly grown in comparison with 1928. But can we compare the beginning of 1928 with the present situation in China? In China we witness at present a new revolutionary upsurge of the masses, and a vast territory has been occupied by the Red Army. But if we ask ourselves: what has been done on the Soviet territory with reference to the organisation of trade unions, what is the state of our trade unions in the principal centres of China, we must confess that the growth is a very slow one, and lags far behind the real opportunities.

I have given a few examples only. But the delegates present here know themselves the situation of the labour movement in their own countries: are you able to enumerate any successes achieved in organisation during the last two years and a half? Are you progressing or lagging behind?

What's the reason for these losses? Where is the origin of this unfavourable situation in a number of countries? The reason is mainly to be found in the un-heard-of persecutions of the revolutionary workers' movement in all countries; all efforts of the bourgeois State are strained to the utmost in the struggle against the supporters of the R.I.L.U. Dismissals from the factories, arrests, murders, breaking up of organisations, the seizure of their premises, the suppression of the revolutionary press, all these are the links of the long chain of capitalist attacks on the working class. The reformist trade union bureaucrats are developing feverish activities in the struggle of the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary wing of the workers' movement; they very often take the initiative themselves in smashing-up the revolutionary workers' organisations. If we cast a cursory glance at the political map of the world, we see that the revolutionary trade union movement is illegal and semi-legal, in at least 30 countries; we know of tens of thousands of supporters of the R.I.L.U. suffering in jails and cut off from active life altogether. Whenever the Amsterdam gentlemen are talking in a sneering tone about the losses of our positions, we are entitled to answer that in some countries the united front of the bourgeoisie, social-fascist trade union bureaucracy and the employers is still stronger than we are.

We have to reckon with the objective situation, of course. But comrades, repressions do not explain everything. And the truth is that we are still working very badly, that we are not yet in close touch with the masses, that we are not flexible enough, that we are not introducing new forms and methods of resistance to the capitalist attacks, that we have not yet worked out a whole system of measures helping us to manoeuvre in the changing situation of the respective country. The origin of our troubles lies in the bad work among the masses, and in the bad liaison between our trade unions and the trade union opposition with the workers in the factories. I wonder if any of the Sections of the RILU apart from the Soviet Union has organised a general inspection of its lower organisations during the last two years and a half? Which of you has charged himself with the task to spend not a week, but say, a couple of days on the study of fifty rank and file organisations, e. g. shop committees, trade union sections, trade union groups, legal or illegal nuclei, on which our sections in the factories and mills are based? I somehow fail to remember such cases. But how do you resist the vicious terror of our enemies if you do not consolidate your main positions?

Another reason of our losses is that many of our organisations are not dealing with their respective problems concretely enough and, instead of sticking to the prose of the economic struggles, they have burst into the poetry of general talk and phrases. There are comrades who think, that revolutionary trade unions are organisations that deal only with world-wide problems, but problems of wages, social-insurance, working hours, housing conditions, women's activities, activities amongst the young workers in the shops—all these problems are too insignificant, too trifling—let the reformist bother about them. This is a purely reformist interpretation of reforms; these comrades forget that the difference between ourselves and the reformists is not that the reformists are for reforms and we are against them, but that we are striving for reforms by way of the class struggle; they, on the contrary, want to achieve them by means of class collaboration.

At this point, quite naturally, the question arises of what tasks confront the revolutionary trade union movement. Are the revolutionary trade unions to function as the Communist parties? If it were so, the very existence of the revolutionary trade union movement would be unnecessary. No, the revolutionary trade unions have their own specific tasks, their own problems; they are the only organisations that can solve them. Among these are, first of all, the problems of the economic condition of the working class. The union that neglects the day-to-day interests of the workers is a bad union. The I. RILU Congress charged our organisations with the task of combining the struggle for the day-to-day needs with the general political aims. The combination of these two factors is the principle underlying the revolutionary policy of the trade union movement. The revolutionary trade unions are organisations following the same path as the Communist parties; but they are using different methods, different tactics. Further, by means of pressure brought to bear at the Congress we strove to get a real measure of self-criticism

developed in our organisations. There is no doubt that there is a change for the better in this respect but it must be considered as most inadequate. After the unsuccessful builders' strike in France, an interesting resolution was published by the Central Strike Commission concerned in which consideration was given to all the negative features of this particular movement. A very good thing; but what was done afterwards? Were any attempts made to explain this viewpoint to the workers. Did the workers who took part in this unsuccessful strike get to discuss this resolution. Were any resolutions passed by them? To all these questions you will get an unsatisfactory answer. The resolution was passed, and then they went on to the next item on the agenda. Yet real work begins only with the publication of a resolution. After all it is necessary to make all our good and sound deliberations understood by the WHOLE of the working masses involved. Take Britain. The position in the British section of the trade union movement is very bad indeed. The National Minority Movement exists on the surface; practically no rank-and file bodies exist at all—there is a little agitation and very little organisation. And did you get the "Worker" as Organ of the N.M.M. carrying on systematic work to explain the reasons for its own weaknesses? Did the N.M.M. Executive attempt to bring those holding membership in the N.M.M. together, district by district, and face them with the question of why it was that things were going so poorly? Not a bit of it. From time to time, the Executive meets, passes the resolutions criticising its own weaknesses, calms down again, and matters go on just as they were before. Can we stand for this sort of thing?

Or let us take the question of unemployment. We all know that there are tens of millions of unemployed, that this is the chief question disturbing the working masses. I want to ask what has been done in this respect in Britain? Have we really made any progress in organising the unemployed. Our unemployed organisation in Britain has stagnated in its development—from time to time hunger marches are organised which are not even of a sufficiently mass character, and then petitions are submitted, and everything follows the old traditions, slowly and bureaucratically. Very little has been done by us to organise the unemployed in Germany, the USA., Latin America; nothing has been done in Japan, etc. And when you ask why, what is the reason for this incorrect approach to this most important question which is now troubling tens of millions of people, you get one answer: the old trade unionist traditions are making themselves felt, we have expressed here the inability to utilise the new situation, to lead the masses who are agitated by hunger and unemployment to unite them around the revolutionary trade union movement. The pre-revolutionary rates of working make themselves felt, while the times are such that other methods and forms of work are required.

There is something more serious in our sections however, You, present here know of no few facts when our sections disregard the growing dissatisfaction of the masses, and when strikes break out without our knowledge. I could give dozens of instances, from the reports received by the R.I.L.U., of the absolutely disgracefully bureaucratic attitude of our officials to what is going on in the factories. They wait till somebody comes to report what is going on at the factories. They all maintain the point of view that the workers must come to them, without thinking that they themselves should go to the factories. In view of this, we often see a discrepancy between the growing activity of the masses and the stationary passivity of our functionaries.

Next, just look at Czechoslovakia, at our sections in America, Britain, Spain, France, etc. Just take a glance at their work. I ask, have they any plan, have they put themselves the task of drafting all their forces into one, most important district? There are innumerable resolutions, but extremely little practical work.

In order to repel the relentless offensive against the revolutionary trade union movement undertaken by the powerful front of our enemies, we must know how to reorganise our ranks, we must change the speed of our work.

Comrades, we must recognise that there is still a certain amount of bureaucratism in our ranks, that there are still many old traditions, and that there is not that persistence, that concentrated passion which is required to beat back the offensive and then to go on to the counteroffensive.

2. Against Right Wing Opportunism and Left Wing Mistakes.

Since the Fourth Congress extremely dangerous and harmful rightwing opportunist deviations have manifested themselves in a considerable part of the RILU Sections, which have threatened the application of the Fourth Congress decisions. The central point of attack by the right wing opportunists was the sharp manner in which the question of independent leadership in economic struggles was raised. The initiator was the right wing group in the Communist Party of Germany, under the leadership of Walcher, Brandler, and others. Even at the Fourth Congress this group attempted to oppose their line to the revolutionary tactics of the overwhelming majority.

They maintained the point of view that independent leadership of economic struggles is bluff, that the conquest of the trade unions means the conquest of the reformist trade union apparatus; that our task is to push the trade union bureaucrats into the struggle; that our sharp assertion that the Amsterdamers are turning into a capitalist tool only hinders our struggle; that we must submit to any and all conditions of trade union discipline; that we should not drive the trade union bureaucrats to the need of expelling us from the unions; that our chief task is to exert all our forces, all means, to remain in the trade unions, even if necessary to give up revolutionary activities. In a word, they based themselves on the tactic of unity at all costs and at any price.

This group had barely come forward against the decisions of the RILU, when it was already in the clutches of the Social-Democracy, who utilised and still utilises these "Communists" in the struggle against the Comintern and the RILU. Great political and organisational work had to be carried out in Germany to wrest from these trade union legalists that section of the workers which was misled by their opportunist theories. The German comrades carried out this struggle against the rights with all possible energy, and now the right are only a small group who publish a few small journals, chiefly for their own consolation.

There were also serious attacks of the Right wing in Czechoslovakia, a group of old trade union bureaucrats, consisting of Hais, Nadvornik, Sikora, etc., considered that the RILU could be played with: at all the Congresses they signed resolutions and upon their return they steadily continued to do the opposite. For many years we systematically fought this gang of social-democrats, who by accident had got into the revolutionary camp. Our aim was to isolate these trade union officials from the masses. When Hais & Co. saw that their well being was coming to an end, violating the statutes and decisions of the International General Trade Union Federation, they seized the premises, funds, and under the protection of the police used this property of the workers for the struggle against the revolutionary workers of Czechoslovakia.

The Executive Bureau of the RILU paid very serious attention to these events in Czechoslovakia. In order to show up to the workers the true face of Hais and his friends, the Executive Bureau sent a special Commission abroad, the object of which was to organise a conference with the leading elements of the revolutionary unions of Czechoslovakia, so as to expose the agents of the social-democracy in our ranks. Hais and his friends, before the arrival of the delegation, declared that they agreed with the RILU in everything, that they only do not agree with their Communist Party. They are prepared to accept all the decisions of the RILU, but that they "do not desire to submit to youngsters in the Political Bureau of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party". The very first speech of these gentlemen showed that the crux of the matter was not the Political Bureau of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party, but that this group desires to get back into the ranks of social-fascism.

The commission, of which I was chairman, offered Hais to settle the conflict on a democratic basis by convening a congress and promised to use every effort to guarantee the real representation of the masses at the congress. Hais refused to settle the conflict on a democratic basis, for he knew that the workers were not on his side and as he intended to disorganise the ranks of the revolutionary movement as much as possible, he declared that he could not accept our proposal. The commission of the E.B. in its first appeal to the Czechoslovakian workers exposed Hais' attitude and predicted that

Hais would be found in the ranks of social-fascism within a very short time. This happened much sooner than many expected in Czechoslovakia. At present we know that Hais was carrying on negotiations with the social-fascists during the whole of last year. But if we could make deeper investigation into the archives, we could find proofs that he had been carrying on negotiations with the social-democrats already before the seizure of the premises, and that he had received instructions from them to this effect. Now the Social Democratic press in Czechoslovakia is celebrating a victory. Hais and his group, together with other Rights, have joined their ranks.

We regret to state that Hais did not leave alone; he took with him 10-12,000 workers, which is of course not his merit but rather the fault of the supporters of the R.I.L.U. And therefore a resolute struggle must be launched in Czechoslovakia against Right tendencies which are very far from being eliminated.

During the same period we witnessed the revolt of the Rights also in France where, after the Congress of Unitary Trade Unions and the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress, the opposition took definite form under the name of the "Committee for the Defence of Syndicalism." Its leaders are Monatte and Chambellan. It is a typical right opportunist anarcho-reformist group, veiling its social-democratic convictions with chatter about the independence of the trade unions and with protest against the "interference" of the French C.P. with the affairs of the trade unions. But if we take the essential feature of the policy pursued by this group, we see that it is an agency of the reformist Confederation within the Unitary Trade Union movement. There was much talk in France about the necessity of creating nuclei and bases within the reformist trade unions, but all this has remained on paper up till now. The reformists, instead, have succeeded in gaining a firm foothold within the ranks of the Unitary trade union movement by creating the "Committee for the Defence of Syndicalism" and other opposition groups.

Several months ago a new opposition made a new appearance in France, calling itself "Unitary". This new opposition turned out from the very beginning, to be under the ideological leadership of the Tratzkyist organ in France "La Vérité". This group uses more elastic methods than the "League for the Defence of Syndicalism"; it even argues with the anarcho-reformists. It uses much finer and better veiled slogans. The group bases itself on the Federation of Educational Workers in France which proclaimed its convictions in a special manifesto, to the effect that it agrees in general with the policy of the R.I.L.U., but does not agree with the Communist Party and opposes the interference of the C.P. in the internal affairs of the trade unions, etc. Not satisfied with that the new opposition quite openly declares that it disagrees with the R.I.L.U. on the question of the radicalisation of the masses, the political character of strikes, and so on. To sum up, the contradictions between the Unitary Opposition and the R.I.L.U. are the following. Is the turn to the left of the masses a fact, or is it a Moscow invention, as asserted by the social-democrats and their echo in the Federation of Educational Workers? 150,000 workers are on strike in France at the present moment—is this a sign of the turn to the left of the masses or not? They approach this question from the point of view of metaphysics,—they want to be presented with all signs of radicalisation and are evidently of the opinion that we can talk of a swing to the left only when the struggles at the barricades begin, only when the whole working class moves into action. But by this they are only exposing their utter ignorance of the most elementary questions of the class struggle.

Let us admit that incorrectly formulated demands were put up during several strikes; that their purpose was not sufficiently clear, that a number of blunders were committed. But does this entitle us to decline to give the strike a political turn? Does this entitle people who call themselves "left" Communists to protest against the political transformation of strikes? There is nothing "left" in all the writing of this group. It is only a right opportunist group which, for the purpose of manoeuvring, considers it more profitable to veil its views with left phrases.

Very serious right vacillations showed themselves in the M.M. in England, in the U.S.A., in Brazil, in Paraguay, etc. The facts prove that extremely dangerous opportunist mistakes, that weaken our movement, were made in several Latin-American countries. It will suffice to mention that the supporters of the R.I.L.U. in Brazil recognise a trade union leadership appointed by the police. We may further mention that in the left trade unions of Finland there was worked out a theory of capitulation to the effect that all principles and all convictions may be sacrificed, for the sake of retaining the legality of the trade unions. This capitulation theory ended with political bankruptcy; when the fascist danger became real, and the leaders were beaten up, the left trade unions, for safety's sake, declined to organise a political strike.

Now the fascists have seen their weaknesses and are smashing up their organisations. During this period serious right deviations appeared in the strongest R.I.L.U. section—in the leading group of the Soviet Central Council of Trade Unions. Already at the Fourth R.I.L.U. Congress several of the delegates of the Soviet trade unions made an attempt to create a right fraction for the struggle against the "ultra-left" line followed by the R.I.L.U. Furthermore, the right deviations of comrades **Tomsky**, **Yaglom** and others were most sharply expressed in the questions of socialist construction and the rates of the reconstruction of the whole activities of the trade unions in connection with the Five Years' Plan. Doubts and deviations were also aroused in this group by their views on the collectivisation of agriculture and all the measures taken in our attack on the capitalist elements of town and country, which pursued the aim of breaking the resistance of our class enemies and safeguarding our progress. All right opportunist waverings and hesitations were based on underestimation of the forces latent within the working class, on the underestimation of internal possibilities of the initiative and energy of the masses released by the revolution. On the question of the R.I.L.U. policy this opportunist group became a centre attracting all right elements of the international trade union movement. The retaining of this group in the leadership of the Soviet trade union movement would have been a serious danger for the Soviet and the international trade union movements. Therefore, the trade unions of the U.S.S.R. launched a resolute attack against the leadership, and in the course of several months a number of responsible trade union functionaries were removed from their posts. This change of the leadership considerably strengthened the R.I.L.U., and strengthened connections between the C.C.T.U. and the R.I.L.U., for a unanimous carrying out of all campaigns, for a common resolute struggle against opportunism within the Soviet Union and beyond its boundaries.

It is noteworthy that a number of right opportunists have already left the RILU (Hais, Walcher) but others are creating opposition within our ranks, as is the case in France. The French opportunists have proved so cowardly that on the ground of a formal pretext they have refused to accept the proposals of the Unitary Federation of Labour to send several of their representatives to the RILU Congress, for the purpose of elucidating their views on the tasks of trade unions in France and all over the world. They went into hiding in the most cowardly fashion. We cannot but say most frankly that we consider their work disorganising and extremely harmful, as it is an attempt to smuggle into our ranks the policy of the Amsterdam International.

We by no means want to throw the workers and the leaders of this opposition into one heap. We know there are very good revolutionists among the proletarians organised in the Food Workers' Union, in the Dockers' Union, etc., who are followers of the Unitary Opposition, thinking that it is leading them to the same goal by a shorter way. We must make all efforts to show to these proletarians whether the Unitary Opposition is leading them. The Committee for the Defence of Syndicalism has become an open agency of Amsterdam—it is breaking strikes, leading the trade unions on to independence, and then, further, into the ranks of the reformists federation. This is the inevitable way taken by any opposition against a correct policy. The leaders of the Unitary Opposition must be frankly told that their policy of struggle against the RILU, but under the banner of the RILU, is a very dangerous game that cannot last very long. We must openly declare here that, while criticising the weaknesses

of the Unitary trade unions of France we shall render them the most systematic and resolute support in their struggle against the different varieties of opportunism, for their class position is correct: they must struggle against the agents of Amsterdam within their own ranks.

Besides, the right deviations and the right groups in the ranks of the RILU, "left" secretarian views and tendencies have shown themselves. We are conditionally calling them "left", as they are at bottom also opportunist. These "left" tendencies have nowhere acquired an organised form. But they are to be met with in several varieties in a number of countries. In respect to this Comrade Merker's views are very characteristic in their incorrectness; his views on the relations between the social democratic workers and ourselves on the one hand, and between these workers and the social-democratic apparatus on the other. Social-democracy embraces hundreds of thousands of workers; are we entitled to say that these workers are lost for the cause of the revolution? Can we lump the social-democratic workers and the social-democratic leaders together? This, of course, would be a great mistake, as it would mean cutting ourselves off from the workers who are quite honest in their mistakes, and who can be convinced of the truth of our cause. The social-democratic functionaries must not be put on the same footing with the rank-and-file proletarians, and the active leaders of the reformists, who are pursuing a strike-breaking policy in the factories, must not be confounded with the rank-and-members of the unions. It is true that the social-democrats and the trade union bureaucracy has a certain foothold in the shops; it is quite true, too, that we must struggle against the Social-Democratic Party itself, and tell every member of that Party that he is responsible for its policy; but the manner in which we talk to the rank-and-file workers must be entirely different from our approach to the responsible representatives of the Social-Democratic Party. The problem is to find a way of splitting away the workers from the Social-Democrat trade union machine, to tear them away from the influence of the strongly organised social-fascist apparatus. That will be achieved only if we discriminate in our agitation and propaganda, and if we create a united front to include the Social-Democratic workers and make every possible effort to draw them into struggle. The united front among the rank and file is by no means something between Communism and reformism. It is by no means a pact of non-aggression between these two. On the contrary, it is an alliance for a joint attack against the employers. This is the only possible basis for any united front.

Some of us often want to astound the workers by extremely left and eloquent formulae. But most of these "left" and right phrases are not serious. Take for instance, the slogan of the general permanent strike. It was after a successful strike, put up in Cuba on the day of international struggle against unemployment. What does the expression "general permanent strike" mean? It is an empty phrase, liable to confuse the worker's mind. Why should we permanently strike? If the workers are so strong as to be able permanently to strike, why do they not overthrow the bourgeoisie, and why not begin to work for themselves? There is very little common sense in this slogan; bluffs of this kind must be most resolutely resisted. A like slogan was proclaimed during the miners' strike in Czechoslovakia. The slogan of an armed strike proclaimed in Japan is evidently wrong. I asked several of our Japanese comrades what the slogan meant, but they didn't know themselves. Who invented this clever slogan? It is in any case utter nonsense. Does the slogan imply that an armed rebellion is to break out here and now in Japan. Obviously not. Does it mean that the workers, after declaring the strike, must defend themselves with arms in their hands, and that they must fight the strike-breakers? The slogan lacks clearness. The Hyogikai writes in one of its appeals for the First of May that "we have got to instil panic into the bourgeoisie". How does the Hyogikai intend to do this? By frightening it by words? The bourgeoisie is not afraid of words. It knows that they are hollow phrases. But the bourgeoisie is afraid of revolutionary actions; while our comrades, on their part, try to substitute revolutionary words for revolutionary actions. I shall cite another example. We read in the appeal of the Hyogikai how to prepare the first of May campaign; the appeal gives the following schedule:

March 15-31 preparatory period, April 1-10 organisational preparatory period, April 10-16 preparatory mobilisation, April 16-25 final period for organisation and preparation, April 26-May 1, mobilisation. I don't understand who is able to explain all this metaphysics; but I should be much obliged to any delegate from Japan who can explain to us what all this means. I shall give a few other examples of left phrases. Taking into consideration that the majority of the members of the reformist unions consist of skilled workers, and that the unions are chiefly defending their interests, a theory sprang up that all skilled workers were hopelessly lost for the cause of the revolution. To say this is as wrong as to deny that a part of the skilled workers are the basis of reformism, and the agents of its strike-breaking policy in the factories.

I should like to direct your attention to some more samples of left phrases. Our trade unions in Czechoslovakia, robbed by the Hais gang, and weakened by continuous prosecutions, were not able to apply the Ghent system owing to the lack of funds. The workers should have been told about it. But what did our comrades do? They published an appeal declaring that the application of the Ghent system was incorrect in principle, that it was extreme opportunism, etc. Thus the illusion was created that the revolutionary trade unions decline to utilise social-legislation. Is such a point of view correct? Of course it is not. It is an evident "left" exaggeration, a left mistake that created very great difficulties for a large number of our Czecho Slovakian organisations.

Take France, for instance, where our comrades put up the correct slogan of wage increases and refusal to allow deductions from the workers' wages in connection with the new

social-insurance swindle. The slogan is correct and should have been supported by all; but when running through the wealth of agitation literature on this problem we often meet very "left" and quite unnecessary phrases and slogans, as for instance: "Whatever the results of the struggle might be, the employers will in any case burden the worker with the expenses for social-insurance." Or: "Down with social-insurance!" And so on. It is all very "left" and patently stupid. Are there any workers who will seriously struggle if you tell them that all their sacrifices and efforts are in vain, as they will in any way be burdened with the expenses of social-insurance? How is it possible to struggle for a wide introduction of social-insurance, when putting up the slogan of: "Down with social-insurance!"

There exists one more variety of deviation that has cropped up during the last period; it is the revived theory of neutrality. The Neo-Syndicalists keep on repeating the same phrase that was current about 20—26, years ago. This theory has been revived with the express purpose to split away the trade unions from the Communist Party. It is contradictory to all the resolutions of all R.I.L.U. Congresses, which emphasised the necessity of the closest relations between the Communist Parties and the trade unions and of common actions on a national and international scale. Will the V. Congress revise what was said by the I. Congress? I think it will be sufficient to confirm our decisions, and combat those who want to drive a wedge between the trade unions and the Communist Parties, and who in the interests of reformism want to weaken the international trade union movement.

(To be concluded.)

Discussion on the Report of Comrade Losovsky.

Comrade Grandel (France)

dealt with the deficient activities of the CGTU. The realisation of the united front from below in actual practice is frequently unclear even to the leading comrades of the CGTU, to say nothing of the sub-organisations. This question has been tackled too theoretically. The speaker drew attention to a number of errors which have been committed in this direction during the recent strikes. There has been too little work of enlightenment among the masses, and that often too late, after a strike was over. There exists even a certain tendency to underestimate the fighting committees. The trade unionists must be definitely instructed as to the right methods of forming fighting committees. We must go to the masses, and carry out the right line of the R.I.L.U. in actual practice. It has frequently occurred that the leading comrades have not known how to carry out the line of the R.I.L.U., therefore the question of properly trained cadres is of paramount importance for the C.G.T.U. The speaker expressed his conviction that the C.G.T.U., with the aid of the R.I.L.U. and of its own active elements, will be able, by energetic effort, to make good the errors committed.

Comrade Walsh (Great Britain)

pointed out the lack of efficiency of the Minority Movement. In the textile workers strike numerous errors were made. In many cases the importance of strike committees was under-estimated. We have, however, learnt much from these struggles. It has been another grave error that we have not carried on the work of enlightenment energetically enough in the reformist unions. We can, however, report some success. In Bradford our work was carried on during the strike by a small group of active functionaries, but in a very short time great success was attained. We have shown the workers that we are capable of leading the struggles successfully. It is a great advance in itself that the workers of Great Britain have seen that they can fight without and against the reformist unions.

Comrade Sen Katayama,

greeted with tumultuous applause, resumed the discussion at the evening session. In his speech he dealt with the weaknesses and faults of the revolutionary trade union movement in Japan. In 1926 the trade unions of a left tendency were disbanded by order of the government and the Communist Party prohibited. Since this time the Left trade unions have

not yet adequately reorganised their activities. They have many weak points, especially the following: Lack of a firm basis in the works and factories, slight influence possessed by the unions, inability to prepare for labour struggles, and lack of international solidarity. It must, however, be recorded in favour of these unions that they have overcome the Right and "Left" deviations, and are now able to lead the struggles of the working class. The most important task of the Pacific Secretariat, and especially of the Japanese unions, is the struggle against the war danger in the Pacific Ocean. Here war against the Soviet Union is being prepared, here the imperialists are most energetic in their armaments for intervention in China. In order to prevent this war, we must greatly intensify our activities in the undertakings of heavy industry, especially among the metal, chemical, and transport workers. For this purpose we must concentrate all our forces on the winning over of the majority of the working class.

Comrade Smolansky (U.S.S.R.):

The V. Congress of the R.I.L.U. will take its place in the history of the labour movement, as a turning point and transition from agitation and propaganda in the revolutionary trade union movement to the organisation of revolutionary struggles. But it does not suffice to issue the slogan of organisation, directives must be given for the organisation of the struggle for the winning of the masses. The speaker considered that the present discussion has dealt too much with past events, and too little with the prospects of our movement in the future. Nothing has been said of the tactics to be adopted after the return home from the V. Congress. We must admit that at the present time the revolutionary movement lags behind the possibilities created by the crisis. The upsurge of the revolutionary movement and the new strike wave sweeping across many countries, point out our path. The labour struggles of the moment are distinguished by affecting the branches of industry now suffering from the crisis, and by the advance of the workers from defence to attack. The strikes are generally spontaneous, and we do not take over the leadership till the struggle has begun. Often the action of the workers has taken us by surprise, and we have but seldom prepared it.

We are still very weak in the reformist trade unions. This neglect has serious consequences. Were our influence in the reformist trade unions greater, and could we win over the elements following the reformists, our struggle would be

much more successful. Some comrades under-estimate the great importance of work in the reformist unions. They consider it necessary to found independent unions everywhere and at once, as if the creation of new unions gave us the possibility, automatically, of influencing the masses. This standpoint is organisation fetishism, and must be resolutely combated.

A representative of the Italian trade unions emphasised that in the theses submitted, but little attention is given to work among the rural proletariat, though this plays an important role in the revolutionary movement of today. In Italy our chief tasks are: The organisation of the masses, extended partial demands, politising of the struggles, united front in the works and factories struggle against the Fascists.

A representative of the trade unions of Cuba stated that there is a strong revolutionary spirit among the workers of Cuba. There has been a powerful strike wave of late, despite employers' terrorist methods.

Comrade Szanto (R.L.L.U.) criticised the weaknesses of the revolutionary trade union movement in the Balkans. In Bulgaria the slogan hitherto used has been: "compel the bureaucrats"; one consequence of this has been the throttling of the tobacco workers strike. In Rumania the revolutionary unions are too passive and lag behind the radicalised masses. The same applies to Yugoslavia. In Greece our comrades have committed the error of not raising the partial demands of the workers to a higher stage.

Comrade Orr (Australia) relates the success of the leadership of the Minority movement in the great mining strike of 1929 to 1930.

Comrade Perez (Uruguay) stated that the chief fault of the revolutionary unions of his country was their failure to devote sufficient attention to the daily interests of the workers.

Comrade Slaattelid (Norway): The revolutionary trade union opposition has had much success of late in the chemical industry. For the coming war this industry is of paramount importance.

On 21st August the discussion was continued.

Comrade Germanette (R.L.L.U.) stressed the importance of the emigrant question. There are about 22 million emigrants in the different countries, and it is the duty of the RILU to devote attention to their enlightenment.

A Polish delegate described the position of the workers in Poland. There are 300,000 unemployed. The textile industry, the most important in Poland, is on the verge of ruin. The only factories which develop are war materials factories. The revolutionary trade union opposition must mobilise the masses against imperialist war danger.

Comrade Winestone (U.S.A.) dealt with the unemployed question in America. There are 7 million. The white and coloured workers fight together under our banner. Comrade Karkisch (USSR.) stigmatised the traitorous role of the Amsterdam International and called upon all revolutionary trade union organisations to profit by the experience gained by Russian Bolshevism in the conflicts with Tsarism. Comrade Canot (Columbia) stressed the importance of the organisation of the rural proletariat. The representative of the Chinese trade unions described the activities of the Red trade unions in Soviet China. These unions have over 64,000 members, extremely active in economic struggles, and aiding the Red Army in the defence of the Soviet districts. A Japanese delegate criticised the ultra-left leaders in the revolutionary trade union central of Japan (Hiogikai), whose policy is fatal to the Japanese proletariat. An opposition has, however, already been organised.

Comrade Watkins (England)

spoke on the danger of an imperialist attack on the Soviet Union. Comrade Quallk (Germany) advanced a number of practical suggestions for organisational work in the trade union opposition in Germany.

The representatives of the Stalingrad Tractor Works and of the Union of the Blind in the SU. gave addresses of welcome.

Comrade Deyey (USSR.)

greeted the Congress on behalf of the 15,000 workers distinguished by the Order of the Red Banner. Comrade Paud (Switzerland), greeted the Congress in the name of the revolutionary workers of French Switzerland.

Comrade Pavlov (YCL)

criticised the "Left", errors of revolutionary youth in the different countries. Comrade Fernandes (Cuba) spoke on behalf of the Negroes of the Latin American States. Comrade Yusefovitch (R.L.L.U.) insisted on the necessity of the systematic organisation of the turn towards the independent leadership of the economic struggles. Comrade Gandibleu (Belgium) criticised the weaknesses of the trade union opposition in his country. The Bulgarian delegate reported on the activities of the revolutionary unions in Bulgaria.

A representative of the

Italian youth

described the frightful exploitation of the young workers in Italy. In spite of all repression, the working youth of Italy is becoming the shock troop of the fighting Italian proletariat. Comrade van den Boom (Belgian) related the many tricks and artifices employed by the Belgian social Fascists against the radicalisation of the masses. Comrade Vitkovsky (R.L.L.U.) spoke on the internationalisation of economic struggles. Comrade Ratnerson (Iceland) described the situation of Icelandic industry. The Left wing of the trade union movement has just sprung into being, but has already had much success. A Negro delegate greeted the Congress on behalf of the Negro delegation, and reported on the results of the first Negro Workers' Congress. In conclusion the speaker proclaimed that the Negro workers all over the world would combat the attacks of the imperialists on the Soviet Union.

At the session held on 22nd August,

Comrade Heckerl

addressed his concluding words to the Congress. The world economic crisis is spreading. It is necessary to transfer the greater part of our trade union work to the works and factories. The sole power fighting for the interests of the working class is the Communist Party and the trade union opposition led by the RILU.

Comrade Losovsky,

in his concluding speech, pointed out the extraordinary unanimity of the Congress in all political and organisational questions.

The Tasks of the Revolutionary Trade Union Movement in the Colonies.

At the session on 23rd August, the Chinese delegate

Comrade Huanping

reported in detail on the tasks of the revolutionary trade union movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The world economic crisis has exercised an enormous influence here. The increased exploitation of the colonial workers has caused the rise of revolutionary trends among both workers and peasants. The upsurge of the labour movement is expressed in numerous political and economic struggles in India, Indo-China, and other countries.

In the discussion on Comrade Huanping's report.

Comrade Heller (R.I.L.U.)

described in detail the present stage of the revolutionary struggle in India. The English trade unions, with the aid of the reformist unions in India, seek to gain influence over the

workers of India. This lends the Labour Government a certain support in its efforts against the revolutionary struggle of the Indian proletariat. This must be counteracted by all-round support given to the Indian revolutionary trade union movement, whose influence may be observed in the recent strike period.

An Egyptian delegate

emphasised that the foes of the Egyptian proletariat are English imperialism and the national bourgeoisie. The workers are beginning to see through the treachery of the trade union bureaucrats, and the soil is prepared for our work.

On 24th August the discussion on the tasks of the revolutionary trade union movement in the colonial and semi-colonial was continued.

Comrade Tom Man (England)

stated that England has a population of 40 millions, whilst its ruling class is only 2 millions. This small stratum holds over 450 million workers in slavery in India, Africa, Canada, and Australia. In every Chinese port English warships lie ready, helping to exploit millions of Chinese workers. We must join the workers of the whole world in the determined and insistent struggle against British and every other imperialism.

An Indonesian delegate

pointed out the fact that the proletarian masses in the East Indies, in Indo-China, and in the Malay archipelago, are already awakening, and have taken up both political and economic struggles.

After addresses from the delegates from Corea, the United States, and Mongolia,

a Representative of the Pacific Secretariat

spoke. He stressed that the Amsterdam International is evidently determined to go to work energetically in the colonies. Therefore the mobilisation of the masses in the colonial and semi-colonial countries against the Amsterdammers must be one of our main tasks.

The Delegate from Palestine

stated that at the present time Palestine is the object of the predatory policy of English imperialism and of Zionism. The expropriation of the peasants and the impoverishment of the whole working population make rapid strides forward. In Palestine a workers' fraction has now been founded, affiliated to the R.I.L.U., having for object the combination of the struggle of the Arabian and Jewish workers against the English imperialists and against the Jewish and Arabian capitalists.

A representative of the French Colonies in Algeria and Indo-China

reported on a number of strikes and risings aroused by the brutal exploitation. In Indo-China, for instance, the pitmen in the coal mines are compelled to work for 14 hours daily, and are subject to corporal punishment. The young trade union movement in Indo-China is inadequately supported by the revolutionary trade unions of France. The European comrades must be induced to lend more aid to the trade union movement in the colonial countries. The speaker considered that one of the essential faults of the proletarian struggle in the colonies is superficial propaganda work, and the inability of the trade union organisations to mobilise the workers for the struggle for their daily demands.

Comrade Adams (U. S. A.)

declared that the strengthening of the revolutionary trade union movement in the colonies calls urgently for a number of organisational measures, the furtherance of international education, and the creation of a revolutionary press.

Against the Trotskyist Attempts at Disruption in the International Revolutionary Trade Union Movement.

A special declaration made by the French and Chinese delegates at the V. Congress of the R.I.L.U. states that the

Trotskyists are playing the part of disorganisers of the revolutionary trade union movement in all countries, cloaking beneath their "Left" phrases their actual support of the bourgeoisie and its social Fascist agents. Many comrades fail to recognise the danger of the disruptive work of the Trotskyists. Trotskyism must be combated in France, China, and all countries where it has adherents in revolutionary organisations.

Close of the Congress.

Moscow, 31st August 1930.

The final session was opened by the report of the Credentials Commission, given by Comrade Germanetto:

The dry statistics of the Credentials Commission bear witness to the tremendous development of the international revolutionary trade union movement. 538 delegates took part in the V. Congress of the RILU: 299 with deciding and 239 with advisory votes. 60 countries were represented at the Congress, among these the Soviet Union with 141 delegates (60 with deciding votes), Germany with 41, France with 45, England with 29, Czechoslovakia with 26, the United States with 36, China with 24, Poland with 20, Italy with 11, Japan with 10, etc. Even such distant countries as South Africa, Australia, Brazil, Guatemala, Egypt, Ireland, Indochina, Corea, Mexico, Mongolia, New Zealand, Palestine, Peru, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, Uruguay, Philippines, Chili, Ecuador, etc. were represented by delegates. One delegate was sent by East Africa, Bolivia, Gambia, Honduras, Cuba, Panama, Formosa, Luxemburg, etc.

At the VI. Congress there were only 421 delegates from 49 countries. At the I. Congress 41 countries were represented.

469 of the delegates are workers. 61 were at one time members of the Social Democratic Party. 235 have suffered under the repressive measures of reaction.

A comparison of the social composition of the V. RILU Congress with that of the last Congress of the Amsterdam International in Stockholm is interesting. Of the 130 delegates at the Stockholm Congress, representing 23 countries, not one represented a colony or a semi-colonial country, nor was there one representative from Latin America. The delegates were not elected; it was simply a meeting of the functionaries of the different national reformist trade union organisations. As compared with this, 464 delegates to the RILU Congress were elected in the works and factories, 38 delegates were elected by trade union organisations, and only 36 delegates were representatives of central trade union organisations.

The report of the credentials commission was passed amidst the applause of the Congress.

The resolution on the tasks of the revolutionary trade union movement, as also the resolutions on the reports of the Colonial Commission for organisational questions, the Chinese and Czechoslovakian Commissions, the Commission for the Negro question, and Commission for social insurance and Red Aid, were passed unanimously. The resolution on the admission of the Italian Federation of Labour into the R. I. L. U. was also adopted unanimously.

Greeted by enthusiastic ovations, a delegation of Bulgarian women tobacco workers presented the Congress with a red flag. The list of candidates for the new Central Council of 90 members, proposed on behalf of the Polish, German, and French delegations, was passed unanimously. Further, an International Women's Committee was elected, an International Youth Committee, and an International Negro Committee.

After Comrade Losovsky had delivered his concluding speech, the delegates proceeded into the street, singing the "International", in order to meet a great mass demonstration of the Moscow workers in honour of the V. RILU Congress. A platform was made of several motor lorries in front of the trade union buildings, from which the Congress delegates could speak. The members of the Congress Presidium, among them Comrades Losovsky, Tom Man, Heckert, and others took their places on the balcony of the trade union building. The whole square was decorated with red placards. The march past of working men and women, employees, students, scholars, and pioneers, across the whole breadth of the square lasted more than two hours.