

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

(Published twice monthly).

Vol. VIII. No. 18.

Workers Library Publishers.
P.O. Box 148, Station D, New York.

November 1st, 1931

CONTENTS

	Page
FROM OPPOSITION TO THE REVOLU- TIONARY CLASS STRUGGLE	546
VACILLATIONS AND WEAKNESS WHICH WE SHOULD NOT TOLERATE	553
FRANKFURT AND BRISTOL	557
FIFTIETH BIRTHDAY OF KUUSINEN	562
THE MINORITY IN THE DOCK By Lozovsky	563
PARTY ORGANISER By V. Pavlova	580
THE SPLIT IN THE ALL-INDIAN TRADE UNION CONGRESS	583

TEN CENTS

FROM OPPOSITION TO THE REVOLUTIONARY CLASS STRUGGLE

THE events in England are attracting the attention of the whole international working-class. The struggle of the British proletariat arouses the warmest sympathy and enthusiasm of every honest worker of all nations and countries.

At the present time a world-wide, historical turn is developing in the workers' movement and the entire bourgeois state apparatus in England, which has already been maturing for more than a decade. The workers in mass demonstrations, in collisions and fights with the police are ridding themselves of their deep-rooted illusion—belief in Parliament, in parliamentary power, in the leaders of the respectable parliamentary opposition and powerful trade unions, who, in conversations with the capitalists and at their congresses "defend" the interests of the working-class movement.

Since the war, out of their own bitter experience, the working masses of England have seen more than once that "their" organisations do not function quite as they should, that very often they turn against the working-class. "Black Friday," 1921, the treachery of the leaders in 1926, already caused the working masses to be on the alert, but the "leaders" were not only capable of explaining to the working masses that there was no betrayal, but were able to prepare the road for still further and even viler treacheries. "Never Again"—such was the lesson which the "leaders" hammered into the consciousness of the masses after the heroic struggle of 1926, just as after the defeat of 1921. The path of class struggle and strikes is no good, what is needed is "peace in industry" and a "Labour" Government.

The experience of the first and second "Labour" Governments and the policy of "Industrial Peace" have taught the masses a great deal. The working-class received nothing from "Labour" Governments. On the contrary, the period of the second "Labour" Government was a period of acute economic crisis and attacks on the working-class. The working masses were relying on the fact that "their" Government would be the bulwark against the attempts of the bourgeoisie to transfer the burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of the proletariat. However, they saw in actuality that the "Labour" Government, according to the admission of the bourgeoisie itself, was the best weapon for conducting the capitalist attack against the workers. In the powerful strike actions of the textile workers, of the miners in 1930-31, the working masses showed that they no longer depend solely on "their" "Labour" Government and turn to the experienced path of class struggle, even against the desires and decisions of the "Labour" Government.

But these actions took place, in the main, within the framework of the existing reformist trade union organisations, although against the wishes of the trade union bureaucrats. The strikes of the miners of Cumberland and Scotland, the strike in South Wales, and a number of other strike actions were already an indication of the rapidly approaching tremendous revolutionary class actions of the British proletariat.

The working-class, on the basis of experience, has become convinced that there is no fundamental difference between the various named Governments which lead the bourgeois dictatorship, that there is no basic difference between the policies of these Governments and the policy of the trade union bureaucrats, that in the decisive moment, both will turn directly against the workers' movement, will disorganise its struggle, prepare its defeat, lower wages, and the standard of living, by adopting police terror.

The Labour Party and the trade union leaders in 1926 prepared the defeat of the General Strike and the strike of the miners. The second Labour Government in 1931 in conjunction with the reformist trade union leaders, lowered the wages of the textile workers, miners, railwaymen, etc., put into operation the first cut in unemployment benefit amounting to £5½ million sterling. In reply to this united attack of capital, the Labour Government and the trade union bureaucrats, the workers entered into more militant and independent actions. This forced the bourgeoisie and its reformist lieutenants to consider a change of tactics, hitherto unparalleled in the history of Great Britain, for the operation of further and new attacks on the standards of the masses.

Already since the spring of 1931, the bourgeoisie was preparing the general attack on the working-class. The whole forces of the bourgeoisie have been mobilised to this end. If the bourgeois Press and politicians proved the necessity of "great sacrifices," if they proved that high wages and social expenditure have a "devastating influence" on industry, on the whole of "national economy" then, the "Labour" Government, on its side, with the participation of these economists, created "commissions" for the official confirmation of the justification of the campaigns of the bourgeoisie, and for the working out of practical proposals for sacrifices.

According to the proposals of these commissions, the "Labour" Government deprived thousands of unemployed of benefit, decreasing the benefit by millions of pounds. On the basis of the May Report the Labour Government was prepared to carry through the merciless "economy measures" of £56,000,000, but the Labour Party and the General

Council, being in power, knew full well that now it was not a question of the last act of the widespread attack of capital, but only the first serious blow at the working-class; that this was only the commencement of an attack on a hitherto unknown scale by the bourgeoisie which was preparing to clutch at the throat of the working masses with the skeleton hand of hunger. Therefore the Labour Party and the Trade Union Congress, feeling that their position was becoming very shaky, that the bourgeoisie, no matter how much it vilified them as opponents, quoted them highly on the political exchange, and above all, anxious about their mass support, went over into the opposition. "MacDonald saved the Nation." "Henderson saved the Labour Party in order ultimately to save the Nation"—thus the Labour Lord Sankey defined the basis of the family split in the "Labour" Party and its manoeuvres.

But the crisis proved to be more serious and the working masses had learned something. Therefore, it was found to be impossible to save capitalism simply by cunning parliamentary manoeuvres.

The development of the world economic crisis showed that British capitalism is one of the weakest economic links in the chain of the strongest economic links of imperialism. More than once Lenin has proved that one of the beneficial effects of crises is that they expose all that is decaying, unmask all that is outworn, all that is false, and reveals all "that is." The world economic crisis exposed the complete bankruptcy of capitalism, as never before, its antagonism to the interests of the broad masses, its savage morale, its antagonism to all progress.

The monopolist decay of this system has reached fantastic heights: the bourgeoisie itself cries about the "stupid" "inexplicable" acts of destruction of commodities which are needed by millions. The *Times* in a panic writes that nothing can justify these actions in the eyes of the man in the street. But these actions of the Government of the United States of America, in destroying cotton harvests, the closing of oil wells by armed force, the actions of the Brazilian and Canadian Governments in destroying tremendous quantities of coffee and wheat, are only more absurd and screaming facts of the monopolist, predatory, character of capitalism.

And what will the *Times* say about the fact that two-thirds of the heavy industry of England, Germany and the United States of America stand completely idle, and that half of the basic industrial workers, starving, without work, wander about in the streets, past shops and stores bursting with unsold stocks. The crisis has unmasked the unprecedented deep decay of monopolist capitalism.

And England stands in the forefront of this decay. Thirty-six per cent. of the national income goes into the hands of the rentiers. Half of the huge State budget of 7½ milliard gold roubles goes into the

pockets of the rentiers, in the form of payment of interest on the War Loan. The income from the foreign investments of capital, i.e., which in the main goes into the hands of the same large rentier class, comprises a similar amount and in its time covered the whole deficit of the trade balance, being equal to half the value of export goods.

Only an insignificant, barely a hundredth part of the internal investments of capital are in the basic industries, coal, iron and steel.

This will appear fantastic to every Soviet worker, but such are the economics of decaying capitalism. Is it surprising after this that the crisis thus shakes England?

In general, the national income of the country has decreased by one-quarter. Exports have fallen and the weight of the imperialist expenditure and decay has increased to a tremendous degree. As a result of the fall in prices the income of the rentiers has grown by 20 to 30 per cent. The same applies in relation to expenditure on armaments and payments of war debts to America.

Taxation on industry has increased, which burden the bourgeoisie immediately attempted to transfer on to the shoulders of the industrial workers, lowering their wages and carrying on a campaign of mass dismissals. The decrease in exports by 50 per cent. is by no means accompanied by a similar decrease in imports, for the rentiers could purchase, not less, but even more. The decrease in imports was in the main on account of the importation of raw materials and semi-manufactured goods into industry. On the other hand, the world crisis "froze" the billions of foreign British investments.

The income from hundreds of millions of investments of capital completely ceased from Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Chili, Germany, etc. The development of the world crisis compelled countries holding capital in London banks to make hasty withdrawals and the general tightening of the London money market on this basis, led to the panic-stricken flight of capital from the English banks and to the fall of the gold standard.

The insurmountable effect of deep imperialist decay which received a powerful impetus from the imperialist war and its results, on the basis of the deepening of the world economic crisis, led to the unprecedented upheaval of the whole of British imperialism, exposed the whole of its decay, the instability of its economic basis, opening out a real, new epoch of the deepening world crisis.

The repercussions—up to the moment mainly economic—of the British crisis, are felt throughout the whole world, both in the vassal countries of Britain and in the centres, Paris and New York.

In France they talk of the danger of inflation. In the United States, as far back as the middle of August,

they wrote about the dangers of inflation and the partial beginnings of a credit inflation.

During the month of October, discount percentages of the Federal Banks increased from $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 3 per cent. in a few days. The discount percentages in the Paris banks also increased.

Like an echo of this hitherto unknown sharpening of the crisis is the occupation of Manchuria by Japanese imperialism, actually the dividing up of China, the lamentations of the capitalist Press of the whole world that the ungrateful workers must participate once again in the sacrifices demanded by the crisis. The new attack of capital hangs over the whole world.

On the eve of the 14th Anniversary of the November Revolution, when the land of Soviets is on the upward grade, opening up giants of industry never before seen in the whole development of capitalism, there is a summing up of fourteen years of development of two programmes, two systems, the proletarian programme which was first outlined by Lenin in the "Threatening catastrophe and how to struggle against it" and the capitalist programme, outlined by the Versailles robbers. And what? Russia through the proletarian revolution found the way out of the catastrophe, restored industry, is constructing industry, is carrying through complete collectivisation and goes forward at an unheard-of pace.

The capitalist world, unable even to liquidate the post-war crisis, entered a sphere of unprecedented sharpening of the crisis, dragging through the swamp of catastrophe.

As in 1917, the question of the threatening catastrophe and how to struggle against it again appears before the whole of the international working-class, and can there now be any doubt that the struggle against it can only be along the path of Lenin, along the path being realised now by the Bolshevik Party, the C.P.S.U., under the leadership of Comrade Stalin?

However, the English boss class, like that of the whole world, thought the exact opposite. It met the fresh intensification of the crisis by a widespread, general economic and political attack on the working-class, accompanying this with parliamentary machinations of greater and less importance, sensational rumours and re-alignments of forces. The Labour Party as a whole, under Henderson, went into opposition, but another section of the leadership of the Labour Party, under MacDonald, proclaimed a "National Government." The opposition from its very inception adopted an attitude of "pure" opposition, making use of every demagogic trick known to it. The liberal *Manchester Guardian* sounded the alarm, declaring that "This was class war," not yet understanding the significance of these words, but seeing behind the opposition the growing revolt and struggle of the masses of the workers.

Henderson, in concert with the boss class set himself the task of stemming the rising wave of working-class revolt against the Economy Bill. However, notwithstanding the demagogy of the opposition, its manœuvres did not succeed as those who instigated them had wished. These manœuvres have already come to nought.

Just before the abandonment of the gold standard, powerful mass demonstrations under the leadership of the Communist Party involving clashes with the police, broke out all over the country. To the rising wave of the workers' offensive in London, Liverpool, Glasgow and Dundee, was added the historic action of the sailors of the Atlantic Fleet, making it clear that the staggering economies had made themselves felt, albeit unevenly and in different ways in all class relations and in every part of the imperialist State. The Communist Party, though sometimes lagging dangerously in the rear, managed to place itself at the head of the masses, adopting the correct line of proletarian struggle. It exposed the theory behind the "economies," the "necessity for balancing the budget," etc. Whose budget was it? Whose economies? it asked. The physicians who sought to cure capitalism were sitting in the Second International. The working-class did not want to cure capitalism but to bury it. "Not a penny from the workers, the unemployed, the sailors, the soldiers, the teachers!" "Down with the National Government!" "A United Front of the Militant Workers!" These were the slogans under which the Communist Party rallied the workers to struggle against the attacks of the capitalists and exposed the manœuvres of the opposition. Henderson is doping the workers with parliamentary opposition and talk of a "third Labour Government" at the very same time as MacDonald is going through their pockets. There are two thieves, but one of them is shouting "Stop, thief."

Neither the formation of a National Government nor yet the carrying out of measures of economy at the expense of the workers could even arrest the swift development of the crisis. Equally, first fifty, and then eighty million sterling of credit from France and the U.S.A. availed nothing. The drain of capital increased catastrophically before September 21st. The Government then went off the gold standard, thus destroying the basic unit of world monetary relations. The abandonment of the gold standard was a blow to the "opposition." Lo! and behold, the T.U.C., Henderson and the "left" I.L.P.ers had been shrieking for a long time that this would be the salvation of the working-class! The boss class, with perfect understanding of the opposition, had pointed out to it that the abandonment of the gold standard was, beyond doubt, the easiest way of attacking the workers but that, at the same time, it meant striking a crushing blow at the position of London as a centre

of world credit and finance. The boss class wanted to carry through their general attack on the working-class by two methods: by the method of direct reduction of wages and benefits and by the method of an indirect reduction of wages and benefits by tariffs and taxes so that, while taking from the workers no less than they would have done by inflation, they would avoid touching the rentiers (shareholders) and save the pound sterling.

The catastrophic intensification of the crisis united the plans of all the basic groupings of the ruling class and drove them to further manœuvres. The intensification of the crisis narrowed the manœuvres of the opposition. One of its trump cards was taken from it by the abandonment of the gold standard. This had to be withdrawn from the demands of the opposition because it had already been put into practice by the Government and so Henderson was compelled to congratulate the Government on this score. But the plans of the opposition are still more dangerously exposed as it rapidly becomes clear to the workers that the abandonment of the gold standard is merely one of the three aspects of a furious attack on the working-class by the boss class and by no means a means of saving it. Already there is a rise in the price of those commodities for which there is a widespread demand, and speculation in such commodities is in process. The powerful retailers have already begun to pilfer from the workers' household budget. Only yesterday the opposition, reflecting that its plans of going off the gold standard had been forestalled and that this plan must therefore now be abandoned, to cut its losses, passes over lightly to a plan to rob the working-class by means of import tariffs, but to-day it suddenly appears in a position where it had no small disagreement with the National Government and the Conservatives, even in words, since so far as plans are concerned it has been rapidly forced to arm itself as best as it can. Again, if it is possible to rob the workers to a sufficient extent through inflation, the opposition will be able to attack a "full" plan of tariffs, uniting on this platform with the Liberals. A lesser political personage, one Brailsford, found nothing else to say than that inflation would really be put into operation when the I.L.P. came to "power."

Items in programmes have changed places as Governments and oppositions have done, but the class war line remains all the time. Following on the accepted projects of "economy" calculated to amount to £70,000,000 in the current and £170,000,000 in the coming budgetary year, following on immediate wage reductions for millions of workers and the formation of an army of unemployed three million strong, the boss class proceeds at once to a lowering of the standards of life of the *whole* working-class by means of inflation and higher prices, and prepares a draft of a programme of high import tariffs which will

increase the cost of living by 10 to 20 per cent. and lower real wages and benefits correspondingly. In spite of this at the very same time the whole boss class is conducting a furious campaign on the necessity for further "economies" and on the necessity of giving the future Government a "doctor's mandate." MacDonald and the Conservatives are asking for a "free hand" to proceed with any measures in the interests of "economy" and the salvation of England. The boss class is merely developing a general attack on the working-class. Alternative measures of economy are accompanied by an intensification of the crisis and calls for the necessity of yet sterner measures of economy at the expense of the working-class and those who work in general.

With regard to primary, general requirements, the idea that inflation would quickly help to raise exports and diminish imports, would constitute a favourable monetary balance in place of the threatened deficit and stabilise the pound, has been followed by swift disillusionment. The pound is falling, prices are rising, and so is unemployment. The world crisis is intensifying, rivalry grows stronger, markets totter, and there will be no exclusive safety for British imperialism in the roaring tide of world economic crisis. "We are traversing a critical period such as there is in every century of development, the events of the next few years determine the direction of our future development for the next hundred years," declares the *Times* in alarm. "If nothing really decisive happens," declared Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, "capitalism must finally collapse in the near future, perhaps in the course of the coming year." "It is not possible to save the situation by the imposition of tariffs alone," announce the whole of the boss classes. "I ask for a doctor's mandate" (the right to do anything to stop the course of the disease) declares MacDonald. "National unity is required, we need a National Government" cries the boss-class. But here the bourgeoisie has not come to a definite decision on this question for the immediate future and stands in uncertainty before the problem as to whether they need "their own" opposition for carrying out the whole of the attack on the workers. Which is best for the bosses, for the strengthening of their class position in the country, for weakening the resistance of the workers? Which is the least dangerous? to draw the Labour Party into open class co-operation with them, or keep it in the rôle of opposition, to confuse the masses of the workers?

Throughout all these manœuvres and confusion, yet more clear and distinct is the line assigned to the Communist Party and the militant struggle of the working-class. From parliamentary opposition and trade unionism being the main stream of labour activity in England and only occasional inclinations towards revolutionary currents and advances, *the*

working-class is making a turn towards revolutionary class struggle. This turn is expressed by mighty mass offensives. The century-old traditions of England and of the English type of submission of the Labour Movement to the interests of the boss-class are broken. This process has only begun, but it is progressing rapidly. Tens and hundreds of thousands of workers in the course of a few days paraded the streets, compelling the police to build barricades in the roads. Considering the lack of strength and numerical weakness of the Communist Party, these movements taking place under its leadership show what vast stores of revolutionary energy and discontent have accumulated in the working-class. The opposition is doing all it can to destroy and disorganise this movement. This movement has not yet touched the broad masses in the reformist organisations but is an alternative to them. The great majority of those who have taken part in the movement up till now, though by no means all, are unemployed workers. But an attack on the whole working-class without exception is developing. The later demonstrations have shown an increase in the participation of employed workers and their families. In the first instance, the movement is proceeding under economic slogans but it is directed against the policy of the National Government, the manœuvres of the opposition and is under the leadership of the Communist Party. If the police baton workers demonstrating before the National Parliament and at the Trade Union Congress at Bristol, they are at the same time arresting Communists, and making raids on the offices of the *Daily Worker*, the organ of the C.P.G.B.

The boss-class strives to beat down the working-class in its attack, but cannot avoid at the same time strengthening its attempts to resist this; while splitting the working-class through its social-fascists agents, it cannot at the same time avoid driving the working-class along the path to revolutionary unity. The formation of a united front on the basis of an intelligible revolutionary programme of partial and more broadly revolutionary demands of the working-class in industry, the trade unions, and labour exchanges, the formation of a united front of workers, soldiers, sailors and poorly-paid employees, in a struggle against the general attack of the boss-class, such is the problem of the Communist Party.

The working-class has answered in a friendly way to the invitation of the Communist Party. The exasperation of the masses is so great that they are showing such resistance to the police and their baton charges that the boss-class has been forced to resort to manœuvres with the intention of disorganising and splitting the movement, adopting flexible tactics of repression and waiting, intensification of the attack and a few compromises. As in the case of the mutiny

of the Atlantic Fleet, it wishes to strike a decisive attitude and make a decisive attack without meeting decisive resistance. But the growth of resistance to it shows that the bourgeoisie is indulging itself in vain with such hopes. It is not chance that the "opposition" is changing its tactics with exceeding rapidity, passing over from the tactic of more active disorganisation of the movement and attack of the workers, and at the same time not discarding such an instrument of disorganisation as parliamentary opposition, a demagogic attack on the banks and a demand for public control in basic spheres of economy, etc. It is only through such manœuvres that the workers are seeing its real face.

The Communist Party steps forward with a clear programme of action. It does not fear the elections, explaining to the workers both their significance and the tasks of the working-class as a whole in the elections. However, the principal and fundamental task of the Party is the mobilisation of the masses of the workers for an open struggle against the attacks of capital. The millions are listening to the Party now and are being drawn towards it. The influx into the Party has increased till it has almost reached mass proportions and the circulation of the Party paper, *The Daily Worker*, is rapidly increasing. The Party is turning its attention to the workers in industry and in the trade unions. It summons the workers to the fight, to take the struggle into their own hands, to take the leadership of the trade unions into their own hands. It proposes a very broad united front, mercilessly exposing the "lefts." It steps forward in defence of wages and unemployment benefit, it demands increased taxation of the bankers, capitalists, landed proprietors, it demands exemption from taxation, direct and indirect, of all workers and less well-paid salary earners. It steps forward against tariffs and taxes which threaten the food and clothing of the proletariat and working people in general; it demands immediate suspension of new military commitments and a trenchant reduction in expenditure on the armed forces, the confiscation of the goods of powerful speculators, their severe punishment, and the free distribution of their goods to the most necessitous workers.

The Party is developing a revolutionary Soviet programme as the way out of the crisis, exposing also on the basis of this programme the "way out of the crisis" of the "left" hypocrites of the I.L.P. and the reactionary leaders of the trade unions and the Labour Party and all the bourgeois parties especially the Conservatives. By this method the Party is mobilising the working-class in defence of wages and unemployment benefit and simultaneously rallying it for a counter-offensive against the boss-class and its Government. The Party will put itself at the head of the workers and lead them finally through meetings, demonstrations and strikes right up to mass

political strikes, a general strike and decisive battles. A necessary preliminary to these decisive battles is the destruction of the reformists in the course of extending the struggle and the transformation of the C.P.G.B. into a mass Party.

Before the English working-class and its advance-guard lie problems of universal historical significance which are of great difficulty and complexity. The British boss-class has centuries of experience behind it, of struggle against the revolution and in disorganisation of the working-class movement, in subduing it to its interests. For these purposes it has designed and perfected all the necessary apparatus. It has subjected those millions strong working-class organisations created by the growth of the workers' movement, the Labour Party and the trade unions, to its interests on an economic basis of imperialist oppression and corruption. Combining a policy of the knout and gingerbread, a policy of sharing its loot, and tyranny, and by adopting a combination of all these expedients, the boss-class has been able to isolate and break up the vanguard of the working-class. This latest manœuvre of making use of the "National Government" and the "National Opposition" is one of its methods of disorganising the working-class front. Under such circumstances there arise before the Communist Party complicated problems which call for a high level of political understanding and leadership in the movement, knowledge of how to mobilise the whole of the forces of the Party, knowledge of how to exploit all the possibilities for mass revolutionary work and above all, knowledge of how to win over the workers in the industries and trade unions.

The Party, from the very beginning, took the correct line of mobilising the masses for the struggle against the National Government and exposing the opposition. The manœuvres of the boss-class consisted in heading off the discontent of the masses by its own guaranteed "opposition" at the head of which was the T.U.C. The tactics of the opposition consisted on the one hand of making attacks on the "Economy Bill" and on the other hand retaining the masses within the framework of the parliamentary struggle against the "Economy Bill" and doping them with hopes that a "third" Labour Government on the principle of "Equality of Sacrifice" will repair all the iniquities caused by the National Government.

A very important constituent element of these manœuvres and tactics is the "left" programme of the I.L.P., Brailsford, and their like. Feeling that the masses of the workers remembered perfectly well all the actions of this rehash of an opposition (in spite of Graham's dictum that the workers have short memories) and were not ready to take the path of pardoning them for their sins, the I.L.P.'ers took upon themselves the rôle of friendly critics of the right leaders and propagandists for a "real" Labour

Government operating with an independent parliamentary majority.

In addition to this the I.L.P. leaders applied themselves with special zeal to the exploitation of the feelings of the masses against the bankers and big capitalists, putting forward a demand for control over the banks and the investment of capital, etc. Brailsford even achieved such virtuosity as a "demand" to conquer power *for* the working-class. All this thunder on the "left" had for its purpose the retention of the most militant and revolutionary-minded workers within the limits of parliamentary opposition.

The Communist Party had therefore, from the very beginning, to place before the workers the question of how to mobilise the workers for *rapid extra-parliamentary mass offensives*. Every worker felt that the boss-class was making an onslaught on his vital interests, wages, unemployment benefit, etc. Henderson came forward and told him to "wait for a third Labour Government." Brailsford, following him, hastened to add that "If you have no trust in a third Labour Government in consequence of your experiences with the two former, then vote for us 'the lefts,' since the whole trouble lay in the fact that in the two former Labour Governments there were right and even reactionary leaders such as MacDonald and Thomas, but we are not like them. Is not our programme all right? Is it not 'leftist'?"

The Communist Party had thus especially at the beginning to concentrate all its forces of agitation and slogans on a rapid *defence* of unemployment benefit and wages. The Party accomplished this by its well-known programme of "not a penny from the workers." It had to deprive the "lefts" of the opportunity to *talk down* the workers by discussions of the best programmes of "economy," the way out of the crisis, etc. The Party had to make it clear to the workers that the chief thing to-day is mass struggle. The sailors' offensive brilliantly reinforced the correctness of the proletarian tactics of the Party. For these purposes, the Party had to keep back at the beginning of the struggle the broad programme of slogans of the counter-offensive of the working-class and link up the propaganda of the revolutionary way out of the crisis in the first instance with the exposure of the left parliamentary way out of the I.L.P. The programme of "Not one penny from the workers" was in itself a revolutionary programme under the circumstances, and was at this stage the fundamental question of the class struggle and the best means of exposing the opposition.

For the exposure of the opposition, the Party had to reckon with the frame of mind of the masses of the workers, especially their confidence in the T.U.C., and the Labour Party which the opposition was trying to strengthen, and renew by their latest manœuvre. Thus the Party quite correctly proceeded to the tasks of exposing the opposition to the masses of the

workers, of severing the workers from it by open attacks—on the basis of mobilisation of the masses against the policy and measures of economy of the National Government. Putting the question of “not a penny from the workers” as the chief question of the class struggle at the given moment, putting the question of the National Government as the chief enemy, the Party opened for itself the path to the formation of a broad, revolutionary single, militant front, of an approach to every worker and to the exposure of the opposition. Although the slogan of “not a penny from the workers” is the slogan of every worker, on the other hand even Brailsford, the “leftist,” refused unity in the struggle with the Communists on this platform.

By this means, the masses of the workers, on the basis of mobilisation round the programme of “not a penny from the workers,” were induced to understand that the opposition is the agent of the boss-class, that the struggle against the National Government in alliance with the opposition is impossible, that the struggle against the attack of the capitalists has to be a struggle against the opposition.

The Party grasped the most important link in the chain in the given situation. However, there was a series of weaknesses in the campaign of the Party, the surmounting of which is an important preliminary to the further development of the struggle.

The most important weakness in the struggle of the Party is that the Party has won no confidence in the industrial undertakings, that the workers in industry are as yet almost untouched by the movement and the campaign of the Party. Without doubt the winning over of the industrial workers is a very difficult task. For this reason it is yet more necessary to underline the insignificance of what has been done in this direction. Here is where it is necessary to make a decisive turn. It is essential, surmounting opportunist resistance to these lines of work, at one and the same time to study very carefully the accumulated experience available and also search for new forms which this work can take.

The second weakness is work in the trade unions. Here great difficulties have to be surmounted. In the trade unions not only is trade union democracy rudely crushed both directly and formally, e.g., when militant workers are expelled from the union, or when trade union bureaucrats over-ride decisions in contradiction to the clearly and freely expressed vote of the rank and file, but also, what is still more important, *the masses of the workers generally are not attracted to, but are divorced from the life and work of the trade unions.* Thus before the Party stands a double task, albeit a single aim and object, namely, to strengthen the existing work in the trade unions on the one hand and on the other hand to increase the participation and activity of the masses of the workers in the trade unions beginning with the most

elementary forms of this activity, trade union meetings, with the aim of getting the workers to take the trade union organisations into their own hands and throw out the treacherous bureaucracy from the leadership of the struggle. This task is an exceedingly difficult one and bound up with work in the industries and unemployed organisations. The Party has had some experience in trade union work, but this work has been carried out by legalist and opportunist methods. Circumstances dictate and give the Party an excellent opportunity at present to develop broad revolutionary mass work in the trade unions.

We are not yet speaking of such weaknesses in the campaign of the Party as the completely inadequate explanation of the line and slogans of the Party not only to the masses of the workers and to a great extent in the *Daily Worker*, but also even within the Party itself.

With the abandonment of the gold standard there has developed a very widespread, active, universal and exceptionally vicious phase of the attack of the bosses by means of inflation and high prices. This hits the employed workers especially hard, affecting the whole proletariat and those who work for a living in general. Already information is everywhere available of the increase in prices, of the pilfering from the budget of the worker's family, side by side with these attempts, direct wage reductions go on and are intensified in many phases. While the boss-class is doing this, it shelters in part behind the motive of the necessity of a return to the gold standard although this will raise the significance of the lowering of wages, and is preparing to rob the workers yet more by means of tariffs.

All these circumstances have led to an unwonted intensification of the crisis. A mighty blow of historic importance has been dealt the economic basis of reformism. The revolutionary class struggle, the transition to the political battle is being accelerated.

A sudden change in the situation, in class relations, demands a sudden change *also* in the work of the Communist Party. The Party has already reacted to this situation by its development and pushing of its programme of “the way out of the crisis for the working-class,” containing partial demands which are higher, broader and sharper, and also of a programme of the revolutionary way out of the crisis under the slogan of “*a Soviet England.*” Not in the least weakening but strengthening by every means in its power its agitation for its partial demands, for its programme of action, the Party must strengthen its propaganda under the slogan of a Soviet England, by this means widening and reinforcing the general fight of the working-class and its attack on the bosses. That the discrediting of capitalist anarchy and the understanding of the superiority of a socialist

planned system has increased in strength to a very large extent among the broad masses of the workers, is not only shown by the "left" programme adopted to meet the situation by the Labour Party. It is exceedingly important that the election programme of the Labour Party, including the "promise" of righting the "injustices" occasioned by the National Government, is built up on the contradictions between capitalist anarchy and individualism and organisation and public control. This programme makes a parade of the slogans of nationalisation, organisation and public control, of the transformation of entire branches of industries into enterprises run in the interests of the public, etc. It is clear that the programme has all sorts of chinks to allow the fulfilment in the future of the orders of the big capitalists; that it is designed to catch votes; it is clear that it differs from the programme of the Conservatives only in words since, in substance, it admits of every possible Conservative interpretation. However, it is important to note that, at the present time, to try to catch the workers' votes, the Labour Party, for the first time for many years, has been forced to resort to phrases about "socialist planning." It would be a great mistake not to see that the circumstances demand propaganda for the Soviet way out of the crisis, that, apart from this, it is impossible successfully to expose reformism and broaden the revolutionary class struggle in defence of the every-day interests of the masses of the workers.

The English boss-class has resorted to a general election. It is endeavouring to make it a "rush" election. The Communist Party has exceedingly

restricted possibilities for running candidates, but there is nothing to prevent it taking part in the campaign everywhere and also of its transforming to a great extent this election campaign into a powerful mass extra-parliamentary campaign.

The boss-class has already begun a persecution of the Communist Party and its central organ. The Party has to raise the level of the organisation to such an extent as to guarantee the continuance of uninterrupted work by whatever means of contact with the masses of the workers may be feasible.

The English working-class and masses are advancing along the path of revolutionary struggle. The period of twilight has come upon what has hitherto been the only united, unshaken and the most powerful party in the Second International.

Its disintegration now in progress is of world-wide historic significance. The proletarian revolution in England is raining blows on this powerful fortress of imperialism and exploitation and colonial oppression all over the world. The struggle and the development of the C.P.G.B. has been sensational and of international importance in the present juncture. The Party is advancing along the broad highroad of revolutionary mass work. The C.P.G.B. from members of the Executive Committee to the latest recruit must realise its obligations to the English working-class and the whole Communist International. English Communists must boldly advance at the head of the workers and then they will be in a position to shoulder the mighty tasks they are called upon to undertake.

VACILLATIONS AND WEAKNESS WHICH WE SHOULD NOT TOLERATE

THE Japanese intervention in China is of first-rate international importance. It spells the beginning of a new partition of China by the imperialists. On the other hand, it is a very concrete and extremely dangerous step towards the preparation of an intervention against the U.S.S.R. It also signifies the bankruptcy of the Kuomintang gang, which has always been leaning on the imperialists in its struggle against the toilers who constitute the majority of the Chinese people, and which has thus led the country to a Japanese aggression.

Japanese imperialism is not only anxious to seize Manchuria and to turn it into a second Korea. It tries to spread its tentacles through the Chinese militarists Hanfu-Tsu, Yantsi-Shen and Feng-Yun-Syang, also throughout the whole of Northern China as far as Peiping and Tientsin. At the same time it stretches its paws towards

Outer Mongolia, and tries to organise an attack on the Mongolian Peoples' Republic. It tried to turn Manchuria into a permanent hotbed of White-guardist plots and of an open preparation for an intervention against the U.S.S.R. It is being fully assisted by French imperialism, which combined its imperialist appetites with the preparation of an attack on the country of victorious Socialism. British imperialism is supporting it. It facilitates Japanese imperialism in the bloodthirsty punishment to be inflicted on the Chinese people in the shooting down of unarmed demonstrators within its sphere of influence and assisting the reorganisation of the Nanking counter-revolutionary centre on the basis of an agreement with the Canton gang. Japan, supported mainly by France, but also by Britain, is acting as an attacking force. The League of Nations, which has sanctioned the Japanese in-

vasion into Manchuria, has fully exposed itself as the diplomatic weapon of that bloc as a means of a preparation of a new imperialist slaughter and as the tool wherewith to fight the U.S.S.R.

American imperialism, which was all the time following a policy of conquest of the whole of China, by means of the U.S. dollar and mainly with the help of the Nanking clique, displayed an ostentatious passivity during the initial period of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria—which was undoubtedly due to its waiting policy in the hope of the possibility of creating an anti-Soviet stronghold. It clearly manifested the cutting down of its interests to those of Japanese imperialism during the further course of events, when Japanese imperialism undertook a number of steps towards consolidating its annexation of Manchuria by starting to connect Girin with the Korean railway system by a railway line.

The present situation in Manchuria is characterised by the following features :

1. The Japanese robbers are engaged in an armed robbery and plunder in Manchuria, using the *most bandit-like* form of imperialist war against the Chinese people enslaved by the imperialists.
2. They organise White-guardist gangs and hatch plots against the U.S.S.R.
3. They are being supported by French and British imperialism.
4. There is a rapidly growing antagonism between the bloc and American imperialism, which latter is trying to seize the Chinese booty that is slipping from its grip.

It would seem that the natural consequence which a Communist ought to draw from the aforementioned, would be the duty to act decisively and firmly. Millions of toilers of France, Britain, the United States and Germany should know in the first place that the *entire* international imperialism is striving to discover as soon as possible a way out of the crisis in a new partition of China and in an intervention against the U.S.S.R. The Communists ought to have explained that it was in no way possible to dismiss the matter by the trite phrase of a united, ever-present and immutable front of the imperialists against the Chinese people and the U.S.S.R. On the contrary it was necessary to show in a concrete manner, that :

1. The attempt to start a new partition of China, is indissolubly bound up with the sharp decline of the standard of living of the European and American workers, that it presupposes the wage-cuts of the workers of Europe and America to such a level as would enable the imperialists successfully to “con-

quer” the Chinese market, thus creating for themselves an outlet from the crisis.

2. It was necessary to show that the imperialist camp was torn by mutual contradictions and that these antagonising elements forced them to *manœuvre* in regard to each other. It was necessary to expose the *concrete* rôle of each of the Great-Power bandits, in order to *show the masses the enemy in one's own country*.
3. It was necessary to show that the complications in the inter-relation between the imperialists do not prevent their rapprochement on the basis of anti-Soviet adventures and of the preparation of an intervention against the U.S.S.R.
4. Finally, it was necessary to utilise the vile campaign staged by the League of Nations in order to expose bourgeois and social fascist pacifism and in order to *mobilise* the masses against a new menace to peace in the country of victorious Socialism, against the sanguinary suppression of the Chinese people, which has already raised in the south the standard of the Soviets.

N. Nishi's article in the *Inprecorr*, which was condemned by the editors of the *Inprecorr*, may serve as an example of the *way Communists should not write*. Nishi represented the matter in such a way as if American imperialism, by its penetration into China *forced* Japanese imperialism to “defend” its interests. He implied by this that in fact there is no such thing as a Japanese intervention. And even if it did occur, it is an intervention falling within the category of “lawful,” customary, mutual accounts between the imperialists. Such evaluation of the situation brought about that Nishi, in a most inadmissible, opportunist fashion toned down the question of the oppression of the Chinese toiling masses and of their new plunder, the question of the preparation for an intervention against the U.S.S.R., the question of the rôle of the Chinese Soviet movement in the struggle against the oppressors and the Kuomintang, which was allowing the whole country to be robbed and plundered. The main defect of the Communist Press of France, Britain and United States consists in their descriptive-informatory method of approaching events in the Far East, in their forgetting the necessity of mobilising the masses against their own imperialism and against its concrete steps.

The position of French imperialism, with regard to Japanese intervention can hardly cause any doubts. French imperialism, including its Social Democratic agents, announced with the greatest frankness that it is in complete sympathy

with the Japanese intervention. By its entire behaviour it gave to understand, that it is ready to support in every way the Japanese robbers, especially when it comes to supporting them against the U.S.S.R. No wonder, the organ of the French General Staff—*Revue Française Militaire* was, immediately before the Japanese intervention enthusiastically praising up Japanese imperialism in Manchuria, thundered against the Bolsheviks and brazenly declared that one must bear in mind that the “Chinese Eastern Railway” was built on French money. Alas! The editors of *L’Humanité* have overlooked this. Comrade Gabriel Peri was indignant at the fact that when the U.S.S.R. warded off Chang Sue Tyang—“the U.S.S.R. was cursed,” whereas now, “Japan is being blessed” (October 5).

The specifically aggressive rôle of French imperialism, the rôle of an agent-provocateur, was not described in a way it certainly should have been. The whole matter was discussed in a few highly moral sentences, such as were always vigorously condemned by Comrade Lenin.

In *L’Humanité* of October 10, Magnan is trying to be witty: “The ‘crux’ of this session of the League of Nations will probably be the speech by Briand, the co-author of the pact Kellogg-Briand, which outlawed the war.”

“Co-author of Kellogg’s pact!” That is all a French Communist journalist has to tell now to the French workers about Briand and French imperialism!

The British *Daily Worker* and the American fraternal organ do not make such big blunders, but still they deviate very considerably from the correct Bolshevik presentation of the question. In the issue of October 5 the British comrades very unsuccessfully compare the checking of the Chinese white bandits by the U.S.S.R. with the Japanese intervention. And they go on to say that “when negotiations were started Soviet Russia demanded only the *status quo ante*.” Instead of showing the contrast in point of principles between the imperialist policy of robbery and plunder of the colonial dependent nations and the Soviet policy of a struggle in defence of the revolution and for peace among the nations, the unknown author quite unwittingly goes as far as to draw a petty-bourgeois comparison between the friendly spirit displayed by the U.S.S.R. and the arrogance of Japan. In the same article in exposing British imperialism the author confines himself to the analysis of the speech of Lord Cecil, the British representative in Geneva.

Why this partiality to judge of imperialism by the speeches at the various international bourgeois conferences and meetings? Is not Japanese imperialism supported by British imperialism in

its desire to reorganise the Nanking government on the basis of ousting American influence and the strengthening of the Anglo-Japanese influence? Are the Cantonese “rulers” not backed by British and Japanese imperialism? And is not this British imperialism already shooting down Chinese in the same Canton.

Perhaps one could object that this blunder was only due to the fact that British Communists are engrossed in the struggle, which is taking place now, in England, itself. However, China is not so far away from London, Glasgow and Manchester. The conquest and new partition of China is the reverse side of the same national imperialist policy, which is ruthlessly cutting down wages “at home.” Unfortunately, vacillations of ideas and vacillations in print have also been manifested by the American *Daily Worker*, which, however, conducted the general campaign against intervention in a more satisfactory manner.

The *Daily Worker* of Sept. 21 writes as follows: “The action on the part of the League of Nations was calculated still further to draw Britain and France into the general whirlpool of events and to increase the struggle between the imperialists, leading towards a conflict over the partition of China, or to an armed war against Japan.”

It turns out that the war between the United States and Japan is now the crucial event of the day. Not an intervention, not the beginning of a new partition of China, not schemes and provocations, directed against the U.S.S.R., but an armed war between Japan and United States, almost on the point of breaking out. Does the proletarian struggle against imperialism in the United States gain anything by such shifting of the centre of gravity of the question? Certainly not. The American Communists are bound to expose American imperialism, first of all by exposing its predatory policy of enslaving China, through Chiang-Kai-Shek and company. They must expose American imperialism as the oppressor of China, as the suppressor of the workers and peasants’ movement in China, as the agent-provocateur of all these anti-Soviet adventures, in which it is prepared to take part, even with the participation of Japan. A POLICY LIKE THIS BREEDS THE DANGER OF A NEW INTERNATIONAL IMPERIALIST SLAUGHTER. If we tone down this question, there is always a risk of rolling down to the position of bourgeois pacifism, and this position we must combat with utter ruthlessness, for it serves as one of the disguises of imperialism.

We notice a certain underestimation of events in Manchuria, even in the German Communist

press. Let us take for instance the Chemnitz *Kaempfer*. After stating that Japan strives for final transformation of Manchuria into a colony, the newspaper continues: "In this way the first step was made towards the partition of China between the imperialist robbers. The consequence will be an enormous sharpening of the imperialist contradictions and THE DANGER OF WAR IN THE PACIFIC." (October 1).

Here again, we find in the centre of attention, not China, not the question of intervention, which is already taking place, not the question of France and Britain taking part in the Japanese intervention, not the question of China being robbed from the other end by the United States, but the question of the sharpening of antagonisms between the imperialists. This last question outweighs all the others. But in reality the German Communists ought, already at the present time, to mobilise the German proletarians against the sale of arms (by the German capitalists) to the Chinese counter-revolution and to the imperialist robbers in China. Surely, these orders have been carried out for over two years. It is also the duty of the German Communists to mobilise the masses against supplying Chinese counter-revolution with military instructors and advisors. This also has been going on for years.

The imperialist robbers are everywhere circulating the sophistry that the League of Nations is "powerless," and therefore can do nothing against the intervention in Manchuria. This sophistry is necessary to conceal the true rôle of the League of Nations in welding together the Japano-Anglo-French imperialist bloc, in systematically preparing, in connection with events in Manchuria a military attack on the U.S.S.R. The deceptive phrase about the "impotence" of the League of Nations was taken up by the entire international social-fascism. The Communists of Europe and America have hardly done anything to expose this provocatory lie, to expose the fact that imperialist pacifism is one of the most important means for the preparation of imperialist wars, colonial plunder and attacks on the U.S.S.R. The League of Nations has shown its true face by legalising the Japanese intervention.

The imperialist robbers, for the purpose of fooling the masses started to circulate a false account of events to the effect that there is no war in Manchuria, that there is only danger of a war. The Communists were bound ruthlessly to expose this abominable lie. That which is taking place in Manchuria is an imperialist slaughter in its worst form. The Japanese military clique is crucifying, throttling and robbing the unarmed masses of an enslaved nation, which moreover is weighed down by the sanguinary oppression of

the bourgeoisie and the landowners. The Communist parties failed to pillory this monstrous banditism.

The Communist press of Europe and America did not engage in a systematic exposure of the fact that Manchuria, with the help of the Japanese intervention, has once more been transformed into a most important bulwark of White-guardist plots against the U.S.S.R., into a stronghold for the preparation of an intervention. The Communist newspapers of England, France, the United States, etc., failed to explain to the workers that the Japanese intervention was indissolubly bound up with the general imperialist attack on China, for the purpose of suppressing the revolutionary anti-imperialist worker and peasant movement for the purpose of crushing the Soviet districts. All the imperialists regard this force — the only champion of the independence, integrity and freedom of China—as their enemy. Before they get at each others' throats in an imperialist war, or embark on a military attack on the country of victorious Socialism, they want to "clear" the rear of Red danger. It is particularly the latest victories of the Red Army in China that are causing their alarm and strengthen their desire to settle accounts with that army.

The *Japanese Communists*, in spite of the most blood-thirsty persecutions, contrived, like genuine Bolsheviks, to come forward with exposures and protests against the bandits of Japanese imperialism.

The Chinese and Korean Communists, in a Bolshevik fashion, have closed their ranks to fight the enemy.

Did the Communist Parties of the imperialist countries fulfil their international Bolshevik duties, in the matter of the defence of the toiling Chinese people?

Did they fulfil to the end the duty of exposing and fighting imperialism in their own countries?

"English, German, American, French Communists and all the adherents of the Red International of Labour Unions! At the meetings before the gates of enterprises, at the enterprises themselves, at meetings and demonstrations, it is your duty to organise actions by the labouring masses against the oppression of slave-drivers, and in favour of the complete independence of China, of the Soviets in China."

Such was the appeal issued by the Western European Bureau of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and by the European Secretariat.

Did this appeal meet with a response?

It did not!

Or only to an insignificant, inadequate extent.

Over and over again we are forced to recall the following stern words of Lenin :

"Perhaps the principal means of attracting the masses to the war are those sophistries with which the bourgeois press is operating, and the most important circumstances explaining the impotence in face of the war, is the circumstance that we either did not analyse these sophistries beforehand or rather that we dismissed them with a cheap, braggardly and alto-

gether empty phrase to the effect that we shall not allow the war to take place, that we are fully aware that war is a crime, etc., in the spirit of the Basle Manifesto in 1912."

The Japanese, Chinese and Korean Communists reacted on the imperialist intervention in a Bolshevik fashion.

The Communists of the "progressive" capitalist powers must correct their unpardonable, unjustifiable backwardness.

FRANKFURT AND BRISTOL

THE Congress of the All-German Confederation of Trade Unions at Frankfurt (August 31st to September 4th) and the Congress of the English Trade Unions at Bristol (September 7th-12th) took place at a time of severe crisis for German and British capitalism. In both countries a huge and ever-increasing number of unemployed, tremendous restriction of output, banks crashing, a crisis in finance and credit, which in England has hurled the pound from its golden supremacy. While the crisis in German capitalism, the weakest link in the imperialist chain, became ever more and more accentuated, the position of British capitalism became more and more "Germanized." The depth of the economic and financial crisis became "Germanized," the extent of the attacks made by the British bourgeoisie on the proletariat became "Germanized," the extent of the English social fascists' betrayal became "Germanized," and the speed at which the class struggle was developing became "Germanized."

The strike of the sailors of the Atlantic Fleet, the mighty street demonstrations in Glasgow, London, Liverpool and elsewhere, in which the workers are putting up a militant struggle against the police, and great strike movements conducted over the heads of the reformist trade union leaders, such as the miners' strikes in South Wales and Scotland—all this shows that the English workers are rapidly commencing to break down the walls of illusion and prejudice which the English social fascists have erected. In Germany this development has already advanced far upon its course. The Communist Party of Germany is leading millions of workers under the banner of Communism, and ever-increasing masses of social democratic workers are day by day becoming more convinced of the rightness and necessity of the Communist policy (vide Hamburg elections). But the brutal blows of the English bourgeoisie, which vie with the blows of the Brüning dictatorship, the naked treachery of MacDonald and Henderson, who vie with the policy of Severing,

Wels and Leipart, are teaching the English workers a hard but effective lesson. And as the latest events prove, the English workers are rapidly beginning to draw their conclusions from this lesson.

At Frankfurt, Leipart declared that he desired a co-operation of German and English trade union delegates in order to find means to overcome the crisis that has taken place in both countries. It may be said that even without this *systematic* co-operation desired by Leipart, a collaboration of German and English trade union leaders has actually taken place.

Both Congresses made their main task the defence of the bankrupt capitalist system from the attacks of the workers. Both Congresses set themselves the task of defending the policy of social fascism before the masses of the workers by means of the most varied manoeuvres, with the object of putting a stop to the growing trend of the masses to go over to the revolutionary camp.

The English and German social fascist trade union leaders take their stand on the side of counter-revolution in all its forms, whether it be in the capitalist or the colonial countries or in regard to Soviet Russia. So far their co-operation can be described as "international."

But, of course, their task is not simply to save capitalism; they also want to save *their* national imperialism, and to this end they pursue a policy which is plunging the working class of *their* respective countries ever deeper into distress. The trade union bureaucracy of each country is trying to propagate and to defend means and methods which at the same time are sweeping the working masses of other countries ever more irresistibly towards ruin. The policy of the German trade union leaders is dealing many hard blows at the English working class, just as the policy of the English trade union bureaucracy represents so many mighty attacks on the working class of Germany and of the whole world.

The fatal effects which result from the policy of one country's trade union bureaucracy may be well illustrated at this very moment by the example of the German miners. The English bourgeoisie is trying by means of inflation (recommended by Bevin at the Bristol Congress as a good remedy for the crisis) to put up a desperate fight for the world market. Inflation means a lowering of the real wages of the English workers. As an answer to this policy of inflation, which has the support of English trade union bureaucracy, the German coal magnates are beginning a fresh colossal attack on the miners' wages. At the same time the German trade union bureaucrats are trying to hinder and disorganise the resistance of the Ruhr Valley workers.

Frankfurt. The books of the All-German Trade Union Confederation show the loss of half a million members. But despite this loss there are nevertheless some 4½ million members still in the "free" trade unions. The delegates to this Congress were carefully sifted. Out of 307 delegates there were only very few workers from the factories, mostly detached members of industrial committees waiting for higher posts. The great majority of the delegates were secretaries and officials of the trade unions.

The ordinary trade union members had no say in these elections; the mandates of opposition delegates were cancelled; opposition workers were excluded and loyal supporters of the policy of the Federation President elected in their place.

It is clear that a congress whose composition had been effected in this way could never be the real mouthpiece of the workers, and it is obvious why this congress did not decide on any measures for fighting the Brüning dictatorship, but on the contrary voted a continuation of the support given to that dictatorship by the leaders of the All-German Trade Union Confederation. This congress could devise no better expedient than that of the capitalists with which Leipart, Tarnow and Co. have associated themselves for better or for worse: the way out of the crisis of capitalism at the expense of the workers.

Just as did the Hendersons, the Citrines and others at Bristol, so did the Leiparts, the Eggerts and the Tarnows at Frankfurt strive first and foremost to shift the responsibility for the plight of the working class from their own shoulders. Leipart declared that responsibility for the present situation must be rejected since the trade unions have no influence on the state of business.

This is a bit steep when it is considered that the leaders of the All-German Trade Union Confederation have "tolerated," that is to say, supported and carried through, all the emergency decrees of the Brüning Government, the destruc-

tion of social insurance, the radical cutting down of unemployment benefit, the reduction in wages and salaries, the mass dismissals and mass taxation. A bit steep when it is considered that the leaders of the All-German Trade Union Confederation have tried to prevent a militant struggle, by every means in their power, by the organisation of strike-breaking, by the aid of the police, by the expulsion of revolutionary workers and members of industrial committees from the factories and trade unions. A bit steep when it is considered how, at the time when the rationalisation methods were introduced, these same trade union leaders "convinced" and compelled the working masses to work longer, more intensively and for less pay.

The close connection of the leaders of the All-German Trade Union Confederation with the Brüning dictatorship was signalled by the fact that, at the congress of the Ministers of Labour in the Brüning Government, the arch-reactionary Stegerwald was one of the chief speakers. This minister unfolded the Government programme, with a little diplomatic dissimulation, of attack on the working class in the interests of the capitalists. Stegerwald declared:—

"We are at present involved in the greatest crisis for a century. As the present Minister of Labour I have had in the last few years to *make all sorts of demands on the German workers, and in spite of this I can face this congress with a good conscience. . . . We may not cherish the illusion that the crisis will be overcome soon.*"

After broadly outlining the burdens which it is planned to lay upon the workers, Stegerwald got down to brass tacks. He expressed doubt if, with the present contributions to unemployment insurance, it would be possible "*to get the unemployed through the next winter.*" The "*social insurance*" which had been created in the last few decades could not be preserved "*100 per cent.*" over the greatest crisis of a century. And after hinting at the extension of the obligation to labour service and the substitution of money relief for the unemployed by soup-kitchens and "payment in kind," Stegerwald appealed to the leaders of the A.G.T.U.C.:—

"The trade unions, too, can greatly contribute to success by enlightening the workers as to the necessary rationalisation of labour and by preventing the accomplishment of such rationalisation being jeopardised *by impossible demands in the direction of wage-compensation. . . . We know that the workers, disciplined by the trade unions, are ready to make sacrifices.*"

What answer do the trade union leaders give to the programme outlined by this minister of the bourgeoisie? Wage-robbery, further reduction of

social and unemployment insurance. The President of the All-German Trade Union Confederation answered this minister, who would be chased away from any meeting by the workers, as follows :—

“The minister, who is an *old champion* of the Christian Trade Unions, has *made a clear and courageous speech*. It is *perhaps right* that the trade unions must demand more than the Government can grant, but we have learnt so to formulate our demands that they are capable of being carried out . . . We thank the minister for his promise at length to put the idea of equality of sacrifice into practice. We are ready to support him on these lines. We beg you not to leave us in the lurch.”

With that, what the Congress really had to say was said. The minister of the bourgeoisie declares the necessity of the measures hitherto taken against the working class and proclaims that this offensive will be continued on a still greater scale. And the leader of the All-German Trade Union Confederation thanks this minister and declares in the name of the federal directorate that he is ready to follow him in this policy. This was expressed, if possible, even more clearly by Nörpel :—

“The trade unions support the Brüning Government, even though they be compelled to surrender the benefits, for no man now knows where events are leading us.”

As to this, the answer is pretty clear. Assuredly they are not taking the side of the revolution, and therefore they will be siding with Adolph Hitler.

But it was not only the business of this Congress to reassure the capitalists that their policy of an offensive against the working class will be supported and carried through; it had not only to proclaim its solidarity with the capitalists in the struggle to save capitalism, but at the same time to make efforts to confuse the workers, to point “avenues of escape,” and thus to prevent yet greater masses of the workers from straying out of the reformist fold into the revolutionary camp.

For this purpose they utilised in the first instance the services of the “sociologist” and “national economist,” Dr. Lederer. This quack physician borrowed his wisdom in the last resort from the fascists, assuredly for the use of those small and middle employers who in particular are suffering extinction in the crisis at the hands of finance and trust capital. Lederer thus being appointed “theoretician” to the Congress, and those who commissioned his services having rejected the victory of the proletariat and the building up of Socialism as a means of overcoming the crisis, he proposes the harnessing of

technique and concentrates in particular on the small and middle-sized enterprises. The “organised capitalism” of Hilferding having proved itself patently and visibly a bankrupt idea, Lederer attempts to organise the harnessing of technique. How that is to be achieved at a time of the most brutal supremacy of finance and trust capital, at a time when the small and middle-sized enterprises are being rapidly annihilated—that is a question about which this professor of the reactionary Utopia has nothing to say. Instead, he proposes, in an elegant, so-called scientific form, that which Stegerwald has expressed more bluntly. The workers are to make sacrifices for the “communism of labour” and accept the 40-hour week *without* wage increases. This proposal is nothing more nor less than the proposal of a radical 20 per cent. reduction of all wages and the taking over of the entire costs of unemployment insurance, and of a part of the unemployed, by the workers themselves.

Eggert, the newly-elected secretary of the Confederation Executive, described the demand of a 40-hour week *with* wage compensation as a piece of petty haggling. He thought perhaps that at a time of such great wage-cutting a mere 20 per cent. more or less was no longer of any importance.

But the leaders of the All-German Trade Union Confederation at this Congress had yet other “avenues of escape.” That which the representatives of Germany at the recent Vienna Conference demanded as necessary to the salvation of German capitalism—foreign loans—was also demanded by Tarnow at the Frankfür Congress; he gave the assurance that the foreign capitalists could send their money to Germany without any qualms, since the might of the All-German Trade Union Confederation would be turned against any piece of adventurism (meaning any revolutionary movement). The Tarnows know, of course, that loans from international finance capital, as the example of Austria and even that of England shows, are only to be had in return for great political concessions and guarantees of attacks on social welfare.

While Leipart has had to confess sadly that the idea of economic democracy has been “thrust into the background,” the German social fascists at the Frankfür Congress try to revive it in a new phrase, in the slogan of so-called “bank control.”

At a time when the workers are being ever more and more infected by the example of the Soviet Union, when the thought of adopting the expedient of Socialism comes ever more frequently into their heads, the trade union leaders could not, of course, pass over the subject of Socialism

in complete silence. So they try to prove that they, too, are Socialists. But not such Socialists as the Communists, who are sufficiently naïve as to think that one must destroy the supremacy of the bourgeoisie if one is going to be able to build Socialism. With furious attacks on the Soviet Union, Tarnow declared:—

“We Socialists are to-day more firmly convinced than ever that Socialism alone can bring liberation. If there were a community in the world organised according to Socialist principles, the battle would be won. But we have not as yet such an example in the world to-day. What we see in Russia anything but convinces us that such methods will improve matters We know that the way to Socialism can lead us to freedom out of our distress. *But we cannot go this way in a day, for we want to lead the working class alive into the era of Socialism.*”

In the name of this “Socialism by degrees” the Frankfurt Congress voted for a further “toleration” of the Brüning dictatorship. In order to lead the workers “alive” into Socialism, the Frankfurt Congress proclaimed the defence of bankrupt German capitalism, which has plunged the German workers into a sea of misery.

Bristol. The number of members of the unions attached to the Trade Union Congress is, according to official reports, 3,719,400, or 25,000 less than last year.

The Congress took place shortly after the resignation of the Labour Ministers from the MacDonald Cabinet and the formation of the so-called National Government. The leaders of the Labour Party and of the trade unions left the Government in order to avoid the destruction of the Labour Party and to preserve their influence over the trade unions by this manoeuvre. So they took the floor at the Congress not in the manner of people who had to give an account of their two years’ policy of abandoning the interests of the workers, but rather as courageous, inflexible “fighters” who had “kept their hands clean.” By this manoeuvre of theirs they tried to remain at the head of the English workers in order to prevent them from developing a real fighting movement.

The leaders of the Labour Party discussed everything at the Congress except the concrete measures necessary to organise resistance against the general attack of the bourgeoisie. It is characteristic that in all the speeches of the leaders at the Congress the word strike was not mentioned once. This Congress of the trade unions completely ignored the wage and strike movements. It also made no attempt to draw any lesson from the previous strike and wage movements.

That was, of course, no accident. The more general the terms in which the English trade union leaders spoke, the more vague the proposals and “expedients” which they aired at the Congress, the more did they avoid coming to a point where it would be necessary to give a clear answer, “Yes” or “No,” to the question of “Fight or not.” The more easily could they put forward, with a redundancy of radical phraseology, their recipes for the salvation of capitalism, without the counter-revolutionary character of their proposals being at once seen through by the workers.

The peculiarity of this Congress was that the *reactionary proposals* for a way of escape from the crisis were put forward by the trade union leaders and adopted by the Congress with a maximum of radical words.

The Congress, which met on the day before the opening of Parliament, was held in an atmosphere of great tension. The Secretary, Citrine, gave a sketch of the events which had preceded the resignation of the Labour Government. He reproached MacDonald with secret chicanery in his relations with the trade unions and called Snowden’s economy programme catastrophic. But, of course, he hushed up the fact that the leaders of the trade unions and the Labour Party, as was afterwards revealed in Parliament, had, before they resigned, agreed to nine-tenths of all the present measures of the present Government.

The most radical-sounding speech was made by the President of the Congress, Hayday. He spoke of the interference of outside forces and he called the finance dictatorship worse than a military dictatorship, and said it must be got rid of:—

“A revolution of the finance people has taken place, more ruthless and complete than a military dictatorship could be The existence of a people’s Government is impossible until the financial organisations of the country are brought under our control. If we do not rule the banks, then the banks will rule us and the policy of the workers and of the trade union movement will come to nought.”

Hayday, like the other trade union leaders, altogether avoided speaking about a crisis of British capitalism. They obstinately denied this and tried to classify the revolution now going on in England as a “conspiracy” or as a manoeuvre of the exchanges. When Hayday spoke about the need of controlling the banks, he, of course, avoided putting this question in a really clear form. For “control of the banks,” those mighty monopolies of capitalism, is only possible when the political organisation of capitalist society and the capitalist state is destroyed. If this be rejected, as it is by the reformist leaders, then a

“control” of the banks can only mean that boards of directors appointed by the capitalist state assist in the policy of finance capital and all its effects and consequences.

Hayday emphatically declared his readiness to fight against the general attack:—

“We are absolutely opposed to the policy of wage-cutting, by whatever means one may seek to justify it. We are firmly united in defence of the standard of living of the unemployed, and we are no less determined in defence of social service . . . We will not agree to cuts in wages without a struggle.”

But from these fighting declarations, Hayday, in common with the other leaders of the Congress, proceeded to draw very different conclusions, and as a result the burdens on the shoulders of the working class are being still further increased.

Amid great tension, *Henderson* spoke at the Congress. His “opposition speech” at the Congress was a counterpart to the capitulation speech which he made in Parliament against MacDonal. He declared that he was not opposed to a Coalition Cabinet as such (which is no wonder in the case of this old Coalition Minister in the War Cabinet), but only to the *mode of its constitution*. *Henderson* unfolded his proposals. Rather a 20 per cent. financial tariff than reduction in unemployment insurance, he declared—a figure which he afterwards corrected to 10 per cent.. This proposal of *Henderson*’s expressed the readiness of the leaders of the Labour Party to adopt a pronounced protective tariff system. His proposal of a financial tariff naturally extends to the cutting down of real wages and the reduction in real value of the unemployment insurance. The other proposals contained in the political resolution of the Congress follow the same line of indirect attack. A prominent feature among these proposals was the suggestion to put an end to the policy of deflation. “Putting an end to the policy of deflation”—that is a demure way of advocating inflation.

The question of a real mass resistance to the general attack was raised by only one delegate, *Lumley*, a member of the Minority Movement and of the executive of the Durham Miners’ Union. *Lumley* was greeted with great applause when he demanded a concrete plan of action. *Collick*, of the Engine Drivers’ Union, likewise reaped a rich harvest of applause when he demanded that an end be put to the policy of Mondism. The political resolution was adopted almost unanimously. A resolution on co-operation with the employers’ unions was adopted after a violent

debate against a minority vote of 160,000. A protectionist resolution of the steel workers was only adopted by the narrow majority of 1,794,000 votes to 1,434,000.

While this Congress was in session the unemployed were demonstrating outside. At the instance of the trade union leaders they were prevented by the police from sending a delegation to the conference.

The situation has developed so rapidly that already after four weeks these two Congresses have been unmasked by the facts. The British bourgeoisie and their National Government are carrying out all the proposals made by the trade union leaders at the Congress. The Government has made the decision to suspend the gold standard. The bourgeoisie are preparing to introduce high protective tariffs. All the expedients proposed by the reformist trade union leaders are being employed by the bourgeoisie as so many additional blows in the general attack on the working class. The remedies suggested by the trade union leaders are rapidly revealing themselves as so many powerful weapons against the working class in the hands of the bourgeoisie. The direct attack on the working class by the cutting of wages, salaries and unemployment insurance is being supplemented and extended by the lowering of the real wages and of the real value of social insurance through rising prices resulting from the inflation of the pound.

In Germany, too, the whole significance of the Frankfurt Trade Union Congress is now revealing itself with the utmost rapidity. Barely four weeks after this Congress the Brüning dictatorship, at the instance of the employers, is beginning a mighty new wage-cutting offensive. Under the leadership of the Minister of Labour, *Stegerwald*, the wages of the miners in the Ruhr district have already been cut 7 per cent. And the German social fascists are tolerating, as they always do, this wage-cut and are trying to prevent the workers from fighting back.

It is now the decisive task of the German and English Communist Parties to wring the millions of trade union members from the influence of the social fascist trade union leaders and to gather them together under the leadership of the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade union opposition. In the deliverance of the trade union members from the influence of the reformists, in the conquest of the principal enterprises, and in the organising of a militant struggle in conjunction with the unemployed movement lies the issue for the development of the revolutionary movement in the next few months.

FIFTIETH BIRTHDAY OF KUUSINEN

HE is fifty years of age and has spent twenty-six years in the revolutionary struggle in Finland and thirteen years in the ranks of international bolshevism. From being the leader of the small Communist Party of Finland he has advanced to being one of the workers on the staff of the world revolution. Since the Third Congress of the Comintern he has been a member of its Executive Committee, one of the Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. and a member of its presidium. Such, in short, has been the career of Comrade Kuusinen.

In 1905 Comrade Kuusinen took his degree as Master of Philosophy, but he was not attracted by an academic career. He did not remain content with the lofty abstractions of academic science, but plunged into the wave of revolution in 1905, took part in the general strike, and was one of the Finnish red guards.

Becoming editor of the theoretical organ of the Finnish Social-Democratic Party, "The Socialist Journal," and its central organ, "Tyuameyss," Comrade Kuusinen was always on the left wing of the Social-Democratic Party, struggling against opportunism, ministerialism, etc.

The defeat of the Finnish revolution in 1918 was the result fundamentally of a repetition of the errors of the Paris Commune. Comrade Kuusinen, who had taken part in leading this revolution and had been a member of the late revolutionary government, was the first after the defeat to submit to the criticism of the Finnish revolution from the bolshevist point of view and so lay the ideological foundations for a new Communist Party in Finland. But he was not only one of the foundation members of the Communist Party of Finland, he also stood at the cradle of the Communist International. At the First Congress of the Communist International, Comrade Kuusinen opposed those comrades who considered that it was as yet premature to announce that Communist conference as a congress. "I think," said Comrade Kuusinen, "that the strength of the new International will be commensurate with the strength of the revolutionary proletariat and not with the strength of this small gathering."

Comrade Kuusinen having sketched the theoretical foundations of a Finnish Communist movement in his pamphlet, "Revolution in Finland," now proceeded to translate these theories into practice. Under the threat of execution he carried on underground work in Finland and was active there from May, 1919, to the summer of 1920, while the most rigorous terrorism was in progress, during which, thanks to his courageous

conduct, he twice succeeded in escaping the police cordons of the Finnish executioners. While he was working underground, Comrade Kuusinen laid in Finland the foundations of a legal revolutionary mass party working under the leadership of an illegal Communist Party.

His practical experience in organisational work in Finland of uniting legal and illegal work and his study of Leninism gave Comrade Kuusinen the possibility of working out for the Third Congress of the Communist International theses on organisational construction and the tasks of a Communist Party. On the subject of these theses, Comrade Lenin wrote to Comrade Kuusinen on the 10th of June, 1921:—

"I have read through your article (three chapters) and theses with great pleasure." At the same time, in another letter, Comrade Lenin insisted that Comrade Kuusinen should without fail read to the Third Congress this document on the question of organisation, remarking in this connection: "He (Kuusinen) necessarily knows and *thinks*" (underlined by Lenin). At the Fourth Congress of the Communist International, Comrade Lenin said on the subject of these theses: "The resolution is excellent, but it is almost purely Russian, that is entirely bound up with Russian conditions." Comrade Kuusinen thoroughly assimilated this critical observation of Comrade Lenin, and in his further work for the Communist International has striven strenuously to translate bolshevik tactics from "the Russian language" into the language of the corresponding sections of the Communist International, studying all their individual local conditions.

Comrade Kuusinen, like a real bolshevik, having assimilated Leninism, has fought against all deviations from the general line of the Communist International. He has combatted "left" Trotskyism and the policy of Ruth Fischer; at the Sixth Congress he struggled against the right opportunist theory of "decolonisation. At the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. he fought against the conciliatory criticism of capitalist rationalisation. But besides this, in his day to day work for the Communist International and in all those spheres to which he has devoted special attention (i.e., national and colonial problems), having studied the testaments of Lenin, he strives always to face a question concretely and ever to adopt a flexible tactic and one which is a result of careful reflection on the subject to be approached.

We send our good wishes to this professional revolutionary who has so staunchly

defended the banner of Leninism in his responsible post in the Communist International, and hope that for many years to come he will fight for this banner till the victory of the world revolution.

(Signed) Wilhelm Pieck, J. Bratkovsky, O. Piatnitzky, Manner, P. Furubottn, Bela Kun, J. Sirola, D. Manuilsky, Sen Katayama, Khatavey, Kolarov, Furini, Knorin, Okano, Chemodanov.

THE MINORITY IN THE DOCK

By LOZOVSKY.

Speech of Comrade Lozovsky (abbreviated).

(From August 11th to 18th, the Executive Bureau considered reports from three federations of the French trade unions, where the leading rôle is in the hands of the so-called "revolutionary syndicalists," who are a minority in the Unitary Federation of Labour (C.G.T.U.)—the minority. We publish here the speech of Comrade Losovsky in the Executive Bureau. The speeches of Comrades Abolin and Piatnitsky will be published in the next number.)

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THE condition of the revolutionary labour movement in France has always especially interested the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. First of all because it is a revolutionary movement, and secondly, because it is the French revolutionary movement, in other words, a movement which has as its task to fight with the predatory imperialism of the French bourgeoisie, which after its victory in the imperialist war has become transformed into one of the most dangerous bulwarks of the world counter-revolution.

The French labour movement, like the labour movement of other countries, has its own peculiarities which are to be explained by historical reasons. It is obvious that it is necessary in this instance to take into account the condition of the French capitalists, the conditions of the working-class, the condition of the labour movement, up to, during and chiefly after the war, the long struggle of various tendencies within the labour movement, which has lasted for so many years, and finally the development of our revolutionary trade union movement, beginning with the split of 1921.

But if the labour movement in France is distinguishable by certain peculiarities, the ideological struggle and the events which we have to consider to-day have no relation to those peculiarities.

The fight against the line of the R.I.L.U. and opportunism is also an international phenomenon, with all its varieties in the different countries. This international phenomenon is one with which we, the R.I.L.U., have had to carry on a struggle from the very inception of our revolutionary International.

We have invited here the minority delegation, so as to become acquainted with its point of view, so as to hear from the members of the minority what it is

that they want and how they look upon the development of the revolutionary labour movement in France. We expected from the minority comrades, reports on the condition in their respective federations, reports which could have given us a picture not only of the struggle of tendencies, which find their reflection in the Press, but chiefly of the work carried on during the last years.

I do not know what impression the reports have made on other comrades. As far as I am concerned, it seems to me that these reports are too much pervaded with the apologetic spirit. They do not give us sufficient information in regard to the peculiarities of the condition in each industry and the conditions of the working-class as a whole. What strikes one mostly is the absence of self-criticism in the reports.

It follows from the report that the weakening of the position of the C.G.T. is the fault of the majority, and that the minority has nothing to do with it. Moreover, the comrades here have said if the C.G.T.U. still continues to exist it is only because of their activity.

This innocence which seems to me exaggerated, especially when I look upon Comrade Rambaud with his appearance of a naive virgin person, if I may so express myself. It appears as if you saved or claim to have saved the labour movement in France. And the real "saviour" is Comrade Boville of which we shall convince ourselves further on. The innocent virgin Rambaud and Boville the saviour! A fine picture!

We asked the comrades: Are you members of the R.I.L.U.? and have received the positive reply from all the speakers: "Yes, we are in the R.I.L.U. and we will remain in it."

This is very pleasant. But I consider that it would have been very, very useful to begin with an enumeration of the points which divide us and those which we have in common. We cannot remain in one organisation for abstract reasons.

AND SO WHAT DIVIDES US?

We do not agree with you on the following points:

1. On the question of the estimate of the position of international and French capitalism.

2. On the question whether there is a radicalisation of the working-class and what are the causes and the symptoms of this radicalisation.

3. On the question of the inter-relations between economics and politics, of the relations between the trade unions and the Communist Party.

4. On the question of the forms and the methods of the struggle for trade union unity and on the question as to what is the unity of the working-class, what are its aims, and how it must serve them.

5. On the question of the position which we must take up in relation to reformism, and the reformist political organisations and trade unions.

6. On the question of strike tactics and the duties of the revolutionary trade unions in relation to the strike movement in other branches of industry and other countries.

7. On the question of the structure, the inner life and the daily work of the trade unions, since we interpret the conception of trade union democracy in a revolutionary spirit and you in a reformist sense.

8. On the question of the inter-relations between the central organisation and the organisations in the localities, and also on the question as to how to straighten out the line, if this should prove necessary.

9. On the question whether war is really imminent, and how, when and by which means the revolutionary international and its sections must struggle against war.

10. On the question of the inter-relations between the International and its sections, and the local organisations of these latter.

11. We disagree with you on the question as to *who you are*.

12. We disagree with you on the question as to where you are going.

On all other questions we agree with you. (Laughter).

And now let us proceed to a systematic consideration of the various points.

IS THE STATEMENT REGARDING THE DECLINE OF INTERNATIONAL CAPITALISM CORRECT ?

I know that there are trade union functionaries, especially from amongst those who call themselves revolutionary syndicalists, who consider that such questions do not concern the trade unions. And yet, we cannot take a single step forward unless we give a reply to this question. The tactics, the daily struggle, all the possibilities and methods of struggle, everything, depends upon the estimate of the question as to the condition in which capitalism on an international and national scale finds itself.

I have put to you the following question : Do you maintain the estimate of the condition of international capitalism which was made by your speakers at the Paris Congress ?

The answer which we received was too astronomical, not sufficiently concrete, We like facts and

not general statements. Your Comrade Chambelland said at the Paris Congress in 1929 :

"It (capitalism) has perhaps been shaken during the crisis which followed the war, but at the present time we see that it has not only become stabilised but it is becoming stronger every day."

Further : "Capitalism has almost entirely emerged from the crisis, which had been brought about by the war of 1914."

And more : "We affirm that it is not true to say that capitalism is in a period of decline." "We do not see a prospect of a decisive economic crisis, (what prophets !), we consider that we have before us a period which will last twenty or thirty years." . . .

These forecasts were made in September, 1929. The economic crisis began in America at the end of 1929, and in 1930 and 1931 it became world-wide. Credit, industry, everything is cracking up, and at the end of 1930 France in its turn is drawn into the world crisis. There are times when people err, but if your "Napoleon" miscalculated, it was necessary to say so, it was necessary to write about it.

Are you responsible before the French working-class ? The thing is not to engage in empty talk, you cannot treat the workers as a flock of sheep. You affirm that there is no crisis, that there is no decline in capitalism and a month afterwards a crisis begins all over the world. Have you had sufficient conscientiousness and sufficient courage to say : "Yes, we were mistaken." Where and when have you, responsible functionaries, recognised your mistake ?

What is now the position on an international scale ? It is sufficient to follow the economic and political Press of the whole world, which registers the crisis, while the statesmen of all Parties foresee great difficulties. And yet you, revolutionaries, you do not see the decline of capitalism. Bourgeois professors, bourgeois economists, English, American, German and even French, speak of the decline of capitalism. But you see nothing ; you remain on the "old positions."

Here is *Cri du Peuple* of February 25th, which contains a leading article on the conduct of the French bourgeoisie in face of the German crisis. The article says : "French capitalism has with a singleness of heart thrown itself forward to the assistance of German capitalism." "It seems as though the French banks are thinking as to how they can help Germany." And all this under the heading of "A Splendid Example of International Solidarity."

What else is said in this article ? In it we read : "See, the Social Democrats in Germany are supporting Bruening and the money which will be received will serve some Noske against the workers." But where in the articles which you write do you say anything about the French Socialists who support French imperialism. You only see the German Noske but you do not notice your own Noske.

But how dare you write in your paper articles on the European position and keep silent about the fact that the French Socialist Party is in favour of the Versailles Peace Treaty, that this Party supports French imperialism to the end, that at its last Congress it was concerned with the question of "national defence" as though this was one of the most immediate questions in France!

Who is threatening France? Disarmed Germany, Soviet Russia, Bulgaria? Yes? The Socialist Party supports French imperialism with all its might, but you yourselves do the same as the social patriots did during the war when they incessantly decried the German Social Democrats, but said nothing of the treachery of the French Socialists.

(VASILIEV: Perhaps the U.S.S.R. is now threatening France?)

And this is called an analysis of the international position. . . . It is thus that you educate the French working-class whom you are preparing for the impending struggles. Your action is a means of diversion, it is a method which consists of keeping silent about the most burning problems which are capable of interesting the French working-class and speak only of general questions, you revile the German Social Democrats and are silent about their French colleagues.

DEADLY ACUTENESS. A FINE EXAMPLE OF INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY.

If you were possessed of two sous-worth of political reason, you would have clearly seen what is clear to all: French imperialism puts before Germany financial, economic and political conditions; and the political conditions are: you will receive financial assistance provided you join the anti-Soviet front.

You do not even know that during many years the whole international policy of England, and especially France, turns upon the problem as how to draw Germany into the anti-Soviet front, so that Poland and Rumania could begin war against the U.S.S.R. You do not even know this and when analysing the international position you keep silent about the tactics of the Socialist Party, and by avoiding this subject you tell the working-class a half-truth which is equivalent to a lie.

Is international capitalism in a phase of decline? Even the leaders of the Second International at their last Congress, looked on all sides for a medicine to cure sick capitalism. I ask you, are you as little revolutionary as they? or is their revolutionism even too great for the minority leaders?

THE RADICALISATION OF THE MASSES.

You said: "Revolution is not yet knocking at the doors of France." Of course not, no, it is not yet at the door, but what is it that you want to say by this?

Do you want to say that the tens of years of capitalist stabilisation, on which you reckon, will permit you to sit with folded arms, and as capitalism is still feeling well, there is no need to think of the future? You wipe out in this manner, from the prospects of the French working-class, not only the revolutionary struggles for power, which in due course will arrive in France, but also—and this is most important—the daily struggle which prepares and hastens the revolutionary fight.

You have created a whole theory, which, strictly speaking, cannot be thus termed, but we have to be indulgent to the "theoreticians" of the *Cri du Peuple*. This theory says that the radicalisation of the masses is nonsense, that there is no such thing. And you said this not only in 1929 at the Paris Congress, where Boville proposed to turn the helm to the right, as if he were not already enough of a right-winger, but you repeat this now also.

What do you call the radicalisation of the masses? Do you mean when the workers go out on the street? But when they go out on the street this will be something bigger. So what then do you understand by the radicalisation of the masses? The comrades of the French minority have a completely metaphysical conception of this problem, which is so important for the international movement. They imagine the thing in the following manner: To-day the workers are asleep; this was, if I am not mistaken, the expression of Chaussin, and a number of other members of the minority, such as, for instance, Boville; they maintain passivity, they have no desire to fight, but to-morrow the working-class will wake up and the struggle will begin.

There are prophets who are called "prophets after the event." There are plenty of these among the minority. Such prophets begin to see a thing when even the blind cannot deny them. But this is not the behaviour of a leader of the labour movement. The rôle of a leader of the national and international labour movement consists of stating, on the basis of definite symptoms, facts which are not yet known or noticed by others.

When I read all that you had written on the radicalisation of the masses, I said to myself that the minority are either unconscientious or unscrupulous. A legend was spread at a certain time in France, that Comrade Molotov in a speech at the Presidium of the Comintern said, in 1929, that the French working-class is on the threshold of the capture of power. Quotations were cited and even yesterday Engler demanded from me that I should "give him Molotov's speech." I asked how could Molotov in 1929 affirm that the French working-class was on the eve of the capture of power? I have just read all the speeches and I could find absolutely nothing approaching it. But what did Molotov say?

He said that the struggle in the whole world is assuming a more and more embittered character. The French labour movement is also entering upon a period of increasing struggle. To be ready for it, to learn not only how to defend ourselves, but also to pass over to the offensive, it is necessary to double the energy of the Communist Parties. It is necessary incessantly to prepare for the great fight and great events.

No conclusions in your sense can be drawn from the speech of Molotov in 1929 and if you will read the speech conscientiously you will recognise that he was right.

But let us return to the problem of the radicalisation of the masses. By reason of a singular perversion of thought, you consider that radicalisation means that this process assumes the same forms all over the world, that it has the same symptoms and entails the same degree of strenuousness in the class struggle. But to think thus means not to know the A.B.C. of the labour movement.

Every one of you looks upon the mass movement from his own corner, from Bordeaux or Rouen, from Gisors or Marseilles. You do not notice the colossal conflicts which are shaking the whole world and side by side with it also the contradictions between Governments, between world imperialism and Soviet Russia, nor do you notice the growth of the revolutionary movement in the colonies. In the growth of discontent in all capitalist countries, including in their number also France, in all these events you have a reflection of the radicalisation of the masses which you do not recognise.

(RAMBAUD : This is not altogether so.)

Is not the strike of 120,000 textile workers in France radicalisation ? Is it not radicalisation of the workers, the fact that in 1931 we had in England with the "Labour" Government hundreds of thousands of workers on strike against the wishes of the trade unions and the "Labour" Party ?

Is it not a sign of radicalisation that the Fascist militia in Italy in some places supported the workers on strike ?

But can we build the tactics of a revolutionary international on the short-sighted estimates of certain minority leaders, who see no further than their noses ?

Has radicalisation been invented in Moscow ? Such a formula is indeed a find for the whole international opportunist Press.

Yesterday the theory was mentioned here, which in America is called the theory of "exceptionalism." Some time ago we heard in this very hall about its exceptional position in the whole world. But now all these prophets are already outside the movement and I fear that if you keep to this "philosophy," as formulated by Comrade Rambaud, you will also find yourselves outside the revolutionary trade union movement.

For one participates in the movement so as to lead it, so as to clear its path, so as to give the workers clear directions and not to put the brake upon it. It is often necessary to put on the brake on railways. Was it then under the influence of the railwayman, Rambaud, that you consider it possible to apply *this* special method, to the labour movement ?

But beware of accidents, they threaten you more than anyone else !

Radicalisation, fortunately, is no invention ; it manifests itself in life, it manifests itself in the struggle. It is but necessary to watch the facts, it is but necessary to read, I will not weary the members of the Executive Bureau with quotations.—I have a whole pile of them from the *Cri du Peuple*, and they resemble the *Peuple* (organ of the reformist C.G.T.), as much as the Siamese twins resemble each other. There is nothing wonderful in this since it is the same "cry" of the same "people."

But there is something in this line of thought which the comrades of the minority should think about. The radicalisation of the working-class movement is composed of objective and subjective elements. It may happen that while there is the radicalisation of the masses this radicalisation does not find any outlet. It remains separate and diffused. In these conditions, the subjective factor, the presence of a revolutionary Communist Party and a revolutionary trade union, play a colossal part from the point of view of the possibility of taking advantage of the objective situation.

But when you deny the radicalisation of the masses, do you remain only on the theoretical plane ? But if I am not mistaken, you are not cabinet scientists nor historians, and when you deny the radicalisation of the masses you draw your daily practical conclusions from such a denial.

What does this mean ? This is what it means. You not only deny the presence of a huge number of new facts, the strengthening of the struggle, but as a result of this view, you take up a passive attitude. You are pulling back the movement which is commencing. In political and trade union language, this is called revolutionary tactics inside out. This term seems to me to be sufficiently scientific and precise.

THE TRADE UNIONS AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

I now pass on to the most burning question of the whole of our discussion. The question of economics and politics, of the Party and the trade unions.

This is a question in which you have proved yourselves masters of confusion. You have resolutions, articles, formulations and you make use of all your fire so as (in your own words) to defend the old traditions of French syndicalism.

Let us consider first of all your point of departure. You say that the economic and political struggles go along parallel lines. The Party exists for the

political struggle and the trade union for the economic struggle ; there are occasions when their paths cross ; then they greet one another and part again. But this is the old anarcho-syndicalist ideology and you are now engaged in reviving and galvanising it.

You state that you start from the resolution of the 1929 Paris C.G.T.U. Congress regarding the leading rôle of the Party. I have asked myself the question : What kind of a resolution is this, which is capable, in the opinion of the minority, of leading to the ruin of the French revolutionary labour movement ?

Here is this unfortunate resolution. Let us look at it. At the end of the resolution adopted on the report of the general activity of the C.G.T.U., it is stated :

“Finally, the Congress declares its decision to carry out its work at all sections in close contact with the Communist Party (the resolution does not say in subjection to it) the only Party of the proletariat and the revolutionary class struggle, the Party which has won, in the fire of past battles, its place as the sole proletarian advance guard, the leader of the labour movement.”

You may argue on the question as to whether the Party has already won the leading place, or whether it will still win it, you may be satisfied or dissatisfied with this formulation, but I put to myself the question : what is it that you have found catastrophic in this resolution ?

But this is not yet all. In the same resolution we read on the following page that : “The proclamation of this leading rôle and its recognition must not be interpreted as either the subjection of the trade union movement or as any change in organisation as foreseen in the constitution, or in the mutual relations between the Communist Party and such mass organisations as the unitarian trade unions.”

(RAMBAUD : To-morrow we will bring the declaration, published in the “Cahiers du Bolchevisme,” in which the Confederation majority is condemned for that concession and for having accepted that addition, and points out the mode of application of the thesis on the leading rôle of the Party in the trade union movement.)

What is more important, a Congress decision or an article ? The Paris Congress, in which as may be seen from the results of the voting, the Communists had a majority, expressed the opinion of the Communists. But have Communists no right to express their opinion ? I think they have.

(RAMBAUD : Without asking the opinion of the trade unions !)

The same Congress declared that this opinion changes absolutely nothing in the inter-relationships between the trade union and the Party, either in the sense of the constitution or from the point of view of organisation.

But it must first of all be pointed out that these decisions were adopted by your Congress, the Congress of the unitarian trade unions. Why then do you, during the course of months, during the course of a number of years, keep on talking and talking about this question and yet do not tell the workers that the Congress, whose decisions you discredit, declared that there is no subjection, that the inter-relationships remain the same as foreseen in the constitution ? Why did you not tell them this ? Obviously, because you wanted to engage in petty intrigues, because you wanted to clear the path for reformism.

Let us consider this problem, the Party and the trade unions. Has a worker the right to be a member of the Communist Party ? It would seem as though he had. Have the members of the Communist Party the right to unite and discuss the questions which interest them ? It would seem as though they had. They have, besides this, the right to express their opinion at any meeting and to put their proposals to the vote. If the majority is for them, the proposals are passed, if they are in a minority the proposals are rejected. Have they this right or not ?

(PERIGNON : This right has never been denied.)

Comrade Perignon says that this right has never been denied. But this is not so, you have denied it. You deny to the Communists in the trade unions the right to strive that the proposed resolutions should be freely adopted, by explaining to the workers the meaning of revolutionary tactics.

You are extremely suspicious of the Party. Under the slogan of the independence of the trade union movement you are conducting a bitter campaign against the Party.

But what is the independence of the trade union movement ?

You write that the question is independence from the whole world, from all Parties ; but is a Party an accidental phenomenon in social life ? You are sufficiently politically educated and you know sufficiently well the past and present of capitalist countries. You know that a Party always reflects the interests of one class or a section of a class.

To say that you are independent of all Parties is to declare your independence also from the struggle of the working-class, it means that you are floating in the clouds, notwithstanding the fact that some of you, Comrade Engler, for instance, have a sufficiently weighty appearance ; this means that you are independent of the working-class itself.

How did it happen that there are two or three Parties with a proletarian social composition ? This happened because the working-class consist of different strata ; side by side with the most conscientious part of the workers there are also the backward elements, there are the elements under

the influence of the bourgeoisie and bourgeois civilisation.

The Communist Party expresses the quintessence of all that is revolutionary in the proletariat ; while the Socialist Party, which carries out the policy of the bourgeoisie within the working-class, reflects all that is backward in the working-class.

This is why we see within the working-class the struggle between various Parties, which reflects the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

You are not members of the Communist Party. But some of you have passed through the Party. It seems to be a simple matter with you. To-day you become a member of the Party and to-morrow you say "I am tired of it."

There are among you people who have been expelled from the Party, some who had left the Party of their own accord, and non-Party people, those who were not members of the Party and who have remained non-Party. Now you are all non-Party. But have you, non-Party members of the minority, any policy? You are trying to work out your own policy. But it is not a policy, it is a kind of mad-cap dance.

How is this to be explained? This is to be explained by the circumstance that the very idea of taking up a middle course—to attack the Communist Party, and yet retain at the same time independence from politics,—this is an absurd idea. History has shown the inevitable bankruptcy of all such attempts. The bourgeois Press expresses its full satisfaction in regard to your independence. If you like, I will quote to you extracts from articles by Charles Dulot, the editor of *Information Sociale* and the editor of that independent paper the *Temps*. If you like I will give you quotations from the *Bulletin Quotidien*, the organ of the Comité des Forges—an absolutely "independent" paper. They take your part. They say: Here we have serious and sensible people, here are people with a true French soul.

The editor of the *Temps*, a highly independent gentleman (laughter in the hall) since he receives hundreds of thousands of francs from the bourgeoisie, characterises the leaders of the C.G.T.U. and the Communist Party in the following manner:

"They are used to submitting without a murmur (Boville told us the same thing), to think as they are ordered, and to seek in the Leninist gospel a solution for all the problems which arise before them."

But who has corrupted the French labour movement?

Boville told you here that it was the fault of Moscow. He tells us: "Your representatives there have no thought for anything. They no longer believe in their cause, they have lost the methods of struggle, and all the possibilities of action are lost. They are not even capable of speaking any more.

They are machines for the preparation of resolutions, empty people who signify nothing, etc. Such are the results of fidelity to the R.I.L.U."

Boville told us about all this; but another supporter of independence, Dulot, speaks in the same language:

"Since the time that Moscow has put in the workers' midst hatred, calumny, insults and dishonourable acts, going to the length of physical force which took place in the Volie Hall, etc.—since that time the cause is not making any progress." It is obvious that Dulot is highly pained that the cause is not making any progress.

Dulot is occupying himself with the labour question. He publishes a paper under the name of *Journal d'Information Sociale*, in which the left Dumoulin is one of the contributors.

(BOVILLE: Perhaps he was a contributor sometimes but not now.) (Laughter.)

Dulot is well informed. He tells us how the left wing of the C.G.T. met, in accordance with his expression, the right wing of the C.G.T.U., and how a common line was worked out at these private meetings. He is so well informed that he must have had access to reliable sources, is it not so, Comrade Boville?

I pass on to another "independent." This is the paper of the Comité des Forges, a highly solid organisation. It turns out that the Comité des Forges is dissatisfied with our despotism. Boville spoke here of our Asiatic methods. He is a European, but we are, of course, Asiatics. So the *Bulletin Quotidien*, also does not like us. It writes:

"The unitarian militants, coming out against Bolshevist despotism have come, on the one hand, to a peculiar reformism (don't think that he does not understand these things), and on the other hand, have become imbued with the spirit of the Amiens Charter." (12/9/1929.)

"The minority feel that the workers are tired of fruitless struggle to which they are incessantly pushed by the Communist Party: they demand a movement for positive reforms (!) or a trade union movement which does not bear a purely political character." (19/9/1929.)

International wisdom is speaking: listen attentively to the words of a class enemy. But it seems that this wisdom is not to the taste of the minority. You repeat in your Press the same language without knowing perhaps that it is anti-proletarian prose of the purest type. You have resuscitated the Amiens Charter, you wish to push back the French labour movement twenty-six years, and you think that the French proletariat may accept this retreat, this "independence of the trade union movement," which leads the trade unions directly into the camp of the enemies of the working-class.

It is no difficult matter to repeat : "independence, independence !" Even parrots can be taught to do that. But it is necessary, however, to see the new position of the French working-class, it is necessary to take account of the fact that its composition has changed since the war.

Before the war you had no powerful heavy industry. To-day France is one of the first countries in Europe in respect of heavy industries. Great changes have taken place both in the social structure of the country and also the co-relation of the forces. But you take no account of this, you continue to repeat one and the same thing.

Whether you want it or not, but the Communist Party is carrying out and is heading mighty class struggles, winning in the fire of these battles the leading rôle and it is not you who can stop the growth of the influence of this revolutionary Party.

I will, in passing, touch upon the strange method which you apply as a form of defence. One of you has said : "Lenin was an opportunist, and it was because he was an opportunist that the October Revolution was victorious."

(VOICE : This was said by Chaussin.)

Comrades, if Lenin had been an opportunist, the Russian Revolution would not have won.

It is curious how you try to hang on to opportunism and try even to drag Lenin himself into the bosom of your family.

(RAMBAUD : We will speak of this.)

What, however, do you call opportunism ?

(ENGLER : To choose the favourable moment . . .)

The favourable moment for action, but this is not opportunism. To choose, however, all moments for inaction—this is reformism. (Laughter.)

It is important to know what we understand by opportunism. Revolutionary tactics is not a straight line ; a different situation arises, and it is in conformity with this, that the methods change, only the methods, and not the positions aimed at. In regard to the methods, they always remain revolutionary.

There is another thing to which I should like to draw your attention. The minority comrades have said in all their speeches : We are not against the Communist Party doing this or that, we do not object to the workers being members or supporters of the Communist Party (just as they do not object to the workers being members of the Socialist Party). (Laughter.) But in our organ, from the first to the last line, you attack the Communist Party on all questions. And if after this you declare that you have nothing against it, well, this does not sound serious.

Your paper has fully deserved the name "anti-Bolshevik" since from the first line till the last it is directed against the Communist Party. This is why your slogan about independence is only a manoeuvre so as to introduce under that flag reformist contra-

band. This is a pseudonym for anti-Communism. Let us call things by their proper names.

I now pass on to the most important question upon which the minority have specialised, the question of trade union unity.

It is just on this question that they send us their endless reproaches. They ask us : Why have you changed your tactics on the question of trade union unity ? We, however, they never leave off repeating to us, have not changed our positions. We are remaining in our old positions. As MacMahon said : "J'y suis, j'y reste" ("Here I am, Here I remain").

First of all I ask you : May not tactics change ? Are they to be fossilised ?

During the course of our struggle there was a definite period when a somewhat vague left tendency was beginning to form in the Amsterdam International, when the leaders of the British trade union movement expressed their desire to establish systematic contact with the Soviet trade unions. This was an epoch when our task in the international trade union movement was, as it is now, to plant deep roots among the wide masses, and to profit by all the zigzags in the policy of our opponents.

In that epoch, fighting against our line, fighting against the R.I.L.U., the Comintern, the U.S.S.R., etc., the reformists had not yet come out as blacklegs during economic strikes, in that epoch the reformists still carried through economic strikes, they still pushed forward the direct and daily demands of the workers, and we considered that on the basis of these immediate and daily demands we could have entered into negotiations with the leaders and get into touch with new strata of the working-class.

When did we break with the new tactics ? when did a change set in ? It was at the moment when the British trade union leaders betrayed not only the General Strike, but also the miners' economic struggle. The international labour movement had to emphasise this event, it was necessary to say what has changed in the reformist trade unions since in so far as the position of capitalism becomes more complicated and its possibilities for manoeuvring become narrower, reformism passes on to direct strike-breaking. We have seen this in France, and we see this in every other country.

We have, therefore, said : The fight for trade union unity—yes, but only from below. Create the united front with the workers in the process of struggle, organise committees of action, committees of struggle, strike committees with workers of various tendencies ; unite the workers of various organisations in the framework of one and the same movement, endeavour always to isolate the leaders, who enter into agreements with the bourgeoisie, and who come forward against the immediate demands of the working-class, against the eight-hour day, etc.

At the present time we see, and I am surprised how blind you are that you do not see, that in all countries, France included, the reformist trade unions not only assist the employers' offensive, they not only support it, but they very often head the movement with the sole purpose of disrupting it.

Is this of any importance to you? Not in the least. Life, the struggle, all the changes that are taking place, are they of any importance to you? Absolutely none. You do not change, you are fossilised.

Not to change is not difficult at all.

You prepared a resolution for the Congress of the C.G.T.U. in which it says: "Unity on the basis of the class struggle, on the basis of the independence of trade union democracy and free convictions." Here we do not see the Amiens charter!

This result is a compromise between your various groupings, for you are not at all as one-sided as you wish to pretend. This can be seen from the articles in the Press of your industrial unions. But we want to know—unity with what aim, with whom and on what basis, etc.

You try to picture yourself unity as an object in itself, as a panacea.

There is a united trade union movement in England, and this united trade union movement disrupts all strikes.

The thing is not in abstract unity, in reformist unity, in unity at any price, in Unity with a capital letter. What we want to know is the object for which unity will be established, who you will unite with, and on what basis unity will come about.

If you were real supporters of unity, if your slogan of unity were not the product of political calculations, then why did you not accept the proposition of the C.G.T.U. on the question of unity?

The manifesto of the C.G.T.U. on the question of unity is not acceptable for the minority, because it does not pre-suppose linking up with the reformist leaders. This is the one disagreement. But if so say so openly. You have told us here that Domou-lain is a great revolutionary, and that you have not despaired of him. You have a strong digestion if you can digest such things. It appears then that Domou-lain is a revolutionist, but in the first place he is a member of the Socialist Party, and in the second he is a responsible member of the "Populaire" . . . (Boville protests.) Why does your left eye see crooked while your right eye sees straight?

You have told us here that there is a great reformist leader who also stands for unity, namely, Digat. I know him a little. In the Socialist Party he belongs to Renaudel's fraction; here is a 100 per cent. unitarian, and so, in your opinion, the fraction of Renaudel, and Paul Boncour, is something good; and you consider that these persons, open imperialists, and open servants of French imperialism, are

unitarians who want unity? They play with you as with children. But you are not children and this is mutual inclination. A friend of Renaudel, a member of the right wing of the French Socialist Party, a friend of Paul Boncour, is also a friend of Rambaud, Engler, etc. And you want us, who have, after all, some international experience, to trust these manoeuvres even to the extent of one cent. What do you take us for?

If you would have carried out a policy which was capable of attracting the workers, the members of the reformist unions, which was capable of setting the workers against these friends of Renaudel, then you would have done a good thing. But you do not want to, or cannot understand, that the object of all these machinations of Dumou-lain, Digat and others, is but the disorganisation and corruption of the C.G.T.U. and the French revolutionary movement.

You must understand that Jouheaux has become unbearable even to the reformists. He sells himself too often and too openly. I would not like to use vulgar expressions, but Jouheaux is something in the nature of a fashionable cocotte; he has become unbearable even to the reformists. They are looking for a deputy, who is supplied with a certain amount of left phraseology, who should replace Jouheaux, who has already compromised himself. Jouheaux receives from the French Government approximately 600,000 francs per annum, this, of course, is not very much for a trade union functionary . . .

(BOVILLE: Not so much, not altogether)

Well, I have not the personal account of Mr. Jouheaux, I have not checked his bookkeeping, but you must understand that when a Minister travels to Geneva and he is paid like a Minister, because he there represents imperialist France, then he receives a nice round sum.

Jouheaux has become unbearable even for the reformists. If this continues the reformist C.G.T. will begin to decompose. The leaders of the Socialist Party, more conspicuous than others, enter into all sorts of combinations, all sorts of machinations, they seek new methods so as to keep the C.G.T. on the path of reformism, on the path of French capitalism.

Such are the tasks of these so-called lefts of the C.G.T.

(LUTHGEN: Dumou-lain said at the Conference of the 10th of June that the reformist district secretaries are as imbued with the same spirit as the prefects.)

You may believe him, he speaks by the book.

Your good intentions do not cost very much, for the road to hell is paved with good intentions. If you want to sit down between two stools, if you consider it possible to cure the reformist leaders of reformism then one can see at once who is the deceiver and who the deceived.

Here is Comrade Bour, an old functionary who bears on his shoulders thirty-five years of a fighting life. What does he do at the time of the textile strike? He sends 500 francs to the reformists, 400 francs to the autonomists and 100 francs to the unitarians. I suggest to you to name even one "left" reformist trade union which would have done any such thing.

It is possible that Bour has acted sincerely, but he committed a crime since it is a crime against the French working-class when a unitarian trade union acts in a manner which shows that it is the reformist union which is of importance and not the unitarian trade union. How then do you, after this, want us to judge you if not as of enemies?

And to think that all this is done in the name of the unity of trade unions!

THE MINORITY AND THE REFORMISTS.

I now pass on to a very important disagreement, which touches upon the question of the relations to the reformists. You say that they are brothers. In your Press you always speak of fratricidal war. What does that mean? When fights go on between workers, these are fratricidal fights, but I ask you: when and where did the Communist Party and the C.G.T.U. leadership organise fratricidal fights between workers? They are fighting, but against the reformist leaders, who are not our brothers, but the brothers of the bourgeoisie, of the Briands, the Poincarés, the Lavalles and the other rascals. These are not *our* brothers, but yours and you have remarkable relatives.

We notice in all your activities, that you are exceedingly gentle, polite and amiable in relation to the reformist leaders and aggressive, sharp, and cynical, as Boville says, who is a specialist in this business, in relation to the Communists and the C.G.T.U. Do you think that this is only a question of temperament? No, this is a policy, this is your line for an approach towards reformism.

Another thing. Our task is to tear the masses of workers, the members of the reformist organisations, from the reformist leaders, to create a gulf between the rank and file workers who are toiling in the factories, and those who draw them towards the bourgeoisie.

Can this be attained by your methods? No. With the assistance of your methods you will not succeed in creating a hostile tendency directed against these gentlemen. Our duty, if we are revolutionists, is to create this hostile current, to make life burdensome to all these bandits, who sell the workers. With your methods, however, you try to make life a burden not to them but to the Communist functionaries, and this is another thing altogether.

This is why your methods of struggle and ours are diametrically opposed to one another.

We want to win the masses by means of the united front and the unity in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and not with the assistance of idle talk, not by entering into alliance with the leaders, as you do, which delays trade union unity and which will in any case be realised without you, against you and your reformist allies.

THE MINORITY STRIKE STRATEGY.

We do not agree with you on the question of the leadership of strikes. You have told us here about strikes in which you have shown wonders. Be it so. Let us take only two great strikes of the current year, the miners' strike and the strike of the textile workers. In the miners' strike we openly confessed our mistakes. We did not carry on self-criticism of the kind which was carried on by Boville here, and which amounts to the criticism of others. You can find in the pamphlet, issued by the C.G.T.U., an enumeration of all the mistakes committed by our comrades in the miners' strike. They made many mistakes, but they did not carry on any strike-breaking work, while there are minorities who did carry out such work, as I will prove to you immediately on the basis of documents signed by them.

The date of the declaration of the miners' strike was fixed for the 16th of March, but the minority miners' trade union in Loire was against this date. Every trade union has a right to be against, when a question is under discussion, but when a decision has been adopted, when a call for a strike has already been issued, then every trade union, whether minority or not, is bound to march together with the others even if it does not agree with the date selected.

But the minority trade union of Loire a few days before the 16th of March, published a placard containing as follows:

UNITARIAN MINERS' TRADE UNION OF LOIRE.

COMRADES, MINeworkERS!

ATTENTION!

MADMEN OR SWINDLERS.

Miners of Loire, the 16th of March is drawing near.

Miners, a big noise has been raised in connection with this date.

Miners, irresponsible persons or disrupters, alien to your trade, desire to compel you to obey without a murmur, like little children, and are spreading false rumours about our trade union and our functionaries.

Miners, remember and bear in mind that there is only one unitarian trade union.

Miners, do not follow any other slogan but the one which will be proclaimed by our respective

trade union organisations ; otherwise we cannot take upon ourselves the responsibility for the actions of others.

Miners, trust us to the end !

Engler, what does that mean ? Is not this strike-breaking ? I ask you what right have the minority to act so despicably ? Is this the independence of trade union movement ? Is all this done for the attainment of trade union unity ? This is the purest strike-breaking and only renegades, people who have sold themselves can act thus, such people and also provocateurs.

Boville said in his speech : "Take the miners' strike, it did not draw in the wide masses." But if your minorities are against, if you are acting against strikes, how do you want the reformist workers to participate in them ? I am no longer surprised that only 35 or 45 thousand miners took part in this strike ! their strike was directed not only against the mine-owners, not only against the Government, not only against the reformists, but also against you.

In connection with the strike of the textile workers you wrote articles. But did you not write in the *Cri du Peuple* that the "conduct of the reformist leaders at the time of that strike was irreproachable?" As though you did not know all the negotiations of the reformists which were going on behind the scenes, as though you are little children ! As though you did not know that the reformists placed themselves at the head of this strike so as to behead it more easily.

The reformist leaders were drawn into the strike of the workers because if they had not taken part in the strike, the workers would have left the reformist trade unions. And you say that "the position of the reformist leaders was irreproachable." In this case, who then is not irreproachable ? Obviously they must be the unitarians.

Another thing, When the strike came to a critical moment, the reformists proclaim the slogan to return to work, and the unitarians the slogan to continue the strike, what does the *Cri du Peuple* do ?

"We, of course, could not find a decision which was capable of reconciling all . . . If unity had existed," the paper writes. It was necessary to say whether to strike or not to but you declare : Oh, if unity had existed . . . and you do not say whether you are in favour of the strike or not, Of what use is it to whimper when the reformists say : "Return to work" and the unitarians : "No, do not return to work." You should not whimper but you should say that it was necessary to continue the strike.

You are searching for a golden mean between those who are striking and those who are disrupting the

strike and you have not the courage to take up a definite position.

In the course of many years we have studied every strike, every dispute, We organised a conference on the questions of strike strategy in Strassburg. No one of you has, of course, read the resolutions of this Conference. We try to find out the methods with the aid of which the working-class can secure victories, can come out of the difficult position in which it finds itself ; but we could never have believed that we could find people in our own ranks who would proclaim slogans directed against strikes.

Neither the R.I.L.U. resolutions nor the resolutions of the conference took any account of the experience, which this new method can give, and for which you have the right to take out a patent.

This is something quite new for us, but something which is so disgusting that I cannot understand how any honest workers can bear it.

TRADE UNION WORK AND THE MINORITY.

You, in accordance with your own words, have your own peculiarities. But are these peculiarities of the movement so great that you must apply trade union democracy absolutely upside down ?

Trade union democracy has not been invented by you. It pre-supposes not only the election of all trade union organs, but also the responsibility of all these organs before the electors and before the higher organs, including in that number also the R.I.L.U. Comrade Rambaud said to us in reply to the question of Piatnitsky : "If your proposals will conform to our constitution we will agree ; if, however, our constitution will not conform to the proposals, the constitution will be the supreme law." Do you think that a national or international movement can exist, can develop, can be strengthened and extended, can increase its influence, if everyone of us will remain in his own little corner and say : "Attention to my constitution !" ? Is anything laid down in your constitution about a revolution in France ? I believe there is nothing stated in it and if a revolution will come, if it will be necessary to fight you will say : "This is against our constitution."

(RAMBAUD : The constitution does not foresee a revolution !)

No. And it will be bad for the revolution when it happens in France ; Rambaud will say : "First of all the constitution and then the revolution."

I ask you how you, supposed to be adherents, members of our R.I.L.U., have the pitiable courage to say : "A new congress is unacceptable !" Why ? We do not know any details. You say that you have the majority. Others say the same thing. Is it anti-democratic on the part of the R.I.L.U. to appeal to the majority and the minority and say : "You argue upon this question, so organise a congress and let both sides be given all the guarantees."

What is there anti-democratic in all this? Why cannot the supreme international organisation apply such a method of intervention and what in your opinion is the role of the R.I.L.U.? What must it do with you? To leave it to all to act as they think fit and not to fight against a split in the organisation, to permit the penetration of the enemy into our ranks, to leave it to you to be independent of the revolutionary international? And you consider that our proposals are opposed to trade union democracy?

I ask you: what inner life exists in your trade unions? what education are you according to your members? where and how have you members of the minority carried out self-criticism of your weaknesses and mistakes? Trade union democracy, however, pre-supposes the carrying on of such self-criticism. Why, after every strike, do you not convene special meetings for the study of the weaknesses and the negative sides? How do you want to educate those who have committed these foolishnesses and mistakes and those who have sincerely made mistakes? But you have a different idea of trade union democracy.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE MINORITY OF THE C.G.T.U.

We disagree with you on the question of the inter-relations between the federation and the trade union centre. Let us make ourselves acquainted with your brief but brilliant history. You have said here that you wanted to straighten out the line of the C.G.T.U. But is it in such ways that the line of an organisation is straightened out? Is it possible to do it with your methods?

First of all, being members of a central organisation, you have formed your own organisation which embraces members of others. You have formed one organisation with the reformists. You call it a committee, but you act as an organisation, with its own budget, with its own newspaper, calling conferences, etc. You have formed a united front with the reformists and against your own trade union centre.

Is it by such methods that it is possible to straighten out a line if there is something to straighten out at all? No, in such a way an organisation is simply corrupted.

But there is something else. You have resorted to methods absolutely unheard of in the labour movement.

That there are spies in every revolutionary organisation is known to all. It is quite obvious that the police would not send their spies to the reformist C.G.T., since the same work is being carried out by its leaders. It is not worth the trouble. The police will also not send their spies to you, since you are hindering the revolutionary movement.

The police send their spies into our ranks in all countries in the world. This is its speciality. It is necessary to fight energetically against such spies,

but it is necessary to know how to fight. The duty of every militant is to strain all efforts to expose these spies. And when Comrade Rambaud puts the counter-question to us, should we expose provocateurs or refrain from doing so, I say that to put such a question is to answer it. Obviously he who conceals provocateurs is an enemy of the working-class. But there is struggle and struggle. There are different methods with which this business can be undertaken.

Referring to all your literature on the question, I see that the whole of your Press write that the Communist Party and the C.G.T.U. is bubbling over, and penetrated through and through with this infection, that the Communist Party is concealing spies, and that the leading organs of the C.G.T.U. do the same.

I ask you, why do they conceal spies? To conceal them they must in some way be interested in this. Therefore, these are such organisations at the head of which are people who are interested in concealing such types?

Let us pass on to the article of Boville in the *Cri du Peuple* on 15th of April. It is headed "We will Expose the Source of Impotence in the Labour Movement—the Police Agents!"

"It is time to raise the alarm," writes Boville, "more energetically than was the case before. The miners' strike has confirmed the fact that the police infection, has brought about a mass devastation in the ranks of the Communist Party and has also embraced the C.G.T.U. Why, they may ask, does the confederation take as bed-fellows anyone without choosing?"

The language of the article is somewhat singular. After all, the C.G.T.U. is your organisation in some way. You declare that you are members of the C.G.T.U. and when you say that the C.G.T.U. is "sleeping with anyone without choosing," do you ask yourself what it means? What is this? Is it the language of a labour militant or that of a Montmartre apache?

"The miners' strike has thrown a bright light on that which yesterday was called the politicalisation of strikes. A happy formula . . . and really, this formula has permitted (listen to this attentively!) all agent-provocateurs, all police informers to pass from their nuclei, where as the result of their caprice too much attention was devoted to theory in the domain of real action."

What have you here in view, Boville? Prison cells or Party cells? ("Cells" is in French the same as "nuclei.")

I continue:

"The document published by us below proves without the possibility of contradiction the colossal rôle which the police play in the leading organs of the strike movement. And it is this Party which pretends to be the leader of the labour movement! The

Party which up till now was unable to drive out from its ranks a single police agent, because, to speak the truth, these gentlemen leave of their own accord, when they consider their mission ended."

And here is the conclusion :

"This ulcer has penetrated much more deeply than we thought up till now. The C.G.T.U. is infected from top to bottom."

I ask you, Boville, have you gone so white that you have lost the ability of blushing? What does all this mean? Spying from top to bottom, spies make the policy of the Party and the C.G.T.U., and the bourgeoisie is against the Communist Party and against the C.G.T.U.!

And you think, that with the aid of such methods you will be able to straighten out the line! What is this, a proletarian method or a police one?

(BOVILLE : They speak of us still more badly.)

Why have you raised such a noise? Where are your documentary data? There is a police protocol in which some sort of a woman spy reports that she had heard of some kind of a strike committee at some kind of a meeting. In accordance with the words of the *Cri du Peuple*, this report fell into the hands of the *Cri du Peuple* through the intermediary of the Socialist Party and the reformist trade unions. Here are the links of the chain: the Intelligence Service, the Socialist Party, the reformist union and the so-called revolutionary minority.

And so a spy was present at a meeting, who then reported to his superiors. And this is described in such a manner that the whole Party, the whole C.G.T.U., is bubbling over with agents.

We, Russian Bolsheviks, have in this respect somewhat greater experience than you. Our experience was first of all based on our personal experience, and also on the data which we have discovered in the archives after the October Revolution. In the archives we have found the names of such workers in the movement whom we could never have suspected of provocation. The documents in these archives are many, and they illustrate the most varied methods of spying.

One of these methods consists in throwing suspicions on active functionaries who cannot be bought. Rumours are begun to be spread that a certain comrade is connected with the police, and the work of corruption of the organisation begins.

But you, members of the minority of the C.G.T.U., are you there so as to assist the police work with your articles which are full of the most absurd stories? Do you consider that it is possible in this way to purify our organisation? Never on your life! If you say that the whole organisation from top to bottom is bubbling over with spies, how do you wish to purify it? What class enemy could take upon himself work as dirty as this? If the Intelligence

Service paid you for your articles, you could not have worked better!

Comrade Boville told us here with his habitual eloquence, upon which I congratulate him, that there are people in France who are speculating on the Russian Revolution.

I ask who are these speculators? The revolutionaries who are persecuted and thrown into prison? What advantages does the membership of the Communist Party give in France? Is it the advantage that all, including in their number also the minority, should throw mud at you, that you should be thrown into prison, and be subjected to persecution? Is this what speculating on the Revolution means? Your language is known to me. Does not the bourgeois Press speak with the same language? Do not the reactionary deputies, the radical-socialists, the Socialists, all the reactionary papers, and the whole yellow Press, cry at all the street corners that the Communist Party, and that the C.G.T.U. is in the pay of the Russian Government, that they speculate on the Russian Revolution?

Why do you make use of the language of our enemies? Why have you forgotten the revolutionary grammar? Your language, your expressions, your turn of words, all this has been appropriated from the Press of the worst enemies of the French working-class. You come to Moscow, to the R.I.L.U. and repeat the same phrases and say the same things.

If you are sincere, what poverty of thought! But such things cannot be spoken sincerely, this is politics, the worst form of intrigue, the worst methods of bespattering with mud.

I ask you: how could it happen, that, whatever proposals were made by the C.G.T.U., whatever campaigns and proposals had originated from the R.I.L.U., you are always against them, you must always speak against us? Either it is too soon, or it is too late. Either it does not conform with the specific peculiarities of the French working-class or you are otherwise engaged. You always find thousands and hundreds of thousands of excuses to be against and always to think of the united front with our enemies against us. What is this, an accident? I do not think so.

THE IMMEDIATE DANGER OF WAR.

You are against our tactics. You have come here to tell us, relying upon the dictionary of Larousse, that the danger of war is not so immediate.

You say: If we will always cry war, the working-class risks being caught unawares, that the working-class does not believe in war. There is no danger of war, no one wants war. I am quite certain that the French workers do not want war. But is it of this that we are speaking? Did the workers want war in 1914? No, they did not want it, but they were

engaged in it and you know what it cost them. Is war prepared openly? Or do you wish to convince us that international imperialism is not preparing war, that the danger of war is not immediately in front of us, that it is not an urgent question?

But in this case, why the armaments? Perhaps, as Briand said at the Washington Conference in 1922, the submarines are built with the objects of catching crabs, and cruisers to catch fish.

And the armaments of Poland and Rumania, and all these negotiations about the united front against the Soviet Union? How do you imagine to yourselves the beginning of war? Perhaps you imagine it as follows: On one fine day, the Committee of the Independence of the Trade Union Movement receives the following letter: "Dear citizens, We herewith duly inform you that we intend to begin war. Please take the necessary measures. (Signed) Briand." (Laughter.)

How, in your opinion, will war break out?

Lenin wrote that war is prepared in the dark, that the struggle with war is exceedingly difficult. Do not believe those who say to you, Let us wait to fight war until the time when war breaks out.

It is necessary to fight against war every day. And when in such an international situation, you in your Press, at the congresses, in your decisions and special resolutions,—when you say that the question of war is not immediate, you thereby disarm the working-class. Did you not say: We do not consider that the danger of war is directly inevitable? Did not Boville here tell us under cover of the dictionary of Larousse, that the danger of war does not bear an immediate character?

When, then, will you begin the struggle against war? What will you do? how will you organise the working masses? Is not the experience of 1914 sufficient for you? What else do you require, what else are you waiting for?

You are so unconscientious that you do not even understand that by your methods you are bringing war nearer.

If we fight every day, if we beat the alarm, if we mobilise the masses, the bourgeoisie sees that the working masses are declaring against war and they therefore retreat.

If you begin your work of lulling, if you keep on repeating that there will be no war, you are doing the work of French imperialism. French imperialism says: These fellows are not acting badly. We may, during that time, engage in negotiations. The French General Staff may send its generals to Rumania, to Poland, may send out its military instructions, etc. The minority will willingly cover us up.

Do you know how many French officers and military instructors there are in Rumania and in Poland? You do not know it. Do you know that in France

where you are playing the rôle of leaders, there are special ports for the forwarding of war material to Poland?

(ENGLER: Yes, yes.)

Do you know that there is a special port for the forwarding of war material to Rumania? Do you know that French imperialism is building strategic railways, that it is assigning millions for the strengthening of the war industry in Poland, Rumania and Czecho-Slovakia?

And you have the doubtful courage to speak, write and declare at meetings and at congresses that the danger of war is an exaggeration, an invention of those who stand at the head of the Communist Party and the C.G.T.U.

Whom are you working for with such methods? Is this revolutionary tactics? These are tactics, which are in contradiction to all the traditions, and the whole practice of the international revolutionary movement.

And you continue to call yourselves revolutionaries, you remain members of the Red International of Labour Unions, and you write on all your letter-headings "R.I.L.U.," as does the trade union of Loire. But tell me, must there be a certain minimum of common ideology, yes or no?

WHO ARE YOU?

In the beginning I asked you: Who are you? As you have not replied to this question, I will try to establish this on the basis of documentary data, because I have an old habit of appealing to documents, even when they are not interesting.

Here is an open letter, sent to the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. by the minority. Two members of the minority were included in the unitarian delegation, Rambaud and Olivier. Rambaud is a sufficiently representative figure for the "revolutionary" ideology and tactics of the minority. They refused. "We will not go," they said, "because the C.G.T.U. has elected a delegation for the whole C.G.T.U."

Then instead of Rambaud, I do not know whether Rambaud could have been so eloquent,—the minority published a document. This document will remain a shameful stain for the whole of your life! You will see that at once.

"Bolshevism," this document says, "is a political system which arose in Russia in 1903 in the specific Russian economic and political conditions (listen to this well!); this system was inspired by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois revolutionary methods (Jacobinism and Blanquism) and has made use of the discovery by Marx and Engels and together with them of the class struggle of the proletariat."

Taking into consideration that scientific discovery is not one of the strong points of the minority, I should like to tell them the following: It was just the Russian Mensheviks who always accused the

Bolsheviks of Jacobinism and Blanquism to which Lenin always replied: "Yes, we are the Jacobins of the twentieth century, the proletarian Jacobins."

You catch hold of the Menshevik accusations, Well, all right, but I do not consider that the Russian Mensheviks suffered from too much revolutionism.

Further on the characterisation of Bolshevism assumes the following form:

"It rejects trade union democracy. It applies a narrow centralism and a method of appointment from above. It readily limits syndicalism by shop trade unionism. It doubts whether freely elected proletarians are capable of leadership. It is a convinced supporter of the subjection of proletarian organisations to the professional revolutionary staff."

This is what Bolshevism is in your opinion.

It appears that you know what is Bolshevism. You are experts in these matters, this is why you have signed all this (. . . . protests).

(PERIGNON: I did not write this!)

The signature under this document is the Committee of the Independence of Trade Unions. Are you a member of the Committee or not? What can be said of such a prosaic style? It is ignorance multiplied by frivolity!

After this brilliant characterisation of Bolshevism—they understand Bolshevism these minority people—they continue:

"Communism is an economic doctrine, which expresses the principles of scientific socialism and manifests itself in the struggle of the proletariat as a class with the bourgeoisie which has constructed itself as a class."

And so, Communism manifests itself, and not through the Party, Communism is something which is on the side of the fight. Every word in this "scientific" phrase is unscientific and is, in plain language, absurd.

But wait a moment, there is something better still. Here is where we can find out who they are.

"The revolutionary syndicalist minority of the C.G.T.U., starting from economic determinism (Boville, Rambaud, you will perhaps explain to us what this means) taking an unceasing part in the class struggle with the employers, striving for labour democracy and having in view exclusively the interests of the proletariat, are of course distinguishable from Bolshevism, but remain in agreement with scientific socialism and aspire with greater right than anyone else to the name of Communists."

Good! Here it is clearly stated that we are not Bolsheviks. We suspected this. Bolsheviks are made of sterner stuff. You cannot make guns and steel shells from warm water and filings. Of course you are not Bolsheviks.

But it appears you are Communists. What does that mean? You are grown-up people and you send such a document to an international congress. Is it

possible to represent oneself in such a ridiculous light? So it appears you are "wild" Communists? Communists who have come to an understanding with reformists against the Comintern? Communists who are fighting with the fundamental principles of Communism? Partisans of Communism, eh? Or Communists-anti-Bolsheviks? You are Communists? Please stop!

In every one of your formulae you manifest your ignorance. What is the difference between a Communist and Bolshevik? And how can it be, that you Communists should be against the French Communists? Why write such things? You say, that you rely upon economic determinism, but none of us knows what this is.

(BOVILLE: This is a misprint! He makes use of a misprint!)

No, this is not a misprint, this is foolishness. If this is a misprint then I can find you tens of these. If your programme consists of nothing but misprints, then why do you send it to the Congress?

But there is something worse, there are some disgraceful things in this document and I will demonstrate them before you.

Is the same open letter we are accused of having broken up the Anglo-Russian Committee, that we have approved of the removal of the old opportunist leadership of the All-Union C.C. of T.U., that we have given instructions in the United States to form new revolutionary trade unions, in a word, we are accused of disruption and are treated as disrupters. But this is not all. I must here cite a quotation which is exceedingly curious.

"The R.I.L.U. renounced the tactics of pushing the trade union chiefs into the struggle in the name of perfectly disruptive tactics, which means that there is a risk that in a short time the German supporters of the R.I.L.U. will unite with the trade unions of the Berlin International."

It appears then that we were wrong when we fought against the slogans of the German opportunists?

Why do you accuse the R.I.L.U. which nowhere maintained these tactics? We consider that you cannot compel reformists to fight. They do not wish to fight, or more truly, they fight against the workers. And so, French opportunism is not sufficient for you, you desire to take under your patronage the German opportunists? I congratulate you on such a kind of internationalism! But there are still worse things. The minority, the representatives of which are here, is dissatisfied with the work of the R.I.L.U. This is its right. If they have something to say, it is their duty to say it. And if Rambaud told us here all that he thinks, it would have been well. Permit me to quote what he writes: "The whole bureaucratic centralism, the whole neglect of trade union democracy, the whole system of secret diplomacy (!), which

was habitual to the Amsterdam International and which we jointly exposed, all this we find in the R.I.L.U. itself."

You had the possibility of coming here and saying all this at the Congress, and to act honestly. And you should have come. Would it not have been better to have appeared, so as to say all this with or without documents in your hands, if you considered your statements right?

You have put forward your accusation absolutely without any proof, without the slightest reference to facts, and with all this you continued to call yourselves members of the R.I.L.U.!

But there is something even still worse.

At the end of this manifesto we read: "In regard to the inner life of the R.I.L.U., we put the question to the Fifth Congress of how does it stand with the question on the financial side? what is the budget of the R.I.L.U.? what are the sums of dues paid from the time of the Fourth Congress by the sections? what is the estimate of expenditure? what is the budget of the working Executive Bureau?"

I see nothing special in this, when one section desires to receive a financial report. But we and you have come here not to play hide-and-seek, and I ask you what should this mean? For you are responsible for this. (PERIGNON: Who signed this?)

This is signed by the Executive Committee of the Independence of the Trade Union Movement of which Chamberland, Boville, Engler, Rambaud and others are members. Answer me: Are you in favour of it?—yes or no! All right, I will answer you: we receive money from the All-Union C.C. of T.U. Is there anything disgraceful in this that we should take money from the Russian proletariat? And you, who have displayed such curiosity, have you sent your dues to the R.I.L.U.? Do you consider that the R.I.L.U. when it has the possibility should assist strikes, yes or no?

(Delegation: Yes!)

Well, and what does the bourgeois Press say? Bolshevik agents, money of the Russian Government, Russian money, etc., etc. You put the same questions to us. Be it so, do not think that we will be ashamed to answer you.

The Soviet trade unions have at present 14 million members. Their annual budget amounts to 600 million roubles, i.e., 7 to 8 milliards francs. For you these are fantastic figures, you have not the slightest idea of all this, but here with unprecedented frivolity write to the Congress and say: "We ask you where did you get your money from?"

Why do you ask this? Are you doing this for the French Government?

(BOVILLE: We will give you a clear answer to this.)

All right, it is necessary to answer this very clearly if you will only be able to do so. I recall how even before the war, in 1910, when the *Humanité* found

itself in a difficult position, the German Social-Democratic Party sent it 20,000 marks. Can you imagine what a howl was raised by the reaction? I understand that the bourgeois Press is against international solidarity, but when you tread the same path, when you do the same, is it not true that this is low-down politics? And you do not protest against this. You wish that the International Congress should wash all this dirty linen? But then one does not reply to such nastiness. One does not reply to provocative letters. (Applause.)

One does not reply to those who are forging weapons for the class enemy, one does not reply to that sort of literature.

After all this, after this manifesto, you say that you are Communists. Being members of this committee you affirm that you are members of the R.I.L.U. Do you think that we shall be able seriously to accept these declarations, do you think that we shall be able to believe you? when you appear before the R.I.L.U. with provocative speeches? Of course not! It is documents that are important, not words.

(PIATNITSKY: Which of the minority comrades here present have taken an active part in the composition of this document?)

BOVILLE AND RAMBAUD: Only we. (Laughter.)

BOUR: Many are laughing. I say that I have not taken any part in the editing of the letter, not because I want to avoid responsibility, but because I was not a member of the editorial commission. But, however, I also take responsibility.

PIATNITSKY: But do you agree with this document?

BOUR: Yes, but you are not interpreting it rightly. (Laughter.)

WHERE ARE YOU GOING?

The question arises, where are you going? Who you are we already know. You have declared that you are in the R.I.L.U., that you intend to remain in it. These are only words. And your deeds? Your deeds, the papers which you have signed, the speeches you have delivered, all this contradicts your declarations of your fidelity to the R.I.L.U.

You say that you are proceeding towards revolution. No, the contrary will be more correct; your line leads direct to the reformist C.G.T., and this means that you are proceeding against the revolution. Whether you want it or no, this is the path along which you are going. When your supporters will understand all this, you will obviously remain alone with the reformists.

We have seen here not only you but also others. There are comrades here, who remember great French orators who had come here and made eloquent declarations. I recall Frossard. Six months after he had returned to France he formed a petty transition organisation, so that afterwards he could again join the Socialist Party and become a deputy for

Martinique. Now he is a millionaire. Yes, Frossard is a millionaire. I do not say that any one of you will become a millionaire. I only note the danger of your path. Mind your step!

(BOVILLE : But these are political details.)

And are you not political details?

(BOVILLE : But we are syndicalists.)

Oh, yes! And those who had been born of syndicalism, those shouters and brawlers, Jouheaux, Evette and the others, where are they now? And the anarcho-syndicalists, who shouted night and day of the social revolution, where are they? In the Chamber of Deputies there are many former Socialists and anarcho-syndicalists, the Briands, the Millerands and the Lavalles. I could quote as many names as you like. We have seen orators, who had preached the general strike, and then killed workers at the time of economic strikes. Your path is the path of reformism against the working-class, whatever the signboards under which you appear, whatever the declarations which you make. Our duty is to tell you with full frankness all that we think, however sharp it may sound.

Now you see where our disagreements lie. For the rest as I have already said, we agree with you! Our position in relation to you provokes demagoguery, and calumny in which you willingly swim. If the R.I.L.U. were a purely Communist organisation, you would have been thrown out a long time ago. But we are an organisation which groups the workers of various tendencies, Communists, Socialists, anarchists, syndicalists, non-Party, confusionists, opportunists and members of minorities. This is why you are still not expelled.

But the R.I.L.U. is not a philosophical club, it is not a masonic society, where according to Rambaud they are occupied with philosophy. It is true, that Rambaud considers that even Lenin was a mason! Comrade Piatnitsky, how long have you known Lenin personally?

(PIATNITSKY : From 1902.)

And I was acquainted with him from 1905, I have met him in France and in other places. Piatnitsky and I have never heard anything of the sort! And yet the Russian Party is exceedingly interested in all questions which touch upon the life and activity of Lenin. No one ever knew that Lenin was a mason.

(LETHGEN : Rambaud is sleeping, perhaps he dreamt it!) (Laughter.)

This is no laughing matter. How can militant functionaries permit themselves such things?

(RAMBAUD : And was Kerr also not a mason?)

Yes, Kerr was a mason, and later left them, but Kerr is not Lenin. How can a man who considers himself a revolutionary talk of such wild things? What is the object? Do you consider that the Bolshevik Party would have permitted masons to be at its head?

In Engler's journal, in the "Proletarian Revolution" I have found something about Lenin which it is worth while quoting since it is characteristic of the level of the people, who still call themselves revolutionaries.

In the "Proletarian Revolution" which contains nothing either of the revolution nor of the proletariat, in the July number for 1931, a report is published of the Congress of the Spanish National Confederation of Labour. The author is unknown, but the editorial board is responsible for the article. In this letter they write about Pestanier. It appears that the leader of the trade union confederation, who had come to an understanding with Primo de Rivera and afterwards with Berenger, and who is now coming to an understanding with the murderer of the workers, Cabaliero, it appears that this Pestanier is a great man, one of the most important figures in Spain. The author of the article writes :

"Some journalists have compared him to Lenin. But he is much greater than Lenin because he is a worker, because he was a shepherd, because he did not simply languish in the libraries of the British Museum and elsewhere, because he did not engage in hair-splitting, because in the very height of 'Pistol-ism' he remained for months the regular editor of the *Solidaridad Obrera* in Barcelona. Happy the National Confederation of Labour that it entered into the fight with such a Pestanier at its head!"

(ENGLER : This was no doubt written by some anarchist. You will not deceive me, I do not doubt for a moment what you are reading, but you will not deceive me.)

And so, Pestanier is greater than Lenin, but the thing does not lie there. The following question arises : It is perfectly known to all that the leaders of the National Confederation of Labour have come to an understanding with the Republican Socialist Government, that they assumed the undertaking not to participate in economic strikes. You have before you a type who betrays the labour movement and who in your journal is called a man who stands "higher than Lenin." What is this like?

(ENGLER : It is like nothing on earth.)

What sort of a method is this? This is a disgrace, something absolutely shocking. What should a man say who has at least two sous' worth of lucidity? He should have said that the National Confederation of Labour is a drag on the movement of Spain, is disrupting the movement. And instead of this this counter-revolutionary is represented to the French workers as a great man "because he did not languish in libraries," because he is an ignoramus.

(ENGLER : This is simply nonsense.)

No, this is not nonsense, this is anti-Communist politics which smells of unheard-of poison. But if it were just merely nonsense, if we read in the minority

publications nothing but foolishness then where will this lead to ?

(ENGLER : They will not be repeated.)

(STEPANOV : Who are the members of the Editorial Committee ?)

The manager of the paper is Chambelland and the editor is Monat. However this be, it bears quite an epic character.

What are we, a philosophic club, an international society for the discussion of all sorts of opportunist deformities, or are we an international of action ?

We are a class organisation which has a right to demand discipline, which has a right to demand recognition of all the resolutions of its congresses, the fulfilment of the decisions of all its leading organs on the questions relating to the international and of the French labour movement.

You are for independence and that means that everyone in his own little corner may be guilty of the greatest betrayals. But this is practised in the Amsterdam International and not by us.

You have linked yourselves up in united front with our enemies. From an ideological point of view, from a tactical point of view, from the point of view of your activities, you have already placed yourselves outside the R.I.L.U., but organisationally you are connected with it. I ask you, do you wish to be members of the R.I.L.U. ? does this bind you to anything before our international organisation ?

(ENGLER : Yes, we have never changed our intentions.)

I think I have already told you the duties which this results in. And now in conclusion, I will permit myself to put to you a few questions :

BE FRANK AND HONEST.

(1) Do you recognise the decisions of the Fourth and Fifth Congresses and the leading organs of the R.I.L.U. ?

(2) Do you recognise the obligation to participate in the campaigns organised by the R.I.L.U. (the International Day for the Struggle with Unemployment, the International Day for the Struggle with War, the Campaign for the Assistance of the Working-class and the Trade Unions in China and Spain, collections in aid of the fighting workers, strikers in other countries, etc.) ?

(3) Do you consider yourselves to be bound by the decisions of the R.I.L.U. on the general questions of the French trade union movement, and also in connection with the solution of disputes between one or another organisation (disputes within the organisation of the railwayworkers on the State railways, expulsions of trade unions and members, who have not been stained in any way ?).

(4) Do you consider yourselves bound to take part in strikes, in manifestations of protest and in all campaigns, carried out by the C.G.T.U., it being

understood that freedom of opinion is only permissible up to the beginning of the movement and after its conclusion ?

(5) Do you recognise the right of the majority to form their committees of defence of the adherents of the majority, within your federations for the defence of their point of view on condition that discipline is maintained in the struggle with the bourgeoisie ?

(6) Do you recognise the right of the delegates of the R.I.L.U. and the C.G.T.U. to be present at your congresses and general meetings and maintain at such congresses and meetings their point of view, leaving it to the workers themselves to judge as to which of the two points of view is right ?

(7) Will you continue also in future to form mixed organisations with the reformists and carry through, together with them, conferences, work out with them tactics, hostile to the R.I.L.U., on the pretext that every trade union and every member of trade unions has the right to do everything he pleases ?

(8) And finally, will you also in future accuse the R.I.L.U. and the C.G.T.U. of disruption, discredit every one of its gestures, every one of its manifestations, in other words, will you come forward within our revolutionary trade unions in the role of enemies, or will you conduct yourselves as members of a united organisation competing among themselves in the matter of strengthening the class positions of the proletariat ?

WITH THE R.I.L.U. OR WITH AMSTERDAM ?

Such are the questions which I put before you. You may still remain in the ranks of the R.I.L.U., you may, remaining in our ranks, enter into fraternal competition with the majority, not on the plane of jumping towards reformism (on this plane we and the majority could not, and indeed, would not, outstrip you), but in the sense as to who can draw the greatest number of workers into the trade unions, who will be capable of organising a strike better, who will be capable of arranging the defence of the workers' interests, who will be capable of carrying through the campaign of solidarity in conformity with the resolutions of the R.I.L.U. and the C.G.T.U. Is there anything unacceptable in these our proposals ?

Through your actions, your policy, your writings, your agitation, hostile to everything which originates from the R.I.L.U., you have now placed yourselves to the extent of being nine-tenths outside the R.I.L.U.

You must understand that an international organisation has also got its charter. You like charters, you only remember charters which are twenty-five years old and forget the constitutions and the charters which have been accepted by your representatives at the congresses of the R.I.L.U.

It is not we who have placed you in this position which leads you into the enemy camp. You have

yourselves gone along this path voluntarily, you did it quite independently, being perfectly autonomous. You will have to make your choice, whom you will march with, with us or against us, with the R.I.L.U. or the Amsterdam International, with the revolution or the counter-revolution.

Make your choice, but beware! do not imagine

yourselves to be great politicians. Do not think that you will be capable of deceiving the labour movement. Whatever the difficulties that you may create for the C.G.T.U., the international labour movement will help the C.G.T.U. to overcome them, to isolate you from the French and the international movement, and you will be beaten to a frazzle. (Prolonged applause.)

PARTY ORGANISER

By V. PAVLOVA.

THE Enlarged Plenum of the E.C.C.I. in February, 1930, formulated the main organisational tasks before the Communist Parties of capitalist countries during the present period, as follows:

"To guarantee the reconstruction of forms and methods of work in the Communist Parties to correspond with the tasks of leading the mass activities of the proletariat (strikes, unemployed movement, demonstrations), agricultural workers and poorest sections of the peasantry (both inside the country and in the colonies) actually achieving the required degree of preparedness for these mass activities. . . ."

In accordance with these tasks the XII. Plenum of the C.C. of the C.P.U.S.A., which took place in November, 1930, paid especial attention to questions of organising the leadership of the mass struggle of the proletariat—of the revolutionary trade unions, the unemployment movement, etc.

Since this Plenum it is noticeable that the Communist Party of the U.S.A. has paid considerably more attention to organisational questions as a whole. A complete page of the Party organ *The Daily Worker*, is daily devoted to organisational problems. In April, there took place two district organisational and agitation and propaganda conferences. A bulletin was issued to help the editors of the factory and workshop newspapers. Several pamphlets have been published on the subject of organisation.

The *Party Organiser* re-issued on a broader principle does not occupy the last place with regard to leadership of the organisational construction of the Party. We have here the two first numbers of this new monthly.

In the first numbers of the *Party Organiser* there is not a single article formulating the main organisational tasks confronting the C.P.U.S.A., or linking these tasks up with political problems.

Both the first and second numbers of the *Party Organiser* give considerable advice about how to build an organisation; some of these suggestions are without doubt useful, for instance, the suggestions concerning preparations for meetings, transfer of offices by old functionaries leaving their posts to deputies, on regulations concerning conspirative

work, regulations about appealing to the Control Commission against party decisions; there is much good advice on the struggle against the bureaucracy. Similar practical suggestions deal effectively with weak points in Party organisation. But all this advice, all these suggestions are somewhat disjointed and neither linked up with each other or with the main political tasks confronting the C.P.U.S.A.

The concrete way in which questions are put (incidentally a very valuable attribute), because of the incorrect point of departure taken, develops in certain articles into a formal, mechanical approach to the question. For example, take the chapter entitled "Party Mobility" (No. 1, page 11). This article talks about how many people should form a unit, how they should be divided into groups, where they should meet and so on, but not a word is written about the main tasks in connection with preparing and leading mass struggles, with winning over the majority of the working-class; nothing is said about how to mobilise the forces of the Party during strikes, how to use mass organisations and all sympathising workers for this purpose, how to concentrate Party forces upon the work, and the more important, sections of the work, how to prepare for the coming new mass action of the working-class and so on.

The *Party Organiser* is wrong in making its task one of mechanically regularising the whole round of Party organisation to the very last details as, for instance: "All Party meetings should start at 8 o'clock sharp and end at 11 o'clock" (No. 2, page 12, "How to Keep New Members"). Instructions of this kind, apparently, are given as a form of the struggle against inaccuracy and against long drawn-out meetings; but as a result we get something quite illogical, since hours of work in the factories are not the same and many factories work in two or three shifts.

This mechanical way of treating organisational questions results in the *Party Organiser* being unreal. The second issue of the *Party Organiser* is as like the first as two peas. We find here just the same problems (most important and necessary for the Party)—how to recruit and keep new members, how to fight against bureaucratic methods, what the Unit Bureau

should do and so on ; but what is most important for the Party *to-day* will not be found in this little book. Inside the Party everything is alive—preparations are going forward for May Day, strikes are taking place in various districts, there are hunger-marches, demonstrations, municipal elections and so on, and the *Party Organiser* is making no preparations to *organise* these mass activities and keeps no record of the results ; organisational questions are raised in the *Party Organiser* in a general way, without any link with current events.

The whole general line of the *Party Organiser* is incorrect in regard to drawing out the initiative of the locals. Workers in the locals are invited to write "in addition to editorship and guidance from the Centre" (No. 1, page 1), which sounds far more like giving permission than like a call for co-operation in the *Party Organiser*, and non-Party members, for obvious reasons, are entirely forbidden to read this organ: on the first page of No. 1 there is a "menacing" heading: "For Party Members Only." Unfortunately the *Party Organiser* is in no way threatened by the "danger" of an excess of non-Party readers ; but if the latter were to begin to show interest in the magazine, they should rather be welcomed and not confronted with obstacles.

The local Party workers responded very little to the advent of the new Party organ. Despite its low price (5 cents per copy) only 20 per cent. of the Party membership has subscribed to it up till now. Neither in the first nor the second numbers are there any articles from local Party members, and local experience is entirely lacking.

Generally speaking the magazine is more in the nature of a reference book on various questions of Party construction, and as such, or as a commentary to Party statutes, it could be quite useful ; but as an organ which aims at assisting the Party in its current struggles and in the work of consolidating the Party ranks, in our opinion the magazine must be changed.

In speaking of those numbers of the *Party Organiser*, which have already appeared, one must not dwell on separate organisational mistakes to be found there. In the rank and file organisations of the American Communist Party, discipline is no doubt not very strong, the authority of the Unit Bureau and its organisational role is very weak, the political level of the units is low, and in the meetings too much time is spent on petty subjects as, for instance, discussions around the candidature of the President, which sometimes take up thirty minutes. As part of the struggle against things of this sort, the *Party Organiser* tries to raise the authority of the Bureau. But again it does this purely mechanically. This is how the *Party Organiser* formulates the role of the Unit Bureau :

"The Unit Bureau in all Communist Parties must be the leading committees which make

decisions on all problems. *The decisions of the Unit Bureau are binding on the unit membership.* The Unit Bureau decides which problems shall be discussed and acted upon by the unit meeting. But the Unit Bureau, like the Section Committee or the District Committee has authority and power to make binding decisions. While the unit meeting has the right and power to change any decision of the Unit Bureau, such cases take place when the Unit Bureau is incompetent and unfit to be the leading committee of the unit. The Unit Bureau in a Bolshevik Party makes decisions on at least 90 per cent. of the problems and questions of the unit. These decisions become the decisions of the Party unit and not recommendations to be discussed and again voted upon by the unit as a whole."

Here are some more short extracts of a similar kind from the same article :

"Democratic centralism in our Party does not mean the false democracy where every question is discussed and decided by the entire unit."

"The Unit Bureau appoints chairmen of the meeting."

"The communications from the Section or District shall not be read unless they are marked by the committee 'To be read at unit meeting' " (but on what sort of documents, anyway, are such inscriptions made?—V.P.). (*Party Organiser*, No. 1, page 4, "The Role and Tasks of the Unit Bureau").

What is incorrect in these directions ? First of all, here the relations which should exist between the unit and its bureau are quite distorted. The main point, that the Bureau is the executive organ of the unit, elected by the unit, and responsible before the unit, is entirely ignored. It goes without saying that the Bureau, like any other executive body, in the interim between meetings, is the leading organ and its decisions are binding upon all members of the unit ; but on no account is the unit to be deprived of the right to criticise the decisions of the Bureau and change them where necessary, with the knowledge of the higher Party organisation, by a decision of the majority of members of the unit to re-elect the Bureau. The most important, significant questions in the life of the Unit Bureau should be raised for discussion and confirmation at the general and delegate meetings of the unit. The President (or Presidium) of the unit meeting must on every occasion be elected by the meeting itself. The Bureau may indicate its candidates in advance to the Presidium of the unit meeting, and if the Bureau enjoys sufficient authority the candidates will be accepted ; in the event of things turning out otherwise, the Presidium must not be forced upon the meeting, especially by means of incorrect reference to the Party statutes.

Another mistake (which is to be found not only in the *Party Organiser* but in other Party documents of the C.P.U.S.A.) is the hazy idea that exists concerning factory and workshop committees. In No. 1 on page 8 we find: "the shop committee . . . is the basic unit of the revolutionary union." This is not true. The basic unit of the revolutionary trade union in the factory is the group of members of this trade union in the factory is the group of members of this trade union organised inside the factory—they are narrow bodies, elected at the general and delegate meetings of the workers of the given factory; they are open to workers of all political convictions, members both of revolutionary and of reformist trade unions and of unorganised workers. The task of the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions is: (1) to create shop committees of this kind on the basis of the broadest possible electorate, (2) to safeguard their own decisive influence in them through their fraction.

In the first issue of the *Party Organiser*, in the chapter entitled "From International Experiences" (page 25) the following is stated concerning the work of the unit of the C.P.S.U.:

"The Nucleus Bureau decides who shall head the various mass organisations as well as who shall compose the leading committees of the mass organisations."

This reference to the C.P.S.U. is not correct. The Nucleus Bureau of the C.P. of the Soviet Union does not decide who shall compose the leading organs of mass organisations, but only suggests candidates for these organs, and these candidates are then, through the fractions, democratically put through at the general meetings of the members of the given organisation. The editors of the *Party Organiser* should explain this side of the question with especial care, as in the American Communist Party there are frequent cases of carelessness with regard to the fundamentals of democracy, and of the appointment of functionaries both in revolutionary trade unions and in many organisations without questioning the opinion of the mass of the membership.

What conclusions can be drawn from the review of the first two issues of the *Party Organiser*?

In order that the magazine may truly act as leader in reconstruction the forms and methods of work in the Communist Party it must itself change its nature.

Organisational problems should be closely connected up with actual political tasks of the Party and should come as a result of the latter. The whole point of departure to be taken in dealing with questions should primarily be directed towards awakening the activity of the rank and file workers and

forcing them themselves to find out the correct solution to daily organisational questions.

Several organisational questions should be raised in the form of discussions. The local experiences of Party construction should occupy the central position, as the exchange of local experiences alone can serve as the basis for raising the questions of Party construction in a truly concrete way; in this connection especial attention must be paid to the question of drawing local Party workers into co-operation in the *Party Organiser*.

This article had already been written when three more numbers of the *Party Organiser* arrived.

Certain defects to be found in the first two numbers are already removed from those that follow. For instance, in the article "What is a Workshop Committee?" (No. 3) the correct line of departure is given as regards the shop committees and the old mistake therefore corrected. Considerably more room is given to correspondence from the locals, which is also a big achievement.

However, despite the fact that the magazine has gone a step forward, the general character has not changed.

The magazine still continues to raise organisational questions in a nebulous way, independently of the political problems of the current moment. Neither the growth of the unemployment movement, nor the strike struggle, nor the Scottsborough case, nor the law against immigrants in Michigan, nor the "Pittsburgh plan"—none of these events are used to any extent in raising the question of the organisational consolidation of the Party and its penetration among the broad working masses.

In the various articles there is still to be seen cases of a mechanical approach to organisational questions. For example, in the article "Regulation and Distribution of Party Work" (No. 5) the question is raised as one of registering the Party work according to the card system. In the same place incorrect instructions of a general character are given to the effect that the more active workers on mass work should not be elected to the Bureau.

In conclusion, it should be stated that the circulation of the *Party Organiser* has grown considerably. Thus, the February issue was sold to the extent of 2,500 copies, March 3,500, April 4,500 and May 6,000. This indicates the growing demand among the rank and file Party workers for a magazine of this kind. If presented in the correct way, there is not the slightest doubt that the *Party Organiser* will play a big part in the organisational construction of the Communist Party of the United States.

THE SPLIT IN THE ALL-INDIAN TRADE UNION CONGRESS

THE split in the All-Indian Trade Union Congress may serve as an example of a split that was prepared for in advance, and carried out from above, against the clearly-expressed wishes of the masses of workers. The bourgeois national reformists provoked the split in the Executive Committee of the All-Indian Trade Union Congress, by trying to avoid a direct meeting with the workers. The session of the Executive Committee, as Subhas Bose, Ruikar and Co. themselves admitted, was prolonged, regardless of the fact that by prolonging it, those workers who were compelled to go in to work at the factories, were thus in actual fact completely deprived of taking part in the further proceedings of the Congress. When it was pointed out to Bose, who was presiding at the meeting, that the opening of the Congress must not be delayed because the next day was a working day for the men, he remarked with a sneer that the workers could "if they wished" arrange for a "hartal"* and not go to work. This bourgeois lawyer, without the slightest embarrassment, tried to show by his whole attitude during the meetings of the Executive Committee, that the opinion of the workers on questions concerning the working-class movement, could not be considered of much importance.

Several months before the calling of the Trade Union Congress in Calcutta, open negotiations had been taking place between the representatives of bourgeois-landlord national-reformism and the direct agency of British Imperialism in the form of Joshi, Chamanlal, Shiva Rao and Company.

Shiva Rao in a letter to Bose dictated the conditions upon which complete unity could be re-established. He demanded outright the expulsion of the revolutionary trade unions and the open denial of class politics. The split at last year's Trade Union Congress in Nagpur was brought about as a result of the fact, that the overwhelming majority of the working class had suddenly taken the road of independent class struggle. The open agents of British imperialism were left with nothing to do but declare their resignation. The representatives of treacherous, counter-revolutionary national-reformism, headed by Bose, in spite of all its sympathy in favour of the reformist tactic of co-operation, could not take the lead of Joshi and Chamanlal, for such a step would have unmasked them completely. They remained inside the A.I.T.U.C. and made the best of a bad job.

* Voluntary stoppage of work and closing of shops and educational institutions, as a sign of protest.

Subhas Bose even allowed himself to be elected president. He reconciled himself to the election of Comrade Deshpande as General Secretary. Having got away with a few obviously treacherous and ambiguous phrases of a general kind, the national reformists pretended they were making great sacrifices in the name of working-class unity. For the time being and for the sake of appearances, they "broke" with Joshi and Co. and pretended to be the supporters of unity with the class-conscious trade unions, in order to prepare a deeper, more tangible split in the Indian trade union movement, in the interests of the native bourgeoisie, and also of British imperialism, with whom this bourgeoisie is endeavouring to establish and strengthen its final agreement.

As soon as the provocative plan for the split was drawn up, Bose without the slightest hesitation or any kind of excuse, gave away the secret of his whole plan. In his concluding speech he said: "This rejection of the Deshpande group will certainly mean a great gain to the trade union movement in India. His reputation was such as to repel many bona fide unions from joining the Congress."

By this declaration Bose made it quite clear that the fight against the class-conscious trade union movement is inconceivable without open alliance with imperialism, with its hirelings, paid to deceive and betray the workers.

In 1930, the Indian bourgeoisie arranged a solemn invasion of the working-class quarters of Bombay. The bourgeoisie approached the people, as it were, in the name of the national cause. A few weeks had scarcely passed when the plan came to light: to split the advanced section of the workers—the textile workers—in order to disorganise the struggle of the working class to win the leadership of the revolutionary masses. The Indian National Congress, with its advance upon the working-class quarters of Bombay, prepared the split in the Girmi Kamgar Union. Kandalkar and his associates have turned out to be the right arm of the capitalists and landlords, always ready to serve the bourgeoisie behind socialist phrases. Kandalkar—together with the renegade Roy and his like—are greeted as heroes by bourgeois national reformism. There could be nothing surprising in the fact that all the provocation in connection with the split at the Calcutta Congress began with the quarrel around the question as to whether the Kandalkar group had the right to represent the textile workers. Indian capital first of all made preparations for the disorganisation of the ranks of the textile

workers, making good use of the crisis, unemployment and the vapours of national unity. Then when the policemen's bludgeons and the authority of Congress had brought the Kandalkar group to its knees, the national reformists took up the rôle of arbitrators on questions of the inner disagreements among the workers.

The Mandate Commission of the Executive Committee put forward a demand to recognise the Kandalkar group as the true representatives of the Girni Kamgar Union and to turn down the representation of the textile workers, headed by Deshpande. From the very beginning Bose and Co. hid themselves from the rank and file of the Congress, under cover of the wangled mandate commission, which began, one by one, to disqualify the representatives of the revolutionary trade unions. Already the question had been squarely raised concerning the Girni Kamgar, and the political jobbers of the Mandate Commission disqualified the representation of railway-workers from the G.I.P. railway. By way of excuse the reason was given that this class-conscious trade union had not paid up 615 rupees in subscriptions to the coffers of the All-Indian Trade Union Congress. When the machinations of Bose and Co. against the Girni Kamgar became distinctly provocative, Comrade Randive brought in a proposal to pass a vote of censure on Bose as the Chairman, since behind the backs of the Congress which was about to be opened, he was trying to remove all class-conscious trade unions which he considered of no use for his purpose.

Immediately this proposal was brought up for discussion, Bose who was presiding at the meeting left the room, leaving Kandalkar in charge of the meeting; this could only be interpreted as having a provocative meaning. The right of Kandalkar to represent the Girni Kamgar Union had not yet been recognised even by the Executive Committee, and there could have been only one motive in leaving him in the chair—to demonstrate yet again that the national reformists are prepared to do anything in order to get rid of the class-conscious trade unions. It was natural that provocation of this kind should evoke the indignation of the revolutionary workers. The volunteers of the National Congress who were present at the meeting tried to bring about order by force. However, they were unsuccessful, since the proletariat showed sufficient firmness and resistance. Bose, who then entered the hall again, immediately declared the meeting postponed. On the opening of the Executive Committee meeting again, the question was once more raised of the vote of censure upon Bose; and moreover four representatives of the radical

wing were disqualified from voting, to two of his agents who accidentally turned up opportunely. Bose illegally gave the right to vote, and moreover he himself took part in the voting, appropriating to himself two whole votes. By means of all this mustering of forces, the proposal to pass a vote of censure on Bose was turned down by 26 votes against 24. In the same way Bose tried to get passed his machinations against the Red Textile Workers' Union. Deshpande and others, seeing that there was apparently to be no end of the machinations of Bose, behind the backs of the Congress, demanded that the Congress itself be opened. Bose declared that this was impossible as the report of the Mandate Commission had not yet been confirmed by the Executive Committee, and as we did not know which delegates were empowered to take part. Moreover the Executive Committee was not yet in a position to place a single resolution before the session of Congress, or even give its own report.

This mockery and trickery on the part of the bourgeois advocate would have gone on for ever, if the worker members of the Trade Union Congress, who were tired of waiting, while behind their backs the most important questions of the India trade union movement were being decided, had not entered the hall where the Executive Committee was sitting. The appearance of the members of the Congress immediately brought confusion. Bose, using his doubtful power as president, declared the Congress postponed for an indefinite period. After this the majority, composed of supporters of the class-conscious trade union movement, opened the session of the Congress and got down to business, passing several resolutions and electing its new Executive organ of the Congress which was to take the place of the national reformists who had deserted the Congress.

At first 37 trade unions were represented at the Congress. The representatives of some of the unions remained with Bose and made a whole comedy of their independent Congress. Several trade unions, up to 25, were represented at the Congress which carried on its business without the participation of the national reformists. Out of all these unions the following should be mentioned: the Girni Kamgar, the Bombay Municipal Workers' Union, the Bengal Juteworkers' Union, the Bengal Paperworkers' Union, the Calcutta Tramwaymen's Union, the Calcutta Dockers' Union, the G.I.P. Railwaymen's Union. The present situation of the Indian trade unions is such, that it is very difficult to say at all exactly or definitely, what actually exists behind the various trade union labels. Several trade unions

which have remained with Bose can only to an extremely small degree pretend to be real trade unions. Actually they are patronised by rich lawyers and business men of the National Congress, almost no workers take any part in them, since they wage no economic warfare and know of no trade union democracy. The Indian worker is only now beginning to control the trade union organisations, to subject them to his own interests and requirements. The process of cleansing the trade unions of opulent and high-handed benefactors is only in the very beginning stages. The Indian bourgeoisie is doing its utmost to prevent the Indian proletariat from speaking in its own tongue. In actual fact the tactics of Bose at the Calcutta Congress amounted to this. Bose tried from the very beginning to stir up organisational strife around particularly insolent wangling of the representation of the trade unions. In this way he hoped to remove from the agenda the big questions which face the working-class movement. In this way he tried to gag the workers, preventing them from discussing their most essential needs.

It must be admitted that to a certain extent the national reformists were successful in their plan, in so far as the supporters of the class trade union movement were not able in the course of the strife to bring out the most important questions of the class struggle. The opening speeches of Messrs. Mitra and Bose at the session of the Executive Committee presented sufficient material upon which all the main questions could have been brought up in a decisive manner.

With what did Bose, as President of the All-Indian Trade Union Congress, come forward at the opening of the Executive Committee session? He said literally:

"I doubt whether I can show any record of constructive work in the trade union movement and during the last year and the early part of this year I was engaged in keen struggles with the British Government—we were passing through a gigantic crisis, rare in recent Indian history. Therefore normal progress in the development of trade unionism has been impossible . . ."

It is difficult to say what is uppermost in this declaration—lies and hypocrisy or flagrant opportunism. Bose was "engaged in keen struggles" with the British Government! And if he had really waged war upon, and not engaged in bartering with, the British Government, then how could this struggle have hindered, and not helped, the "normal progress in the development of trade unionism"?

Bose from the very first moment revealed to the Executive Committee of the Trade Union

Congress that all the activities of the national reformists in the trade unions amounted to the fact that they . . . are in the service of the Indian National Congress. Bose had no hesitation in admitting that since the Nagpur Congress the national reformists had been trying to reduce the significance of the Indian trade union movement to a minimum, to sacrifice it to bourgeois national-reformism. Mukunda Lal, who had been elected General Secretary at the session of the fake "Bose" Trade Union Congress, was most eloquent, after the Calcutta events, in his description of the position inside the Indian trade union movement:

"Taking advantage of the weakness of our organisation, the capitalists have been fiercely attacking the workers. During the last year, thousands of workers have been thrown out of employment. On the railways alone nearly 40,000 have been discharged. And many more are fearfully awaiting the same fate. Thousands are working short time, earning correspondingly lower wages. In the jute industry of Bengal about half the workers have been thrown out in the street and forced to a state of starvation. Practically all the rest are working part time. The cotton mills of Bombay and other places to-day can no longer complain of a trade depression. Thanks to the boycott movement, they are enjoying a period of boom in the midst of general depression. Still, there are about 30,000 workers unemployed; and the wages of all those on the job are reduced all round. Unemployment and wage-cuts have become the order of the day, practically in all the industries and trades of the country."

Mukunda Lal himself is fairly skilful at interpreting Bose. The bartering between the Indian bourgeoisie and British Imperialism, the same bartering that Bose calls warfare, did not prevent the Indian capitalists from using all the difficulties of the crisis and unemployment in their own interests. This period of self-denying struggle on the part of the masses, was used by the bourgeoisie for the most flagrant attacks upon the working class. The Indian bourgeoisie manifested considerable cunning of a practical kind. They transferred all the burden of deprivation to the shoulders of the working class. Further they made a profitable investment in the "passive resistance" campaign, by converting even this means of struggle against revolution into an item bearing interest. Malaviya, the cunning old jobber of Congress, appealed to the Bombay mill-owners for support, basing his argument upon the advantages which the National Congress had brought to Indian capital:

"Had the National Congress not supported Swadeshi (national industry) where would the Bombay textile owners be to-day?"

Vallabhbhai Patel, one of the foremost supporters of the National Week Campaign, is even more cunning and sly when he assures the workers that :

"The mill-owners in Bombay are on no account in such a flourishing position or in receipt of such considerable profits. There is a certain amount of friction between you and the mill-owners, but this is a domestic affair and you must work jointly. Do not think of them as capitalists and that co-operation is difficult."

The Indian National Congress during 1930-31, not in words, but in deeds, demonstrated its loyalty to the interests of Indian capital and private ownership of the land; to an exactly similar extent it gave proof of its hostility to the working class. The successful attacks of capital in circumstances of a growing universal national crisis would be impossible if the national reformists were unable to disorganise and demoralise the ranks of the workers by taking away from them the most elementary means of struggle, and even the trade unions. Kandalkar made himself a "somebody" because he was the first to issue the slogan: "The workers and peasants are the hands and legs of the Congress." Only a very short time elapsed, and this formula of political servility was translated into the language of trade unions. In his declaration in May, 1931, Kandalkar and Co. wrote in black and white :

"The trade union does not share the opinion of those who suppose that the interests of the workers demand that the trade union limit its activities exclusively to the functions of a strike committee."

Kandalkar and Co. prove by the whole of their political activities that they consider the essence of the class struggle, by which they swear, to be negotiations with the capitalists. There was a time when in Russia in 1917 Kerensky and Co. made an attack upon the working class and the peasant masses under the slogans of "revolutionary democracy." In a sense, during the embryonic stage of the Indian revolution, the Indian capitalists do the same thing, as Kerensky did, behind phrases about "socialism" and "national liberation."

Indeed, Bose, in his opening speech, managed to : (1) bend the knee to the Round Table Conference; to propose that the trade unions, instead of condemning it, await the results; (2) declare their readiness to co-operate in the Geneva Labour Bureau of the League of Nations, by agreeing to discuss this question each year in the Congress; (3) recommend that the Irwin-Gandhi pact be left

out of the discussion; (4) greet the proposals of the Whitley Commission, the boycott of which had been raised at the Nagpur Session of the All-Indian Trade Union Congress the previous year. To top all this, Bose, in his opening speech, bowed low before the National Congress and menacingly shook his fist at those whose attitude was not sufficiently respectful to it. Only half of the declarations of Bose would be quite sufficient to make the National Congress show its true face. In actual fact the opening speech of Bose is a whole programme of subjection of the Indian working class to "its own" bourgeoisie and to imperialism. The supporters of the revolutionary class-conscious trade union movement lost a fine opportunity of unmasking the enemies of the working class. Instead of quarrelling with Bose and Co. about the rights of the Red trade union of textile workers, inside the narrow walls of the Executive Committee, they would have done much better to have demanded at the Congress itself an open, broad discussion of the question of the counter-revolutionary pact of Irwin and Gandhi, about the Whitley Commission Report, on the question of the cruel attacks being made by capital and imperialism upon the Indian working class.

They let this opportunity slip by, and thus allowed Bose and other representatives of the Indian bourgeoisie to speculate by confronting the Indian labour movement with both its antagonists—Moscow and Geneva (International Labour Bureau). Very little work was required to unmask the fact that Geneva was brought forward by Bose and company only in an artificial, hypocritical sense. Bose spoke in favour of Geneva in his opening speech. As for Moscow, the capitalists and their lackeys call any sort of defence of the interests of the working class "Moscow."

All the Boses, Kandalkars and Ruikars came to Calcutta with the prepared intention of splitting the Trade Union Congress at all costs. The mask of hypocrisy should have been torn from them; they should have been shown up in their true colours. The workers should have been shown that national reformism not only betrays the interests of Indian complete independence, but also is in opposition to the most elementary defence of the interests of the working class. National reformism helped the bourgeoisie during 1930-31 to throw tens and hundreds of thousands of workers upon the streets, without offering them any kind of compensation, without obtaining any sort of assistance for the unemployed. National reformism helped Indian capital to disorganise the strike struggle of the workers. The forty thousand railwaymen mentioned already have to thank Giri and Ruikar for the fact that they have been deprived of bread. The unprecedented

decrease in wages per capita could not have been carried out if the working masses had not been seized unawares by mean, lying phrases about the need for all classes to make equal sacrifices in the interests of national liberation. Indian capital knows full well why it is afraid of Communists in the Indian labour movement. It was no other than the same Patel, greeted in Berlin on his way to the Round Table Conference with rotten eggs, who propounded the question as to why the Indian bourgeois hates Communists: "He throws aside all attempts to bring Communism into the struggle in India, as it only complicates everything. The superlative need of the moment is the united front—with the direct task of finishing with foreign domination. When Swaraj is established in India, there will be sufficient time to examine all governmental systems from the point of view of their respective merits. In the heat of the struggle it would be madness to provoke the united opposition of the Princes, the landlords and industrial magnates." Unity with the landlord and capitalist is to be forced upon the most revolutionary class of our time, the proletariat! This is not a simple task, and it is especially difficult of achievement when the working class has already ceased to be an unconscious mass. Already in 1921 Gandhi sounded a note of warning about the dangers connected with using the working-class movement for political purposes. During the struggles of the last four years an Indian proletarian vanguard has been formed, which is more and more being crystallised into the kernel of the whole Indian working-class movement. The mass of Indian workers has left behind the rich lawyers and moneylenders of the Indian National Congress, and are now speaking through the Communists and the class-conscious trade unions.

In order to save their failing influence upon the radicalised working masses, the national reformists are compelled, on the one hand, to adopt a policy which will provoke splits from above, and on the other hand, to disseminate phrases about "socialism" and "revolution."

The same Bose, in the same opening speech, repeated the declaration of Mr. Roy and other Right renegades. Bose said:

"The Karachi session of the Indian National Congress passed a resolution on Fundamental Rights. However insufficient the resolution may be, it stands for a departure from the old tradition for the recognition of some of the rights of the workers and peasants and for a definite move in the direction of Socialism. It is the potentiality of the resolution rather than the actual contents . . . that appeals to me."

Subhas Bose has a nebulous way of expressing himself. However, he repeats almost word for

word the utterances of the Right liquidators. It is the old appeal to democratise the Indian National Congress from below, but for the time being . . . the Congress will accept "socialism" and "revolution" and absolutely and entirely follow its leadership. The Indian national reformists have borrowed much from international Social Fascism. In the circumstances existing in India, national reformism to a certain extent is called upon to play the same rôle as regards imperialism as Social Democracy plays in European countries. It is just for this reason that national reformism, as the class struggle grows stronger and more intense, makes more and more use of socialist and democratic phrases in its struggle against the working-class movement and revolution. It is just for this reason that national reformism finds its direct agents in renegades from Communism like Brandler, Roy and Co. It is just for this reason that national reformism everywhere tries to bring forward its own falsification, its substitute, its forgery, in place of the true struggle, the real militant organisation of the working class. The heroic struggle of the Bombay textile workers threw up the Girmi Kamgar Union upon the crest of the wave of the working-class movement. The Indian bourgeoisie a few months later created a duplicate of the red trade union, Kandalkar's imitation. The struggle of the workers made class unity an especially urgent requirement. At first Kandalkar and the Roy clique, then Bose, with his associates, tried to unite the agents of capital against the workers, as a substitute for working-class unity. The whole struggle of the Indian workers during the last two years convinced them, however, of the necessity of uniting the Indian trade union movement on a real all-Indian scale. The Boses, Kandalkars and Co. have laid their hands on this as well.

The falsification of Socialism and the revolutionary struggle has become for them an organic requirement, because only by means of such falsification are they in a position to maintain bourgeois influence among the working class. Is not the list of resolutions passed at the Congress of big and small Boses in Calcutta sufficient in itself? —(1) Greetings to the Five-Year Plan and Socialist Construction; (2) Condemning the Government for refusing to issue passports to Messrs. Saklatvala and Gallacher; (3) protest against the death sentence on eight negro strikers in the United States; (4) special resolution on unity; (5) resolution on the offensive against capitalism; (6) resolution demanding "unconditional" transfer of all power to the people, freedom of the peasantry from all exploitation, nationalisation of the land, public utilities, mineral resources, etc., control of the economic life of the country

by the workers and peasants, and so on and so forth.

Here everything is to be found. The more evil there is to hide up, the more flowery and eloquent the phraseology. The capitalists are happy to get off with phrases of this sort, when they are lowering wages by 20-25 per cent., when mass dismissals are universal, when the working hours are being lengthened.

The economic struggle of the workers is spreading more and more throughout the land. The most distant corners of India are in the throes of the strike movement. For the first three months of 1931 alone 3½ thousand workers went on strike, and 730,000 days were lost. Over 20,000 workers were concerned in strikes in Bombay during the first half of the year. The workers are waging a stubborn, desperate struggle against advancing capital.

In Karachi the dockers and factory workers in April were already organising demonstrations and placing pickets before the warehouses and homes of rich merchants with the slogans: "Give us bread or the chance of earning bread," "We demand the payment of two rupees a day to unemployed workers." The pickets of the unemployed workers demanded that the merchants hand over the keys of their warehouses, on the basis that they had the right to the contents of the warehouses. The terrified merchants were compelled to give considerable sums of money to the workers.

Quite recently the textile workers' strike in Bangalore resulted in a conflict between the workers and the police, as a consequence of which there were killed and wounded. The Red Girni Kamgar Union of late has carried out a number of successful strikes, which have forced back the front line of capital. The Girni Kamgar Union is taking the most active part in the Sholapur strike, which is literally the chief interest of the whole town. Not only the workers, but the women workers as well arrange the picketing, struggle with the police and defend their rights.

Now, more than ever before, the time is ripe for the creation and consolidation of militant class trade unions with strong factory and workshop nuclei, strike committees and factory committees formed from among the rank and file. Moreover, it is high time that the all-Indian working-class movement were a united force. British imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie are more afraid of this militant unity of the working class than of anything else in the world. The *Statesman*, commenting on Bose's speech at the Congress, wrote:

"The best feature of Mr. S. Bose's speech, however, seems to us to be in what he did not say. He did not for the sake of momentary

applause urge his hearers to reckless courses in the present economic crisis. He admitted the difficulties of the employers that it is sometimes impossible for them to maintain their old staff . . ."

The exploiters are not afraid of flowery phrases about "Socialism," but they are always able to find practical use for all confusion and wavering in the ranks of the exploited. Without any exaggeration one can say that the peasant rebellions and revolutionary outbreaks in the towns (like the Chittagong uprising) throw a light upon the road of the working class in its struggle for class self-determination, on behalf of its own organisation, its hegemony of the national revolutionary struggle. Despite the despicableness and foul treachery of Ruikar, the threat of a general strike on the railways is still imminent. The Indian workers need a strong Communist Party capable of leading each individual strike, capable of laying the foundation of general class unity as the basis of each strike. The Indian workers need red trade unions, which live by the class struggle and grow up in this struggle. They need the most elementary militant organisations. The time has come for them to take a good broom and sweep out of their unions and organisations all foreign elements, all agents of the bourgeoisie who are hostile to the workers. The workers cannot afford to have respected lawyers at the head of their trade unions. The Whitley Commission said this in its report. When the workers have no militant trade unions, even during strikes they are compelled to get up to their necks in debt to the moneylenders. The moneylender reaps a rich harvest from the unemployment of tens and hundreds of thousands of workers.

The split at Calcutta cannot be looked upon as a decisive turning point. The kernel of an all-Indian organisation of trade unions has been created, but it is still weak and unfinished so long as the struggle against Joshi and Bose has not been developed to the end on the all-Indian arena, so long as this struggle is not bound up in one with the struggle against advancing capital, so long as this struggle is not converted into a struggle for the class unity of the proletariat. Only the first steps have been taken towards the formation of an Indian class-conscious trade union movement. Time and circumstances demand Bolshevik determination and the Bolshevik rate of development. Those who split the movement from above must meet united, unanimous resistance from below. By organising their counter-attack against capital, the Indian working class at the same time will create the decisive factors necessary for its hegemony in the national revolutionary movement.