

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts — Please reprint

INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 11 No. 36

PRESS

6th July 1931

CORRESPONDENCE

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

<i>Speech of Comrade Thorez (France)</i>	657	<i>Speech of Comrade Weinstone (U.S.A.)</i>	666
<i>Speech of Comrade Garlandi (Italy)</i>	661	<i>Speech of Comrade Pollitt (Great Britain)</i>	669
<i>Speech of Comrade Arnot (Great Britain)</i>	663	<i>Speech of Comrade Piatnitzky</i>	673

The XI. Plenum of the E.C.C.I.

The Discussion on the Report of Comrade Manuilsky.

Speech of Comrade Thorez (France).

Comrades, the French delegation states its agreement with the draft theses and with Comrade Manuilsky's report, including the severe but just criticism of the glaring inadequacy of our Party.

One of the facts which is now the most significant in the evolution of international politics is the rôle of imperialist France at the head of the anti-Soviet bloc. Why, France instead of England, for example? To answer this question it is necessary to analyse the essential characteristics of French imperialism which, first of all, are the domination of an immense colonial empire by the French bourgeoisie and the appalling exploitation of the Indo-Chinese people. This already shows that imperialist France cannot remain indifferent to the development of the economic and revolutionary crisis.

A second characteristic is the position of imperialist France as a victorious country depending upon the Treaty of Versailles, and its satellites, to plunder the German people.

A third characteristic is that imperialist France is the leading country of a number of vassal states in Central and East Europe: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia, where it exports an enormous amount of capital and from where it draws new excess profits, trying to consolidate thus its system of hegemony on the European continent. At the same time, we

note the existence of a considerable reserve of 50 milliards of gold francs in the vaults of the Bank of France.

A fourth characteristic, particularly marked since the return of Alsace-Lorraine, is the increased proportional weight of industry in economic system of imperialist France. Since the war the exploitation of a considerable mass (two and a half million) foreign workers has been added to the difficult conditions of labour of the native proletariat, and these are submitted to absolutely criminal treatment. It has recently been reported to us that Polish workers in the eastern mining basin receive a wage of 11 francs per day and even 7 francs per day for certain categories. These immigrant workers are barely maintained in the canteens of the employers only so that they would not die of starvation; each time one of them dares to fight on the side of his French comrades, he is chased out of the mine and deported. There is therefore slavery not only in the French colonies but also in France itself for a considerable mass of immigrant workers.

Another element is the influence of the world economic crisis in France.

Up till quite recently the French bourgeoisie claimed: "In France we do not know and we will not know the crisis". That was proof of fatuity and great ignorance because French production depends in a great measure, upon the world market.

Speech of Comrade Piatnitzky (Page 673)

Since the internal market has ceased to grow, after the restoration of the liberated regions, more than one-third of the products of heavy industry and textile products are exported; consequently, the decrease in the power of consumption of the masses, the development of frantic competition between the various capitalist countries could not fail to have its repercussions in France.

A country which is at the head of an immense colonial empire must inevitably be affected by the crisis. The reduction in the price of raw materials resulted in very great difficulties in the colonies exploited by French imperialism and creates even in Indo-China the elements of a revolutionary crisis. French imperialism is affected by the world economic crisis through the decline in the price of rubber in Indo-China, of ground-nuts in Africa, through the difficulties on the wheat and wine market in Algiers.

To this must be added the advent of the economic crisis in France itself.

In the last analyses made by the C.I. and in the analysis of Comrade Stalin at the XVI. Congress of the C.P.S.U. one can see the symptoms of the approaching crisis in France. In fact it exists. The decrease in the returns from industry and transport, in the budget receipts and in the export figures has already reached 10 per cent, and the perspectives plainly show that matters will become worse!

Up to the middle of last year there was no unemployment in France; now it exists.

The representative of the Ministry of Labour said recently in Geneva: "In the month of January there were 15,000 unemployed receiving benefit in France." But there are actually 350,000 totally unemployed, and one million partially unemployed.

At the end of March there were half a million totally unemployed workers in France and one million and a half partially unemployed. I am not stressing the sharpened crisis in agriculture. By maintaining an enormous duty of 50 francs on a quintal (hundred kilograms) of wheat, the French bourgeoisie hopes to protect French agriculture from the world economic crisis.

I think that the theses should more emphatically stress this entrance of imperialist France into the world economic crisis.

To this must be added the crisis in the vassal countries of French imperialism: the agrarian crisis in Rumania, in Jugoslavia and in Poland; then the crisis of the Young Plan and the difficulties in balancing the budget of the French bourgeoisie. Thus the positions of French imperialism are menaced both from within and without.

All these causes determine the growing aggressiveness of French imperialism and its attack against the Soviet Union.

One must still ask another question: Why is French imperialism in such a hurry? Because for it, much more than for all the other imperialist countries, the question of time is a determining factor. The crisis of the Versailles system, on which the strength of French imperialism is based, results in the weakening of this imperialism and jeopardises the political and military hegemony of imperialist France. That is why all the parties in France—with the exception of ours, of course—rally around the intangibility of the treaties of the imperialist war, the intangibility of the system of Versailles. This also explains the frenzy of the French bourgeoisie when any blow is aimed at the system of Versailles, as, for example, the Austro-German agreement. Of course, there is also manoeuvring with regard to the German government for the purpose of obtaining possibilities of strengthening the anti-Soviet front.

The French bourgeoisie is sensitive to the development of the agrarian crisis in the countries of Central Europe. "It is absolutely necessary to do something for the countries of Central Europe, if we do not do anything, if we do not come quickly to the aid of these people, they will be the sure prey of Bolshevism," said Briand in leaving Geneva.

French imperialism is sensitive to the development of the revolutionary struggle in Germany.

The German bourgeoisie and the socialists interpret this pre-occupation of the French bourgeoisie as a foreboding of the eventual defeat of its plans brought about by the victory of the German working class.

That is also why, in view of the developing revolutionary movement and the possible break up of the entire Versailles

system, the French bourgeoisie is sensitive to the phenomenal development of the U.S.S.R.; that is why, in spite of the difficulties and the rivalries between the various capitalist countries, they hasten to gather an attacking army against the U.S.S.R.

Under the aegis of MacDonald France also makes concessions in the agreement between the French and the Italian bourgeoisie.

Up till that time we witnessed the sharpening of the Franco-Italian conflict, and if French imperialism actually makes some concessions on secondary points, it is for the purpose of bringing about an imperialist concentration for the fight against the Soviet Union.

In conclusion I want to stress what Comrade Manuilsky has said in the name of the C.I.:

"We, (the French proletariat and its Communist Party) bear a great responsibility as far as the actual and immediate defence of the U.S.S.R. and of the German revolution, the support of the colonial revolution, especially the revolution in Indo-China, are concerned."

It is the consciousness of these responsibilities that makes us unreservedly accept the criticism of the International in view of the great rôle that devolves on our proletariat and its Communist Party.

How can we fulfil our task? How can we frustrate the plan of French imperialism? How shall we fight?

We must fight in accordance with the conditions created by the economic offensive, by the repression, by the development of fascism, by the complicated and cunning manoeuvres of social democracy.

The Communist International's estimation of the character of the economic offensive against the proletariat has recently been absolutely verified in France. The economic attack against the working class has become more general, extensive and acute. In many corporations the eight-hour day has been attacked. They tried to take away the eight-hour day from the miners who already had it before the war. The wages were attacked in all the corporations, indirectly, in the metal industry, directly for the miners and railwaymen. The "Comite des Houillères" (Collieries Committee) wants to reduce the miners' wages from 4 to 10 per cent; for the railwaymen, the French Government prepares a cut of 5 to 10 per cent.

But the attack of the bourgeoisie meets with the resistance of the masses, as shown by the numerous strikes. In Cours, a mining centre, a strike has been in progress for more than eight weeks, and this is not an isolated event.

For some time, throughout the country and in all the corporations, strikes and movements to resist wage cuts have been numerous; this is a sign of the vigour of the French proletariat of which the most recent example is the preparation of the national struggle of the miners.

In France, progressive fascism manifests itself in two forms.

First, the so-called legal forms of repression against our militants. For the last two years, they no longer sentence only for offences but for "assumed" offences. The secretary of the National Federation of Metal Workers, Comrade Galopin, is sentenced to two years' imprisonment as "presumably" responsible for an anti-militarist newspaper, etc., etc. More than that, Comrade Deleuze has been sentenced as "presumed" organiser of a demonstration. It is as well to point out that it is under the Steeg government, supported by the Socialists, that a police attack was made against our comrades in the prison of Nancy who are still in prison under the common law although they have already served their sentences for political offences.

In France, all our Communist municipalities have been unable for years not only to carry out a Communist policy, from the administrative point of view, but even to administer the affairs of the commune as the bourgeois and socialist municipalities are doing.

The second form of fascism is the creation of extra legal fighting organisations against the working class, which constitutes a very grave danger to which our C.C. has drawn the attention of the Party.

In St. Denis, a suburb in the north of Paris, where we have the great majority of the workers behind us, the bosses succeeded in forming an organisation of 2,000 ex-soldiers, bourgeois and workers, training them in a chauvinistic spirit to fight against the working class. We should therefore carefully watch e. work among the exsoldiers and in the A.R.A.C.

Another important fact of this recent period is the formation of fascist trade unions within the ranks of the working class.

Our Party and our red trade unions have not remained indifferent. In the course of the navvies' strike a beginning was made with the work of disintegration in these new unions.

We must also note the attempts to draw the working youth into the fascist sport organisations, the organisation of camps by a number of cultural and sport organisations where they are drilled with a view to the war.

With regard to social fascism, I believe it would be well to add a few words to the theses characterising social fascism in France, which is of a rather original nature, for it differs from social fascism in Germany or from that of the Labour Party in Britain although their basis and forms are identical. By its international rôle, by its attack against the Soviet Union, one can say that within the last period French social democracy has surpassed the German. There is a sort of rivalry between the „Populaire“ and the „Vorwärts“ to see which will go the furthest in calumny and aggressiveness.

The rôle of French social democracy in the colonies cannot be ignored: it has proclaimed even in parliament its will to see that the colonial empire is kept intact, and the French Socialists endeavour to hinder the development of the colonial revolution.

The attitude of the French Socialists on the question of Alsace-Lorraine also deserves mention; they have declared: „We are first French and then socialists“.

French social democracy which combines pacifist talk with militarist practice, is personified by M. Paul-Boncour who, while indulging in much palaver on peace at the various international conferences and in numerous speeches in France, introduced into the French Parliament the law for complete mobilisation and had it adopted.

Just a few words on the most recent manoeuvres of the socialists and reformists to break up the working class movement.

Several months ago a big strike broke out in the North of France. Under pressure of the masses the reformist leaders launched the slogan to strike while doing their utmost to damp the fighting spirit of the working class and to make them accept compulsory arbitration to such an extent that after several weeks of strike an agreement was concluded which could have been obtained by means of arbitration without the strike.

Now they want to cut the wages of the miners. Our Unitarian Federation has been organising for many weeks a protest movement of the miners. The employers have come to an understanding with the reformists so as to manoeuvre. In concord, they try to break up and bring to nought the efforts of the colliery proletarians.

I want to deal with yet another aspect of social fascism. Perhaps in no other country will the corruption of social democracy be found to be so advanced, open and cynical as in France. In many of the political and financial scandals that have recently burst in France, the Socialists were not very much behind the politicians of the business world. There is a socialist banker who has been sent to prison; another socialist is counsel for a large capitalist firm. I do not know if in any other country the corruption of the social fascists cadres is displayed as cynically.

Comrade Manuilsky's report shows how the symptoms of the disintegration of social democracy make their appearance with the development of the crisis. Of course, we cannot as yet say that this applies absolutely to France; nevertheless, with the crisis, with the disappearance of the illusions that French capitalism can escape the crisis, one can see a certain change in the relation of forces between us and social democracy.

At the commencement of last year the elections marked the Socialist advance and the setback of the Communists.

But in the month of September, in Belleville, a proletarian district of Paris, the Socialists lost 35 per cent of their votes; in October in Marseilles; another big proletarian centre, they lost 40 per cent of the votes; in the month of February and

March the elections in Lyons, an proletarian centre, resulted in a decline of 43 per cent in the Socialist poll. Several days ago the elections in the mining centres of the North resulted in a Socialist loss of 23 per cent.

But in the elections where we did not have a setback, we did not advance very much either. In Lyons we have only doubled our poll: in the North we gained 18 per cent; in Marseilles and in Paris we did not make any progress.

(A comrade: Who gained?)

No one; there were many abstentions.

I shall give two more striking examples. In Cours, where the strike now rages, the Socialists obtained 1,200 votes in 1929, and the Communists 150. This year during the strike; the Socialists only got 550 votes, and the Communists 520, that is, more than three times as many as in 1929.

In a suburb of Brest, where the workers of the Arsenal live, we beat the Socialist list in the first ballot, and by the united front and „class against class“ tactic, with the support of the Socialist workers, we beat the bourgeois list in the second ballot. This shows the great possibilities for our Party to win the masses.

A certain change is also noticeable in the relation of forces in the heart of the reformist trade unions.

In La Pallice the C.G.T. of the dockers union dissolved and the workers came into our Unitarian Trade Union. In Cours, the liquidation of the C.G.T. union was effected, and 700 members were brought into the Unitarian Union.

One must know how to use the correct tactic of the united front, because, in France, if it means a fight to a finish against the leaders of social democracy, against the reformist organisations, it cannot certainly mean surrender of all claims to the socialist and reformist workers.

We must admit that for a certain period we have somewhat neglected the tactic of the united front. In the Party and even in the Central Committee there is a tendency to make it a general rule to propose the united front to the reformist organisations. Of course, our C.C. has made a stand against such practice, because the reformist leaders cannot help in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, but, on the contrary, they, endeavour to break up the movement of the working class. Such a line would be a condemnation of the „class against class“ tactic.

I shall now give a short survey of the work of our Party.

Let us recall our short analysis of French imperialism from the outset, its triple source of excess profits (colonies, the German people, and the foreign workers in France) . . .

(Comrade Lozovsky: And the French proletariat?)

And the French proletariat also, of course. But the French proletariat is a source of ordinary profit, while the exploitation of the labour of foreign workers yields excess profit to French capitalism and enables it to corrupt a section of the working class.

If we bear in mind that up to the month of June, 1930, the French bourgeoisie has succeeded in escaping the world economic crisis, we must admit that the work of the French Party has run up against definite objective difficulties.

Since the X. Plenum we have expelled a former General Secretary of our Party and six of his colleagues, almost our entire fraction in the Town Hall of Paris, one deputy and an important group of corrupt leaders of unitarian trade union organisations who now carry on a desperate fight against the militant Communists in the unitarian unions and before the masses.

For a period of ten months, this caused a real physical dislocation in the management of our Party! Many members of the leadership in prison and all the others leading a completely illegal existence.

However, this cannot in any way mitigate the severity of the criticism of the International. On the contrary, we have confirmed this criticism in our practice.

Comrade Manuilsky has shown up some of the essential weaknesses of our Party, for example, our weakness in the capacity to manoeuvre. I shall take trade union unity as an example. The Political Bureau, and the Central Committee afterwards, have rightly reacted to the resistance to the correct tactic of trade union unity. But we lacked boldness, we delayed, and the help of the Communist International was once again of benefit to us.

A second great weakness is our international activity. I shall not mention the defence of the U.S.S.R., as our Comrade Cachin will take that up. We should now fight against our own imperialism together with the German proletariat, for the defence of the German revolution, having profited by the experiences of 1919 and 1923, when the French bourgeoisie was a decisive element in preventing the German revolution; unfortunately, we must state that the work of the Party on this field is inadequate. It is the French proletariat and its Communist Party which should be in the front ranks of the struggle against the Young Plan and all the other treaties of misery and slavery.

The greatest weakness of the French Party is the inadequacy of its work in the colonies and for the defence of the colonial peoples. During the war in the Rif, in 1925, our Party carried on a very large agitation and led a 24-hour strike against the war in Morocco. Today, in face of the revolution in Indo-China, the activity of our Party is scandalously inadequate. The Central Committee of our Party should take radical measures to alter this state of affairs.

A third weakness is the stagnation of the Party organisation. We suffer from these weaknesses in the Party and in the trade unions. Our Party has again lost members. The C.G.T.U. has lost members. This loss is all the more serious because it has taken place in industrial federations, among the metal workers, the textile workers and miners.

The penetration of the Party into the factories is still very weak.

Such weaknesses, comrades, show how struggle within the Party itself to pass over from mere phrasemongering to the effective application of the directives of the Communist International is absolutely necessary.

Thanks to the criticism and the aid of the Presidium, the activity of the Party since last June shows slight progress which we do not want to exaggerate.

Considerable progress was made by the Party and the trade unions in the preparation of the miners' struggle. We mobilised our Party and the Y.C.L. from top to bottom, we mobilised the departments of the Central Committee; the C.G.T.U. obtained the participation of the big industrial federations and local unions. The conference of worker correspondents in Argenteuil (suburb in east Paris) decided to help the miners' struggle. Our press made a very big effort. We have aroused the attention of all the workers. Even Trotzky's paper was obliged to admit that "never has a strike been so thoroughly prepared". From the propaganda of the tactic of the united front and trade union unity we passed over to its effective realisation, through the election of strike committees, the holding of workers' congresses, the national congress of the miners and the wide participation of the C.G.T. workers where the idea was launched of a "united federation of underground workers".

The 25th of February also constituted a change for our Party because it was a demonstration organised in the factories and in the streets of Paris, despite the big police forces. The better penetration into the factories on the basis of immediate demands in the enterprises also denotes some progress. Finally, the 25th of February has seen the workers rebelling, striking the police and protecting the militants of our Party and our trade unions. They prevented their arrest. These are not very big things, but they denote a big change for France. The chief weakness of the 25th of February, however, was the insufficient activity of the unemployed and their organisations.

The campaigns of the Party are being constantly improved. Our French Party always passes for a Party that knows how to carry on agitation, but does not know how to organise. But the important fact of last year is that we no longer know how to carry on agitation. We have taken ourselves in hand since the trial of the Industrial Party and within a single month we assembled 288,000 workers at our meetings. At the time of the trial of the Mensheviks we carried on agitation in the factories. At Renault our militants spoke before 800 workers. At the close of the meeting a resolution of solidarity with the workers of the U.S.S.R. and their Bolshevik Party was passed, condemning the criminal conduct of the agents of the Second International.

Last year we retreated before social democracy; we were on the defensive, whereas since the elections at Belleville we

again attacked social democracy. The Belleville campaign was a great stimulus to the Party. In general, the results of these elections show the progress of the Party and the consolidation of its poll.

In the fourth place, in the month of June, the C.I. could have blamed us for not having interested ourselves in the movement of the committees for the defence of the "Humanité". Now we have a network of committees for defence of the "Humanité" which comprise 15,000 members only in the Paris region.

Fifthly, it is the halt in the losses, in the decrease of the membership of the unions and of the unions and of the Party, and also a certain tendency towards recruitment of new members. In the region of Nancy we brought over 700 workers from a factory of chemical products, in a body into the Unitarian trade union.

These are facts, comrades, which show that the Party has made a progress.

One of the criticisms of this Plenum has strongly impressed us. This concerns our anti-militarist work. After the first of August our Central Committee confirmed the slackening of the struggle of the Party against the war, and has consequently taken measures which we are already applying. We have held a number of special conferences regarding our anti-war work, because such a situation is serious for our Party on account of the rôle of French imperialism which is correctly characterised as the gendarme of Europe. However, we cannot agree to the reproach of opportunism in practice which is levied at our anti-militarist work. If one says great weaknesses, we reply: Yes. If one says opportunism, we reply: No. We still think that our experiences can be cited as an example to other Sections of the Communist International.

I shall cite two simple facts; in 1928 60 demonstrations in the barracks and on board ships; in 1929 110 demonstrations; in 1930 150 demonstrations.

(Comrade **Manuilsky**: When there are greater possibilities, we demand more.)

That is true. That is why we say that if you reproach our Party with great weaknesses, we are in agreement, but if you cite our Party to the International as an example of opportunism in practice, we say: No.

In the months of January and February, 1931, we already registered 34 demonstrations.

The second fact is our work in the navy. Several weeks ago there was a trial at Toulon where five young sailors, who became Communists while on their ships in the Navy and who mutinied, were arraigned before the Naval Tribunal. They were acquitted. A similar fact has not occurred for the past ten years. It is the pressure of the sailors, organised under our leadership, which forced the most reactionary Naval Tribunal to acquit our comrades.

We think that this is not the result of the opportunism of the Party in the work among the sailors.

But it is correct to consider the regression in the organisation of the Y.C.L., and also the weakness in the work among the peasantry as a very great danger to the carrying through of the anti-militarist work of the Party and the Young Communist League. That is why we accept Comrade Chemodanov's criticism regarding our insufficient help to the Young Communist League. We have drained the Young Communist League of its forces to replenish our own cadres, and now we pay dearly for it; this experience should be of use to the Communist International. From now on we must make a much greater effort to support the Young Communist League. We are absolutely in agreement with Comrade Chemodanov's slogan: "No Party nucleus without a nucleus of the Young Communist League."

To these last questions, the anti-imperialist work, the Young Communist League, and our struggle against war, we call the attention of the Communist International, as also to the defence and the extension of the Socialist system, the defence of our proletarian fatherland, the U.S.S.R., the necessity to strengthen the common struggle and the solidarity of our proletariat with the proletariat of other countries.

The French delegation expresses the conviction that, with the aid of the Communist International, our Party will rise to the height of the responsibilities that are incumbent upon it, and that it will not fail in its task.

Speech of Comrade Garlandi (Italy).

The trend of the general capitalist crisis after the VI. World Congress of the Communist International has confirmed the correctness of the analysis and perspectives given by the C.I.

When we speak today of political crises, we must endeavour to define the character of the present political crises, that is, we must not give a characteristic applicable to any period. The causes and character of the political crises change in accordance with various factors which must be analysed separately in every situation. The political crisis is a commotion in the upper strata which can be brought about by the very motives which produce a revolutionary situation, but which does not necessarily require the existence of a revolutionary situation.

The political crisis of 1919 to 1922 in Italy was accompanied by a revolutionary crisis of which it formed part, but in 1924 we had the political Matteotti crisis unaccompanied by a revolutionary crisis.

But the present political crises are manifest also as a product of the sharp economic crisis and of the social consequences of this crisis; thus the present political crises are among the most important symptoms of the approaching revolutionary crisis.

Consequently, today the distinction between the "political crisis" and the "revolutionary crisis" tends to diminish. This is a characteristic feature of the situation.

It is too naive to assert that there is no distinction between the political crisis and the revolutionary situation.

Certain documents of the Communist International and of some of the Parties (Germany, Poland, etc.) give a good characteristic of the development of the economic crisis into the political, and of its maturing into a revolutionary situation.

Another characteristic feature of the present situation is the process of the fascist transformation of the state.

We can henceforth assert that fascism is an organic product of democracy in the period of capitalist disintegration. This process follows different paths, but it presupposes always a regrouping of the ruling forces which rest on the petty-bourgeois and peasant masses, and even on the backward strata of the proletariat. This regrouping is the result of the pressure of the proletariat, and is accompanied by the establishment of a fighting organisation, and by the transformation of the state apparatus, in order to adapt it to the capitalist offensive.

Fascism is not always the outcome of a coup d'Etat. What is a coup d'Etat? It is a sudden interference with the existing lawful relations.

Fascism need not at all get into power in the Italian manner. We must study the different ways of fascism, and adapt our tactic accordingly.

Fascism is a reaction which rests on a mass basis, and by our policy, we must henceforth prevent the crystallisation of strata which can provide fascism with a mass basis.

The proletariat can retard the fascistisation process, provided it is led by a strong Communist Party with a correct policy. The proletariat can fight fascism, can prevent its progress and can defeat it. In Germany, the fascist road is barred by the German proletariat led by the C.P.G.

Our analysis on fascism should give an exposé of the distinction between fascism and social fascism. There is no opposition between fascism and democracy in view of the fact that the ideological positions of social democracy are the same as those of fascism. But this does not entitle us to contemplate the possibility of the organic fusion of fascism and social fascism.

Capitalism is manoeuvring with these two reactionary mass organisations. One cannot speak of **unity in the reaction** which extends from finance capital to social democracy, and the simultaneous utilisation of fascism and social fascism by capitalism is a necessity for its offensive and defensive manoeuvres.

While confirming the gradual maturing of the elements of a revolutionary situation, our analysis tells us that there is a discrepancy between the rhythm of the maturing of the objective elements and that of the subjective. We have not made very much progress with the conquest of the majority of the working class; we have certainly been able to establish a workers' and peasants' bloc, but we have not yet succeeded in giving our daily political activity the fundamental character of a proletarian revolution which, to be victorious, must be popular.

Our Plenum places before all Communists the task of accelerating the tempo of the work for the conquest of the majority

of the proletariat and of its allies. The hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution must be the result of the policy of the proletariat towards its allies.

With your permission I will deal briefly with an old question which is, however, always new: **our work in the rural districts.**

Needless to recall that there is an agrarian crisis which brings with it a formidable reshuffling of classes in the countryside. Peasant strata which have been pauperised, or which are in the process of pauperisation, are in open revolt against the big landowners, the state and its apparatus. Fascism is taking advantage of this revolt: Peasant parties led by the agents of the big landowners, by the ideologists of so-called ruralisation, are being established for the purpose of eventually using the peasants against the industrial proletariat.

Can one fight effectively against fascism without depriving it of its peasant basis? The struggle for the conquest of the peasants is one of the characteristic features of the present struggle between capitalism and the proletariat.

But we are not yet within reach of the agricultural proletariat which must become the principal revolutionising element of the peasantry. The agricultural proletariat has to put up with conditions much worse than those of the industrial proletariat, and represents a formidable revolutionary force.

But we are still minus an agrarian policy. The theses of the II. Congress of the C.I. and of the V. Plenum of the E.C.C.I. exist only in our libraries.

On the other hand, our adversaries are developing a remarkable activity, so as to prevent an alliance between the industrial proletariat and the toiling peasantry. A decisive change is essential on this field.

In his address to the first conference of the Council of the Peasant International, Lenin welcomed this conference as one of the great events in the history of mankind. The great problem of the proletarian revolution is the creation of a Red Peasant International through the revolutionary struggle of the toiling peasantry, led by the proletariat.

Let us produce specialists of the peasant question, let us form cadres for rural work, let us convince all the comrades and all the Parties that work in the rural districts is the work of the whole Party.

One must send comrades from the ranks of revolutionary proletarians to the rural districts for work among the toiling peasants, one must draw up plans of action for the peasantry, analyse the reshuffling of classes in the countryside, study the demands for the various strata of the peasantry, the forms of work in the countryside, and organise everywhere workers' and peasants' congresses to which delegates should be elected at factory and peasant conferences.

We must bar the way to our adversaries. In all the reports of our C.C.s we must give accounts of the mass work of the Party in the rural districts.

The analyses of the situation in Germany, Britain, France, Italy and in all the other countries omit to mention the development of the agricultural crisis and social and political facts in the countryside, they omit to give a picture of what we intend to do in the countryside. With the exception of a few countries—Poland, Bulgaria and the colonial countries—the reports of our C.C.s give hardly anything on this subject.

The slogan "Turn your attention to the countryside", launched by the Plenum signalises the character of the revolutionary drive, and sounds the alarm regarding military intervention against the U.S.S.R. Neither do we pay enough attention to the conquest of the young workers and peasants. The leadership of the Party does not give the necessary lead to the Y.C.L. in its work.

One notices among the adults a certain aloofness with regard to the youth which is at times the expression of a conservative and passive spirit in the old cadres of the Party. Frequently Y.C.L. work does not differ much from the work of the Party, the activity and the methods of work of the Y.L.s are not always supple and youthful. The sectarian tendencies, pointed out by the last Plenum of the Y.C.I., have not yet disappeared.

Such are the general points which I wanted to stress, in order to show how to diminish the discrepancy between the growing seriousness of the class struggle and the preparation of our Parties.

However, these necessary criticisms must not make us forget the fact that we are struggling everywhere under difficult conditions, and that despite of it, our influence is growing throughout the world.

The so-called Bolshevik danger, the danger of proletarian revolution worries world capitalism. Our Parties are maturing and coming into being in the midst of struggle. Our political activity is becoming the axis of world politics.

I will say now a few words about the attainments, shortcomings and immediate tasks of the Communist Party of Italy.

Last year's enlarged Presidium has discussed the questions which confronted our Party at that time. A more thorough discussion regarding some of the essential problems of the life of our Party took place a few months later in the Political Secretariat of the C.I.

After last year's Enlarged Presidium, we worked for the turn in our activity decided upon by the majority of the Political Bureau of the Party and endorsed by the Presidium of the C.I.

After the blows received in 1928, we got out of contact with the base of the Party with the result that the ideology of other classes found its way into the Party; and when with the sharpening of the crisis in Italy, the masses began to get into motion and showed signs of spontaneous activity, the Party considered the question of assuming the leadership of these movements.

It was then that we started the struggle against opportunism which had been maturing in the Party during the years which followed the promulgation of the exceptional laws in Italy.

There were several cases of **opportunism** in 1928-29, **Serra's** case was by no means an isolated one. The C.C. was solid against **Serra**. If we had been able that time to discuss more thoroughly the Italian problems, we would have seen that a whole group of comrades was crystallising around **Serra**. It was after the X. Plenum that the position of the leadership was shaken. In the discussion on the application of the decisions of the C.I. to the Italian situation, our C.C. did not succeed in clearing up the positions, and arrived at a compromise.

Two or three months later the Party and the P.B. decided on a thorough turn in the organisation and mass work of the Party, in order to diminish the discrepancy between the objective situation and the activity of the masses, and increase the capacity of the Party to lead these movements. It was then that four members of the P.B. that is, nearly half the P.B., began to oppose the line adopted by the majority and the C.I. These comrades tried their hand at factional work, at forming a nucleus in the apparatus of the Party, at making capital out of the difficulties we were encountering in our work, in order to secure the leadership of the Party. But the C.I. supported the stand taken up by the majority of the P.B. which, thus reinforced, carried on an energetic struggle against the opportunists.

The opportunists turned towards the Trotskyists, and started a campaign of slanders against the Party and the C.I. Even if the comrades in the lower organisations have now recognised the correctness of the line of the leadership of the Party, we still meet there with considerable opposition in the practical field, and in the mass work. It is essential to get the best of all this opposition by persuading all honest and revolutionary workers in the Party to accept the line of the Central Committee, otherwise we will not be able to make progress with regard to mass work.

The first steps in the direction of the turn have cost us many sacrifices. We have lost a considerable number of active comrades and staff members who were arrested and given heavy sentences, several of them were killed.

We will have to study this question more thoroughly, because we have no strong reserves, and the formation of new cadres is proceeding rather slowly. We must economise our forces more than ever, but we must also pay more attention to our methods of work.

We have had some good results on the organisational field. After a few months of steady work, we were able to hold hundreds of local meetings for the purpose of explaining to the comrades the meaning of the turn, and give them the necessary directives for the reestablishment of the Party organisations.

The membership of the Party has grown a hundred percent, that of the local organisations 150 per cent. We have been able to establish connections with regions from which we were isolated since 1926.

Our factory nuclei are very weak, especially in the large works, in the large industrial towns. Generally speaking, they have no managing committee, in most cases the leadership is in the hands of one comrade who takes on the whole work.

This is how an active member of our Party appraises the position of our nuclei:

"We have but few factory nuclei, and we must do our utmost to get into all the important works. The main problem is to make the few nuclei we have function as political organs.

Even today our Party is not yet able to say whether we have in this or that works a real mass nucleus which gives a proper lead to the workers employed there in their struggle.

Where our factory nuclei are functioning, their work consists in circulating the central press and sometimes in collecting membership dues.

Frequently the workers hear of the existence of Communists in the works only when some of the older comrades are arrested, or when leaflets and pamphlets are being distributed.

But the employers can use repressive measures, dismiss, reduce wages, rationalise and attack in every possible way the labour conditions of the workers without being incommoded by our nuclei".

This quotation gives prominence to our organisational weaknesses.

The Confederation of Labour is not very active as yet. Its work resembles too much that of a central trade union committee. Its apparatus adheres too much to the apparatus of the Party.

We have done something with regard to the mass movement, but we have not yet gained the necessary experience for the organisation of a mass movement. There have been no committees of action in any of the demonstrations or strikes. In Trieste where the movement was important owing to the number of workers on strike, the slogans of the Party and of the Confederation of Labour had nothing to do with wage reduction, they demanded a wage rise. But subsequently a reduction was accepted, certainly smaller than that demanded by the employers, five to six per cent, instead of twelve, simply because the struggle was left without leadership.

The same defects are noticeable in the few movement with which the Communists had something to do. Was the fighting spirit of the Turin strikers, kept up for the first three days organised and given a lead by our comrades? No. There were certainly some individual attempts, but nothing of an organised nature. There were possibilities to expand the Turin movement, to link it up with the discontent in the works and factories after the decision of the government, in accordance with the industrialists, to reduce wages. It was possible to link up the movement of the unemployed with the protest movement of the employed workers, but this was not done.

To believe that mass work cannot be developed without previously establishing a strong Party organisation, is tantamount to encouraging passivity in the Party.

These problems were placed before the meeting of the Enlarged Central Committee last December, and the comrades recognised the necessity of this work.

Our Party must certainly move more rapidly. The question of tempo is evidently connected with the question of cadres. Our cadres are very weak, and it is difficult to form new cadres. Our old cadres are tired out or too well known to the police, and they cannot give all that is required in the present situation; moreover, they frequently refuse to be replaced. These comrades must make room to the young elements, to people less known to the police, to members who have joined the Party after 1926 but are well able to understand the work of the Party and willing to put up a fight.

We must also form our trade union cadres, so as to make the special work of the Confederation of Labour better known.

The question of **tempo in the development of the mass work** is closely linked up with the sharpening of the crisis in Italy.

At the beginning of 1931, the Bulletin of the Fascist Confederation of Industrialists contained the following statement:

"One cannot expect rapid improvement in the economy of Italy which, owing to the strong ties connecting it with the economies of the various countries, must necessarily adapt its development to the general development of the crisis."

In all the branches of industry, on the field of finance, foreign trade, etc. the prospect is not very bright.

Unemployment grows, one can estimate the number of industrial and agricultural unemployed at 2,000,000.

This year the government must pay three milliards of treasury bonds; next year it will have to pay four milliards, and the treasury will have only one and a half milliards to spend.

These are the reasons of the tentative rapprochement with France which will have serious consequences in the international and home policy.

In the home policy, this can lead to a certain attenuation of the crisis, but also to an aggravation of the internal antagonisms, because the capital brought into Italy will not be used for production, but for public works. Consequently, the government will have to increase the public debt and will demand a greater participation of the population in the payment of taxes.

There is a state deficit of 900,000,000. That is why all the salaries of the civil servants have been reduced. Payment of arrears of taxes is more rigorously enforced, and this has led to the bankruptcy of a large number of small peasant farms.

Speech of Comrade Arnot (Great Britain).

Comrades, in the present world situation presented to us by the thesis it is clear that an international strategic question must be that of the hegemony of the proletariat in the national revolutionary struggles.

This together with the agrarian crisis, as part of the world economic crisis (intensified by it and intensifying), makes it important to consider the work of the Communist Parties of the imperialist countries in relation to the colonial struggles. The ruined peasantry of Asia, Africa, and South America are the greater part of mankind, and their ruin reacts on the highly developed capitalist lands. Already the working class in the imperialist countries are beginning to understand this and the consequent need for closer connection between their position and the position of the toiling masses in the colonies.

This Plenum should be a turning point for the work of the Parties in the imperialist countries, in which in almost every case there has been serious under-estimation of the importance and urgency of this work.

In no case is the responsibility greater than in our Party, British imperialism having by far the greatest colonial possessions. Especially at the present moment it is necessary for us to consider this, when the British imperialist bourgeoisie are seeking a way out of the world economic crisis through the most intensified and brutal exploitation of the exploited classes of the Empire; and when as a result of the world economic crisis, especially of the agrarian crisis, as a result of sharpening inter-imperialist antagonisms, and as a result of the contradictions between the emancipation of the one-time colonial peoples of the U.S.S.R. and the merciless subjugation of the colonial peoples by finance capital, the whole of the British Empire is rocking and the forces of disintegration are becoming stronger and stronger.

Of the whole British Empire, comprising nearly a quarter of mankind, the crucial point for British imperialism is India, where the whole revolutionary upsurge of the exploited masses in the last year has dealt shattering blows at British imperialism.

"India", says Lord Rothermere, "is the liich-pin of Empire.

If India goes, all goes."

Because of India, the MacDonald Government was kept in power in 1930, with the openly expressed support of both Lloyd George and also of Baldwin. Because of India, the distinction between His Majesty's Government and His Majesty's Opposition has entirely disappeared. On India there is a united front of the imperialist bourgeoisie, and a formal coalition dating from the appointment of the Simon Commission four years ago, a coalition that extends from Baldwin to Lloyd George, from Lloyd George to MacDonald, from MacDonald to the so-called "Lefts" of the I.L.P.

1930 is the greatest year of revolutionary development in the history of the Indian toiling masses: British imperialism has used every means, mingling fraud and force, cunning manoeuvres with bloodthirsty and murderous suppression in a way which the British bourgeoisie have learned from two-hundred years of oppression of India, Ireland and other colonies. In this work the social fascist government of MacDonald has showed itself a worthy government of the Second International. The colonial theory of opportunism at the Amsterdam Congress

In view of the forms of organisation which fascism has imposed on the Italian society, the maturing of the political crisis is slower in our country than elsewhere. But at the same time it is of a more serious character which augurs a revolutionary crisis in Italy as soon as the political crisis has matured.

We must combat among our comrades the idea of a relaxation between the fall of fascism and the proletarian struggle for power. On the contrary, if our work—basing itself on the immediate demands of the masses and following the trend of the mass struggles—is carried on from now onwards stubbornly and with a purpose, we will be able to overcome fascism and capitalism.

Comrades, we can be satisfied with the balance of our work for 1930, if we take into account the point of departure of the end of 1929. But these results must be considered only as the beginning of the application of the turn. Next time we will give you a better account of our work. With your help we will overcome the new difficulties.

twenty-six years ago expressed then as belief in the "civilising mission" of European civilisation is now expressed in practice in mass murder, in machine guns, tanks, aeroplanes and in burning, flogging and slaying. But Sholapur, Peshawar, Kishorigunj, the Berars, Sindh, Burma, the Red Shirts of Peshawar and the rising of the Afridi tribesmen (peasants of the hills) and the innumerable dacoities now going on show the strength of the mass revolutionary upsurge against the Labour Government, the tool of British imperialism.

All of this is carried out in the name of the "liberation of India", "pacification", "advance to self-government", etc. These hypocritical murderers are supported by the Left-wing social-fascists, Maxton, Brailford, and others, who criticise the Labour Government merely on the ground that it is going rather too slowly and so attempt to create in the ranks of the working class of Great Britain the illusion that these tools of British imperialism stand for the ending of British rule in India. Against all these, the Communist Party of Great Britain, with all its weaknesses, is the only defender in Britain of the struggle of the toiling masses of India against the onslaught of British imperialism and the persecutions of the Labour Government.

The effect of the world economic crisis on the trade of Britain with its Indian colony has been catastrophic. The share of Britain in India imports has fallen from 63% pre-war to 41.6% in 1929/30.

This serious blow takes place under the pressure of competition from its imperialist rivals as well as from the boycott inside India.

As regards the imperialist rivals of the British bourgeoisie, while no governmental move has been made, it is clear that America takes one standpoint and the French bourgeoisie another. The bourgeoisie of the U.S.A., without doubt, in pursuit of their policy of the Open Door, would favour the Indian capitalists. But the French bourgeoisie, it is equally clear, supports British imperialism in their work of suppression. And why? Because Indo-China is next door to India; and they cannot remain unconcerned at the revolutionary upsurge in their neighbour's colony.

But of all the imperialist powers, Japan, whose export to India of cotton piece goods increased in 1929/30 by averages of 40% to 63%, is the most serious rival of Britain in Indian trade.

Figures cannot give an adequate picture of the condition of the toiling masses in India. Terrible before, it has now, reached a pitch of degradation and misery which is well-nigh unbelievable.

Ten years ago the census of 1921 revealed the contrast between the average expectation of life of the Englishman (which is 53 years and has been rising), and that of the Indian (which is 22 years and has been rapidly falling under "beneficent" British rule).

Now ten years later the position is much worse than this statistic of the expectation of life summing up in a single terrible figure the effects of a half century's rule of the British sahibs.

Under such conditions the forces of revolution are ripening. This applies especially to the agrarian revolution which alone

with the national struggle for emancipation, is the main axis of the revolution in India. Under such conditions, there is a rapid development of the class relations, and every class is set in motion. According this has been the year of greatest revolutionary development of the Indian working class and peasantry. Against this all the forces of imperialism have been mobilised and consolidated.

I already mentioned the formal coalition of all three bourgeois parties in Britain, extending from Baldwin to MacDonald and Maxton. Under the menace of revolution this has now been further extended into a counter-revolutionary alliance with the Indian national reformists, headed by Gandhi. The Viceroy of India, Lord Irwin, has shaken hands with Gandhi, and Gandhi on behalf of the Indian bourgeoisie has accepted the terms of truce. This Irwin-Gandhi Pact is a real turning point. It marks the beginning of the end of illusions about Gandhi.

Not only in India, but in Europe and America the illusion has been fostered that Gandhi is a representative of the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie. He is supposed to be a Tolstoyan, a saint, a believer in soul-force and against all violence. Books in this sense have been written about him, and a thoroughly false view spread of him and his associates in the Indian National Congress.

It is necessary to say now that this Gandhi is a representative, not of the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie, not even of the reactionary petty bourgeois utopians, but of the Indian capitalists and landlords. As for his belief in non-violence, this can be measured by his participation in recruiting a corps of Indians on the side of British capitalism for the imperialist slaughter. Not only does Gandhi represent this treacherous Indian bourgeoisie linked up with landlords, but his active part in the betrayal of the revolutionary struggle began already when the struggle itself was beginning. The Irwin-Gandhi Pact is only the consummation of this treacherous rôle. From the very beginning Gandhi headed the movement in order to behead it. This can be proved by the whole of his policy. Let us take only a few items in the last year and a half.

First, the acceptance by the Delhi Manifesto of Lord Irwin's Dominion Status declaration in 1929 October.

Second, the resolution of the Lahore Indian National Congress December 1929 by which the Madras Declaration of Independence was reaffirmed, and the threat launched of non-violent civil disobedience in order to restrain the revolutionary upsurge.

Third, his famous 11 points which he proposed to the Viceroy, in return for which he was willing to capitulate and to throw overboard the deceitful slogan of independence. These points were the demands of the Indian bourgeoisie for tariff protection, etc.

Here, I will quote the speech of one of the leading capitalists of India, Hussain Bhey Lajji, President of the Indian Merchants' Chamber, at his speech at Chamber meeting says:

"I make bold to say that in the universal desire manifest to have responsible government at the centre and especially with regard to finance and commerce all that fight of ours has played no small a part. It shows the justification for our agitation that the eleven points of Mahatma Gandhi were always based upon the economic and financial platforms of the Chamber and other similar institutions."

(*"Bombay Chronicle"*, 26 January 1931.)

Fourthly, after the campaign of mass civil disobedience began Gandhi sought in every way to limit it, to restrain it, and to hamper it up to the moment when he would be able to betray it. While he was carrying through his spectacular pilgrimage to defy the salt tax, he sternly refused to proclaim non-payment of "land tax". "If I were the Government tomorrow", he said to the correspondent of the "Daily Telegraph", "I should require to have the land tax". It was in this same interview, that he stated he was against any withdrawal of the British troops from India.

Fifthly, when the mass pressure for non-payment of the land tax became too strong, Patel, Gandhi's lieutenant, was forced to agree to it. But they sought to limit it, they wanted to confine it to the largely kulak region of Bardoli in Gujerat, and for other parts of India (Bengal and United Provinces) where landlordism was rampant, they urged that there should be the refusal only to pay the insignificant police tax. In this way Gandhi sought to hinder the development of the agrarian revolution, — just as he did 9 years ago, when in February 1922, by his treacherous betrayal at Bardoli where he ordered the

rebellious peasants to pay rent, he showed himself to be a representative of the landlords.

Sixthly, after his conversations and manoeuvres in Yeravda prison in August, when his emissaries to London, the Liberals Jayakar and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, had come back, when he was released from jail to carry through his treachery, his first move before meeting the Viceroy was to post off to Bombay there to get his instructions, not from the Indian National Congress of which he was appointed Dictator, but from the leading capitalist millowners.

Now, finally, when the Irwin-Gandhi Pact has been carried through and the treachery consummated, what happened? After a year of the most brutal repressions and mass murder by British Imperialism, with 40,000 to 50,000 political prisoners, the Viceroy said he would not release the Meerut prisoners or the Lahore prisoners or any other group of revolutionary fighters. What did Gandhi say? At this moment when millions of Indians were locked in a life and death grapple with British imperialism, Gandhi said in effect:

"You can do as you like with the revolutionary fighters for Indian independence, so long as you help our cotton industry."

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact.

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact is of historic importance. It is a real turning point, it is the beginning of the end of illusions, it clears the way for revolutionary advance.

Already from the events at Karachi and Cawnpore it is clear that the masses are not deceived and that the revolutionary movement is developing upwards into mass action. At Karachi, Gandhi was greeted with cries of "Assassin! Murderer!". A year and a half ago mass demonstrations wearing Gandhi caps were carrying black flags and shouting "Simon, go back!". Now Gandhi, this same Gandhi, the Mahatma, the holy man, was met by crowds carrying flags and shouting "Gandhi, go back". Such is the tempo of development of the revolutionary movement. At Cawnpore while this Plenum is sitting, an insurrectionary movement is taking place, hundreds have been killed, and not the soft words of Irwin and Gandhi in their conversations, but the rattle of machine-guns and the rumble of tanks are showing the realities of British rule. The insurrectionary movement in Burma goes on undaunted, and so does the movement of the Red Shirts of Peshawar, whose device is the "Hammer and Sickle", whose slogans of struggle are a witness to the powerful influence of the example of the U.S.S.R., where only a few hundred miles to the North the peasants of Uzbekistan have been liberated from colonial oppression.

On the side of British imperialism every move and every manoeuvre was bent towards this Gandhi-Irwin Pact. The Round Table Conference was itself a mass of manoeuvres: — for instance the Liberals Jayakar and Sapru come as the secret emissaries of Gandhi who proudly sits aloof in his extremely comfortable prison; for instance, the calling in of the Maharajas, the Indian princes, the most reactionary feudal monarchies now existing in the world; for instance the carefully staged transformation scene by which the downtrodden colony of India vanishes, its place is taken by a wonderful new federal India with rajahs and all included. It is not federal but feudal. It is not independence, but a strengthening of the feudal imperialist regime. It is this which the Indian bourgeoisie in their dread of the revolutionary masses have accepted through their representative Gandhi.

While the press organs of British imperialism were chuckling over the Round Table Conference trick that they had pulled off, what was the attitude of Gandhi and his supporters?

On the side of the Indian National Congress there was the atmosphere of the developing agrarian revolution. Not only Gandhi, but the so-called "Lefts" of the Congress were plaintively calling on the government to release Gandhi and the I.N.C. prisoners to stave of the revolution.

Here is the statement of the Calcutta journal "Liberty" of which Subhas Chandra Bose, the leader of the "Lefts", is the editor:

"The Indians too want an honourable settlement, but they do not see at the end of the Round Table Conference any chances of an honourable settlement. They too believe that India can escape revolution only through courageous reconstruction. But those can reconstruct this, who can still avert the impending revolution have been placed in jail. If things

are allowed to drift thus, the menacing thunder of discontent (i. e. revolution) will not take long to burst."
 ("Liberty", January 6, 1931.)

It is clear that the "Lefts" with all their talk of a "Socialist Republic" with their nominal support of a General Strike, are a mortal terror of the developing revolution.

Their attitude was already shown six months earlier during the insurrectionary movement of Kishoriganj, where the Bengal peasants, mostly Moslems, rose against the money-lenders, mostly Hindus.

They burnt their mortgages and killed their oppressors. Immediately a deputation of the "Left" National Reformists approached the Governor of Bengal and hinting that it was a pogrom stirred up by British imperialism, asked for the immediate suppression of the peasant rising. The Governor pointed out that it was not a religious, but an economic struggle of the toiling peasants against the blood-sucking landlords and money-lenders. He said he would take all the necessary measures more effectively, to suppress this peasant rebellion; and he thanked the deputation; and expressed his gratification that he had the support of those followers of Gandhi in his forcible suppression by machine-guns and mass murder of the revolutionary peasant masses.

What happened in Kishoriganj also happened in The Berars and in Burma where the peasant rebellion is still aflame.

The Afridi rising is also a rising of poor peasants of the hills, and the main reason (apart from the strategical reasons for the preparation of war against the Soviet Union with India as a military base) for the proposed expeditionary force which was to cost £ 22,000,000 against these Afridi peasants was that they have proved to the hundreds of millions of toiling masses how ten thousand peasants can hold out for a whole summer against the force of British imperialism provided they have arms in their hands.

The Indian Working Class and the Communist Party of India.

With this development of the agrarian revolution as part of the general revolutionary upsurge and with the advance of the proletariat to the hegemony (which is shown by significant signs such as the adoption of proletarian slogans by the peasants), the central question becomes the development of this hegemony under the leadership of a strong centralised disciplined illegal Communist Party.

The pressure of the masses is growing and with the Irwin-Gandhi pact a new stage is open. Only the subjective factor, the development of the Communist Party, is still lagging behind. The Communist Party exists, but exists in the process of formation.

The Platform of Action of the Communist Party of India is a document which is bound to have the greatest effect in its development.

On the question of the general strike, the Party was able to put forward this slogan and under the pressure of the masses the All-India Trade Union Congress were compelled to accept this slogan. Though some of the national reformists in the Trade Union Congress fought against it, others (Bose, etc.) took the more cunning step of accepting it in order to betray it. On this question of the general strike there were also waverings amongst some of our own comrades, who, while accepting the General Strike on principle, for so-called tactical reasons ("the masses were not ready", etc.) were against it.

It is clear that in this central struggle for the leadership of the working class, in the advance of the working class to the hegemony of the whole revolutionary movement of the masses, a most important task of our comrades is the fight against Gandhism as the main obstacle.

Above all, they must carry on the fight against the "Left" Gandhists such as Subhas Bose, the Chairman of the All-India Trade Union Congress, whose line it is to be more radical in the Trade Union Congress and to accept reluctantly the line of Gandhi in the Indian National Congress, or against such as Jinnadas Mehta who takes up a more radical position in the Indian National Congress and less radical in the Trade Union Congress while his henchmen, Kaldikar, carries on a campaign against the General Strike.

The split in the Girni Kamgar Union carried out by Kaldikar at the behest of the Indian National Congress was a move by the bourgeoisie in the class struggle against the Indian proletariat.

There should be no question of compromise with Kaldikar. Compromise with him is compromise with counter-revolution. Our Indian comrades should not do it.

Work and Tasks of the C. P. G. B.

Our task (by agitation, by propaganda, exposing the social fascists, by solidarity demonstrations working up to strikes, work in the army and navy) is to build a single united struggle of the British and Indian masses for the overthrow of British imperialism. We have to break down deeply-rooted imperialist ideology amongst the British workers and, above all, by action, we have to unite the struggle of the British workers with the toiling masses of India.

How have we fulfilled these tasks? All comrades know the backwardness on this question of the British Party (caused by years of neglect of the colonial struggle) and revealed by the attitude of our delegation on the colonial discussion at the VI. Congress of the Communist International. If, however, we compare what we have done in the past period with previous activities, then we can record some steps in advance, certain achievements. But they are little enough in comparison with the magnitude of the task and the tremendous struggle of the Indian masses.

As regards the propaganda carried on by the Party specially in the "Daily Worker", it has been relatively good and has been described as good in the resolution of the Presidium six months ago.

By means of persistent and continuous propaganda, we have carried on a popularisation in the ranks of the Party and amongst the masses of the decisions of the VI. Congress on the colonial revolution. We have carried on an agitation amongst the dockers and seamen in various ports, and in the London branch of the Indian National Congress we have carried on work among the rank and file to break them away from Gandhi.

The League Against Imperialism has developed, its work and has also taken over the defense of the Meerut prisoners. Last month it held a Conference attended by 220 delegates appointed from working class organisations including trade union branches, co-operative societies and branches of the Independent Labour Party. This last fact means a breach into the ranks of the "Lefts", the most dangerous enemies of the workers at this moment.

Immediately the mass movement began to reach a higher stage of development a year ago, we issued a leaflet in which we demanded withdrawal of the troops from India and called on every British soldier to fraternise, to imitate the example of the Garhwal Rifles of Peshawar. And though this second slogan was censored in the legal leaflet we prepared, we found other means of getting this slogan of fraternisation put out.

There have been still, however, very great weaknesses in our work; many shortcomings; many mistakes. Throughout the Party there is still a serious under-estimation of the importance of the colonial struggle, an under-estimation that results from the bad heritage left by the past opportunist leadership.

Only from this can we explain the fact that the Minority Movement for weeks during this year never even mentioned India in its newspaper, "The Worker", and in general almost entirely neglected to carry out the tasks in colonial work set it by the V. Congress of the R.I.L.U., and for the failure to carry out the proper control over our Minority Movement fraction we are responsible.

We must say that we have not yet succeeded in making the colonial struggle, the support of the colonial revolution part of the daily work of the Party: It is not part of the life of every cell, every basis unit, every district.

The tasks of the Party are to wage a determined fight to expose the Labour Government and to make clear that it is the tool of the most brutal and bloody imperialism. We have particularly to fight against the Left wingers so-called, against the Brailsfords who go to India and form in Lahore a socialist party and put forward a strong line of criticism of imperialism and of MacDonald in words, while in practice they support the MacDonald Government. We have continually to bring out the contrast between the position of the colonies of imperialism and the position of the nationalities in the former colonies of Tsardom. We have to carry on our propaganda amongst the Indian students and seamen and in this connection to build up a red Marine Workers' Union: to organise demonstrations at

all the strategic points so that the news of those demonstrations can get across to our comrades fighting in India.

We have to deepen our I.R.A. activities in support of the prisoners whom Gandhi has left to rot in the jails of the Labour Government. We have to intensify our work amongst the forces of British imperialism.

Above all we have to present the struggle in a concrete form so that in every factory producing for export (nearly every British factory does) the workers on the basis of their daily work shall be brought into closest relation and solidarity with the struggle of our Indian and colonial comrades. So that every factory paper shall contain, not a mention of India as something extra, but as a part of their own struggle in the factories against the common enemy.

Speech of Comrade Weinstone (U.S.A.).

Comrades. I want to address my remarks chiefly to three questions — the struggle against unemployment and the organisation of the unemployed masses, our Trade Union work and the methods by which to combat the plans of the bourgeoisie to destroy the growing revolutionary movement.

Upon our success in the struggle against unemployment and upon our Trade Union work depends the growth of the American Party as a mass Party. In the United States at the present time unemployment is the main issue upon which all political parties and groups are forced to present their positions.

Since the outbreak of the crisis unemployment has grown to 10 million in the United States, in addition there are several million workers engaged in part-time work. The militancy of the workers in the United States shown in the past year has expressed itself in unemployment demonstrations, in the struggle for immediate relief and for unemployment insurance.

Under these circumstances the manner in which we struggle against unemployment is of decisive importance for the growth of the Party. The struggle against unemployment is the central task of the Communist Party.

Unemployment existed in the United States before the crisis, the number of unemployed reaching about 3 million. Had we raised the question of unemployment and of the fight against it during the prosperity days, had we raised the question of unemployment insurance as we were directed by the C.I. many times during 1927—2829 we would have been far better prepared for the period of the crisis and would have succeeded in enrolling large masses of workers in the struggle for this decisive issue of the American working class. The question of unemployment today is an issue affecting practically every household in the United States. March 6th 1930 was an expression of this fact.

There was a hope among many workers that because of the riches of American capitalism, because of the huge increase in production, because of the penetration of American imperialism in various corners of the world, the American proletariat would overcome the growing insecurity, would maintain stability in its living conditions and would even improve its status. The crisis shattered this hope. The proletariat of America realised that they had been tricked by the propaganda of the bourgeoisie, by the A. F. of L. and by the Socialist Party. With the bankruptcy of prosperity, there was the collapse not merely of a phrase but the bankruptcy of a complete system of class collaboration, a system based on the idea that with the concentration of industry and the strengthening of the monopolistic position of the American bourgeoisie, the conditions of the broad masses of the American proletariat would thereby improve. On March 6th the workers gave voice to this awakening.

On March 6th there was an elemental upsurge of the American working class in defence of its living standards, and in the first place in defence of its job.

On March 6th the American worker recognised that his security of the job was breaking down, that the assurance of the job for to-morrow was not forthcoming, he began to realise that he was a wage-earner, a proletarian like his brother in Europe. But on this day, also, the workers in the United States were asserting their desire to organise themselves, to fight off hunger and starvation.

Comrade Manuilsky said that there was a certain dizziness in the ranks of the Party as a result of March 6th — undoubtedly this is true. There was an idea that we had already sunk our roots among the broad masses of the proletariat; that the wave

of class struggle would rise higher and higher, and spontaneously and automatically pour the masses into the Party.

In carrying out this task we have to use the example of the Meerut prisoners. Amongst those 31 prisoners for the first time in the history of British domination in India, three representatives of the English working class are standing in the dock along with the representatives of the Indian toiling masses. Such a fact as this is the best proof of solidarity. It is a challenge to all the bad traditions of the past. We must see to it that this continues: that in all the struggles that lie before the toiling masses of India under the leadership of the Indian Communist Party, the Indian workers will find fighting with them in their own ranks representatives of the British working class, British workers, who will thus be proving in practice that they understand it is a common struggle against a common enemy.

We must state that the Party was not able, because of certain weaknesses, to take full advantage of the revolutionary upsurge in order to consolidate the movement, to extend it, and to bring the workers into definite organisation. It did not realise fully that the masses came out to struggle for their most immediate interests, to fight for relief from the inevitable hunger, that they wished to organise in order to conduct this fight. The slogans which we put forward for March 6th were sufficient to call out the masses, such slogans as "Work or Wages" and other general slogans, but they were not concrete enough for the further development of the struggle.

I shall not go into a discussion of these slogans, but shall give only one illustration. The slogan for unemployment insurance which was put forward late and which was not made the central issue, was the demand for 25 dollars a week for every worker and 5 dollars for each dependent, that meant that a working class family with one breadwinner, wife and two children would receive 40 dollars a week under conditions where the average wage in the United States is 25 dollars a week, where huge masses of workers receive 10 to 15 dollars weekly, and in the South many workers get as low as 6 dollars. Such a demand would mean that a worker would receive twice a much income when out of work as during his period of employment.

Just one illustration in regard to organisation. On July 4th very late after some preliminary arrangements, we called a conference of the unemployed at which 1,300 delegates were assembled. The conference lasted one day. The actual preparations for this conference occurred one week before the conference. This conference was in fact a big mass meeting. It is true that it elected an Executive Committee which was charged with the task of forming Unemployed Councils in the United States, but after July 4th very little was heard of this Executive Committee.

Under these conditions workers that came out on March 6th in order to struggle for their immediate demands and in order to organise themselves for this struggle, did not find in the Communist Party the practical organiser of the fight against unemployment.

At the November Plenum of the C.C. this question was taken up quite sharply in accordance with the discussion and directives of the E.C.C.I., and we must state that by developing the struggle for the day to day interests of the masses, the movement has advanced. After the Plenum of the C.C., we can record an increase in activity in the struggle against unemployment, though we must state quite frankly that only in the recent period has the question of unemployment been put forward as the central task of the Communist Party. Recently, a wave of demonstrations has been developed in the United States by the Party. Local hunger marches occurred in the chief cities and 24 smaller cities State-wide hunger marches took place, and on February 10th, nation-wide demonstrations in which 200,000 workers participated, occurred. On February 25th 400,000 workers participated in demonstrations in 71 cities and towns.

The demonstrations were certainly smaller than on March 6th, but it would be a mistake to say that there has been no improvement over March 6th, in respect to organisation, in the concreteness of the slogans and demands put forward, and in the penetration of new areas. As a result of the recent fights,

we can declare that the Party was able to once again gain the upper hand in the leadership in the struggle against unemployment.

Our comrades also learnt to carry through the demonstrations better, to carry them more directly to the state authorities. In Minneapolis, the demonstrators invaded the State Assembly, and spoke for hours. Such militancy was not only true of Minneapolis, there has been a number of invasions of the city and state administrations, militant mass pressure upon the city and state authorities which helped to expose the position of the bourgeoisie before the broad masses of workers. Undoubtedly as a result of this alone the influence of the Communist Party has grown. Undoubtedly as a result of these marches and demonstrations, the large numbers of workers have come to know of the Communist Party, and growing numbers of workers are beginning to recognise in the Communist Party, the champion of their interests.

What is necessary at the present time? In my opinion, our work must be improved in two respects, in the content of the work and in the measures for the organisation of the unemployed. We have carried through demonstrations, militant ones, but we have not yet convinced the masses that aside from demonstrations, the Communist Party can carry forward the fight for immediate relief and the fight for unemployment insurance. We still stand before the task of organising a mass struggle for these everyday demands and for bringing the wide masses of workers into the day to day fight.

We must develop a mass struggle for unemployment insurance, by more diligently exposing the conditions of the workers, by bringing the mass of the workers into this fight, we must apply many forms of activity in order to make the issue of unemployment insurance the central decisive issue of the American proletariat. In regard to the Unemployed Councils, we are in agreement with the proposals made by Comrade Piatnitzky. It is necessary to make the Unemployed Councils the organ of the day to day struggle for the immediate demands and be foremost in the fight for the unemployment insurance. I believe that the emphasis which has been laid here in the Plenum upon the formation of a firmer form of organisation is correct. The T.U.U.L. must be the leader of the Unemployed Councils, they must be organised on a local and district scale. This is the only basis upon which we will be able to bring the masses of the unemployed into the ranks of the Councils. The Councils of the unemployed must be built up upon the basis of the bread lines, the lodging houses, but we must concentrate chiefly upon the bodies of unemployed workers who are the most oppressed, and we must reach out into the neighbourhoods.

It is absolutely essential to draw the revolutionary trade unions and the fraternal organisation into the Unemployed Councils, so as to unite the struggle of the employed and unemployed workers.

A further word in regard to social insurance. The struggle for social insurance is an historic task for the Party. Social insurance, insurance against unemployment, illness, maternity, for the development of labour protection laws, particularly in the South, will be fought for by the American proletariat, and we must recognise that through the struggle we will be able to develop a broad trade union movement in the United States. It is inconceivable that the American workers will not undertake this fight of providing themselves with the protection for their most acute needs. But this fight can only be developed by overcoming the resistance in the ranks of the Party to the slogan of social insurance, a resistance which manifested itself in the opposition to the development of the campaign for the collection of signatures in connection with the Unemployment Insurance Bill.

With regard to the trade union work. The Communist Party from the very moment of its formation was confronted with the task of organising the American proletariat in the trade unions. The workers in the steel industry, automobile, chemical, marine, the majority of miners are unorganised in the United States. The A.F.L. makes no effort to organise these basic masses. The Socialist Party which is a junior partner of the A.F.L., as Comrade Foster correctly described it, likewise makes no effort to organise the American workers. The I.W.W. collapsed soon after the first struggles following the world war, the present time the Muste group are making some manoeuvres regard to organising the unorganised masses, but the only force which can and is willing to take up this historic task is the Communist Party.

The American workers are compelled with iron necessity to seek organisation and in the first place the trade unions. But the workers will not automatically enter into our trade unions, it will be necessary for the Party and the trade unions to go to the American workers and to convince them of the necessity for entering our ranks, to demonstrate to them through the daily practice of the Party and the trade unions that we can build mass trade unions that are ready and able to fight for their daily interests. This has not yet been achieved.

In the past two years we have built up trade union organisations with 40,000 members in them in mining, needle trades, textiles, seamen, lumber and a number of other unions, but the basis of these unions have been chiefly in the small shops. What has happened during the crisis with these 40,000 members? We must state quite frankly that they have declined. Why was this so? Because these unions did not place before their members, the primary task of defending the practical interests of the workers in a material way, because they became chiefly Agit-Prop adjuncts of the Communist Party (Question: Have they been good Agit-Props?). Many locals of these unions arose during a period of struggle, for example, in the South, in the textile areas of New England, etc., and soon after the struggle, these locals practically disappeared, because the unions have done nothing to keep the members in their ranks.

During the struggle the Party and the T.U.U.L. raised the perspective of fighting against the employers, they laid before the workers the hope that this was an organisation that would really fight for their interests against the employers, but after the struggle practically nothing was done to realise these promises of the Party and the League.

We cannot make any success with the old methods of work, with pure agitational methods, with general promises, with lack of concentration upon particular factories and industries, with methods which do not draw upon the initiative of the workers and make them feel that the organisation which they are setting up is their own. Unions which do not devote themselves in the very first place to defending the most intimate needs of the masses cannot develop into mass organisations. The unions will not become mass organisations with one blow in the United States, but they can develop into organisations embracing wide masses, only if they devote themselves patiently to the everyday struggle. Strikes play a big rôle in the formation of trade unions and in their further development and therefore strike strategy is of decisive importance for the whole future of our trade union organisation. Numerous examples, however, can be cited of the lack of strike strategy, of the failure to learn the lessons of very serious mistakes such as have occurred in Illinois, in the New Orleans marine strike, etc. When the Marine Union in Philadelphia called out a strike in which not a single worker responded, the reasons for which were correctly given by Comrade Lozovsky, then we must say that our comrades are dreadfully repeating earlier mistakes and are not applying strike strategy. The greatest weakness in strike strategy is the failure to draw in the masses, to establish organisations from below, is the form of approach to the masses and in some instances even the application of bureaucratic methods.

But I wish to touch upon one of the most serious weaknesses in our trade union work, that is the relation of the Party to the trade unions. Is there a realisation of the entire Party that its major activity must consist in mobilising workers for the economic struggles and building trade unions? Do the units of our Party, the fractions in our mass organisations, apply themselves energetically to this central task. We must say that this is not yet the case.

There is an idea in the ranks of the Party which has not yet been liquidated, that there are two types of Party members, one type of Party member who concerns himself with day to day routine tasks required by the Party organisation, who is regarded as a Party man, there is the other type who works in the trade unions, who does mass work, who is considered as a sort of second class citizen. Under these circumstances the Party doesn't concentrate sufficiently upon economic struggles, and work in the trade unions is considered as a secondary or territorial task of the Communist Party. But for the organisation of trade unions in the United States it is necessary for the Party to entrench itself in the big factories.

It is entirely impossible to expect that trade union organisation will be established in the large factories, in these fortresses of American capitalism, where the workers are terrorised by the whole system of espionage of the bourgeoisie, unless the

Party establishes organisations, nuclei which conduct day to day work, carry through agitation, surround themselves with sympathetic elements, unless they give leadership in the fight for the daily grievances of the workers, directions and leadership in the drawing of workers into the trade unions.

The task of forming shop nuclei is not a mechanical task, it requires patience, hard spade work, concentration, direction from above, and initiative from below, assistance to the local functionaries, explanation, example.

Yet we have many good possibilities which have not been exploited in order to establish shop nuclei. For example, we have a press with 150,000 circulation, the "Daily Worker" itself circulates in 1100 cities and towns. What is being done with these 150,000 readers of the Communist press in the United States? It is clear that not the first steps have been taken in order to cash in upon these contacts in order to utilise these workers to build up trade union organisations.

There are 40,000 to 50,000 members in the Mutual Aid organisations who are under the influence of the Party, you can say therefore that the most elementary things such as exploiting these contacts, have not been done in the building of trade unions.

Some improvement has been made since the Party last November set itself the task of making a turn in its trade union work. For example in connection with Lawrence, there were 10,000 workers who came out for a week, the revolutionary union gained 1500 new members, it was also an achievement of the union that it was actually able to settle the strike. Previous to this strike the idea seemed current in the Party that a strike was a good one if it lasted a very long time.

I wish to close upon the last question, the strategy of the bourgeoisie and its attack upon the revolutionary movement. Comrade Browder referred to the Fish Committee and its proposals to illegalise our movement. The heart of the Fish Committee recommendations is the attack upon the foreign-born workers whom they propose to fingerprint, register, withdraw citizenship, deport, etc. As Comrade Browder stated the capitalists are not waiting for the formal execution of these proposals into law to commence their attacks upon the foreign-born workers. These attacks are already on the way, deportations of the foreign-born workers number one thousand monthly, alien bureaux have been established in the local police departments and raids are taking place daily. In these raids the workers are forced to show papers proving that they have entered legally into the United States and many workers are arrested. 100 revolutionary workers stand today before deportation.

What is the object of the bourgeoisie in this attack? The object and strategy is clear, by means of the attack upon the foreign-born workers, the bourgeoisie means to terrorise and illegalise the movement, not by open declaration that the Party is illegal, but by striking at the weakest point of the Communist Party, the fact that the majority of its members are foreign-born workers. The largest number of workers in the revolutionary trade unions are likewise foreign-born, and so the bourgeoisie hopes to intimidate the foreign-born workers, to drive them out of strikes, etc.

What steps must we take to counteract this attack? In my opinion the Party has not yet placed before itself this question. It appears to me that it will be impossible to counteract the attack of the bourgeoisie, if on the one hand we don't make the most energetic mass campaign for the defence of the foreign-born workers and on the other hand we don't make the most determined efforts to establish a strong kernel of American workers as the basis of our movement.

This doesn't mean to lessen the work among the foreign-born workers and among the Negro workers, on the contrary it means the unification of the American white workers with the Negro workers, with the foreign-born workers, upon the issues that can draw these workers together, upon issues upon which all sections of the workers can unite, that is the issues arising out of the capitalist offensive.

Here we must ask the question, is it possible to draw the native-born American workers, I mean, particularly the young native-born workers, into the ranks of the revolutionary movement.

It may appear to the comrades that this is a simple question, yet it is a fundamental question, affecting the development of the revolutionary movement in the United States. As you know

one of the main causes for the absence of a mass revolutionary workers movement, one of the main reasons for the historical backwardness of American Labour, has been the division of the working class along lines of nationality, the American and foreign-born, along lines of a division among whites and blacks. This division has strong roots socially and economically.

American capitalism, Yankee imperialism, as the resolution of the C.I. upon the Negro question stated, has broken the American workers into pieces, into castes, with the Negro workers at the bottom, constituting the caste of untouchables. The native-born workers at the time when the European proletariat was forming its political parties, escaped wage slavery by taking up the abundantly free land and became independent, self-sustained farmers. This compelled the American bourgeoisie to import foreign labour power. The American worker felt himself not a member of his class but a citizen of the State. With the development of the trusts since the beginning of this century and especially the last ten years, as a result of rationalisation, the American workers have been sucked into industry, have been proletarianised in large numbers.

Numerous examples can be cited of the turning of these workers, these machine tenders, to the agitation and propaganda of the Communist Party. For example in the tour of Comrade Foster this has been clearly brought out. Comrades report the awakening of the American workers throughout the West. It is also to be seen in the struggles of the Southern workers and in the fact that our "Daily Worker" has increased in the course of the last year from 15,000 to 40,000 circulation. That means that many of the new readers are native labour, particularly the young generation of native-born whites, of foreign-born parents.

Here rises the question whether it is possible to keep the American workers in the ranks of our Party once we have secured them. In my opinion if there is no radical change in the whole method of work, in the form of approach of the Party to these workers, it will be entirely impossible to keep them within the ranks of the Party. The Party is not only foreign in its composition but it is also "foreign" in its methods of work. Comrade Thälmann spoke of the difficulties of the German worker who may be said to have been born into the Socialist movement, to understand the phrase of the "third period" b how strange must it sound to the American worker and how much stranger still must sound the advertisement in the "Daily Worker" a year ago for a "Third Period Dance" to celebrate the anniversary of the "Daily Worker".

When an American worker enters the Party he is regarded very often as a suspicious element. It is true that many workers who are native-born have been used by the bourgeoisie as spies, and this reflects itself in the uneasiness in the Party upon the entrance of new American elements. He is very often put on probation for a year and viewed with suspicion for another year and if he is able to last this period, then indeed he must be an exceptional worker. It is not surprising that many such workers who have been drawn into the Party in the last recruitment campaign have left the ranks of the Party after a few months. It is absolutely necessary to break down this clannishness of the Party which reflects itself in this fear of the American workers who are now entering into the struggle.

The most determined fight must be made in defence of the foreign-born workers, in the struggle for the unity of the blacks and whites, and most serious efforts must be made to win the American worker for this united struggle.

I wish to recall the words of Engels in his letter to Sorge in 1890 that unless we get a basis amongst the native-born American workers it will not be possible to build a broad mass Party, but once we get a foothold — said Engels — the movement will go forward, will go forward by leaps and bounds with a tempo and energy characteristic of the American people. Here the activities of the Y.C.L. in attempting to win the young generation of native-born workers are of decisive importance.

In conclusion the reports of the Party in the last period, the activities of the Party in the last year show that the Party is making progress, the line has been straightened out, the general direction in which the Party has been travelling is a correct one. What is necessary is on the basis of the line of the Party to apply more energetically, more determinedly such experience as that of the German Party in mass work in order to develop a broad mass movement around the Communist Party.

Speech of Comrade Pollitt (Great Britain).

Comrades, since the Enlarged Presidium last February, the economic crisis in England has intensified to a tremendous extent, and a review of figures of trade for 1930 shows a marked drop in all the exports of the basic industries of the country. The best comparison that can perhaps be made as showing a marked deterioration of British capitalism is in the figures showing the trade balance in foreign investments: in 1920, £ 128,000,000 trade balance available for foreign investments; 1930 this was reduced to £ 39,000,000, and there is no possibility and certainly no perspective in view of the economic crisis in England being modified to any extent. The respective bourgeois economists of all schools are at their wits end as to how to deal with the crisis. For instance, in a series of talks on the wireless Sir Josiah Stamp one night advised the workers of England to save their money and he was followed by Professor Keynes the next night who advised the workers to spend more. At the same time there is a tremendous rise in unemployment, which now amounts to three millions in Great Britain. And this is associated with the financial difficulties of British capitalism because the unemployment benefits are a tremendous drain on the national resources of the country.

The course of the disintegration within the Empire which has been a marked feature since the end of the war has within recent times undergone a tremendous intensification. So in Australia to-day there is a most acute political difference both in regard to issues of domestic policy as to how to meet the economic crisis and also between the Australian State Government and the Bank of England and the financiers of the city of London. In Canada there has been an increase in the tariff against British goods. At the very moment when there is a campaign going on against slave labour in the U.S.S.R., the Canadian Prime Minister has decided to increase the tariffs against British goods in order to keep these goods which were made by British slave labour out of the Canadian market.

In South Africa there are also very sharp differences. All of these differences were more clearly and particularly brought out at the recent Imperial Conference where MacDonal and Thomas hoped to be able to show how their policy, would heal the breach with the Dominions. This conference was a dismal failure and since last October there has been a very sharp intensification of the differences between the various Dominions and the Mother country, but particularly has the Labour Government's policy in regard to India been seen the most clearly.

The Round Table Conference was a conference of the Labour Government with all the reactionary elements inside India. After it had ended, the Pact between Irwin and Gandhi was signed which is influenced as a result of the growing struggle in India on the part of the workers and peasants, in order that by the influence of the National Congress and the Gandhi leadership together with British imperialism, the rising revolutionary struggles of the Indian workers and peasants could be more effectively put down and at the same time of drawing the Indian Nationalist movement within the orbit of the attempts to frame a united front against the Soviet Union.

And yet how short lived have been the hopes of the Irwin-Gandhi pact. There has been a mass rising against Gandhi on account of the Lahore executions and we see for the first time in India tremendous manifestations against Gandhi and against the rôle of the Indian National Congress, all tending to intensify the rapid process of disintegration within the Empire itself.

Then the British Government is meeting with increased difficulties in Palestine, Egypt, and China, where they are menaced by the great victories of the Soviets and the red armies there. We have had British warships and troops sent in order that they can assist Chang Kai-Shek against the Soviet power and the red armies as the occasion arises.

The three power naval pact recently concluded with France and Italy was a pact which, as Mr. Alexander, Minister of the Admiralty, admitted on his return from Paris, was prompted by political motives, not with an attempt to bringing about some form of naval disarmament, but that it was brought about in order to strengthen their leadership on the European continent; and this means to strengthen the anti-Soviet bloc against the U.S.S.R.

In spite of the increasing capitalist rivalries all over the world arising out of the crisis, of the growing armament policy

and the rising war danger, it is clear that the central feature today is the war danger against the Soviet Union, and England particularly is playing a leading rôle, its campaign for an economic blockade, directed by the Churchills and Brentfords, is aimed against the Soviet Union.

It is a campaign that is prompted by fear of the tremendous victories which are being achieved in the Soviet Union and the objectives of the campaign can be clearly seen in the following extract from the objects of the Trade Defence Union. This is the union of Churchill and Brentford and they are carrying on a campaign for an economic blockade of Soviet goods. They say they want to bring about a common front at home of trade organisations and politicians, and to link up with organisations abroad so that the nations present one front in the economic war to the common enemy, Communism. They launched their campaign at a meeting in Albert Hall in London. This meeting was attended by many London comrades who were successful in being able to smash it. Nevertheless, we must not under-estimate this Union. They have behind them some of the most powerful organs of the press.

But in this connection the rôle that the Labour Party is playing in alliance with the German Social Democrats as the two leading factors of the II. International is a very important and dangerous one for the working class and a careful study of the resolutions which have been adopted at the Labour and Socialist International since its formation in Hamburg in 1923 will show that in every important resolution, on the initiative of the German and British delegates, with the support of Dan and Abramovitch clauses have been introduced which have for their object the framing of opinion so that when the time comes for the open intervention, as was revealed in the recent trial of the "Industrial Party" and in the trial of the Russian Mensheviks, then the working class, under the leadership of the II. International may have had their minds already prepared for the war against the Soviet Union.

But to see how far this policy has reached in England. In the recent municipal elections in England, in the whole of the St. Georges and Whitechapel areas in London which is a dock area, a big poster was displayed which had these words "Warning to Moscow Communists". "Hands Off London Democracy". "No slave labour and starvation wanted here" and this was the poster that was posted over the name of Mr. Bevin, the secretary of the Transport and General Workers Union.

What is the chief characteristic of the situation today? It is the instability, the disintegration, the new groupings which are taking place in the three capitalist parties. Inside the Liberal Party you have two weeks ago Sir John Simon declaring that the time had arrived when the Liberal Party must be prepared to depart from its traditional policy of free trade and have an open mind on the question of tariffs, and he was followed by Sir Josiah Stamp who said that the time for the fiscal policy of England undergoing a change had arrived.

This was immediately taken up by Garvin in the "Observer" and stated to be one of the platforms upon which it should be possible to form a national government in which Lloyd George and MacDonald, Mosley, Beaverbrook and Baldwin could all have leading positions.

Later Professor Keynes, came out with an important article demanding a revenue tax of 10% being placed on all imports into Britain.

The Liberal Party is divided as a result of the present tactic of its leader Lloyd George. In every by-election this Party is losing thousands of votes. In the last four elections it has lost altogether over 24,000 votes and the great dissatisfaction inside the Liberal Party is a reflection of the economic situation in Great Britain to-day. Inside the Conservative Party you have the open fight between the elements grouped around Beaverbrook and Rothermere against Baldwin and his followers. The significance of this fascist group of Beaverbrook and Rothermere consists in the fact that they have possession of the most popular organs of the press, not only in London, but they control almost all of the most important provincial papers—both the morning and evening newspapers. In the recent by-election in St. Georges in Westminster they put forward their candidate, Sir William Petter, who was one of the group who founded a new Industrial Council of Trade headed by Sir William Morris, and in a straight fight

the Beaverbrook candidate got off 11,000 votes and the official Baldwin man got 17,000 votes.

Inside the Labour Party the differences of opinion are manifesting themselves so rapidly that it is almost impossible to keep pace with them. If one contrasts the strong position that the Labour Government occupied in September 1929 when it was able to impose a 6¼% wage reduction in Lancashire, when it was able to carry through the Young Plan; with the situation in which the Labour Government finds itself in to-day (and I will give my views later on as to why it is not thrown out) we see what a tremendous change has taken place in Britain during the last eighteen months. This Labour Government has pursued one of the most callous policies of social fascism that can be found in any capitalist country. Its wage reducing manoeuvres have been most dastardly. They have succeeded in reducing the wages of 500,000 cotton textile workers, 260,000 woollen textile workers and 150,000 South Wales coalminers. By its policy in regard to the coalfields (and the mining industry is still the basic question for British capitalism) it has split the Miners Federation from one end of the country to the other. Everyone of the 13 coal districts is working on different agreements expiring at different times, with different conditions and different wage rates. The possibilities of united action on the part of the miners have been destroyed by this Labour Government after generations of struggle and suffering to build up national unity, to get national wage scales and strike action.

By its foreign policy it has been able to carry on the policy of imperialism more ruthlessly than was ever dared to be carried out by Lloyd George or Baldwin and it has aimed at splitting and disorganising the ranks of the workers, but it now comes forward at this moment with its demands for all-round economy, and Snowden comes to a meeting to make a speech, and he says: "Lenin had to call for sacrifices and retreats in Russia in order that the revolution should consolidate itself and that the Russian workers and peasants responded to Lenin's appeal. He today is in the position of Lenin and calls upon the workers to sacrifice in order that they can save their country" and this manoeuvre must not be misunderstood.

The Labour Government has elected a commission of economy and the terms of revision of this commission are exactly the same as the Geddes commission which was appointed in 1922 and made tremendous slashes on the social services that were being enjoyed by the working class.

The Mosley Group. What is the importance of this new group, of this new party? It consists in the fact that it is a group of individuals who have been looked upon as the left wing, both of the I.L.P. and the Labour Party itself.

And what is their programme? Their programme calls for a re-building of trade, particularly the export and home industries, to control the whole of the imports into Britain for closer co-operation with the Dominions, for the reform of Parliament, which they say is becoming a talking shop and they want to transform it into a workshop, and in order that they can tackle the present situation, they call for an emergency cabinet of five men who will have supreme power to carry through the Mosley programme.

A review of their pamphlet "A National Policy" shows the character of their objectives. They say the question of the ultimate goal of society is excluded by the very urgency of the problems which confront us. In other words, at the very moment when the issue is Communism or slavery, they go over to a political platform which means the driving down of the workers to the lowest possible level. In another part of the programme they declare: "We must not be afraid of catch-words" whether Socialism or Protection.

Comrades, this Mosley group started off with £ 80,000 which has now been raised to £ 250,000 and they are being backed financially by the group associated with Sir William Morris, the millionaire motor-car manufacturer who one year ago founded the National Council of Trade for the protection of a firm foreign policy and a drive for currency. They are making a drive into the most important trade unions of the country; they are organising mass meetings in all the proletarian centres of England and I believe we have to formulate our appreciation of what this Mosley group stands for. We must realise that they represent in embryo the first open fascist forms of organisation in Great Britain and while it would be a mistake to over-emphasise their importance because of the fact that by leaving the Labour Party they have undoubtedly put themselves in an unfavourable light in the

eyes of tens of thousands of workers, nevertheless every aspect of their propaganda should be carefully followed by us in order that we can be in a position to expose this group as the first form of fascist organisation whose programme is the most complete exposure of reactionary driving down of the workers at home and abroad that we have yet seen.

The I.L.P., the sham "Lefts", understand very well the growing mood of disillusionment which is now widespread among the working class and they are coming forward at every opportunity with their programme and their policy couched in revolutionary phraseology in order that they may divide the workers and lead them along illusory paths away from actual struggle. Since then they were active in the recent strike in Lancashire; they brought forward a programme in which they advocated the control of the cotton industry from the plantation to the finished products. They organised a so-called rank and file deputation to go to the House of Parliament from Lancashire. They introduced a motion in Parliament to enact emergency legislation to deal with the crisis in cotton industry. They knew that this motion would never be discussed, but they were anxious to deceive the workers. But they never mention anything about mass work to fight for relief for the strikers.

The General Council of the Trade Union Congress is also following the new changes which are taking place in the British working class and on two important questions has recently made an important gesture which has for its objective the heading off and deception of the leftward movements of the militant British workers. First on the question of unemployment insurance, when the Government appointed a commission whose objective is to cut down the unemployment insurance, the General Council of the Trade Union Congress made a protest and had instructed all the affiliated trade unions to refuse to give evidence before this commission because it considered the terms of reference unsatisfactory.

The second question was on the trade union bill that was introduced by the Labour Government. It made its protest when the Labour Government was prepared to accept the terms for the Liberal Party. The General Council gave the instruction that the trade union bill must be withdrawn rather than an agreement should be registered for the Liberal-Labour agreement on this trade union bill. But they protested at the fact that under the Trade Union Bill all strikes for political objective were illegal.

When the Labour Party fought a by-election in Bristol and their candidate was the very man who introduced this Bill into the House of Commons, he admitted in the House of Commons that if this Bill was passed then the General Strike as in 1926 would be illegal.

These attempts of the General Council are an attempt to retain their influence over the best organised militant workers. In a recent speech Bevin made it clear that they are trying to deceive the workers that they—the trade union leaders—have a more radical policy than the Labour Party and they are protesting against the policy of this government, and we have to more systematically and simply expose the rôle of the General Council of the Trade Union Congress, not to under-estimate its influence. It is a very important thing, and Comrade Manuilsky in his report referred to the way in which the Social Democrats in control of the apparatus throughout the Labour Government are able to influence the workers. This is true, but in no country more than in England because of the system of social services, most of which are paid through the medium of the trade union movement.

We have got there a situation where the lower strata of officials in the railways, transport, distribution workers, are able to increase their weekly wages by £ 1.0.0 or 25/— a week, as a result of the commission they receive as secretaries of the union branches, and many workers will tell you that they prefer to interview the boss of the factory than the trade union secretary, because they are afraid of putting him to any inconvenience. And they exert a tremendous influence as is seen in South Wales where, though every delegate to the Congress was mandated to strike action, the bureaucracy felt themselves so strong that they refused to put the resolution for strike action.

When strikes are called against their wishes, they head the strikes, as they headed the Scottish strike, the Lancashire strike, the South Wales strike, they place themselves at the head of the strike movement and every minute they are con-

sidering how to deceive the workers by their collaboration with the Government by coming forward with formulations for the basis of an agreement which are so complicated that the masses don't understand them until they get their wages the following week at the pay office, and find out how cruelly they have been betrayed. This tremendous influence of the bureaucracy is still something we have to be constantly struggling against. It think some of the points brought out in Comrade Thälmann's speech should be especially noted by our Party, particularly where he referred to the necessity of the comrades penetrating among the social democratic workers in order to be able to win them away from the influence of their leaders and into the ranks of our Party. For us this is an important question, but I know that in England the attitude of nine members out of every ten in our Party to a new worker and particularly to an I.L.P. worker is that if they are not prepared to swallow the whole 21 points of the Communist International programme they are social fascists.

The trouble is that our comrades do not differentiate between the workers in the I.L.P. and their leaders and because of this we build up a great barrier between ourselves and the workers who are still in the other parties. If we look at some of our factory papers we see a tendency to use language which indicates a sectarian attitude instead of agitating among the workers in the I.L.P. where there is a tremendous ferment in progress. In Glasgow recently in the ranks of the I.L.P. there was a demand for disaffiliation from the Labour Party. What does this show? It shows that there is a growing dissatisfaction inside the rank and file with the Labour Government. These workers are trying to find some new way out and if we could only get into contact with them on the basis of their immediate daily struggles we would surely be able to win them over to our Party.

Now a few words with regard to the present capitalist offensive and the lessons to be drawn for our Party. I think the big thing in England is that in spite of the fact that the workers' ranks have been split, they are waging an iron resistance to the capitalist attempts to reduce their wages and worsen their conditions all around. We see that the capitalists are unable to carry through, the full extent of the demands that they are putting forward at the present time. For instance, the "Economist" as strongly protested against the fact that the railwaymen's award does not solve the problem of the railways and that this 2½% cut does not fill the bill, and does not answer the financial and economic needs of the budget. They are protesting that they are unable to carry through their full programme of wage cuts. Why? Because of the militancy of the workers, because of their unity in actual struggle in spite of the disorganisation and splitting that has taken place. To-day we have a big strike wave in England which has not been headed by the Party and by the Minority Movement. There have been more lockouts and strikes in Britain than in any other country. In England the strategy today is not to divide section against section, but to divide section within section, to divide the skilled workers from the unskilled and the aim of the employers is that the least wage cut should prevail for those workers who are in the key positions of industry. For instance, the railway companies could not carry through their attack if it were not for the fact that the engine drivers and firemen were given more favourable conditions than the others.

What is new in this situation? The new wave of strikes takes place at this period, which is a period of great unemployment; when the workers go on strike with no fear that the army of unemployed would take their jobs, that is one of the big achievements of the National Unemployed Movement, and the movement can take to its credit, the fact that since the end of the war there has been no single instance of large scale blacklegging.

In all these struggles in which our Party has actively participated it has had a tremendous influence. In Bradford the officials of the unions of the employers said that it was the influence of our Party that caused the result of the ballot to accept the terms. In Burnley and Nelson in the weavers' lockout 24-1 against negotiations, 21-1 against negotiations, the direct result of the propaganda influence and the work carried on by our Party, but we are not able to develop the independent forms of struggle, the independent forms of leadership, so that we are not in a position to be able to give the call—strike on—, we are not able to get the lead of the strike movement. The reformists are able, on the whole, to call the workers out and call the strikes off, and the mines reopened. What indications

are there that there is a ferment inside the ranks of the working class movement in England?

Henderson, the Foreign Secretary, and Greenwood, the Minister of Health, came to Manchester, an important industrial centre. They spoke in a hall which holds 3500 people, only 400 workers came and of these 200 came from us to disrupt the meeting.

In the Whitechapel by-election every cabinet minister that went to speak for the labour candidate, didn't get a hearing. Lansbury was in tears asking, "what he had done". Tillet said: "Is this what I have given my life for?" This is an important indication of the growing feeling of opposition that is taking place at the present time. We see among the railwaymen, where the power of Thomas is still strong, we see in the important districts of the railways, London, Manchester, Glasgow, resolutions demanding strike action against the wage reductions. We see in South Wales last month 747 miners demand strike action and they only lost by a narrow margin of votes; they were beaten by 787 against 747 for strike action.

This is a widespread mood of disillusionment, seen for instance in the whole of the Labour Government vote. In the 11 by-elections the Labour Government has lost 70,000 votes. But comrades what comes out of this, that in this situation of the strike actions of the workers on this wave of disillusionment and disgust, why doesn't our Party grow. When Comrade Manuilsky puts the question—why in spite of the betrayals of Social Democracy don't the workers come to our Party, this is the basic question for our Party.

Comrade Thälmann yesterday made one or two points which I consider are of special importance in this connection and I would like to say one or two things about them. How did he put the feeling of certain German workers towards the Brüning Government? They look upon it as the lesser of two evils and this is also true of the workers in England. The process of disintegration in the Labour Party is not a steady one.

Take for example the by-election in Pontypridd. There are five thousand unemployed workers here. The Labour Party entered that election and it is the only fight since 1929 where they have only lost 158 votes. When I saw the figures I could not believe that it was so. In every other by-election they had lost from two to five thousand votes. And this is a district where the railwaymen, and miners are having their wages attacked, and the unemployed are threatened with the loss of their unemployment benefits, all through the instrumentality of the Labour Government, and they have only 158 votes less than in 1929. In this by-election only 110 workers wrote Communism on their ballot. It is true our Party is very weak here, but I think our vote was so small because the workers thought that the Labour Government was the lesser of the two evils, just as up till 1906 the workers voting for the Liberal Party as the lesser of the two evils. We have not been able to break through this tradition. One of our greatest obstacles is the fact that thousands of workers still see a difference between economic and political struggles. They will fight and strike against the same labour leaders that they will vote for at the elections. In England to-day in spite of the rôle of the Labour Government there are still hundreds of thousands of workers who look upon it as a lesser evil than the Baldwin government. We collected £ 370. from the workers in one of the poorest areas in the East End of London, and still we only got 2000 votes in that election. The workers said: "We believe that you are right, but what chance has one man in parliament? Do not ask us to waste our vote by voting Communist."

Another question raised by Comrade Thälmann was the question that in Germany there is amongst large sections of Social Democrats the fear of splitting their Party; this is also another one of the problems that we meet with in England. What is the reason that Mosley has not been able to get the support that he thought he would get? First, that the workers thought that he was splitting the Party, if he had stayed inside the Labour Party to fight then he would have had more chances, but immediately he steps out of the Labour Party into the country to fight the Labour Party from the outside, then Mosley has got to face a tremendous amount of hostility from those who are in the ranks of the Labour Movement, and this fear of splitting is a tremendous thing and our job is to show that only our Party is the Party that fights against splits, that only our Party can lead the workers in struggle, and unite these ranks which have been disorganised by the Labour Party.

It would be silly to argue that these are the chief reasons that our Party does not grow, the reason for our slow development does not only lie in this factor. We are still a sect. The bulk of our comrades are not yet convinced in their individual work for the Party line in the factories and mines, that they are organisers and leaders for our Party, we are failing to break new ground, to seek new circles of workers, to be able to bring the workers into our Party.

Two weeks ago of the leading comrades reported. He came from the Bradford district, he was reporting on the number of workers who left our Party in Bradford and he said we had a discussion when some of these workers joined our Party as to how long they would remain in. And, comrades, this comrade was only saying openly what many of our comrades say all over the country, not how we are going to utilise them, but speculation on whether they will leave us in one, two or three weeks, and this is one of the basic reasons why the Party doesn't grow, because there is no attempt to bring in the new masses and draw them into work and activity for the Party.

Can the Party say that there is no change, that there is no improvement? Comrade Manuilsky's criticisms of the Party are correct and I think that he let us down lightly. I think that it is true to state that whilst the Party is not playing a leading rôle it has made a big improvement in its influence. In all of the recent economic struggles the Party has played a leading part and in South Wales in my opinion the strike action at Lewypni that was recently carried out under our leadership was one of the most important events which have taken place.

When Comrade Thälmann this morning was speaking about the Ruhr struggle and asked was it an advance or defeat, I want to assure Comrade Thälmann that in January when we were working in South Wales, the effect of the strike call that was issued by our German comrades and the response that it received had an enormous effect to the struggle in South Wales and at every meeting that we addressed and were able to show that our Party in Germany was able to call a strike of miners it had a tremendous effect on the South Wales miners in the carrying on of the struggle.

But our weakness consists in that we are not able to get the decisive rôle in the strike, but that the influence of the Party is growing is undoubted, and I consider the fact that we have stopped the decline in our Party and that we have now made a slight upward turn is the most significant thing that we can record.

We have made since last November 200 new members. We have 48 factory papers with a circulation of 17,000; we have increased the circulation of our "Daily Worker" by 1,000 a day since November although our circulation is still only 10,000.

Some trade union branches are now sending resolutions to us instead of to the "Daily Herald", and an important district committee of the London Electrical Workers has placed an advert in our paper in connection with a strike meeting. This is a little thing, but it is indicative of the growing influence of our Party in this union. In the last eighteen months we collected from the workers more money for our paper and our general activities than in the previous ten years put together. We were able to organise a national conference of the League Against Imperialism which was attended by over 200 delegates from all over Britain. The national conference of the F.O.S.R. had 161 delegates in attendance.

Our Charter Campaign with all its weaknesses and shortcomings has, since last September, brought our Party into closer contact with the masses than ever before. Our activities in connection with the Charter campaign have done much to break through the isolation of the Party. Our usual circulation for Party pamphlets is about five thousand, but 110,000 copies of the Charter Pamphlet have been sold all over Britain. In addition, twenty thousand copies of our Party manifesto have been sold in the last two months. While these are all small achievements, I mention them to show that there is an improvement in the situation, and by making a real effort we shall be able to transform this slight improvement into a real turn. What are the weaknesses of the Party? First, our isolation and the danger, of our isolation from the Leftward moving masses, particularly our isolation from the unions. In the recent South Wales Conference where 717 votes were cast for strike action, we only had three comrades there. Secondly, our colonial

work in times of revolutionary ferment, particularly during the Indian events. Last spring our propaganda work was good, but our practical work was especially weak. Thirdly, absence of the revolutionary conviction and understanding of the political but our practical work was especially weak. Thirdly, absence of a powerful revolutionary trade union opposition and the lack of revolutionary work in the trade unions. Fifthly, national insularity and weak internationalism as seen in our attitude towards international resolutions, and in this case I am thinking particularly of the R.I.L.U. resolutions of the last Congress. Sixthly, sectarianism and passivity, inflexibility and lack of manoeuvring, particularly in strike situations.

One or two organisational factors in regard to our Party,

The Party has 2711 members, 30% of these are in the main industries, 65% are in the trade unions, 53% are unemployed, only 25% are in the M.M. We have 32 factory cells with a membership of 843. Since the Presidium there is a marked advance in our Party education, there have been 11 district schools organised and 72 study circles and in the study circles 597 Party members are attending and 192 non-Party members.

We believe the British Delegation on its return will set up the following as the most important immediate tasks of the Party: to lead the economic struggles of the workers and to win the leadership of the working class. To achieve this the Party must intensify its work on the basis of broad united front activities from below, linking up the daily struggles with the general aims of the working class and advancing political slogans corresponding to the change in the situation, and upon the basis of the capitalist offensive against the working class, organise activities against the growing tendencies towards fascism and the growing war danger. We believe that this movement could be best organised around the demands and the programme of the Workers' Charter which we look upon as being the means through which we will build up our contact with the masses in Britain, and through which we shall build a mass revolutionary trade union opposition, the nucleus of which we have to-day in the Minority Movement. We believe that a sharp turn must be made in our work in the reformist unions, and we must link up this work with factory education. On the basis of the line of class against class we must increase our activities for the solidarity in the revolutionary struggle of the Indian masses. We must build up the League Against Imperialism, and by systematic and planned campaigns for the Party and the "Daily Worker", especially in those strike areas where the Party has been active, expose the rôle of the social fascists, especially their betrayal of the workers' struggles and their policy against the U.S.S.R. We must also carry on the fight against the war danger and intervention. Also we consider that our Central Committee discussion a month ago shows that we have started to make up our shortcomings in regard to work amongst the youth.

I do not think any section of the International can be proud of its work in the Y.C.L.

At the same time it would be wrong to say that all the fault lies with the Parties. I think if an analysis were made of the various publications of the Young Communist International, they would be found to be written in a language that even old Bolsheviks would find difficult to understand never mind young workers.

Perhaps it is different in other countries, but in England the Y.C.L. speaks in a language that the young workers do not understand. They speak in a language which I myself manytimes find exceptionally difficult to follow, and because of this they fail to attract the thousands and thousands of young workers into their ranks.

But the bourgeois agents manage to do it and we have got to learn very much from their methods, the Boy Scout movement, the Y.M.C.A., Girl Guides, the Social clubs in various working class centres, attracting hundreds of thousands of young men and women and they do it in order to preserve their capitalist ideology over them, and if they can do it we can do it with the message that we have to deliver to the masses of young men and women. We have comrades in the movement who can write national decisions and resolutions in a much easier and popular style than of necessity have to be framed in plenums. We can make our drive in various forms, we can greatly utilise the sports movement, our experience has proved where with a new orientation to this work, we now have a sports movement with 7,000 members,

but our comrades still do not realise that it is their job to personally work, to personally recruit new members. By this new form and this new approach we can win thousands of workers to our ranks.

Our appeal to the Young Communist League must be the appeal to the youth of the country and must be made an appeal on the broadest basis, and we must also utilise the achievements of what has taken place in the Soviet Union and would attract hundreds of thousands of young workers. We must regard the Y.C.L. not as a hindrance, but as a necessary prerequisite to our work.

Finally, we believe that the next task before the Party is to raise before the entire Party the urgent necessity of the struggle against the special forms of British sectarianism and a real turn to mass work, and the development of new cadres, the revolutionary of our methods of propaganda and agitation and then on the basis of the whole struggle linking this to our revolutionary aims and revolutionary way out.

Enlightenment campaign of the line of class against class and for the 5th congress decisions of the R.I.L.U. for collective work and activity of the entire Party membership.

One final word in regard to the task against opportunist passivity which is associated with the name of Comrade Horner. Comrade Horner as a leading comrade in our Party and

in the International, has recently been the subject of an acute discussion in our Party. Comrade Horner's line was the line of passivity, the line of lack of faith in the masses, and the line of lack of faith in independent leadership. Comrade Horner does not believe in the new line of the Communist International; he does not believe in the line of the Party. And inside our Party we have had a bitter struggle as a result of this fight against Horner, but what he stood for is not something that is peculiar to Comrade Horner, it is deeply rooted in the Party. Throughout the Party there are tendencies of trade union legalism, passivity, over-estimation of the influence of the trade union bureaucracy. Our fight against Horner has done more in South Wales to bring about the splendid fight of the independent struggles led by the miners of the Rhondda Valley, and we now have to understand this struggle and the means of extending it to a wider stage.

I am confident that as a result of the work of this Plenum, as a result of the achievements of the Soviet Union, we shall be able to convince every Party member of the need for personal activity and work on the basis of carrying forward the line and really endeavouring to lead the big economic struggles that are pending. I believe that this small turn in work is the beginning of a big development in our Party and that we are going forward to big successes as a result of the big experiences and the obstacles which we have had to face in the last period.

Speech of Comrade Piatnitzky.

1. Work Among the Unemployed.

Comrades, I want to deal with three questions: (1) the question of unemployment, i. e., the unemployment movement; (2) the extent to which we have strengthened our positions in the factories; and (3) the fluctuation in membership and the reasons for it.

As a consequence of capitalist rationalisation carried out at the expense of the working class, structural unemployment was already rife in the principal capitalist countries in 1928 and 1929 when the boom was still at its height. But when the world economic crisis broke out, unemployment reached unprecedented dimensions.

All the hopes of the bourgeois and Social Democratic economists that there would be a seasonal improvement and that unemployment would diminish in the spring of 1931 proved vain. On the contrary, after a slight drop in the number of unemployed in the beginning of the Spring, unemployment is now greater in some countries than it was in January 1931. Hence, unemployment at the present time is not a passing phenomenon, and for that reason the Communist Parties, the red trade unions and the trade union oppositions must work energetically among the unemployed. This has not been done up till now in spite of the fact that the number of unemployed is from three to four times greater this year than last year. The demonstrations on February 25 in almost all the countries, except Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Austria, were worse than last year. This was stated by Comrade Manuilsky in his report, and the comrades who have spoken up to the present have not refuted it.

What is the reason? There are many reasons. The chief of them, I think, are as follows: the abstractness of our agitational slogans, the absence of broad unemployed organisations, while those organisations which exist were chiefly occupied with the organisation of demonstrations. Work among the unemployed was not of a concrete nature which could organise the unemployed and attach them to the Communist Parties for a long time. I will try to prove this.

Abstract Slogans.

Take the slogans of some of the Parties. Here are the slogans of the Communist Party of America: **"Work or wages,"** I must say that if I were unemployed and in America, I probably should not have understood this slogan.

(Comrade Lozovsky: And did you understand it in Moscow? (Laughter).)

In Moscow! I know that if a worker in the U.S.S.R. is unemployed, he receives unemployment pay. I know this very well.

But this is not all. Look at the second slogan: **"Don't starve — fight."** I think that few people wish to starve, even in

America. It is true that they can improve their situation by fighting collectively, but there is no need to be niggardly with words.

The third slogan: **"Fight for the seven-hour day and the five-day week"** was right. But there was not the addition — **"without reduced wages"**. In what way does the last part of this slogan differ from reformist slogans? In America particularly this slogan was dangerous. Why was it dangerous? Because in America there are many groups even among the bourgeoisie who say: Let the workers work two or three days a week, so as to give the unemployed a job. Would the bourgeoisie lose anything from this? No! They would only gain. Every two or three days in the week a new worker would be at work, efficiency would increase two or three times and wages would remain as before, that is, only for two or three days work. This would be an actual worsening of the conditions of the working class, reducing it to pauperism. Our Party issued the proper slogan: **"Fight for the seven-hour day"** and then added: **"the five-day week"**; how are the workers to know that if the Communist Party proposes a five-day week, they must reject the three-day week. This is of great importance for America.

The fourth slogan: At the Plenum in November, Comrade Klein at a session of the C.C. of the Party illustrated how the election campaign was carried on by the Party agitators. He said: "Our candidates are recommended to the workers as follows: The chief question is social insurance. It is true this law can only be carried out under the dictatorship of the proletariat, but nevertheless we want the workers to vote for us."

I do not know what comrades in America mean by social insurance. In all probability, only under the dictatorship of the proletariat will it be possible to carry out insurance which will be exclusively at the expense of the employers without payments by the workers, and the workers will receive full wages during illness, disablement, etc. This is correct, of course. But some kind of insurance can be introduced under the bourgeois system. In France recently, a system of insurance was introduced which was so bad that the workers went on strike against it, but it was insurance.

Unfortunately, such abstract slogans were in evidence not only on the unemployed question. Comrade Foster at the same Plenum stated that, "during the miners' strikes which took place recently there were such slogans as 'a labour and farmers' government', 'nationalisation of the mines', and nothing about the immediate demands of the striking workers." It is hardly likely that the Party can lead strikes with such slogans.

The question of charity in America plays a great rôle, because there is no insurance in America and assistance is chiefly received from charity. I have examined all the slogans and have not found one either for or against charitable assistance,

and in the agitation they blankly oppose charity, which cannot attract to the C.P.U.S.A. those destitute unemployed who are compelled to appeal to philanthropic societies for bread, rotten coffee and help for their children.

Passing on to the Communist Party of Great Britain, the slogans for February 25th were: "Workers and Unemployed, Organise." This slogan seems to be right. In my opinion they wanted to say something else: "Workers and Unemployed, Fight Together." But as this was not explained, the slogan was abstract.

The second slogan: "More Relief for the Unemployed." You cannot ask for "more" in this way.

You have to say how much for each category. As far as I know, in England things are different from those in Germany. In England everyone receives the same rates independently of his qualifications or wages. Perhaps I am wrong.

(Comrade Remmele: The unemployed in Germany are divided into several categories.)

Yes, in Germany things are quite different. In Germany the dole is paid according to the size of the wages.

In Germany the workers pay and they receive according to their wages. But in England, as far as I know, men without a family receive 17/-, for their wife they get 9/- and for every child they receive 2/-.

(Comrade Arnot: We demand more.)

Very well, more, say 5/- for each child instead of 2/-. You should have said concretely how many shillings more. "More" can mean anything. "More" might be three times more than full wages. That would also be "more".

The third slogan: "Repudiate the War Debts." This is a fine thing, of course, if it had been linked up with, let us say, such demands as: Let the workers refuse to pay dues to the insurance fund, extend insurance to railroad workers, office workers and agricultural workers, and take the money from those sums which you will not pay on the war debts. But the bare slogan "Repudiate War Debts" does not add anything from the point of view of influence on the masses.

There is another abstract slogan. At first I crossed it out, but after Comrade Pollitt's speech I think that it can be included among the abstract slogans which are incomprehensible for the masses. After Snowden's speech on the necessity of reducing the unemployed dole, our Party put forward the slogan: "Workers, Fight Against the Government of Starvation and Slavery." If they had added: in India, Egypt, etc., maybe the workers would have understood. But Comrade Pollitt yesterday argued for a long time to prove that many workers still consider the "Labour" Government to be the best they could have under the present conditions.

If the English comrades come to the English workers at the present time with this slogan of "the Government of Starvation and Slavery", it seems to me that they will not be understood. The English workers are not starving to the same extent as the Indian workers. Obviously, we must give such slogans as will draw in the workers, mobilise them for the struggle, so that they will understand them, so that these slogans will attach them to our Party.

I pass on to the slogans of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Their first slogan was "Bread, Work, and All Power to the Workers" (Laughter). What is wrong here? Of course everything is right. But can you attract the workers with it? I am convinced that it was not by this slogan that the Party achieved its successes among the unemployed. "Organise the Proletarian counter-attack in town and village." How is the counter-attack to be organised? By demonstrations, strikes or by something else?

Before the fascist demonstrations in Prague, the following slogan was put forward: "Long Live the International Solidarity of the Toiling People in Town and Village!"

I must say that I have examined all the slogans of the C. P. of Germany on the question of the election campaign and the unemployment campaign. All the slogans were undoubtedly correct. Only during the metal workers' strike I found one slogan which seems to me to be not quite correct. There was a slogan: "Kick Brüning's Social Democrats out of the Strike Committees." This was during a strike. The tactics of the united front from below demand that the social democratic workers be brought into the strike committees, but of course, not in such numbers as would put them in the majority. However,

such a slogan could be interpreted to mean that we must not elect social democrats to, but throw them out of the strike committees. I think this slogan was wrong.

(Comrade Remmele: This slogan was wrong.)

Take the slogans for February 25, 1931, printed in the manifesto of the Communist Party of France. The first was "Against Reactionary Oppression", the second "Against Fascist Preparations", the third "Organise by Sending Masses of Unemployed Workers into the C. G. T. U. by the Best of Them Joining the C. P. F." How? The unemployed, apparently, will themselves choose which of them are the best, so as to attract them to the Party. The fourth slogan was: "Employed Workers, United, Elect your Delegates, Present Your Demands to the Employers. Quit Work to Support Your Delegates, Demonstrate in the Factories and Strike under the Slogan: "Not One Centime Reduction in Wages!" Can we present to all factories and all the unemployed such a slogan as "Elect Delegates and Present Demands"? Can we? In my opinion we cannot. This is an abstract slogan, absolutely not adapted to the situation. But this slogan is also repeated in the manifesto of the C. G. T. U. on February 25th. An addition is made to the last slogan which I read: "Organise Demonstrations near the Factory Gates and the Factories Together with the Unemployed. Committees of the Unemployed, Organise Street Demonstrations on February 25th." You would think that they had not enough paper. They appeal to the employed with the same slogans as to the unemployed.

Slogans are the ideological side of the work among the unemployed. The slogans of the Party make it possible to agitate for it, to penetrate among the masses. Slogans differ from other forms of agitation because they are short, but they must be so clear that everyone who receives them will understand them. From the point of view of the ideological preparation of the unemployed campaign, there were many failures in many Communist Parties. Evidently the method of agitation will have to be changed here.

I have given only a few of the slogans issued by five legal Parties. In other Sections of the C.I., the slogans were often just as abstract. Such abstract slogans cannot attract the broad masses of the unemployed to our side.

The Need for Various Methods of Work Among the Unemployed.

I will pass on to another question, the question of whether we can work among the unemployed in general, among all the unemployed in all countries. There would be no harm in working among all the unemployed if we have the forces and the necessary apparatus, and if we can take them all in. But we can see and we all know that our Parties do not possess all these factors. Therefore, in my opinion, we must differentiate the work among the unemployed. There are unemployed who are badly provided for and there are unemployed who are more or less well provided for. I will try to show this by figures.

According to official figures in Germany, on January 1st, 1931 there were 4,357,000 unemployed. These are official figures, the number was really greater. Out of them, 2,155,000 unemployed men and women received the unemployment dole. 667,000 received the crisis dole (the crisis dole is considerably smaller than the usual unemployment dole). 1,535,000 unemployed were compelled to apply for charity. Even the bourgeois papers state that over 700,000 of them did not receive any dole at all. In Poland and Czechoslovakia, a very insignificant number of unemployed receive unemployment pay. Even in England there are many sections, such as railroadmen and agricultural workers, who do not receive the dole. In England there are 300,000 to 400,000 unemployed who for various reasons have been removed from the lists of those due to receive the unemployment dole.

Would it not be better for us to try to organise those unemployed who are worse off, although they are much more difficult to organise? For instance, take Germany. If you can organise these people on the labour exchange who receive the dole and even those who are compelled to apply for charity to the municipality (they can be organised), it is nevertheless extremely difficult to organise the people who do not receive anything in either of these places. They have to be sought for and captured, and a special apparatus is necessary for this.

But on the other hand, if this category of unemployed were organised, something has been done for them already of course, the Communist Parties could penetrate deeply among the unemployed proletariat, deeply among these masses. Therefore, I think that maybe we should raise the question of the differentiation of work among the unemployed, owing to the fact that the Communist Parties have not sufficient forces to work everywhere among the unemployed, because up to the present we have on our side maybe 5% of all the unemployed, even according to the most optimistic statistics of the Parties themselves.

Good and Bad Work Among the Unemployed.

Now I wish to give two examples which show what successes can be attained when we work among the unemployed, and how the Communist Parties lose influence among the unemployed, and also among the employed, if they work badly or not at all.

The first example is from **Czechoslovakia**. I think that I need not deal in great detail with the work of the C.P.Cz. among the unemployed. Comrade Gottwald yesterday spoke of this in detail, but nevertheless I wish to give some figures about their work. During the course of two weeks — in January and the beginning of February — the C.P.Cz. organised and carried on in 13 districts a total of 255 demonstrations and meetings with about 68,000 participants. Not all the districts have yet given information about this campaign. In all districts (not only during these two weeks, but for the whole time), the C.P.Cz. made demands through the unemployed in 494 municipalities and communes. In most of the municipalities and communes, the unemployed received assistance in money, food, fuel, etc. The Congress of the unemployed which took place not long ago was sufficiently wide. There were 982 delegates, of whom 385 were members of Red Trade Unions. There were 105 belonging to reformist trade unions and 492 unorganised workers. 577 unemployed committees were represented. The Congress of the unemployed adopted a platform of demands for the unemployed which had been prepared by the C.P.Cz. and the Red Trade Unions.

If the C.P.Cz. has obtained great successes among the unemployed, it is owing to this good and painstaking work. Therefore in Czechoslovakia this year, the demonstrations on February 25th were not only bigger and better than last year, but the C.P.Cz. and the Red Trade Unions increased their membership by 5,000 to 6,000 members.

To take another example — **America**. Last year, according to all figures, including those given in the bourgeois papers, 1,250,000 persons took part in the unemployed demonstrations of March 6th, 1930. Last year there were not unemployed organisations in America. When the unemployed heard that there is a Party which fights for their demands, they responded on a large scale. This year, according to exaggerated figures (I emphasise that the figures are exaggerated), about 300,000 persons took part in the unemployed demonstrations. We should further note that last year the number of unemployed in America was half as many as this year.

What is the cause? Allow me to read you a document which was sent from one district of the C.C. of the Party. After the November Plenum of the C.C. in 1930, Comrade Darcy was sent to work to District 13, California, and on January 12th, he wrote to the C.C. from San Francisco as follows:

„For the past few weeks our chief task has been to convince our comrades here that they must really begin serious unemployment work. Up till now their concentration has been upon Skid Road **exclusively**. This holds true for San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles and Sacramento. In the other towns there wasn't any unemployment work at all done. When I proposed concrete forms of activity against the effects of unemployment such as the fight against evictions, demonstrations in front of gas and electric companies to force the turning on of metres which they had shut off, food fights, etc., the comrades found every excuse under the sun why we couldn't carry through such struggles. In regards to evictions they even denied that there were evictions in this district. They said that the law and the community cheasts prevent any family from being evicted.

After a fight over this question in the open section meeting and the district committee meeting the whole membership began discussing this question and the day before New Year's,

purely by accident, one of our comrades in walking through the Mexican section of Frisco saw furniture on the street in front of a certain house. We were notified and with a handful comrades, aroused the neighbourhood against this eviction. A thousand workers gathered in front of the house, a fight took place with the police who drew guns and finally the workers succeeded in carrying the furniture into the house again, and established a picket line of neighbours for several days. It is now two weeks, and this worker is not yet evicted. The result of this fight was that **we won a victory inside the Party in turning their attention towards mass work** and outside the Party we got our baptism as a struggle organisation and not merely a bunch of talkers. I am enclosing herewith exhibits 1 and 2 which were the leaflet and petition circulated by the neighbours against this eviction. The fight over this eviction also helped considerably in making our Sacramento demonstration on the 7th whatever success it was.“

I am afraid that Darcy's letter is not an exception. I doubt if it is harder to work among the unemployed in American than in Czechoslovakia. This is confirmed by the results of the work of Comrade Darcy in Sacramento. Evidently, the work is carried on that way throughout America.

Comrade Darcy came to Sacramento at the end of December 1930. From December 31st to January 6th, the following preparational work was made for the All-American Unemployed Demonstration on January 7. I will read a list of all the demonstrations and meetings, because this is very characteristic and is typical of all Parties.

When they work, the workers flock to them. Here is an outline of our activities since Wednesday Dec. 31st, 1931:

1. Shop gate meetings:

- a) S. P shop — 4 meetings
- b) Libby McNeal Cannery 2 „
- 6 meetings

Reached an average of 2,000 workers.
Leaflets distributed, D. W. sold, sign displayed.

2. Flop House Bread Line meetings:

- a) Recreation Centre (Flop House) (1000 workers) — 5 meetings
- b) Bread line Salvation Army 4 „
- 9 meetings

Results: 1. 500 signatures collected.
2. 27 members got in.
3. 1,500 workers reached.
4. 150 D. W. distributed.
5. 1,00 leaflets distributed.
6. Signs displayed.

3. Meetings in front of Employment agencies. 2 daily — altogether 14 meetings.

Results: 1. 42 members joined.
2. 375 D. W. sold.
3. \$ 20 collection taken.
4. Average 250 workers reached in each meeting — total 3500.

4. Indoor meetings. 2 meetings daily (afternoon and evening) total 14.

Results: a) Attendance Full House 150—200.
b) Members taken in — 72.
c) Collection taken — \$ 12.
d) Literature sold 8.
e) Total workers attending 3,000.
f) Signatures taken 150.

5. Residential Section meetings — 6

- a) North Sacramento 4
- b) West Sacramento 2
- 6
- 1. Total attendance . 250.
- 2. Members taken in 6.
- 3. D. W. sold 12.
- 4. Signatures taken . 35.

6. City Party meetings — 4.

Workers reached 2000
Members joined 27
Collection taken \$ 9.50
Signatures taken 162

- D. W. sold 115
 Leaflets distributed 1000
7. Open Forum — 2 Open Forums held.
- Full capacity attendance — 150.
 - Signatures taken in 76.
 - Members taken in 16.
 - Collection literature sold \$ 6.75.
8. Out of town activities.
- Stockton — campaign carried under great difficulties. Steiner opportunist element, demoralising organisation. Unemployed Council strengthened. Delegation arrived consisting of 12 2000; leaflets distributed.
 - Committee of 3 with car sent to outlying towns of Marisville, Grosville, Roseville.
 - 2000 leaflets.
 - 250 D. W.
 - 100 U. S. applications.
9. Publicity. Leaflets.
- 5 different leaflets in English.
1 leaflet in Spanish.
2 Women leaflets.
 - Capitalist press reached every day.
 - One big truck with signs going throughout city.
10. General accomplishments:
- Members 190.
 - Signatures 1098.
 - Literature sold \$ 35.
 - Collection \$ 38.
 - Workers reached 5000.
 - 55 meetings held.
 - 14 speakers used.
 - 1 eviction case was successfully fought.
11. Expectations.
- 10,000 workers.
 2,000 workers in the parade.
 8,000 on the sidewalks.

The result is undoubtedly very big, but the Californian district is not altogether a proletarian district, it is not an industrial district, but if this work had been done in Detroit, Philadelphia and other places, I am convinced that the results would have been the same.

It is now clear why the unemployed movement in America is on the downgrade. For a whole year the unemployed were without leadership. No work was carried on among them. How could the unemployed come to a demonstration to which the Party called them on February 25th, 1931 in the same numbers as they came last year on March 6th?

The Nature of the Work Among the Unemployed.

Now I will pass on to the nature of the work among the unemployed. I think that the kind of work among the unemployed has also been unsatisfactory. Up to the present time, in all parties, with a few exceptions, the chief method of work among the unemployed has been abstract agitation and the organisation of demonstrations.

In Germany the Unemployed Committees appoint commissions for youth, women, office workers, newspapers, for the workers who have to appeal to charity, but the nature of the work of these commissions, as far as can be discovered (the German comrades will explain in greater detail when they speak), was chiefly agitation and propaganda.

In the "Humanité" on March 3rd, there was a very interesting paragraph on the work of the Rouen Unemployed Committee. It said:

"It consists of 26 members. It includes an organisation commission, for increasing the work among the unemployed, a housing commission which sees that the unemployed are not evicted, a defence commission to protect demonstrations, and a controlling and informational commission which watches the factories to see that there is no overtime and struggles against improper dismissals."

I do not know what these commissions do in practice, but the Rouen comrades in my opinion have tried out the ground for improving the nature of the work of the unemployed committee. Up to the present, unemployed committees have chiefly organised demonstrations. In my opinion, it is right for the

committees and councils of the unemployed, in addition to agitation and the distribution of literature, to organise demonstrations and recruiting for the Red Trade Unions and T. U. opposition work in which the unemployed themselves are interested.

I think that there are many branches of the work which could be performed by unemployed committees and councils. If the unemployed committees and councils organised housing commissions, and these housing commissions tried to prevent evictions which take place in many towns, they could get into contact with that part of the unemployed which suffers from this. The news spreads very rapidly that there is an organisation which helps the unemployed, and the unemployed will unquestionably come to it. Then the defence commission which would give legal advice and would even defend the unemployed in the labour or other courts which try cases of withdrawal of unemployment relief. The economic commission which would collect money and organise dining rooms for children.

Comrade Thälmann gave me yesterday a very interesting report of a session of the Central Unemployed Committee in Germany. Several comrades spoke there and stated that the National Socialists and in some places even the Social Democrats are trying to hang on to the unemployed movement, that the National Socialists are even organising kitchens for the unemployed and for youth. They do this very badly at present. They compel the youth who come to eat there to work, and this of course is not very attractive for the youth. But if they open kitchens and give dinners free or almost free, then we shall hardly be able to stop the hungry workers going there.

(Comrade Thälmann: There are already such kitchens in the Ruhr.)

Our American Party has not been able to prevent the unemployed from taking charitable relief in America and will not be able to do so. The unemployed organisations (committees and councils of the unemployed) can collect money from the employed workers and organise kitchens even if only for children. This must be done by the economic commission. But how? The committees and councils of the unemployed must emphasise in their agitation that such kitchens cannot reduce the need of the unemployed, they must not forget our general slogans of social insurance, and finally they must establish a general control of the employed and unemployed workers in these dining rooms, so as not to allow them to cause more harm than good. We must be very cautious with such dining rooms. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the committees and councils of the unemployed must commence to organise these dining rooms, first of all for children, through the economic commissions, which will have to be formed. They can help us in the work among the destitute unemployed.

The organisations of the unemployed will draw in those sections of the workers who are at the brink of want, they will connect up with the unemployed movement. The organisational commissions for the organisation of processions, demonstrations, the campaigns to present demands, as in America, where they collected signatures for the insurance bill, (the commission for collecting signatures there exists quite separately from the leadership of the unemployed workers, from the unemployed committees). The organisations commission could have many other functions.

The picket commission would organise pickets in factories where there is a strike. Pickets of the unemployed and strikers are of great importance for carrying out the slogans given by the Communist Party, urging a common struggle of the workers and the unemployed. Our Parties have achieved something in carrying out this slogan. In many cases the unemployed movement has joined up with the employed workers. The workers who see that the unemployed are standing in pickets and do not let strikebreakers pass and do not take the job in place of the strikers, will unquestionably link up with the unemployed movement and will help it.

The control commissions. It seems to me that the example of the Rouen comrades is of great importance. If there were such control commissions to watch that the workers did not work more than seven or eight hours, so that there would be no overtime work, or if any factory is preparing to introduce increased rationalisation, on these grounds it would be possible to mobilise the unemployed so as not to allow it. This is a new form of struggle, no less important than demonstrations.

Finally, the trade union commissions. In my opinion, the tasks of the trade union commissions are very important.

Firstly, they must find out who is a member of a trade union and try to get them on to our side. But this is not the

most important thing. The chief thing is to organise the members of reformist and other trade unions, to tell them everything which their unions are doing, make them disposed to work with us, to send them to trade union meetings to call upon the T.U. to demand a seven-hour day without reduction of wages, not allowing wage-cuts, not permitting overtime work or new rationalisation. This is not the same thing as the previous "Zwingt die Bonzen" (compel the trade union bureaucrats to fight). No, it is not the same thing. When unemployed members of a trade union come to trade union meetings and put forward demands which are understandable by the workers, I am sure that they will get a majority at these meetings. The reformists will not carry out the demands. The trade union opposition and the unemployed members of the union will find it easier to fight against the trade union bureaucrats. When the ground is prepared, in the way the slogan may be put forward: Join the Red Unions, join the T.U. opposition, throw out the reformist T.U. bureaucrats, etc., according to the conditions, the time and the place. In this way we weaken the reformist trade unions and break down the authority which they have in the eyes of the men and women workers.

This is a big field of work. Will this work be easy? No, it will not be easy, but undoubtedly difficult. Why? Because the unemployed is a fluctuating element — here today and tomorrow in another place. We need to seek for them and catch them. But if there are so many members of the Red trade unions who are unemployed, so many supporters of the T.U. opposition, and so many unemployed Party members, the Communist Party can organise them. They must be united. They must work actively in the committees and on the unemployed councils and in the commissions. The unemployed committees and councils at the present time unite hundreds and thousands of the unemployed. When they begin to work better, they will attract still more unemployed. If all the commissions work well, especially the trade union commissions, a great deal can be done.

However during the last year work has slackened even in the reformist trade unions, in such countries like England, America, Czechoslovakia, Sweden and Norway, and even in Germany, while the socialdemocrats and reformists in all these countries continually and openly betray the interests of the working class on questions which can be understood by the masses. Therefore, it is necessary to increase the work inside the trade unions so as to expose the trade union bureaucrats. For this purpose, we should also use the unemployed. The work of these commissions, as I have shown, will provide activity for the councils and committees of the unemployed, because the workers cannot endlessly march in demonstrations at the call of the unemployed councils and committees, and they must not limit their functions merely to this. If committees and councils of the unemployed are organised, and the workers see that they are organisations which defend their interests, the Communist Party can penetrate into the midst of the working masses through them. Besides the commissions mentioned above, committees and councils of the unemployed must form Agit-Prop and cultural and educational committees which must publish papers, organise short courses, distribute literature, etc.

Right and "Left" Sectarian Deviations in the Work Among the Unemployed.

In spite of the fact that up to the present time, extensive organisations of the unemployed have not been formed in all countries, in the activity of the existing unemployed committees and councils, there have been in some countries "Left" sectarian and right deviations from the general line of the C.I. In some places, the unemployed attacked the peasants who brought products to the city markets, and took their products without payment, and it is not always the rich peasants who haul their goods to the markets. There have been cases when the unemployed attacked little breadshops. Such "confiscation" will feed no one, or but a few people, but it can antagonise the poor and middle peasant masses, while it is very important for them to take a friendly attitude to the unemployed movement and to the workers' movement in general. There have been cases when the T.U. opposition, the Red T.U.'s, the committees and councils of the unemployed, which are under the influence of Communist Parties, have put forward only local partial slogans, not linking them up with the general slogans of the Communist Party in the struggle against unemployment (insurance against unemployment to the extent of full wages at the expense of the employers

and the government), nor with the general struggle of the whole proletariat of the given country which is opportunism in practice.

How many committees of the unemployed are there and how many unemployed do they include?

As far as I have been able to discover in the five countries which I have mentioned here, where there are legal Communist Parties, and where the unemployed movement is also legal, there are in Germany, 1,400 unemployed committees, elected by about 300,000 to 400,000 workers, in Czechoslovakia, there are about 1,100 unemployed committees which at the outside represent 150,000 unemployed, in America in November 1930, at the Plenum of the C.C., it was stated that a few dozen committees existed with 2,000 members. (Evidently, at the present time, since February 25th, the American comrades have extended the network of unemployed committees). In England, there are 152 local unemployed organisations with about 20,000 members. Recently, the English comrades have increased the unemployed organisation (in September 1928, it had only 8,000 members).

What forms of organisation of the unemployed exist up to the present time?

In France, in the Paris district, there are 45 committees. They have already a united committee. In other towns in France, there are also unemployed committees, but in France, they have not yet made a serious start to include and organise the unemployed.

In England, the unemployed movement has existed as an independent movement since 1921. In the local unemployed organisation, there are members of the organisation paying membership dues. Until recently, their chief work consisted of defending their members in the administrative organs which deal with the affairs of the unemployed (not looking after all the unemployed, but only after their own members. The unemployed organisation until recently were merely the lawyers for their members in all courts which deal with the affairs of the unemployed). Their external activity consisted of organising unemployed processions (hunger marches). In reality, this was a union of the unemployed, a sectarian organisation looking after its own members. Only recently, when the Communist Party began, under great pressure, to deal with the unemployed movement, the leaders of this organisation began to unite the movement of the unemployed with the movement of the employed for a common struggle. And this has already given good results by increasing the membership. On February 21—23 this year, there was a Congress of the unemployed in England. According to the decisions of this Congress, the character of the unemployed movement and its methods of work will be changed. The unemployed movement is closely connected with the Minority Movement. In England, there is a general national Executive Committee of the unemployed.

It is difficult to say what are the forms of the organisations of unemployed in America. Comrade Bedacht, who reported at the Plenum of the C.C. in November 1930, on unemployment, stated: "The leadership of the unemployed movement must be completely and also formally in the hands of the T.U.U.L., and the revolutionary trade unions." (Retranslated from Russian.) It seems to me that this is what killed the unemployed movement, because there are few Red trade unions there. They have very few members. Comrade Foster reported at the same Plenum of the C.C., that the Red Trade Unions and the T.U.U.L. are not going forward but backwards all the time, and as the unemployed movement was linked up with badly functioning trade unions and the T.U.U.L., this movement did not extend widely. Only after the Plenum of November 1930, the Party organisations began to pay attention to the unemployed movement, under the pressure of the C.C. (a further rôle was played by the fact that International Unemployment Day — February 25th, 1931 — was approaching), and they increased their work among the unemployed. Without this, the demonstrations on February 25th could not have gathered 300,000 people. In New York the Unemployed Councils were formed under the Red Trade Unions: needle workers, sailors, restaurant workers, office workers, metal workers, etc., and in addition there were formed territorial unemployed councils. No All-American centre of the unemployed has yet been formed.

In Germany, in addition to unemployed committees at the Labour Exchanges, there are also groups of the Revolutionary

Trade Union Opposition. In the last report of the German unemployed centre, it says that such groups number 600 with 30,000 members.

Thus, in Germany, the unemployed movement is an official part of the Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition. Out of more than 5,000,000 unemployed in Germany, about 300,000—400,000 unemployed took part in the election of 1,400 committees, and 30,000 unemployed are in the T.U. Opposition. Besides unemployed committees which were elected at the Labour Exchanges, there are also unemployed councils in the wards, towns, districts and provinces parallel to the existing organisations of the Revolutionary T.U. Opposition.

In Germany, there exists also an All-German Committee of Unemployed, elected at a conference of representatives of the local unemployed organisations.

In **Czechoslovakia**, the unemployed movement commenced as an extensive movement. Comrade Gottwald yesterday reported on this. At first the Red Unions took no part in the movement whatever. It was organised by the Party organisations. Only now the Red Trade Unions want to make this movement an official part of the Red Trade Unions. The C.P.Cz. succeeded in doing something for the unemployed, and owing to energetic and capable work among them, an extensive movement resulted. The unemployed committees which were elected at meetings of the unemployed in various places (at the Labour Exchanges, in communes, in wards and district, etc.) are organised in town, district or county organisations. The National Unemployed Congress of Czechoslovakia which took place recently elected a Central Committee of Unemployed.

What form of organisation of the unemployed should be recommended to the Communist Parties, the Red Unions and the T.U. Opposition, especially in countries in which organisations of the unemployed have not yet been formed (France, etc.)?

The unemployed movement must have a broad basis, it must embrace all the unemployed, irrespective of the Party or trade union they belong to. It is not a matter of organising unemployed unions, of close organisations, but of organising a wide unemployed movement. The unemployed committees and councils must become the **leading** bodies of the movement and be responsible to it. Hence we must determine what the relations between the unemployed organisations and the revolutionary trade union movement should be.

It is not a question of the formal connections between the unemployed movement and the red trade unions or trade union opposition.

In actual practice, the driving force, the foundation of this movement must be the Red Trade Unions, the T.U. opposition and the Party. The members of the Red Trade Unions, the T.U. opposition and the Party must be united and must act in an organised way in all places where the unemployed gather together. Comrade Thälmann told us yesterday that the reformist trade unions are already discussing the question of the unemployed movement. The National Fascists are trying to attach themselves to it. This is inevitable, because under present conditions, unemployment is not a passing phenomenon. Therefore, we must work very energetically and hard among the unemployed.

This movement must be non-Party, not attached to any Party, nor to any kind of trade union. Take Czechoslovakia or Germany. The workers in Germany consider the T.U. Opposition to be an organisation of the C.P. The Red Trade Unions in Czechoslovakia are looked on by the workers as unions of the C.P. If the unemployed movement is attached to the Red Trade Unions in Czechoslovakia or to the T.U. Opposition in Germany, then everyone will count it as a Communist movement and this will frighten many workers who follow the reformists, etc. away. Even in France, everyone knows that the Red Trade Unions belong to the C.P. and these unions have publicly stated this scores of times in their arguments with the Syndicalists who are fighting against the Communist Party having the dominating influence in the trade unions. If the unemployed organisations will become known as being "Under the Red Trade Unions", "Under the T.U. Oppositions", the members of the reformist trade unions may not enter this organisations, and the supporters of the Catholic center may also not enter. There is no need to speak about members of other parties. In Czechoslovakia where there are 13 trade union alliances, where every Party has its own trade union alliance, naturally their members

cannot enter such an unemployed organisation. If the unemployed movement is wide and free, formally not attached to any Party or trade union organisation, then every unemployed worker can join it. It will only be possible to include the wide masses of the unemployed in these organisations if they are not labelled as "unemployed movement under the Red T.U.s", or "under the T.U. Opposition". Of course I am not opposed to the Party and the Red Trade Unions leading this movement. On the contrary the leadership must be strongly in the hands of the T.U. Opposition or the Red T.U.s., even more strongly than it has been up to the present, and of course in the hands of the Party. For this purpose no label or title is needed, but efficient energetic work in the spirit I have shown here. Then there will be no force, no Party, which could get the unemployed movement out of our hands.

It is stated that if the unemployed movement is not under the T.U. Opposition or the Red Trade Unions, then there may arise a cleavage between the employed workers and the unemployed. This argument is very serious. The strong side of the unemployed movement in 1930 and 1931 lay in the fact that from the very start it was linked up with the workers in the factories. This connection was established, of course, not because the unemployed movement was under the T.U. Opposition or the Red Unions (in Czechoslovakia it was organised by the Party over the heads of the Red Unions, and in America the unemployed movement was wasted away and has not had any strong contacts with the employed workers in spite of the fact that it was under the Red Trade Unions and the T.U.U.L.). Evidently this does not guarantee that the unemployed movement will not be separated from the struggle of the whole proletariat.

For this purpose it is necessary for the unemployed movement to be under proper leadership (through members of the Party, the Red T.U.s. and the T.U. Opposition) the leadership of the C.P. If the committees and councils of the unemployed send pickets during a strike, this will link up the movement of the employed and the unemployed. Campaigns and demonstrations should be organised and carried through together. This is very important because the C.P. must not allow any split between the employed and unemployed, because there is a danger that when workers strike, let us say against wage cuts, the unemployed in countries where there is no unemployed insurance may take their place and in this way they can break any strike. Up to the present, the unemployed have not only refused to break strikes, but they have actively assisted them, owing to the fact that the C.P. was the initiator in creating the unemployed organisations. If work among the unemployed is increased, if agitation is not abstract, if the work of the committees and councils is made very concrete and if all the unemployed can enter the unemployed movement independently of their party or union, then the unemployed will in the future as well, far from becoming an interference in the struggle of the working class, be active participators in it.

Is there any need for a national C.C. of the unemployed?
In the minutes of a session of the C.C. of the unemployed in Germany, comrades stated that they feared the existence of a separate unemployed organisation. Yesterday Comrade Gottwald expressed the same fear. In this they were quite right. We must not form an isolated organisation of the unemployed. Therefore, in my opinion, we should not form a national C.C. of the unemployed organisation. Maybe it would be useful if the committees of the unemployed are united into councils of the unemployed of the town, district, province or possibly the state, because they have state assemblies and legislatures, etc, where the unemployed organisations can put forward their demands, etc.

I do not propose to dissolve the German, English or Czech Central Committees of the unemployed, but need our comrades in France, for example, form such a committee? In my opinion they should not. The unemployed should be organised in the frameworks of the administrative unit of each country on a scale not larger than the province or state, with the exception, possibly, of Germany where there are separate Republics, such as Saxony, Bavaria, etc., with their own parliaments, budgets, etc., to which the unemployed can present their demands. For such organisations of the unemployed, there is a field of activity. But what work can exist for the committees of the unemployed on the scale of the whole country? There is no such work. Who formulates the demands for the unemployed? The Party, the Red Trade Unions, or the T.U. Opposition. Who represents the interests of the unemployed? The Party, the Party press, the Communists in Parliament, etc. The experience of work among the unemployed in all countries is not yet very large.

For that matter, in England our Party has carried on work among the unemployed for ten years, because all this time there have been over one million unemployed in England. The English experience shows that we should not form either a union of unemployed with membership dues, etc. nor a central committee. The National Unemployed Movement in England, as I have already said, reached 5,000 members in 1928, but the Executive Committee of the Unemployed Movement led the organisation by circulars from the center, and in this way it fettered the initiative of the local unemployed organisations which waited for instructions from the center, with the result that the unemployment movement did not extend as wide by as it should. The National Unemployed Movement in England became converted into a sectarian body with membership cards, membership dues, but without mass work and without influence on the broad masses of the unemployed. If the comrades in the localities had developed their initiative without waiting for instructions from the center, if they had worked among those sections of the unemployed who receive the smallest doles, among the most destitute, then they would have had an extensive movement. But this was not done.

We must avoid the English experience and not form central committees but develop wide initiative in the localities. We should form secretariats under the central leaders of the Red Unions and the T.U. Opposition specially for work among the unemployed. This does not mean of course that we must not call unemployed congresses of the whole country to formulate demands or to support these demands.

Conclusion.

I think that it would be a good thing if the commission on the first point in the agenda of the Plenum considered the question of the forms of organisation of the unemployed, because the problem of the unemployed at the present time is very real. There are about 35 million unemployed men and women workers. Up to the present there is no political party, no trade union except the Communist Parties and the Red Trade Unions and T.U. Opposition which go to any trouble for the unemployed. The C.P.s, the Red Unions and the T.U. Opposition have the fullest possibilities of organising the unemployed for a common struggle along with the workers in the factories. Up to the present time this possibility has not been fully utilised either by the C.P.s or the revolutionary T.U. movement, while the unemployed are already falling into the clutches of charitable organisations (America). Among them is being spread the legend of "dumping" and "slave labour" in the U.S.S.R. In case of war they will be called up to the army first of all. The social fascists and the national fascists are already trying to strengthen themselves amongst the unemployed. In addition many millions of unemployed will still go back to work. If the C.P., the Red Unions and the T.U. Opposition carry on work among them, we can improve through them our connections with the factories.

We must deal very seriously with the organisation of the unemployed, draw them into the general struggle of the proletariat more energetically than we have done up to the present, and out of their ranks we must increase the Red Unions, the T.U. Opposition and even the C.P. The chief thing to be avoided when organising the unemployed is the formation of sectarian leagues of unemployed. We should not have compulsory membership dues and membership cards, although we should register the unemployed in the committees and collect **genuine voluntary subscriptions** from the employed workers and even among the unemployed who are receiving unemployed pay.

The primary elected organs of the unemployed (committees) must be elected at meetings of all the unemployed, independent of the parties or trade unions to which they belong, at the labour exchanges, flop houses, food lines, etc. The committees will have to report on their work to all the unemployed. Only with such an organisation, the unemployed movement will not have a sectarian character but will be extensive. Our slogan calling for a common struggle of the unemployed and the employed workers, in spite of the fact that up to the present the work among the unemployed has been very poor, has given fine results. Up to the present the unemployed have not been strike-breakers even in countries where they do not receive the dole and where the proportion of organised workers is not very large, as in America. This common struggle should be increased still further.

2. The Work of the Communist Nuclei, Red T.U. Groups and T.U. Opposition Groups in the Factories.

Party Nuclei in the Factories.

How do matters stand with regard to carrying out one of the important slogans which is set out in all the chief decisions of the Comintern, the Profintern and their sections — the transfer of the centre of Party and trade union activity into the factories?

I will give statistics once more for the same five legal parties — the C.P.s of Germany, France, America, England and Czechoslovakia, which will answer this question.

Up to the present, very little attention has been paid in the discussion to the foundation of the Party, or any rate, what should be the foundation — the factory nucleus. Only Comrade Thälmann made a slight reference to this. Here are the statistics. In my opinion there is no other way of deciding how we have consolidated ourselves in the factories.

The number of factory nuclei and street nuclei and the number of members in them.

Germany. The number of factory nuclei was:

1926	1928	1929	1930
2243	1556	1411	1524

In addition there were 57 nuclei on big estates. Previously there were no such nuclei.

(During the election campaign for the Reichstag 188 factory nuclei were formed.)

The number of street nuclei in the C.P. of Germany was:

1925	1929	1930
110	2519	2824

The street nuclei increased between 1929 and 1930 by 305 while factory nuclei in the same period increased only by 113. **The percentage of Party members included in factory nuclei during the last four years in the CP. of Germany:**

1927	1928	1929
15.61 %	18.69 %	14.7 %

(1929 figures taken on data from 12 biggest Party districts.)

We have not yet exact figures for 1930, but probably the percentage was greatly reduced, as is shown by the statistics on the number of Party members working in industry, compared with 1928 and 1929.

In the C.P. of Germany, the proportion of the total number of members who were working in factories was:

1928	1929	1930	1931
62.3 %	51.6 %	32.2 %	20—22 %

(The reduction in the number of Party members working in factories must be attributed to dismissals in connection with the crisis, first of all of the revolutionary workers — members of the Party.)

The following figures showing the fall in the number of Party members working in the factories for the six chief districts in 1930, are interesting compared with 1929:

District	December 1929	October 1930
Berlin-Brandenburg	56.0 %	45.4 %
Halle-Merseburg	60.3 %	34.5 %
Wasserkante (Hamburg and other ports)	53.5 %	38.2 %
Saxony	57.0 %	40.0 %
Ruhr	44.3 %	24.4 %
Lower Rhine	41.8 %	22.7 %

In 1929, in 1,411 factory nuclei, as I have already said, there were only 14.7 % of all the Party members. In 2,519 street nuclei there were 45 % of all the Party members and in 2,175 local organisations in which there are no factory nuclei, street nuclei and nuclei in the estates (there were in all 2,779 local organisations in the C.P.G. in 1929), there were 40.3 % of all the Party members.

Here is the distribution of Party members in 1929 among factory, street and local organisations where there was no nucleus, for ten districts of the CP. Germany.

District	In Factory Nuclei.	In Street Nuclei	In local orgs. without Nuclei.
East Prussia	9.59 %	48.99 %	41.41 %
Danzig	5.82 %	38.73 %	55.44 %
Halle-Merseburg	13.59 %	33.27 %	53.13 %
Thuringia	10.51 %	37.79 %	51.69 %
Mecklenburg	10.70 %	59.9 %	30.84 %
Northwest	14.70 %	45.57 %	40.35 %
Ruhr	34.12 %	58.2 %	7.76 %
Hessen-Frankfurt	4.19 %	59.51 %	46.29 %
Baden	14.05 %	31.12 %	54.82 %
Só. Bavaria	6.15 %	57.93 %	35.92 %

In the Ruhr a great of the Party members are organised in factory nuclei. Among the above mentioned districts I have not mentioned some important industrial districts such as Berlin-Brandenburg, but in general this distribution of Party members in the factory nuclei, street nuclei and local organisation without nuclei can be considered to be the general feature for all the other districts.

Czechoslovakia. In the C.P. of Czechoslovakia in 1926 there were 1301 factory nuclei, in 1928 there were 954 and in 1930 there were 399. The number of Party members in them constitutes 14% of the total membership. The number of street nuclei in 1928 was 639 and in 1930 it was 360. In 1930 33% of the Party members were in street nuclei and 53% in local organisations without nuclei. This means that in Czechoslovakia the greater part of the Party members, the overwhelming majority, are not in factory nuclei.

U.S.A. The factory nuclei of the C.P.U.S.A. numbered in 1927 166, in 1928 111 and in 1930 133. (They included approximately 10% of all Party members. In factory nuclei were there 989 Party members). Street nuclei in the C.P.U.S.A. in 1928 were 468 and in 1930 there were 417. At the end of 1930 there were 10,768 members. If we count that in 133 factory nuclei in 1930 there were 1,268 members, this means that in the street nuclei and local organisations there were 9,500 members. The fact is that in the U.S.A. a tremendous number of Party members are not yet in factory nuclei.

Great Britain. In the C.P.G.B. at the beginning of 1930, there were 44 factory nuclei and in September 1930 there were 39. In them were 218 Party members. In November 1930, out of 2,555 members of the Party, 1,376 were working in factories, 845 were unemployed and 334 were housewives.

Comrade Pollitt gave other figures but they were for the last few months.

We have no information on the number of street nuclei in the C.P.G.B. but in England there are 118 concentration groups in which there are 851 members of the Party of whom 323 work in factories.

France. We have no complete figures for the C.P.F.

In 1928 the C.P.F. had 898 factory nuclei with 17,448 members, which forms 33% of the total number of Party members. (At that time the C.P.F. had 52,372 members.)

We do not know how many factory nuclei there were in 1929, but they had 10,800 members which was 24% of the total membership. In 1929 the C.P.F. had 45,000 members. The large percentage in factory nuclei is very striking, but this is explained by the fact that they attached 15 to 18 members to every 3 members working in factories, so that this does not mean that they really had such a large percentage of Party members really working in the factories and included in factory nuclei.

In 1930 the C.P.F. had 666 factory nuclei, of which 134 were in the Paris district. The number of members in them is unknown.

The number of street nuclei in the C.P.F. was:

1928	1929	1930
2,410	No data.	1,837

In the street nuclei and local organisations without nuclei there were in 1928 34,927 members which comprised 67% of all Party members, and in 1929 34,200 which is 76%. In 1930 the C.P.F. had 38,240 members, but we have no information as to how they are distributed among factory nuclei, street nuclei and local organisations without nuclei.

Yesterday Comrade Thorez said nothing about this in his speech. Possibly the other French comrades who have yet to speak will tell us.

What is the size of the factory and street nuclei?

In Germany we have figures only for 1929. The number of nuclei in the C.P.G. in 1929 was as follows:

No. of factories with nuclei.	Membership of the factory nuclei.	No. of Street Nuclei.	No. of Members.
761	Up to 10	1,216	Up to 20
240	Up to 15	559	Up to 30
164	Up to 20	305	Up to 40
123	Up to 30	160	Up to 75
56	Up to 40	158	Up to 100
31	Up to 50	6	Over 100
36	Over 50		
Total 1,411 factory nuclei		2,404 street nuclei	

If we take statistics for 1930 and the last months of 1930, the proportion of Party members in street nuclei will be bigger because unemployment has recently greatly increased. The C.P.F. has several times split the street nuclei into smaller ones because they have very many members. Now I have been told by several German comrades that they have again started to increase the number of street nuclei so as to reduce the number of members in them, or they are preparing to do so.

We have no full figures showing the number of nuclei in the C.P.Cz. We have figures from 9 big factories with 59,000 men and women workers. At these factories, the number of workers varies from 1,000 to 18,000. In all these factories there are nuclei of 9 to 60 members each. Only in one nucleus are there 250 members. In all these nuclei there are 505 Party members. Comrade Gottwald did not deal with this matter in his speech yesterday.

(Comrade Gottwald: I could not finish my speech yesterday because the session closed.)

No one deprived you of the floor today and you could well have continued this morning. You said you would speak later. It will be a good thing if you would do so, and if you would descend a little lower than the Central Committee and tell us what is happening in the nuclei.

In the C.P.U.S.A., from 3 to 18 members form a nucleus.

In the C.P.G.B., from 4 to 6 members on the average form a nucleus. This does not mean that there are no more members in some nuclei, but on the average they are very small.

In France, in the Citroen Works with over 15,000 workers, there is a nucleus of 15 Party members. In the Renault Works, where 15,000 also work, there is a nucleus with 18 members. In Boulogne at the Farman, Carnot and Salmson Metal Works, each employing some 1,500 to 2,000 workers, there are only 9 Party members (not in each of them but for the whole six factories). In St. Etienne (Lyons District), out of 24,000 miners there are 24 Party members. It is not known whether they have nuclei or not. In the 15th Party district, at the Talbot works, etc. were there are 60,000 metal workers. . . .

(Voice: In the whole district.)

In the whole district, I say, there are four factory nuclei in which there are 10 members.

The figures are taken from the materials of the C.C. of the C.P.F. Notice that all the documents which I quote here and all the figures which I give are taken exclusively from the documents of the central committees or the reports of the instructors of the E.C.C.I.

In which factories are there nuclei?

We have figures for the C.P. of Germany only for 1929.

Factories with nuclei.	No. of workers.	% of factories with nuclei.
33 out of 71	over 5,000	46.4 %
328 out of 1,051	1,000 to 5,000	31.2 %
245 out of 1,780	500 to 1,000	13.7 %
702 out of 40,188	50 to 500	1.74 %
103 out of 148,112	10 to 50	0.06 %

1,411 factory nuclei.

Thus, 1411 factory nuclei are distributed as follows: 1050 nuclei are in small and medium factories with 10 to 1,000 workers, 361 nuclei are in factories with 1,000 to 5,000 workers or more.

Czechoslovakia. We have no figures for 1930 except the 9 factories which have already been mentioned. In 1929 out of the total number of Party members working in factories, 67% were in factories with 50 to 100 workers, 20% were in

factories with 100 to 1,000 and only 1% were in factories with over 1,000 workers.

C. P. U. S. A. As a general rule, the Party members are working in small and medium factories. Only a few Party members are working in big factories. Out of 133 factory nuclei, 120 were in factories with a total number of 517,410 workers.

France. Out of 134 nuclei in the Paris district (according to the figures of the Paris district committee), "many" are in small and medium factories. In St. Etienne, out of 23,000 metal workers in factories with over 500 workers, there are only 17 Party members. In the Eastern district, including Moselle, in which is concentrated the steel production of the whole of France, there are 3 nuclei. At the Schneider-Creuzot factories with 11,000 workers, there is not a single Communist.

C. P. G. B. No data.

The T.U. Opposition and the Red Trade Unions.

Matters are still worse with regard to the transfer of the centre of trade union work to the factories. The Red Trade Unions and the T.U. Opposition in Germany have not yet formed their groups in many factories. The T.U. Opposition has not yet formed groups in all the factories where the C. P. G. has nuclei and where the T.U. Opposition put forward its lists in 1930 for the election of factory committees. The Red Trade Unions of France and America and the Minority Movement in England have no solid position in the factories.

In Czechoslovakia on December 31st, 1930, the Red Trade Unions had groups in 144 factories, and trade union delegates in 18 factories (there is no information as to in which factories and how they work). The T. U. Opposition in Germany set itself the task of organising groups in all the factories where lists are put forward this year in the elections for the factory committees. If they carry out this task, they will make a tremendous step forward. But unfortunately there is no possibility as yet of speaking of a strong basis on the factories even in Germany.

How do the factory nuclei work? We have documents which show that in all countries a few nuclei are working well, but the majority of factory nuclei are unfortunately passive and work badly.

I wish to quote some documents showing how the good nuclei work because many comrades have talked a great deal about the nuclei but know very little about how the nuclei work. I will quote a document from one comrade, an instructor of the E.C.C.I., who was in France and took part in the work of the factory nuclei. He saw this work and described it as follows:

"The only organisation in the district (Boulogne) which is doing serious work is the nucleus in the Renault factory. 18 Party members of whom 8 are foreigners are divided into 4 shop-nuclei organised in the chief shops in the factories. The nuclei have a common bureau consisting of four secretaries of the shop nuclei and a constant worker from the district committee (a member of the district committee) attached to the nucleus.

The nucleus, although its numbers are small, nevertheless tries to establish direct contacts with the factory and tries to lead the struggles of the workers. For example, several numbers of the factory newspaper had been issued in which the demands of the workers were put forward in a general form. Every shop nucleus held a number of meetings of sympathisers, holding them illegally. All the members of the nucleus invited to these meetings those comrades from their shops whom they had succeeded in interesting by individual agitation.

At these meetings of sympathisers at which there were 7 to 20 comrades, demands were examined, and in addition three new members were obtained for the Party and five for the trade union.

In the revolutionary T.U. Opposition there are 30 members.

After such work carried on for a month, the demands were found to be greatly concretised both for the Renault factory as a whole and for several of the workshops in particular.

Then the comrades issued a leaflet setting out the enlarged and concretised demands. The leaflets were distributed during the dinner interval by a brigade of about 20 unemployed who gave them out at the four chief entrances to the factory. During the distribution of the leaflets, comrades from the metal workers' union and the Party organisation explained to the

workers who gathered around the speakers all about these demands.

The influence of the Party among the workers in the factory is growing. Another example which shows that although we do not understand how to lead the struggle, nevertheless the work has already been commenced, is as follows:

In the Central Tool Shop where 1000 workers are employed and where there is not a single Party member, one morning there spread a rumour that wages were to be cut. During the dinner interval, two sympathisers found the secretary of the nucleus of the Renault factory and informed him of this. The comrade immediately told them to bring a few workers to a meeting. Four turned up at the meeting. They undertook to distribute in the factory the leaflets which were drawn up during the day, in the district committee, dealing with the struggle against wage cuts proposed by Renault and urging an increase. The distribution of these leaflets was carried on well and the material made a good impression on the workers. They saw that the Communists are not working **outside the walls of the factory**, but that there was an organisation **in the factory itself**, that in the organisation the **workers themselves were acting**, being able to hide themselves cleverly from the factory police, of which they had heard so much. This fact greatly assisted the growth of confidence in our organisation.

The management proposed to reduce wages on February 4th, but the workers answered that they would strike if any attempt was made to cut wages.

The nucleus set itself the task of putting forward on February 25th a platform of demands for the whole factory and organising the preparations for the election of committees of struggle. The Renault nucleus is one of the best working organisations in the Paris district."

In such a tremendous factory where over 15,000 workers are employed, a group of 18 comrades, by their clever and painstaking work **inside the factory**, had a great influence on the workers, tremendously greater than if they had worked from outside.

In Czechoslovakia also there are several nuclei which work well.

a) **The nucleus in Karlshütte works actively.** A large proportion of the Party members come to meetings of the nucleus. The Party committee pays great attention to this nucleus.

b) The Witkovitz nucleus before the elections to the factory committee carried on good work. The members of the Red Trade Unions in the factory committee carried on a struggle against the reformists in the factory committee. Their speeches were printed in the factory newspaper "Vitkovar".

c) The nucleus at the Kolben-Prague Works from the beginning of December 1930 carried on active work. In January, before the elections of the factory committee, the nucleus published and distributed 20,000 leaflets. In addition the nucleus periodically publishes a newspaper with a circulation of 300 to 500, and this nucleus received assistance and leadership from the Prague Party Committee.

There are very many good nuclei in Germany. But the Party press for some reason writes nothing, about them. In the C.P.G. there is a special organ — "The Party Worker" — which deals chiefly with Party structure, passing on experience of the good work of Party organisations and criticising bad work and mistakes. If we examine it for 1930, there is nothing at all in it about the work of the nuclei as a whole. There are good descriptions of how individual comrades do good work, how they take part in strikes, but no description is given of the factory nuclei as a whole, how they organise the struggle. Concerning the factory nuclei of the C.P.G. I must state that the overwhelming majority of them are passive and do not take part in the struggle in the factories, do not carry out the Party line, do not mobilise the workers. This is still our great weakness.

I have taken two facts from "The Party Worker" concerning the factory nuclei in Germany whose work is medium or bad, and I wish to read you descriptions of their weaknesses because they are very characteristic not only for Germany but for many nuclei in other countries. In Germany an investigation was made of the work of factory nuclei. This is a very important factor and a very interesting experience, and I recommend the

Party committees of other Parties to do the same; carry on a real investigation of how the factory nuclei work.

I have reports on the investigations of two factory nuclei. I will read them.

"The investigation showed the following:

During the last year the nucleus suffered greatly from internal difficulties. At first, inner-Party disputes with comrades who were attached to the nucleus played a very important rôle, and then there were personal quarrels caused by the late secretary of the nucleus. However, in the factory which has been for many years one of the strongholds of social democracy, the opposition grew very rapidly (chiefly among the turners). A few Party members gather the non-Party workers with opposition tendencies and carry on very active work among them. The non-Party oppositional workers sent a delegation to a meeting of the nucleus to criticise shortcomings in its work.

After the liquidation of internal dissensions, the nucleus together with the non-Party opposition workers brought about a brilliant success of the opposition at a large meeting of the workers. The number of members of the nucleus in the factory increased immediately from 18 to 32, and almost 100 workers joined the revolutionary T.U. Opposition. Last spring the nucleus did not put forward its Red List. Two comrades were elected to the factory committee, these comrades in general were too passive and even made serious mistakes, which they admitted". ("Party Worker", 1930, No. 3, March).

Non-Party workers had to intervene to liven up the Party nucleus.

I will give the report on the investigation of the nucleus at Siemens-P. I do not know if this is a big factory — Siemens-Halske, Siemens-Schuckert or some other factory.

Five comrades are working at the Siemens-P. factory, and 3 comrades from various factories are attached to them. The factory is completely under the influence of the social democrats, because our nucleus does not carry on any revolutionary policy. 90% of the workers are unorganised and have no representative in the factory committee. Three comrades are members of the factory committee. Last year they were elected on the reformist list. The control commission ascertained that 'these three communist members of the factory committee, voted together with the reformists in January for the dismissal of 90 workers. At a session of the nucleus, where the control commission reported on this, the Secretary, who was one of the three members of the factory committee, defended his action in agreeing to the dismissals. After a long discussion, the nucleus decided at the last meeting to put forward a Red List this year. Only the Secretary voted against this decision'. ("Party Worker", 1930, Page 89).

I will read two more extracts as examples of the bad work of nuclei in the Paris district. The same E.C.C.I. instructor in France and of whom I have already spoken writes concerning the work of the nucleus at Citroën:

"The experience obtained at the Renault factory is not applied at Citroën, where nothing has so far been done in putting forward demands.

The nucleus at the Citroën factory has 15 members, and only last week it was split into four shop groups. The only method of contact between the nucleus and the workers in the factory is the factory newspaper and proclamations, which are insufficient if they are not only to serve as a means of agitation among, but as a means of organisation of the workers.

A trade union section does not as yet exist.

When discussing the question of preparations for February 25th and of setting tasks, the members of the nucleus who have never done any serious work in the factory, did not believe in the success of such work, however much they were assured that the comrades in the Renault factory did accomplish certain things. It was plain that as they had done nothing as yet, they had not the courage to start to work. At the last meeting of the Citroën nucleus, two comrades from the Renault factory were present. They greatly encouraged the Citroën comrades, and the latter resolved to call a sympathisers' meeting.

Here is an extract taken from another document of the C.P.F.:

"In Chapinot, a suburb of Nancy, a workers' centre, we have a Party nucleus, but we have there also a circle of freethinkers headed by a Communist. The Party nucleus is quite inactive but the freethinkers' circle is very active".

Of course, I am not opposed to the organisation of free-thinkers' circles, but I think that it would be better to make the nucleus more active.

In the C.P. of Czechoslovakia, the nucleus bureau at Poldihütte does nothing, nor does the fraction in the factory committee do anything. Only five out of the 28 members of the nucleus in the Prague Iron Works at Kladno do any work at all. The nucleus does not issue a factory newspaper.

I will not give any more examples of the bad work of the nuclei of the C.P. of Czecho-slovakia.

Why did I not describe the work of the nuclei in my own words? We have often spoken and written in detail of how a factory nuclei ought to work. Evidently we were not believed, because there has been no great success in this work as yet. I have quoted the documents of the Parties themselves. In these documents are clearly shown what good results are obtained when the factory nucleus works well (Renault factory) and how bad matters are in factories when the factory nucleus does not work or works badly. Yesterday, Comrade Thälmann pointed out that we cannot limit ourselves merely to nuclei in the factories and that we need also revolutionary delegates. We need to have feelers everywhere either in the form of factory committees or as revolutionary trade union delegates, or as delegates to anti-fascist conferences, etc. This is absolutely right and absolutely necessary. But if factories have no Party nucleus at all or if they have nuclei which work badly, i.e. the factory nuclei which are helpless and passive, how can they lead, direct, give the line, point out what to do, to the revolutionary delegates, to the delegates at anti-fascist conferences, groups of the trade union opposition and the Red Trade Unions and Red Factory Committees, or to other groups of mass proletarian organisations in the factories?

German practice (the rôle of the factory committees in 1923, when there were no factory nuclei) has shown that without nuclei revolutionary trade union delegates, factory committees and other mass organisations in the factories with very few exceptions, will be passive, they will not know what to do in most cases. Further, if there exists a smoothly working organisation of reformist and social democrats, many of the above mentioned revolutionary organisations will come under their influence and will be discredited in the eyes of the workers. When the workers elect anyone, they want to see his work. And if the revolutionary trade union delegates, the members of the factory committee, or if other organs elected by the workers, vote for the dismissal of workers, they will not have any authority among the workers.

Of course, it is not sufficient for nuclei to exist in the factories. It is necessary for them to work well. There have been cases when members and secretaries of factory nuclei have voted for the dismissal of workers in the factory committees while the nuclei have made no objection. The workers will avoid such nuclei which allow their members to vote in favour of dismissals. Such nuclei will scarcely be able to unite the delegates and other elected workers in the factory. We must activate the factory nuclei — the foundation of our organisations. The Party committees should lead, control and assist them in their difficult and important work.

In these factory nuclei, in spite of the fact that they are passive, there are deviations, both of a "left" sectarian character as well as of a right opportunist character. For example, there have been cases when members of a nucleus were not expelled for voting in favour of dismissals. Is not this opportunism in practice of the deepest dye? Or when members of factory nuclei will not talk to workers who are members of a social democratic party or with members of the reformist trade unions, will not carry on agitation among them and confine themselves merely to cursing them, on the ground that they are all fascised, that they have all become reactionaries, that all of them are Zörgiebels. Is not this the worst form of sectarianism? Of course, we cannot have any success among the worker members of the social democratic parties and the reformist trade unions if we do nothing but curse at them.

Only in one Communist Party — the C.P.G. — has any work been done to transfer the centre of activity to the factory, which does not mean, of course, that in this matter, everything is well with the German Party.

During the last election campaign, the C.P.G. transferred a great part of its activity to the factories, it organised meetings of workers in the factories themselves, and at factory gates. During the preparations for the metal workers' strike in Berlin,

the district Party organisations transferred workers' meetings far from the factories and the speakers will not be comrades into the factories or near them, and this gave tremendous results. But even during the strike, the work of the factory nuclei was not noticeable. It did not exist. I have a document, parts of which I will read, a document which was well written, which gives an excellent picture of what kind of work was done by the local Party organisations and groups of the T.U. opposition in this Berlin strike of 140,000 metal workers. It is in great detail, but **not a word** about the factory nuclei. I will only read a few of the most important parts of this document:

"After September 16th 1930, 79 factory newspapers were published (including 59 in the metal works)". (It does not say who published them.) "Leaflets were published by the nuclei" (which nuclei? Street nuclei or factory nuclei?) "22 of them with 51,000 copies. There were 94 factory meetings before the strike and 122 during the strike", (it does not show who called the meetings).

(Comrade Neumann: The strike committee).

"46 metal works discussed the question of the metal workers' strike. 177 manifestations took place in factories. There were 18 factory demonstrations. There were 131 sessions of Party and T.U. organs". But not of factory nuclei. Nothing is said of them in the report. But it says that "the street nuclei agitated at 78 factories and held 58 meetings". The factory nuclei in the factories which struck, evidently did not function at all. The other factory nuclei were not drawn into the struggle of the Berlin metal workers.

It is possible that the rôle of the factory nuclei was omitted from the document by accident, but the document speaks of everything in such great detail that it cannot be the case that its authors forgot to mention the rôle of the foundation of the Party — the factory nuclei —. It seems to me that the factory nuclei can function and should function even during a strike at their factory.

The same took place in the Ruhr province. When the miners' strike was being prepared, it turned out that many mines in which there were nuclei and groups of the revolutionary T.U. opposition, and on which we counted as certain strikers, did not strike, while mines which we did not count on at all as being likely to join the struggle and in which there were no nuclei and groups of the revolutionary T.U. opposition, struck. What does this show? It shows that we have not yet established good contact with the factories and therefore the pulse of life of the factories is not taken into consideration by many of the Party and revolutionary trade union organisations.

The factory nuclei and, after them, the revolutionary T.U. delegates, the groups of the T.U. opposition and the Red T.U.s are working badly for the additional reason that in many Communist Parties, Red Trade Unions and T.U. oppositions the chief campaigns are carried on apart from the factory nuclei, Red Trade Unions and groups of the T.U. opposition in the factories. The C.P.G. is the only Party which has organised courses for new members. But where were these courses organised? In street nuclei and not in factory nuclei. How could these new members, even if they work in factories, be asked to go into factory nuclei when they attend courses in the street nuclei, when they have already settled down and received some kind of duties in them. In his report, Comrade Chemodanov said: How does it come about that there are no Y.C.L. nuclei in places where there are factory nuclei? Comrade Chemodanov, it is just because most of the factory nuclei are passive and work badly. If there were properly functioning factory nuclei in the factories, there would be groups of the T.U. opposition, groups of the T.U. unity and Y.C.L. nuclei. It could not be otherwise. But as there are nuclei which work badly, they not only fail to form Y.C.L. nuclei but they do not even know the feelings of the workers.

I wish to say a little more about nuclei in war factories. This is a real problem at the present time. The revolutionary workers, the members of the Red trade unions and the T.U. opposition will be thrown out of them. Anyone who is connected with the Party to the slightest degree will be thrown out, if not immediately, then a little later. Therefore, the work must be organised in a different way in these factories than in other factories.

Maybe, we should decentralise the organisations in such factories, set up group of three, at the outside of five who appoint a representative for contact with the shop bureau of the factory nucleus. The nuclei will work mostly illegally, through the newspapers and leaflets. Meetings will be called not

far from the factories and the speakers will not be comrades who work in the factory. At such factories, a Party committee must be formed to which one member of the district committee or the town committee who is well acquainted with mass work, will be attached. These attached comrades must tirelessly direct this work. It is a thousand times worse to be thrown out of such factories than out of other factories, because it is harder to get into them than into other factories, even at times of good trade. The factory management and its spies will select reliable workers. But this does not mean that the groups of three or five, the shop bureau and the Party committees in these factories, must be passive and do nothing so that they will not be thrown out of the war factory. They would then be useless. They must be active so that their work will be felt, but so that it will not be known who is carrying on the work. A conveyor can carry proclamations as well as machine parts.

This problem must be raised and carefully studied by all Communist Parties. To remain without nuclei in war factories during a war, means to have omitted the most important thing.

Now I will give the propositions which I would formulate for the improvement of the work in the factories:

The Communist Parties are faced with the same tasks as last year: the transfer of the center of activity of trade union and Party work to the factories, for this task has not yet been out by far. For this it is necessary:

1) For the T.U. opposition and the Red T.U.s. to reconstruct their work on the basis of the factory.

2) To review all the street nuclei and remove from them all the workers who are working in factories, so as to strengthen the existing factory nuclei, and if they work in factories where there is no nucleus, then to form nuclei there.

3) Without giving up the efforts to attract the unemployed to the Party, the Y.C.L., the Red T.U.s. and the T.U. opposition, to increase to the maximum degree the recruiting of working men, women and youths for these organisations **directly from industry**, because the economic crisis is every day throwing the revolutionary workers more and more out of the factories. (There are very well drawn up statistics in the Berlin-Brandenburg district committee on the social composition of the members who are taken in by them. Everything is written in the greatest detail. But one thing is missing — which of the new members work in the factories and which of them do not. And this is tremendously important.) If we take in employed workers at the present time, this means that we get into industry at the time when every worker is thinking that tomorrow he may be dismissed. The workers are not confident that they will not be dismissed tomorrow. It is easy to work with such workers in industry. I do not mean by this that we should not accept unemployed workers. Unemployed workers should be accepted in all the organisations which are close to the Communist Party and into the Communist Party.

4) To pay attention to the improvement of the work in the existing nuclei, groups of Red T.U. and the T.U. opposition, and the organisation of Party nuclei, groups of the Red T.U.s and the T.U. opposition in the big factories and in the chief industries, in war factories, transport, chemical works, etc.

3. The Fluctuation of Membership in the Communist Parties and Red Trade Unions and its Causes.

How do matters stand with regard to fluctuations in the number of members?

In the C.P. of Germany there is a certain phenomenon which I do not know how to explain, namely, between December and January there are great variations in the number of members of the Party. The statistics on the number of members in the C.P. of Germany are drawn up on the number of paying members.

During the first half of 1928 there were on the average 118,579 members of the Party; in the second half of 1928 there were on the average 124,511 members. The difference between the first and the second half of 1928 was 5,454 members.

In May, 1929, there were 105,744; in October 98,527; in November 113,487 and in December there were 135,160. The difference between May and December was 29,416.

(Comrade Thälmann: Between Christmas and New Year's Day they do not pay membership dues).

As for 1930, the figures I have are contradictory, because those given by Comrade Kreutzburg, the

head of the Org. Dept. of the C.C. of the C.P.G., on January 30th, 1931 in his report to the E.C.C.I. do not correspond with those which were recently published by the Party press of the C.P.G. Evidently, the C.C. received additional information concerning the acceptance of new members by local organisations for October, November and December, only in February 1931.

In January 1930, there were 133,000 members paying membership dues, in May there were 121,000, in November—165,000 in December—176,000. (Yesterday, Comrade Thälmann gave the figure as 180,657 dues paying members at the end of December, 1930. This same figure appears in the Party press of the C.P.G.). The difference between January and December is 43,000, and between May and December it is 55,000. If we consider that in December there were 180,657 members, the difference between May and December will be 59,657 members. At the end of 1928, the C.P.G. had 124,511 members. In 1929 about 50,000 members were accepted. There should have been that year 174,000, but in December 1929, there were only 135,160 members. **This means that 39,000 persons left the Party.**

The fluctuations in 1930 are very striking if we take the figures by quarters. In the first quarter, 23,548 new members were accepted. In the second quarter, 15,588 were accepted; in the third quarter 39,106, and in the fourth quarter 64,844, a total of 143,056, i.e. more than there were in the C.P.G. at the beginning of the year. In January 1930, the Party had 133,000 dues paying members. It to this we add 143,056 who were accepted during 1930, we get 276,056. But at the end of December, there were only 180,657 members, which means that during 1930 the number of members who left the Party was 95,399. It is true that the number of new members who remain in the C.P.G.—47,657 members—is approximately as many as the total membership of the C.P.s of France, England and America together. But the tremendous number of 95,000 members went back.

There are very good symptoms during the last two months. Yesterday Comrade Thälmann said that at the end of February, the C.P.G. had 206,000 members. In December there were 180,657 members, in January 1931, 19,820 were accepted, in February evidently 5,523 were accepted which makes a total of 206,000 members. (I do not know exactly how many were accepted in February.) This means that fluctuations considerably decreased for these two months in 1931. Previously there was an increase from October to December because the Party members paid their membership dues better, but commencing with January there was a fall lasting till the middle of the year. Membership dues were paid most of all in the last two months of every year. If in January and February this year the number of members did not decrease, but on the contrary increased, it means that the fluctuations in January and February have grown less. If the C.P.G. can put a stop to fluctuations, it will obtain tremendous successes, because an inflow of 143,000 members during the course of one year shows that the Party has enormous attractive force. I think that some of the workers who left the Party could have been retained. I shall speak of this again.

The C.P.Cz. At the beginning of 1929, there were 81,432 members in the Party. This is a figure which the present leaders do not question. Previously they gave bigger figures. In October 1929 there were only 48,000. In the first quarter of 1930, there were 30,212, in April 24,000, in May 35,593, on July 1st, 1930 37,181, in the fourth quarter of 1930 there were 37,998. And now the Czech comrades say that they have about 40,000 members.

The number of members accepted this year is a secret. We do not know it. The number who left is also unknown to us. But I am convinced that there are great fluctuations in the C.P.Cz.

(Comrade Gottwald: 10%).

Gottwald says 10%, but I think that it is still more.

But even that is good, and the Party has scored a great success in ceasing to go downwards, and instead of that, has risen ever since April. I must say that if there is now an inflow of members into the Party and the trade unions, it is because the C.P.Cz. has worked well among the unemployed. The workers saw that this is the only Party which is really fighting for the proletariat, but not because the Red trade unions of Czechoslovakia have worked well. I would not say that. Let Comrade Zapotocky who is here tell us how work was carried on among the workers by the Red trade unions in 1930. It will be very useful.

C.P. of Great Britain. We have information from 6 districts out of 9. In the period from May to November 1930, 423 members joined these 6 districts and 518 left. Apparently things are slightly better in the C.P.G.B. now. It has accepted about 300 members more, but I do not know how many have left, and Comrade Pollitt did not say anything about this in his speech yesterday.

C.P.U.S.A. In October 1929, there were 8,800 members of the Party. From December 1929 to July 1930, 7,178 members were accepted. This means that there should be 15,978, but in July 1930, there were 10,768 members. Thus, 5,210 members left the Party (2,010 old members and 3,200 of the new members).

C.P. of France. I have no exact figures. We have had to search for the figures. The situation is as follows: In 1929 the Party had 45,000 members. In 1930 it had 38,240 members, in 1931 35,000 members. For the same years the Y.C.L. had: 1929 7,347 (the figure given by Comrade Chemodanov), in 1930 6,000 and in 1931 3,350 members. However, the C.P.F. is taking in new members all the time, and in spite of that it is going downwards. This is not only true of the Party and the Y.C.L. The same is taking place in the Red trade unions. I cannot give the exact figures for the fluctuations in the Red trade unions, but there are many documents speaking of a decline in membership, and the leading comrades of the unions openly talk about it. And this is taking place at a time when the proletariat of France are fighting, wish to fight, when a mass of strikes are spontaneously breaking out.

What are the causes of the fluctuations? Yesterday, Comrade Thälmann pointed out that fluctuations take place because the street nuclei and the factory nuclei work badly. I should like to extend this formulation. It is not only the nuclei which "work badly".

(Comrade Thälmann: They are one of the most important factors).

Of course, the nuclei should be the foundation of the Party. But in most cases the district committees and the town committees and the provincial committees work badly, and sometimes we may go even a little bit higher the C.C. (Laughter.)

(Comrade Thälmann: And still higher.) (Laughter.)

Comrade Thälmann points to us. I should be the last to say that I or comrades like me always do what is necessary at the right time to signalise mistakes in the work of the local party organisations of the Sections of the C.I. We are, however, guiltless of this sin. Commencing from 1924, we have all the time been saying and writing in the Party press and in the letters and documents to the C.C.s of the Communist Parties on the necessity of transferring the centre of activity of Party and trade union work into the factory and of the necessity of improving the work of all units of the Communist Parties, Red trade unions and the T.U. opposition. I can confirm that which Comrade Thälmann said yesterday and which we agreed upon long ago, namely, the conclusion that fluctuations are caused by bad work. I will try to prove this by documents from the C.P.s themselves.

One of the causes of fluctuation is undoubtedly **unemployment**. There is tremendous unemployment among Party members, even in Germany. If in Germany only 20 to 22% of the members of the Party in 1931 are working in factories, that means that 78 to 80% of the members are unemployed. They travel from district to district, from town to town, and part of the members are lost. But unemployment is not the chief reason for the fluctuations of the members. If all sections of the Party and trade union organisations worked well, it would be possible to attract the unemployed Party members into work at least among the unemployed, into the unemployed committees, give them Party papers, leaflets, etc. to distribute. They might be used on Party and trade union work and in this way we could keep contact with them. The chief cause of fluctuations among the members is undoubtedly the bad work of the Party and trade union organisations and organs.

Here is a short quotation from America:

"The comrades of the Chicago district, for example, point out that one of the sub-district organisations which includes the biggest industrial centres (e.g. St. Louis, with a population of over one million) carries on all the work itself and has not yet succeeded in forming a collective leadership in the form of sub-district committees with departments.

In a number of districts, the district organisers are approximately at the same level of development. In some sections such as Seattle, Kansas City, Butte, Denver, etc., the whole of the work of the organisations is on the shoulders of one person — the district organiser. He distributes the "Daily Worker", goes round to workers' houses, speaks at street and factory meetings, etc. The comrades here have not yet solved the question of how to bring in new elements to the work of the district organisation and in this way to improve and lighten the work of leadership."

Can we developed extensive activity of the Party organisations and deal with all the work if we organise in this manner? Of course not. Here is an extract from the report of Comrade Martin at the Secretariat of the C.C. of the C.P.F. (He was sent by the C.C. of the C.P.F. as an instructor in the coal district of Gard — the Languedoc Party district.) He writes: "Although I expressed my impressions of the coal district of Gard to the Secretary of the District Committee, it will also be useful to inform you of the situation of the Party organisation there. The situation is pitiful. There is no other district where we have such great possibilities of strengthening our organisation and where we have shown such a lack of ability to utilise the situation. Sixteen municipal councillors and twelve Unitarian miner delegates are representatives chiefly on paper, they do very little that is really practical if we look at their activity from the point of view of the Party line.

Our Party has not a solid basis in the factories. We have seats in the municipalities, but the Communist line is not carried on there.

The leadership of the district is extremely weak. The Secretariat has no authority among the elected representatives, nor influence among the masses.

... The miners' delegates have much free time which could be used by the Party organisation. However, nothing is done in this direction.

... The delegates regularly put questions to the miners. Then they write a report to the prefect, and that is all. If the prefect does not reply to the report, the delegates writes another letter.

... During the catastrophes at Alsdorf and Saar I demanded that the question of these catastrophes should be put on the agenda of all nuclei, the trade union sections, and factory meetings, and that this question should be examined from the point of view of the general situation of the miners at Gard. However, this was not done.

... It would be difficult to have a more favourable platform for a trade union and Party campaign, in order to form committees of struggle. However, nothing was done... The chief blame belongs to the leaders of the trade union and the leaders of the district Party organisation. No one gives the necessary directives to the delegates.

... Our municipal councils are scandalous. No one can distinguish them from the bourgeois municipal councils. There is no Communist work. In the Communist municipalities inertness and passivity is so great that the priests have a predominating influence. The district Party organisation which does not give the necessary directives is chiefly to blame."

The situation in the Eastern and the Lyons Party districts and in the Troyes district is not much better. I have here the reports from many Party districts which were sent to the C.C. I will not read them all, I will only give a few excerpts from the documents of the Paris Party District. I will give extracts from the discussion at a session of the bureau of the Paris Party district on February 25th 1931 on the trade union question.

The Secretary of the Paris district, Comrade Selor, said: "You have not yet made business-like preparations for a struggle. The work is being carried on badly. You have lost members and in addition there remain tendencies to work passively. For the taxi-drivers at the end of September 1930 we proposed at one meeting to form a commission to work out the demands for the abolition of the percentage basis of pay. And what have we done all this time since the end of September? The question has not even been raised before the workers.

... Among the leather workers and fur workers, we agreed to put forward the usual annual demands of the bootmakers when the busy season starts. What is the situation now? The time when these demands should have been put forward has been allowed to pass.

... I should add that the demands have nowhere been passed on to the masses. During the last few months, nothing has been done anywhere to form a strike fund.

Conclusion: phraseology, wordiness, are becoming ever more deeply rooted. This must cease. Otherwise the situation for us will be the same as in August, i.e. our work will be empty and we shall not make an effective step towards the preparation of struggles."

This was said by the secretary of the Paris region, Comrade Selor. I think that comments would be superfluous. At the same session, Comrade Semard stated: "In the 20th district organisation (Paris District) and in the trade union movement, no advance has been made because we have not been able to overcome our weakness from the point of view of organisation and the leadership of the work.

... All this arises from the fact that we are badly lagging behind from the point of view of our methods in the trade union movement."

After all this, can we wonder that—

"... in previous years we had no time to change the membership cards for the navvies because the comrades came to the trade union office in such great numbers. This year on the contrary the comrades do not come to us" (these are the words of Arachard, from the minutes of the District Bureau of the Paris Party district on January 13, 1931), and that "... the membership of the 20th district Party organisation of the Paris district has fallen. We are finishing the year with a reduction of 20 000 supporters".

These are not my words. It is the statement of Comrade Murrat from the minutes of the District Bureau of the Paris Party on December 23, 1930.

One more small quotation from the report of the instructor of the E.C.C.I.:

"The leaders of the Paris district without question must carry on a great deal of work, because the district gives the impression that it has been without any leadership until very recently. It is true that Selor is now there and he takes his work seriously".

I could quote similar documents from all the Parties of the Comintern in capitalist countries. Neither the Communist Parties nor the T.U. opposition and the Red Trade Unions, nor the Y.C.L. with few exceptions, have yet succeeded in utilising to the necessary extent the growing dissatisfaction of the worker and peasant masses in connection with the world economic and agrarian crisis, owing to the insufficient or bad work of the local Party, T.U., Y.C.L. and other kindred organisations. Therefore, it is not wonder that there is such a great fluctuation in the membership of all Communist Parties, Y.C.L. organisations, Red Trade Unions and other mass organisations.

In the C.P.G. measures have been taken to reduce fluctuations. The mere fact that short courses have been organised for new members, which has not been done by any other Party, at any rate I do not know of any, attracts a large proportion of the members into the work. But in other Parties unfortunately this does not take place. Hundreds of thousands of non-Party workers actively assist the Communist Party in election campaigns and during strikes, but many of them have not yet joined the Party and the Red Trade Unions. Many of them who do enter the C.P. and the Red Trade Unions, afterwards leave them because they expect from these organisations militant activity, while in many cases our organisations function badly.

What should be done to reduce fluctuations?

1. Improve the work of the nuclei, district committees, town committees and provincial committees.
2. Set practical work for the new members.
3. Form circles and short for the new members.
4. Instruct the C.C.s. of the C.P.s. to study the causes of fluctuations and to remove all causes which make it impossible for Party members to remain in it.
5. Reconstruct the system of statistics of Party members in such a way that it will be seen how many members are in the Party, how many pay membership dues, and, chiefly, **how many have been drawn into active Party work.** The greater the proportion drawn into Party work, the smaller will be the proportion of those who leave the Communist Party. We can and must keep such statistics.

The general conclusions from all that I have said to-day are as follows:

a) The bad work of the Party organisations increases fluctuations and prevents us from bringing in the militant revolutionary workers.

b) The absence of a great change in the matter of transferring the centre of activity of Party and T.U. work to the factories does not really make it possible for the C.P.s., the Red Trade Unions and the T.U. Opposition to fight against the influence of the social democrats and reformists in the factories, to enlarge their membership by an inflow of workers from the factories, to know the feelings of the workers, to organise the struggle against the attack of the capitalists. When the active elements of the C.P., the Red Trade Unions and the T.U. Opposition are removed by the bourgeoisie during the time of war, the only possibility for successful work in the industrial centres, in the factories, will be on condition that there are well functioning nuclei (the revolutionary delegates in Berlin during the world war of 1914-18 carried on a tremendous amount of work, and they showed how necessary it is to have revolutionary organisations in the factories).

c) The absence of strong and energetic committees and councils of the unemployed and of systematic work among

them — abstract slogans and abstract agitation among the unemployed, the prevalence of demonstrations while other forms and methods of concrete work are not adopted — does not make it possible to organise the broad masses of workers for the struggle, to recruit them into the Red Trade Unions, the T.U. opposition and other mass organisations and into the Party.

d) In view of the weakening of the work in the reformist and other trade union organisations, the absence of the systematic publication of factory papers and the wide distribution of the Party press which, unfortunately, does not increase but decreases, we have not been able organisationally to seize on the growing political influence of the Party among the masses.

e) We must make determined efforts to abolish these phenomena which prevent us bringing about a real change in Party work, in the work of the Y.C.L., the Red T.U.s. and the T.U. opposition, so that the Comintern, the Profintern and all their Sections will be able successfully to organise, lead and carry to victory the proletariat in the coming struggles against the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, for the dictatorship of the proletariat.