

**TWELFTH PLENUM OF THE E. C. C. I.**

# **THE NEXT STEP**

**In Britain, America  
and Ireland**

**PRICE 5 CENTS**

**SPEECHES AND REPORTS**

**By GUSEV,**

**POLLITT, TROY and PRINGLE**

## "TWELFTH PLENUM" SERIES

---

*Other pamphlets in this series containing indispensable material for the study of the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.*

---

- Capitalist Stabilization Has Ended—*Thesis and Resolutions* . . . . . 10c
- The International Situation and the Tasks of the Sections of the Communist International—*Report by O. Kuusinen* . . . 15c
- Tasks of the Communist in the Struggle Against Imperialist War and Military Intervention in Connection with the Outbreak of War in the Far East—*Report by Okano, Japan* . . . . . 5c
- The Communist Parties of France and Germany and the Tasks of the Communists in the Trade Unions—*Report by O. Piatnitsky* . . . . . 5c
- The U. S. S. R. and the World Proletariat—*Report by D. Z. Manuilsky* . . . . . 10c
- Guide to the Twelfth Plenum—*Handbook for Propagandists* . . . . . 15c
- 

*Order From*

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148, Sta., D.

New York City

# THE NEXT STEP

in Britain, America and  
Ireland

(SPEECHES AND REPORTS  
XII PLENUM E.C.C.I.)

Price FIVE CENTS

WORKERS' LIBRARY PUBLISHERS,  
P.O. Box 148, Station D, New York.

The End of Capitalist Stabilisation and  
the Basic Tasks of the British and  
American Sections of the C.I.

(Reprinted from No. 19 "Communist International.")

S. GUSEV.

I.—THE GROWTH OF THE REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE,  
FASCISM AND SOCIAL-FASCISM.

**T**HE clearest indication of the end of the stabilisation of capitalism is the development of the world revolutionary upsurge, which arose on the basis of the world economic crisis and includes the revolutions in China and Spain, the approaching revolutionary crisis in Germany, Poland and Japan, the tremendous strikes in Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, Great Britain, U.S.A., the maturing of the revolutionary crisis in India and a series of revolts in South America (Chili, Peru, Brazil).

Ever increasing masses are coming forward to the front of revolution. The forces of the world revolution are growing. But at the same time, the forces of counter-revolution are rallying together. "The party of revolution rallies the party of counter-revolution" (Marx). The development of the revolutionary upsurge, and the growth of revolutionary crises cannot take place in any other way. There is not and could not be a revolution which did not have the counter-revolution against it. It is therefore not correct to think that the development of Fascism signifies a weakening in the development of the

forces of revolution. This can only be the case after the defeat of the revolution, after the ebb of revolution, in the period of reaction (e.g., the growth of Fascism in Italy in 1922-23). But such a view is absolutely incorrect under conditions of the development of a revolutionary upsurge. The development of the revolutionary upsurge signifies not the weakening, but the growth of the forces of revolution. The forces of revolution are increasing and beginning their offensive, and as a result, the forces of counter-revolution are rallying and passing to the counter-offensive against the forces of revolution. The struggle is blazing up and rising to its highest level—to revolution.

Thus, in the epoch of the Socialist transformation of society, bourgeois-imperialist counter-revolution is not some chance objective hindrance for revolution, but an historical inevitability. There cannot be revolution, without counter-revolution.

The historical inevitability of counter-revolution has to be stressed, particularly owing to the fact, that a view has appeared in some of the sections of the C.I. as though the development of Fascism is an unforeseen, and at the same time, very dangerous, "super difficulty" for the revolution, that the development of Fascism practically means the end of revolution. Fascism itself, according to this view, arose as the result of the incorrect course of the C.I. and its sections. Such a view of Fascism cannot be called anything but capitulatory. As, in the opinion of those who hold this view of Fascism, revolution can only be victorious when there is no counter-revolution, the appearance of Fascism is declared to decide

the inevitable doom of revolution in advance. Therefore they propose to retreat, to capitulate to Fascism. Such capitulatory views were contained in the recent speech of Comrade Humbert Droz in the Swiss Communist Party, which objectively gave the International Rights a political platform.

Comrade Humbert Droz has renounced these views, but this cannot destroy the fact that such views appear from time to time, not only in Switzerland. The source of these views is the failure to understand that it is precisely the growth of the forces of revolution that inevitably evokes the solidification of the forces of Fascism.

The same failure to understand the relation between the growth of revolutionary forces, and the development of Fascism, in the period of the development and the growth of the revolutionary upsurge, lies at the basis of the fatalistic theories which arose a year ago in the German Communist Party, which were very properly criticised at the time by Comrade Thälmann. What is the essence of these fatalistic theories, which seem, externally, to be similar to the thesis of Marx of the inevitability of the rallying of the forces of counter-revolution, in the course of the development of revolution; but in reality are a gross distortion of this thesis? The essence of these fatalistic theories is that the working class must first pass through the Fascist reaction to understand the necessity for revolution, that only a Fascist dictatorship can bring the masses right up to the necessity of commencing a revolutionary struggle; in short, that without counter-revolution, revolution is impossible, that the counter-revolution rallies the party of revolution. This

is the direct opposite of what Marx says. It is not revolution which evokes counter-revolution as Marx and Lenin taught, but, they hold the contrary, counter-revolution produces revolution. Thus the starting point of the revolutionary upsurge is not the growth of the forces of revolution, as Marx and Lenin taught, but the growth of the forces of counter-revolution.

A correct Marxist-Leninist postulation of the question of the relationship between the growth of the forces of revolution, and those of Fascism, is of decisive importance to the whole strategy of the C.I. and its sections. The views of Humbert Droz lead to a retreating capitulatory strategy, and the views of the German "fatalists"; to a passive waiting strategy, i.e., in practice to the same capitulation to Fascism as with Humbert Droz. However, the revolutionary upsurge cannot mean anything else but the beginning of the strategic advance of the revolutionary forces, in which there may be defensive and offensive tactical fights.

The question of the relations between Fascism and Social-Fascism is of equal importance for Bolshevik strategy to the question of the relations between the growth of revolutionary forces and the development of Fascism. This question is worked out in detail in the theses. But in some sections, nevertheless, a misunderstanding of the basic rôle of Social-Democracy as the chief social bulwark of the bourgeoisie continues to exist, and there is a misunderstanding of Bolshevik strategy in connection with this.

The Bolshevik strategy of the C.I. has always been to deal the main blows against the conciliatory parties (against the Social-Democrats and

the national reformists). It is sufficient to glance at the history of the Russian revolution to see this.

Here is what Stalin said when reviewing the three phases of the Russian revolution :

*First phase, from 1903 to the February revolution in 1917.*

Aim : The overthrow of Czarism, and the abolition of the last feudal survivals.

The essential force of the revolution : the proletariat.

The immediate reserve : the peasants.

Direction of immediate attack : to isolate the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie who were obliged to win over the peasants and ward off the revolution by an agreement with Czarism.

Disposition of forces : alliance of workers with peasants . . .

*Second phase, March, 1917—October, 1917.*

Aim : To overthrow imperialism in Russia and withdraw from the imperialist war.

Essential force of the revolution : the proletariat.

Immediate reserve : the poorer ranks of the peasants.

Probable reserve : the proletariat of neighbouring countries.

Favouring circumstances : the prolonged war and the imperialist crisis.

Direction of immediate attack : to isolate the petty-bourgeois democrats (i.e., the Mensheviks and the Socialist-revolutionaries) who were trying to win over the mass of rural workers and to avert revolution by an agreement with imperialism.

Disposition of forces : alliance of workers with the poorest peasants . . .

*Third phase* (begun after the October revolution.)

Aim: To consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country and to use it as a fulcrum for the overthrowing of imperialism in all countries. The revolution is not to be limited to one sole country and has entered its world-wide stage.

Essential force: the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, and the revolutionary movements of the proletariat in other countries.

Principal reserves: the semi-proletarian masses and the peasants of advanced lands, the nationalist (liberationist) movements in colonies and dependent states.

Direction of immediate attack: to isolate the petty bourgeoisie partisans of Second International, promoters of the policy of conciliation with imperialism.

Disposition of forces: alliance of proletarian revolution with nationalist movements in colonies and dependent states. (Stalin, "Leninism," page 96.)

As we see, at all three stages, the main blow was directed against the conciliatory parties.

In 1905, the Bolsheviki were accused of getting too absorbed in the struggle against the liberal-monarchist conciliatory bourgeoisie, and paying less attention to the struggle against the enemy, against Czarism. In 1917, the Bolsheviki were accused of getting too absorbed in the struggle against the conciliatory petty-bourgeois parties, the mensheviki and S.R.'s, paying less attention to the struggle against the enemy, against the bourgeoisie.

Such accusations only show a complete failure

to understand the rôle of the conciliatory parties and the essence of Bolshevik strategy.

Why must the main blows be directed against the conciliatory parties in the period of the preparations for revolution, and its approaching development?

Because the conciliatory parties (the Social-Fascists and the national reformists) in the period of approaching revolutionary development, are the most dangerous social bulwark of the enemies of revolution. Therefore, it is impossible to overthrow the enemy without isolating these parties, without tearing the wide masses of the toilers away from them.

Both Social-Fascism and Fascism represent bourgeois-imperialist counter-revolution, but Social-Fascism is a special detachment of bourgeois-imperialist counter-revolution, having its own special tasks. What are these special tasks? They are to strive by all means to reach a compromise, to conciliate the proletariat with its class enemy, with the bourgeoisie (particularly with Fascism). They are to preach compromise, and also to carry on a bogus "struggle" against Fascism, to restrain the workers from attacks on Fascism, from resistance to the political and economic offensive of capital, or, in short, to restrain the workers from revolutionary activity, from revolution. Thus Social-Fascism plays the rôle of a shield, behind which counter-revolution can organise its forces. Therefore, to beat the enemy, the bourgeoisie, we must direct the main blow against its chief social bulwark, against the chief enemy of Communism in the working class, against Social-Democracy, against Social-Fascism.

It may seem that in Germany, at the present time, for example, the chief social bulwark of the bourgeoisie is Fascism, and that, therefore, we should deal the chief blows against Fascism.

This is not correct. It is not correct, firstly, because Fascism is not our chief enemy in the workers' movement, but Social-Fascism is our chief enemy there. What does this mean? It means that to win over the majority of the proletariat, i.e., to prepare the *basic* condition for the proletarian revolution, it is necessary to direct the chief blows against Social-Fascism.

It is not correct, secondly, because the blows directed by us against Social-Fascism differ from the blows delivered against Fascism. Fascism is open counter-revolution utilising social demagoguery. Social-Fascism is concealed counter-revolution. For example, take the attitude of German Fascism and German Social-Fascism to intervention in the U.S.S.R. The Fascists are for intervention, and openly say so, while the Social-Fascists are also for intervention, but talk openly, of defence of the U.S.S.R. (resolution of the II International). This means that we have to strike at Fascism, in a different manner from Social-Fascism.

It is in Germany at the present time that we can see most clearly the difference in the character of the blows which we deal against Social-Fascism and against Fascism. We expose the Social-Fascists, but we never call for an armed struggle against them. We fight the Fascists in the streets, carrying on explanatory work among the masses to the extent that the Fascists still use social demagoguery. In the period of preparations for revolution (and it is just such a period which

we are now passing through in Germany, Poland and Japan), our chief weapon is exposure, or to use the expression of Marx, the "weapon of criticism." The armed struggle, or as Marx expressed it, the "criticism of weapons," is our secondary weapon in this period. We direct the chief weapon against the main social bulwark of the bourgeoisie.

The united front with the Social-Democratic workers in the struggle against the Fascist gangs, unites both forms of weapon—the chief and the secondary weapons. On the one hand, the united front is an armed struggle against Fascist gangs, and on the other hand, the united front is the best means of exposing the Social-Fascist leaders in practice.

From all this, it is clear, that in the period of preparations for revolution, we direct our chief weapon at this period against our chief enemy in the working class, i.e., against Social-Fascism.

The main blows against Social-Fascism, the isolation of Social-Fascism, — this means the winning over of the majority of the working class, and also the toiling masses of the petty bourgeoisie in town and village, converting the toiling masses of the petty bourgeoisie from a reserve of the bourgeoisie into a reserve of the proletariat. Without this, the victory of the revolution is impossible.

## II.—THE WINNING OVER OF THE MAJORITY OF THE PROLETARIAT AS THE FUNDAMENTAL STRATEGIC TASK OF THE SECTIONS OF THE C.I.

The end of capitalist stabilisation and the growth of the revolutionary upsurge sets the basic strategic task of winning over the majority

of the working class before all sections of the C.I.

This task is made vastly easier because, as the result of three years of crisis, we find everywhere an upsurge of the mass movement, proceeding differently in different countries. The situation which has arisen at the present time may be characterised as follows: The wide masses of the workers (and, in some countries, the peasants as well) are prepared for the struggle. Some big sections of workers are entering the struggle, sometimes under the leadership of the Communist Party (Brux), sometimes (especially in economic fights) under the leadership of the reformists (Lancashire), and recently they have begun to act independently, against the wishes of the trade unions (Belgium). In the latter two cases, the leadership of the struggle began to come under the Communists' influence in those places where they attempted to intervene, which is a very significant thing.

The influence of the sections of the C.I. is growing everywhere, despite the fact that, in a number of sections, we cannot point to any considerable successes in the matter of improving their work in the period since the XI Plenum, either politically or organisationally, which might have explained the increase in their influence.

The masses want to fight. They are seeking leadership, and, however weak the work of our sections may be, they come to us.

The course of the Lancashire strike may serve as a clear example of the strong tendency towards the Communist Party, of the masses entering the struggle. Take the beginning of this

strike, the strike in Burnley. In this town there are 87 textile factories, and the number of workers reaches 25,000. In Burnley the Communist Party had 9 members and 9 non-Party members of the Minority Movement. In addition, our Party was not popular among the organised workers because it had obtained a firm reputation for being against the trade unions. On July 24th, owing to the growth of strike sentiment among the workers, our Party held a meeting in Burnley. Unexpectedly, 5,000 workers came to the meeting, which was an unprecedented event in Burnley. This meeting was decisive. On the next day, July 25th, the strike commenced, and the leadership was practically in the hands of the Party, although the Party had not prepared for this. The workers demanded that the members of the Party should give them instructions about the further extension of the strike. In two days the strike pickets under Party leadership closed all the 87 factories. In the night of July 27-28 the Party organised a march to the neighbouring textile centre of Nelson, with the aim of extending the strike. 15,000 workers took part in the march.

I will not describe the further course of the strike. The Party made a number of mistakes and let the leadership of the big mass movement slip out of its hands

Does not this example of the Lancashire strike and the example of the American Communist Party, which, last year, led the big miners' strikes in Illinois and Ohio, show that the masses are ready for the fight, and are seeking the leadership of the Communist Parties and the Red Trade Unions; that Communists need only to exert

even slight efforts and the leadership will fall into their hands?

The things which hindered the English and American sections most of all in obtaining the leadership of mass activity was their sectarian approach to the masses, their over-estimation of the influence of the Social-Fascists and trade union bureaucrats among the workers, and hence their efforts to remain only in the opposition. Then there is the completely insufficient initiative of the lower Party organisations and the Red Trade Unions, and also the R.T.U.O., and, finally, the weakness of our cadres.

*The sectarian approach to the masses.* The sources of the sectarian approach to the masses in Great Britain and the U.S.A. are different. In Great Britain, it is to be explained by the fact that the British Communist Party has supported the Labour Party at the elections for a number of years, and the necessary transition to the tactic of "class against class" was accompanied by a stubborn inner-Party struggle against the right deviation. Therefore, the tactic of the united front with the workers who belonged to the Labour Party was looked on, by a large portion of the Party members, as a step back from the tactic of "class against class." On this basis, there arose a sectarian resistance in the C.P.G.B. to the adoption of the tactic of the united front with the workers who belonged to the Labour Party and the I.L.P. The British comrades were afraid of the united front, and therefore, in spite of many favourable conditions, the British Communist Party has hardly any practical achievements in this matter. However, in countries like Great Britain and Germany,

where there are big Social-Fascist parties and big reformist trade unions, there can be no question of winning over the majority of the workers unless the tactic of the united front is adopted, and unless work is carried on in the trade unions. Therefore, the sectarian tendencies in the British Communist Party lead in reality to a right opportunist lagging behind the mass movement, and this is the chief danger.

The situation in England at the present time is such that the British Communist Party could win thousands of workers from the Labour Party and the I.L.P. into its ranks, and those of the Minority Movement. The majority of the members of such organisations as the Poplar Branch of the I.L.P. in London, and a number of others, might join our Party. But the Party does not see this task, and does not set itself this task, because it does not know how to distinguish the manœuvres of the Leaders, from the genuine strivings of the workers. Therefore, it happens that the Party repulses the workers of the Labour Party and the I.L.P. who are turning in its direction.

Here is a very characteristic example of how this is done.

As we know, the I.L.P. recently split away from the Labour Party and published its "new programme." Among these "rules" there are some very "left" things—"the winning of power by the united working class," "abandonment of the method of gradual reform," "a swift passage from capitalism to Socialism," "the socialisation of the vital resources of the country, including the banks and finances, the land and agriculture,

the chief branches of industry and transport," etc.

This is all inside the country. On an international scale, there is the following programme :

"Steadfast opposition by individual and collective resistance to all war preparations and tendencies. If war is declared . . . the I.L.P. will demand . . . an immediate general strike. It reaffirms its demand for disarmament by example, irrespective of what other Governments may do."

How did our Communist Party react to the disaffiliation of the I.L.P. from the Labour Party, and its rules and programme, which I have just quoted?

Firstly, the disaffiliation of the I.L.P. from the Labour Party was declared to be a "swindle." There is no doubt that there was a very considerable proportion of swindling in the disaffiliation of the I.L.P. But to describe it entirely as swindling means to fail to see the mass of members of the I.L.P. behind the swindling faces of the leaders, or that these members really want to renew, or, as the members of the I.L.P. themselves say, to "rejuvenate" the I.L.P. and turn it into a revolutionary party. This genuine leftward turn of the workers in the I.L.P. (and in the Labour Party) is missed by our Party. The Party does not understand that when workers leave the Labour Party, this is a difficult turning point in their political development.

Secondly, with regard to the programme of the I.L.P., an article was published in the "Daily Worker" under the title : "Lay down your arms ; surrender to imperialism."

In this article, quotations were given from the

programme of the I.L.P., which I have already cited, that the I.L.P. repeats its demand for England to set the example of disarmament "irrespective of what other governments may do"

Further, the article goes on to "prove" in a "smart" and far-fetched manner, something which is not in the programme—namely, that the I.L.P. proposes that the Red Army should set the example of disarmament.

It is not surprising that such methods arouse indignation among the workers who sympathise with the I.L.P. and repulse them from the Communist Party.

One Lancashire worker, whom the "Daily Worker" itself describes "a good fighter for the workers," wrote a letter to the Editor on the subject of this article. In reply to this letter, the "Daily Worker" published an article under the title: "The I.L.P. wants to disarm the proletariat."

Extracts are given in this article from the letter of the worker.

Here are these extracts:

"The article is an insult to the intelligence of every class-conscious worker. It is a direct misrepresentation of the actual facts.

"The Communist Party knows perfectly well that when the I.L.P. says 'disarm by example' they do not mean the revolutionary workers, but the National Government."

The article further contains the following brilliant syllogism:

The I.L.P. demands that England should set the example of disarmament. But the I.L.P. is a party which calls itself Socialist. Therefore,

it would demand that a Socialist government in England should set this example. Therefore, it demands that the Socialist government of the U.S.S.R. should set the example of disarmament.

What sort of idiots does the "Daily Worker" think the British workers are, when it dares to publish such articles! These articles, comrades, are not mere funniosities, not rarities from the museum of muddleheadedness, which fall outside the sphere of class analysis. No, this is a line, this is the tactic by which the British comrades hope to win over the workers.

Is it possible to organise a united front with the workers of the I.L.P. and the Labour Party with such a tactical line?

I will pass on to the U.S.A. The sources of the sectarian approach to the masses in the Communist Party of the U.S.A. are not the same as in England. Sectarianism is explained here by the fact that, up to the present, the majority of the members, and especially the leading cadres of the Party, have not been native-born American workers, and a considerable proportion of the cadres come from small industry, while a considerable number of them are of petty-bourgeois origin. The real nature of this sectarianism consists in a right opportunist lagging behind the mass movement.

In distinction to the British Communist Party, the Communist Party of the U.S.A. has several big strikes to its credit, which it led independently.

This experience shows that our Parties and Red Trade Unions have wide possibilities of leading independent economic fights. But this

possibility is utilised without any definite and consistently applied plan, in a partisan manner, from time to time, and case to case. Therefore, it is not surprising that the strikes which are successfully led by us do not leave any trace on our Parties and our trade unions. Remember the famous strike of the textile workers in Gastonia, which obtained the sympathy of the workers of the south for us, and which gave us the possibility of building up our Party organisation there. And what have we now in Gastonia? Not a single Party member. Take last year's strike in Illinois and Ohio. After the strike, our union did not grow stronger there, but weakened.

The C.P.U.S.A. has recently led several big strikes and big revolutionary unemployed actions, but it is quite obvious that strong sectarian tendencies, especially on the question of the attitude to partial demands, lie at the basis of this lack of plan and partisan attitude in the sphere of the leadership of economic fights by the C.P.U.S.A.

Comrade Bedacht states that in a number of cases he found, that when our comrades spoke in the election campaign, they apologised for the fact that the Party put forward partial demands. They stated, that, of course, they knew that the solution of all problems is revolution, but that the workers do not know this, and therefore we put forward partial demands, although they have absolutely no meaning (laughter). At one meeting where Comrade Bedacht spoke on the question of social insurance, the workers in the hall told him that other Party speakers had informed them that our campaign for social insurance was not serious, that we did not expect to get any-

thing out of it, and we were not worrying much about it, because any concessions would objectively patch up the capitalist system, the workers would be satisfied, and would not want a revolution.

Sectarian tendencies in the C.P.U.S.A. are the chief hindrance to carrying out the tactic of the united front.

Here is one example, of many, showing how this tactic is operated.

There was a strike of 25,000 textile workers in Lawrence. At the meetings of the strikers, which were held by the United Textile Workers' Union (affiliated to the A.F. of L.), there were usually 3,000 to 8,000 persons. We held meetings on the outskirts, and 300 to 500 people came to us. Thus we were isolated from the basic masses of strikers. When the reformists called a meeting for the last time, and thousands of workers came to it, there was no one to speak at this meeting, because the reformists had already decided to end the strike, and they left the meeting unattended to. But our comrades did not know about this meeting, as they took very little interest in any of the meetings called by the reformists. The strike was broken.

One American comrade describes the attitude of the Party to the strike as follows: They look on the struggle led by the revolutionary trade unions as the struggle of "our workers," and on the strikes led by the A.F. of L. as the struggle of "workers who are not ours."

Here is another American witness, Comrade Bedacht, who stated at the July session of the Polit Bureau: "Our comrades divide the working

class into two categories—our friends and our enemies.”

“Our workers,” and “not our workers”—that is the united front, American style! However, this sectarian position not only fails to hinder, but is the basis for deeply opportunist “gentlemen’s agreements” with the reformists, for the “division of spheres of influence,” as was the case in Illinois.

Work among the unemployed, on the admission of the American comrades themselves (statement of Comrade Newton), “is still carried out on a narrow basis and has a sectarian character.” Therefore, it is not surprising that it is weakening and narrowing. In the first quarter of 1932, there were 30,000 registered in the unemployed organisations, and in the second quarter, there were 13,000.

One of the biggest mass political actions, in which the Party played a prominent rôle, was the movement of the veterans.\* I must stop to analyse the line of the Party in this movement, in view of the fact that such mass movements, which extend to the petty-bourgeoisie, as well as the workers, are becoming more widespread in the U.S.A., and the question of the winning over of these masses by our Party becomes exceptionally important.

In the leadership of the Party, with regard to the veterans’ movement, there were a number of vacillations, the chief source of which was the doctrinaire sectarian approach to the masses. At first the Polburo made a decision: “Convert the march of the veterans into the sending of a mass

---

\*See “Communist International,” No. 16 (1932).

delegation elected by ex-soldiers in Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia and New York."

As further events showed, this decision was absolutely incorrect, and, in essence, was likely to demobilise the masses and stifle their initiative.

The movement developed widely, and could have become still wider, if the Party had not taken a completely incorrect line from the very start.

But even when the movement had become very wide, and 25,000 veterans had gathered in Washington, the Polburo was still unable to give up its doctrinaire sectarian approach to it, and made the following decision: "Our comrades must take the line of carrying out the sharpest class differentiation in the camp of the veterans."

Instead of trying to extend the influence of the Workers' Ex-Servicemen's League, which had been organised by us, and taking the leadership of the movement as a whole, the League was to isolate itself from the overwhelming majority of the veterans, from the petty-bourgeois sections, and hand them over to the fascist, Captain Waters, to Norman Thomas of the A.F. of L., and to the Reverend Cox, the founder of the Blue Shirt fascist organisation.

What is the use of such a policy? It is not a line for winning over the masses. It is the line of running away from the masses.

The tendency to hide from the masses led to strong vacillations on the question of the organisation and leadership of the struggle of those hundreds of thousands of working families, who are at the same time the owners of small houses, against the government and the banks which are

taking these houses away from these workers, for non-payment of taxes, or interest on mortgages. Such a movement, you see, is not a pure class movement, because in this struggle the working class is not counter-posed to the capitalists!

The same doctrinaire tendency causes doubts among the leadership on the question of the organisation of the struggle of the workers and the petty-bourgeois strata against the automobile tax, which bears with equal weight on the poor little Ford, which is essential for the farmer or the worker, and the luxurious automobile of the millionaire.

In the U.S.A. there are enormous possibilities of mobilising and organising the masses. Take only the movement of the railwaymen for a pension. This movement fell into the hands of the democratic politicians who introduced a Pension Bill into Congress. At the same time they formed a Pension Bill Club which has over 250,000 members (according to the figures of these politicians), and publishes a newspaper with a circulation of over 400,000.

The T.U.U.L.\* paid no attention to this movement for over a year, in spite of the fact that mass meetings, for the popularisation of this Bill, were taking place everywhere. It was only a year later that it intervened, and then only very undecidedly.

At the present time, in the North-Western states, there is developing a peculiar wide "strike" movement of farmers, directed towards raising prices. The farmers have organised many pickets, with the aim of raising prices, and

---

\*Trade Union Unity League.

they refuse to allow food to be taken into the towns.

According to telegrams, the A.F.L. is already making attempts to wreck this movement by all kinds of manoeuvres. The pickets have already had big conflicts with the police; and what is our Party doing? The telegrams do not say anything. Evidently it is not doing anything and is occupied with wavering and doubting.

These doubts and waverings, caused by the doctrinaire sectarian approach to the mass movement, must be very great in the present case, because this movement of the farmers is directed towards increasing the prices on food, which is plainly not advantageous to the workers as consumers.

I must examine this case in more detail. Higher prices on necessities are not advantageous to the workers. Therefore, it might be said, that, in this case, the workers should act against the farmers.

Such a line of reasoning is absolutely incorrect. Such a tactical line would be a fatal political mistake, because objectively it would lead to our Party coming out against the farmers and in alliance with the bankers, the exploiting farmers, and the police, who are beating up the farmers' pickets.

It would also be the grossest political mistake for the Party to declare itself neutral with regard to this movement on the grounds that, on the one hand, this movement is objectively revolutionary as it is directed against the capitalist system, but, on the other hand, it is antagonistic to the interests of the workers. Our Party can never win

over the masses if it keeps neutral and neglects such objectively revolutionary movements. The Party must call on the workers to support prices and for the annulment of mortgages, and for reduced rents, at the same time organising the workers for the struggle against wage-cuts, and for higher wages. The Party must explain to the workers and poor farmers the decisive importance of their joint struggle against the capitalist system, the necessity of the development and strengthening of their alliance in this struggle, the necessity of mutual aid in this struggle.

The deepening of the economic crisis, the end of capitalist stabilisation, and the revolutionary upsurge are bringing with them tremendous mass movements, fighting actions of *all* the oppressed and exploited, with the most varied and frequently contradictory demands. If we get confused in these contradictions, if we hide from them, if we are content with friendly neutrality towards the petty bourgeois masses who are entering the fight against capitalism under reactionary slogans, we shall display the completest failure to understand how a popular revolution takes place, and what must be our attitude to mass movements.

Here is what Lenin wrote in connection with the question of the Irish Rebellion in 1916:—  
 "To imagine that a social revolution could possibly take place without the revolt of the little nations in the colonies and in Europe, without revolutionary outbursts on the part of the petty-bourgeoisie with all their prejudices, without the movement of the non-class-conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against the oppression of the landlords,

the church, the monarchy, the national bourgeoisie, etc.—to think this means to *abandon social revolution*. It would mean to draw up troops in one place and say: 'We are for socialism'; and, in another place, and say: 'We are for imperialism,' and this will be the social revolution . . . The socialist revolution in Europe cannot be anything else but an outburst of the mass struggle of all the oppressed and discontented. Some of the petty-bourgeoisie and the backward workers will inevitably take part in it—without this participation it is impossible to have a *mass* struggle and impossible to have *any* revolution, and it is equally inevitable that they will bring into the movement their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their weaknesses and mistakes. But, *objectively*, they will attack *capital*, and the conscious vanguard of the revolution, the advanced proletariat, expressing this objective truth of the varied, many-voiced, diverse mass struggle, can unite and direct it, win the power, seize the banks, expropriate the trusts which are hated by all (although for different causes), and carry out other methods of dictatorship which, on the whole, will bring about the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the victory of socialism, which is not immediately 'cleansed' from petty-bourgeois dross" (Lenin: "Results of the Discussion on Self-Determination").

The decisive elimination of the doctrinaire sectarian approach to mass movements which dooms the Party to right opportunist backwardness, such is the central and all-deciding task of the British and American sections of the C.I. Without such an elimination, without a radical change in the

approach to the masses, these Parties will be fated to a position in which the masses will pass by them, and, at the best, they will sometimes, and in individual cases, be able to take charge of separate mass actions in a partisan manner, as was the case in Burnley and in Illinois; they will not be able to consolidate their influence on the masses firmly.

What are the basic conditions which are necessary to bring about this decisive change in the approach to the masses? There are two conditions—the reorganisation of the Party on the basis of inner-Party democracy, and the formation of new cadres.

### III.—INNER-PARTY DEMOCRACY — THE FIRST FUNDAMENTAL CONDITION FOR THE WINNING OF THE MASSES.

I do not intend to speak of formal democracy, of the democracy which is preached by the social-democrats, and on the basis of which, they have built up their Party. I wish to talk about real Bolshevik democracy. What is Bolshevik democracy? It consists in drawing all of the members of the Party into the political life of the Party, into the everyday work and struggle of the Party, into the collective work of preparing and leading mass struggles, into energetic comradesly work on the basis of iron inner-Party discipline, because Bolshevik democracy does not exclude, but presupposes iron Party discipline.

“We understand democracy as the raising of the activity and class-consciousness of the Party masses, as the systematic attraction of the Party masses in practice, not only into the discussion of

questions, but into the leadership of the work" (Stalin).

There is still far too little of such genuine Bolshevik democracy in many sections of the C.I., and this is the first and basic cause why these sections cannot turn towards the broad masses.

I shall use chiefly American material for illustrating the question of inner-Party democracy, but such, if not all, that I shall say about the shortcomings in the development of Bolshevik democracy in the American Party, applies also to other sections.

In practice, the Party members, the Party cells are not drawn into political life. Politics is for the leading organs, or, at best, for the activists. It never gets lower than the activists.

"The American comrades are afraid of political discussion; they have not organised any discussion for the study of the decisions of the 13th Plenum, and are not organising any discussion for the study of the decisions of the 14th Plenum now. In the cells only organisational and technical questions are discussed, and the collection of money is the chief work" (From the report of the instructor of the C.I.).

Sometimes general Party meetings are called, but they are only for show. The speaker gives his speech, replies to questions, and at the end there is no discussion, no consideration whatever.

Can there be any question of initiative among the Party members and the lower Party organisations under such conditions?

With regard to the attitude towards the new Party members, here is a typical example from the C.P.U.S.A.

"During the last fights of the unemployed in

Here is still another example of exceptionally abnormal relations between the leaders and members of the organisation. I am speaking of the Pittsburgh City organisation. Over 70 per cent. of the population of Pittsburgh consists of steel smelters and metal workers. Our organisation

I could give many facts showing that efforts to keep and to make the best use of Party workers are hindered by a formal bureaucratic understanding of Party discipline.

1932).  
 "In Eccles we have a group of new comrades, and amongst them, one old comrade who has been in the Party since 1923. Some of the new comrades were previously in the I.L.P. At first they all worked well, together with the old comrade, but when they began to develop, and after they had studied the resolutions of the E.C.C.I., disagreed with the old comrade on a few questions, he began to tell them that they were not in the I.L.P. now, etc." (Minutes of the P.B., July 9th, 1932).

Britain :  
 Here is the attitude to new members in Great

The workers have to overcome tremendous difficulties to get into our Party.  
 Within a few weeks 120 of them were again lost to make them into active Party members, etc. were made to visit them at home, to consult them, were put down as 'hopeless,' and no attempts appeared at these meetings. Therefore, the others of the Party organisation, but only 30 out of 150 were invited two or three times to the meetings Party. They received Party cards, and maybe New Conington, about 150 workers joined the

had 66 members, of whom only two were workers in the steel industry.

The relations between the secretary of the District Committee and the members of the city organisation were completely abnormal. The Secretariat of the District Committee looked on the whole city organisation as a hive of opportunists who did not want to work, but wanted to be quiet, etc. The workers of the Party, and the trade unions, did not take any part in the everyday work of the city organisation. To carry out this work, people were sent to Pittsburgh from New York and other Party organisations. All this still further deepened the impression of the members of the city organisation that they were not considered as full members of the Party, and they were not recognised by the District Committee. The result of this unhealthy situation very soon made itself felt at the end of the strike. Oppositional feelings arose. The Secretariat of the District Committee reacted to this, describing the comrades as opportunists, slackers, demoralised elements, etc.

At the present time the Pittsburgh organisation has become healthier; it has grown and strengthened. Almost all the old Party members are actively working.

Something similar to the events in Pittsburgh took place at Cleveland also.

The shortcomings of inner-Party democracy in the U.S.A. stand out with increasing prominence in the attitude taken up towards mass organisations. They are looked on, and treated as a source of money.

In a mass organisation under our control, the International Workers' Order, we take \$2 a

month membership dues from the workers. As a result, in the course of the first quarter of this year alone, 1,800 members of this organisation were expelled for non-payment of membership dues.

This is the destruction, and not the strengthening of mass organisations, the mass basis of the Party.

The financial policy of the American Party contains anti-democratic, purely business features. The mass organisations have repeatedly protested against the free way in which the Party organisations deal with their money. The tremendous difference between the salaries of the lower and higher functionaries cannot in any way fit in with inner-Party democracy. Tremendous amounts of money are spent, without any necessity, on travelling expenses, which are very high in the U.S.A., and there is no money for the newspaper in the south, "The Southern Worker" (a mere \$120 a week), and this paper, which had already become popular among the negroes, has been discontinued.

As you see, comrades, the financial policy of the Party plays an extremely big political rôle, both in the matter of winning over the masses, and in the development of inner-Party democracy, and in the organisation of the press.

Is it possible for a Party which suffers from big defects in the sphere of inner-Party democracy, such as the absence of political life in the cells, a formal and bureaucratic attitude to the question of securing new members for the Party, absolutely insufficient collective work in the leading organs, an impermissible attitude to mass

organisations, an anti-democratic financial policy—is it possible for a Party with such defects to cope with the tasks which face it at the present time—the task of firmly attaching to itself those broad masses who are being roused to the struggle by the crisis, and securing them for the Communist Party? No, it is impossible. It is precisely these shortcomings which explain the tremendous fluctuations in the Party membership.

A sharp change is necessary, a decisive change in the inner Party régime. Unless this takes place, the Party cannot become a mass Party. Unless this takes place, its numerical growth and the extension of its political influence will lag more and more behind the mass upsurge, and the Party will not eliminate its sectarianism, its separation from the basic strata of the native-born American workers.

This decisive change in the inner-Party régime, this democratisation of the Party, cannot be carried out unless new cadres are formed in the Party and the old ones strengthened.

#### IV.—THE RENEWAL AND STRENGTHENING OF CADRES AS THE SECOND BASIC LINK FOR THE WINNING OVER OF THE MASSES.

The tremendous importance of drawing in new cadres, the renewal of cadres, and the strengthening of these, evidently remains foreign to the American and English Parties up to the present time. They do not understand that new cadres form the future of the Party, and they stubbornly cling to the old cadres.

“We get the impression,” writes the instructor, “that the Party does not want to have new cadres at all. Some of the cadres, who have

completely failed dozens of times in the districts, are again sent to other districts."

Listen to what Comrade D. said at a meeting of the Pol-Buro: "I think it a very characteristic fact that in the 13th year of our Party's existence there is not a single district with a leadership composed of workers from that district, of participators in the struggle of this district."

This shows, best of all, that a policy of securing new cadres is not carried on. The work is conducted with one and the same cadre, shifting them from one district to another, and, furthermore, they are chiefly New York cadres.

Here is what the instructor writes in connection with this question in the Pittsburgh organisation:

"Simple workers were considered to be insufficiently trained to be accepted into the Party. Throughout the whole strike of the miners the city organisation did not recruit a single member. There were undoubted symptoms of white chauvinism as well."

Take further the composition of the students at the International Party Schools. Experience has shown during the last year that the leaders of the American Communist Party approached the question of selecting the students with a casualness bordering on the criminal. The composition of the students was unsatisfactory, and the directors of the School had to devote a tremendous amount of energy to the struggle against deviations, against white chauvinism, anti-semitism, and factious groupings which arose in the American group.

The British Communist Party was instructed by the C.I. to select 250 comrades and put them

through a school, in the course of six months. Recently we received a report on the carrying out of the resolution of the C.I., and we noted definite achievements on every task, except the task of forming new cadres. Instead of 250, only a few dozen persons were put through the schools.

It must be remembered that the basic cadres of the English and American Communist Parties have not been changed for several years. These cadres grew up in the sectarian period of the existence of the Parties. Many of these comrades cannot get rid of their sectarian tendencies. It is precisely this part of the cadres which forms the chief hindrance to eliminating sectarianism.

With regard to the U.S.A., I should especially add that a certain part of the cadres grew up in conditions of unprincipled factional struggle, in other words, that this part of the cadres did not come forward because they were completely suitable for responsible political and organisational work. However, there are many facts showing that new cadres of leaders have arisen among the working masses, who have made themselves prominent in strikes in Britain, U.S.A., Belgium, etc., and that these new cadres are genuine mass workers, and incomparably more strongly connected with the masses than a large part of the old cadres, who are incapable of abandoning their sectarian tendencies. They have already been tested in experience, in Party work in Britain, where a visible improvement of our work in the factories, and the turn towards the masses is connected precisely with the entrance of these new cadres into the Party. They were tested by experience in the Party organisation of Chicago. In those sections of Chicago in which new

cadres were secured, the work improved, according to the testimony of Comrade Gebert, but in the sections where there are no new cadres, it is in as deep a decline as it was before.

By enlarging our cadres, by bringing in new forces which have been thrown up by the masses in the ever-widening struggle, by drawing new cadres into the Party and ideologically training them, we shall link ourselves firmly, with the masses, renew and strengthen the Party cadres and put aside those who resist the drawing in of cadres, removing the fossilised sectarian elements from the leadership—this is our task. Unless this task is decisively carried out, there cannot be any turn away from sectarian isolation and towards the masses.

The British and American Parties are faced at present with four fundamental tasks :

(1) To direct the basic strategic blows against Social-Democracy, to win the masses away from it, to isolate it from the masses ;

(2) To win over the majority of the proletariat and the poor farmers, to train them in a series of fights and to convert them into our political army ;

(3) To organise our Party into a mass Party on the basis of Bolshevik inner-Party Democracy based on iron discipline, into a revolutionary staff of this political army ;

(4) To enlarge, strengthen and renew our Party General Staff.

In 1925 Comrade Stalin described the revolutionary outlook as follows :

“The world revolutionary movement at the present moment has entered the zone of the ebb of revolution, but this ebb must give place to a

flow which may end in the victory of the proletariat, but also may not end in this victory, but be replaced by a fresh ebb which, in turn, will give place to a new flow of the revolution." (Stalin: Questions of Leninism).

The prophecy of Comrade Stalin was justified. We have now a new flow of revolution, and this flow may end in victory. But for England and the U.S.A. this victory is only possible if these four fundamental tasks are carried out: the destruction of Social-Democracy, the destruction of Social-Fascism, the formation of a mass political army, the conversion of the Party into the fighting staff of this army, and the formation of a strong general staff.

If they are able to carry out these tasks, then victory will be obtained in the second round of revolutions and wars.

But, however things may end in Britain and the U.S.A., it is quite clear that the basis of the world revolution, the U.S.S.R., will emerge from the second round of revolutions and wars larger and stronger.

# THE C.P.G.B. IN THE FIGHT FOR THE MASSES

(Reprinted from No. 17-18 "Communist International.")

H. POLLITT.

COMRADES, in spite of the desperate efforts of the British capitalist class to find a way out of the crisis, the outstanding feature of the situation in England to-day is not an alleviation of the crisis, but a steady deepening and this in spite of the fact that a revolution is taking place in the fiscal policy of England, expressed in the traditional free trade country embarking upon the system of tariffs. And now the temporary gains which the change in fiscal policy and the going off the gold standard undoubtedly brought to a certain section of industry last autumn have disappeared. The position in basic industries is steadily getting worse. The Ottawa Conference not only revealed the growing disintegration in the Empire, but it has also considerably sharpened the conflicting interests between various groups of British capitalists and its meaning for the British workers as a whole is a tremendous increase in the cost of living.

What have been some of the social consequences of the crisis in Britain? Even Government figures have to admit an unemployed army of three million. If we take into account the hundreds of thousands of workers who are no longer registered unemployed, we have in England an unemployed army of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  million. In 1920 the average earnings of a miner were £5 1s. 6d., whereas to-day they are £1 15s. 10d. For a building worker they were £5 2s. 6d., to-day

they are £3 12s. 6d. For a railway porter £3 12s., to-day they are £2 6s. In 1920 the average earnings of a woman weaver in Lancashire were £1 9s. 6d., to-day they are 11s. 4d. This tremendous fall in wages, in spite of the growing resistance of the workers to-day, has demonstrated to the workers better than any theory could have done that wage reductions do not bring back the old conditions.

In many big industrial centres which were formerly looked upon as beehives of industry and prosperity, such as Glasgow, Sheffield, Openshaw, etc., there are tremendous factories, not a single worker is employed to-day. In many principal mining towns not one worker is employed.

Another important factor which sometimes in our propaganda we did not make sufficient use of, is the deliberate destruction of the factories, which is now being carried through on instructions of the banks to limit competition, and the further fact of the complete rationalisation of British industry which the banks are aiming at.

For example, in the last twelve months, twelve big shipbuilding yards closed down, seventy-one berths have been destroyed, and in one case, a shipyard, which in 1920 was laid down with every phase of labour-saving machinery, since then has not constructed a single ship, and the machinery has been burned and sold for scrap iron. In one of the biggest combines in Manchester before the war, and which recently employed 7,500 workers, to-day there is employed only 500 workers. In 1920 the directors of this firm constructed a new factory which was filled with the latest type of heavy engineering machinery, amongst which at

that time was considered to be the finest set of electrical turbine engines in the country. That machinery never produced a single thing. It is now being sold for scrap iron.

The National Government came into power on an unprecedented majority, with the slogan of "work and wages," men and women, which undoubtedly succeeded in deceiving masses of workers into voting for the National Government at the last election.

It is now clear to all, as the last two by-elections showed, that disillusionment with the Government's policy has already set in; that the chief line they are trying to carry through is attacks on the working class and this is their line on an international scale.

Firstly, they carry through their programme of economies and cuts prepared by the Labour Government. This is a significant fact which our Party, of course, is tireless in driving home to the working masses.

Now the National Government is preparing new cuts after carrying through the whole programme of the economy cuts—a programme that met with the fiercest resistance from that section of the working class no one ever thought would resist, namely, the sailors of the Atlantic Fleet in Invergordon last September. That historical incident in the history of the British navy is one that will have increasing repercussions in the coming autumn, when undoubtedly new attacks will be made on all sections of State employees. The mutiny of the Invergordon sailors forced the National Government to make concessions to the army, the police and the air force which cost millions of pounds. Reductions which the

Government had been confident it would be able to put throughout without any resistance. Now the Government is preparing a new plan and aims to reduce State expenditure by £100,000,000 between September and next March, by reducing the benefits of the unemployed and reduced expenditure on all vital social services.

In foreign policy its whole line has been to intensify the basic antagonism of imperialism, namely, the Anglo-American antagonism. This is shown in the decision reached at the Lausanne Conference; it is seen in the line being prepared for the coming world economic conference. It is reflected in the policies pursued by the British Delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference; it has been seen more strongly at the Ottawa Conference. Immediately the Conference had begun, President Hoover made a speech which was a warning signal to Britain that America understood very well the whole of the war ambitions which Ottawa signified as far as American imperialism was concerned. While it is true that the whole line has been to intensify this old antagonism between England and America, the Ottawa Conference was especially directed against the Soviet Union. This has also been seen in the secret agreements made at Lausanne; in support for Japan in Manchuria. This was also reflected in the "gentlemen's agreement" arrived at between England and France, where it speaks of a certain policy in regard to European affairs and no one can have any doubt that this is simply the policy of Britain and France towards the U.S.S.R. It has been reflected in the large exports of munitions and war materials from Britain to Japan for the latter's predatory

ambitions in Shanghai. Ottawa also showed an open attempt to create more effective war preparations even at the expense of certain sections of British manufacturers who are anxious to work on orders for the Soviet Union. But, finally, in this aspect of foreign policy, Ottawa has not only shown the disintegration within the Empire itself. It means that the workers are going to have to pay more money for bread and meat and all forms of tinned foods they consume, unemployment will increase, and the Trade Agreement with the Soviet Union will probably be destroyed.

The policy in regard to India is one of brutal and ruthless repression. We have to-day a situation where more men and women are in prison in India than ever in the history of that country, and the latest decision of the Government in proposing a so-called solution of the communal question in India further divides and disunites the forces in India fighting against British imperialism.

But even a more significant development, more significant from the point of view of the drive being carried out by the National Government, namely, towards Ireland, is the fight against the Irish Free State.

This is not simply a question that it wants to force De Valera to pay the three million pounds due from Ireland to Britain every year, on account of a settlement made in regard to land some years ago; or to force De Valera to sign the oath of allegiance to King George, the underlying motive is to make the Irish people once and for all understand that the National Government will never allow Ireland to become an independent republic.

What is the position of the British working class in this situation? Is it a down-and-out working class; is there no fight and militancy in the British working class?

We have any number of facts to show the tremendous developments taking place, even though developing unevenly. First, is the fact of the policy of disaffiliation from the Labour Party. of the I.L.P., a policy carried through under mass pressure, and this reflects the increasing disillusionment with the Labour Party on the part of vast sections of the working class.

The growing revolt of the trade union branches against the iron rule of the trade union officials; the mass pressure which has compelled leaders in unions like the engineers, railway clerks, electricians, etc., to reinstate expelled Communists who had been expelled by the union for periods of from one to three years. It is reflected in the character of the speeches and resolutions which have been made and adopted at a whole number of important trade union conferences, such as the engineers, railwaymen, etc., this year, where the leaders of the trade union movement have made demagogic speeches which is the reflection of the mass pressure upon them and they are now endeavouring to canalise that mass pressure so as to keep the rebellious elements from coming into the revolutionary camp. The wave of radicalisation is also expressed in the growth of the anti-war sentiments, in the splendid and unprecedented attitude of trade union delegates at the anti-war conferences, in the election of seventy-one workers—dockers, engineers, miners—who were sent to the Amsterdam Anti-War Congress. It has been reflected in the mass unemployed demonstrations,

particularly those of last autumn (October, November, December) where for the first time since 1926, the period of the general strike, hundreds of thousands of workers came out into the streets and demonstrated. This militancy and radicalisation has reflected itself during the past ten months in the various economic struggles that have taken place (10,000 weavers in Great Harwood, 10,000 dockers in London and Liverpool, 3,000 London Lightermen, 10,000 Lucas workers, and the strike of the 3,000 Leicester hosiery workers) and in the present strike of the 200,000 Lancashire weavers and the whole series of other strikes this year. In England we can therefore see a fighting working class, and although radicalisation is proceeding unevenly, we see deep and fundamental changes taking place which only the more sharply emphasise the weaknesses of our Party, the serious lagging behind of our Party and our isolation from the masses, which is the warning note to the whole Party to improve its methods of work so that we can give that leadership for united action to this growing mass movement that can only come from the Communist Party.

What has been the policy of the reformists during this period? It is absolutely true to declare that the Labour Party stands to-day very largely discredited in the eyes of the British working class, but it is undoubtedly making every effort to make a come-back. It does this by the use of demagogy, by bringing forward of programmes disguised as Socialism. For example, for the coming Labour Party Conference in October, a whole series of resolutions have been prepared dealing with finance, land, industry, trade, etc.,

and the essence of all these resolutions is that the Labour Party, given a Government with a majority, will reorganise the whole of the economic life of England; that by a series of corporations representing the employers, the consumers and the workers, it will be possible in this common family to be able to constructively begin in England the planning of industry and trade. This is Labour Socialism, but a careful examination of the Labour Party's policy on every one of the questions they are dealing with, reveals the fact that, stripped of its phraseology, its line is an anti-working class line, a capitalist line.

How cunningly and skilfully these left manoeuvres are to deceive the masses is seen on the question of the Means Test. It is true to say that nothing is so hated as the Means Test. The Labour Party, when it was the Government, was the Government which introduced the Means Test, and it won the recent bye-elections in Wakefield and Wednesbury, both important industrial centres, simply on the ground that it was fighting the Means Test, when, in reality, it was the father of the whole scheme.

The Trade Union Congress opens in Newcastle on September 5th. The chief programme before the Congress of the General Council is a programme which is described as public control and regulation of industry and trade, and the General Council leaders of the Trade Union Congress have worked out a complete scheme whereby every industry can be brought under public control, with each of these industries being run on the lines of a public corporation, and they will then give a square deal to the workers, employers and trade unions. They define the goal of organ-

ised labour as the following: That it is to make industry a public service functioning in the interests of the whole community and organised on a model scientific line, with the aim of securing the maximum welfare for the people, and they are asking the delegates to reaffirm this policy.

The Trade Union Congress talks about fighting the Means Test. It also talks about the necessity of having shorter hours, the necessity of a forty-hour working week, but while it talks like this it is putting into operation the splitting of the unemployment movement.

Now just a word or two about the I.L.P. It would be wrong to underestimate the decision of the I.L.P. to disaffiliate from the Labour Party. It was on the initiative of the I.L.P. that the Labour Party was formed, and it represents a tremendous change in the traditional attitude that a decision should now be carried through that the Party which formed the Labour Party should leave the Labour Party. This decision was carried through at a recent conference in Bradford, there being 241 votes for disaffiliation and 142 against disaffiliation.

This disaffiliation takes place at a time, not when Labour is a Government, and when the results of its policy as a Government are so obvious to the workers; it takes place at a time when the Labour Party is in so-called opposition to the National Government, and so deep is the disillusionment of the masses with the policy of Labour as an opposition, that the I.L.P. as the so-called left wing within the ranks of the Labour Party, now senses this feeling down below and it puts the question of leaving the Labour Party in order to become an independent political force.

In the ranks of the I.L.P. there has been a split since this policy was carried through, and one section of the I.L.P., called the loyal section, is to remain affiliated to the Labour Party and it is undoubtedly carrying on a big campaign.

It would be wrong to underestimate to the slightest extent the importance of this decision.

It is interesting to know how the conference in Bradford was organised—the conference to carry out the policy of disaffiliation. The first business of the conference was to pay a tribute to the memory of the Hungarian comrades executed; secondly, to send a tribute to the prisoners at Meerut; and thirdly, to pay tribute to the leaders of the C.P.S.U. for services rendered to world Socialism.

After these three items had been got through, then the ordinary business of the conference took place. At the conference a whole plan for Socialist Britain was brought forward. There is everything in that plan, except how the revolution shall be achieved, and the main thing of the plan is that everything is there, and everything can be achieved without a revolution. This is described as being the revolutionary Socialist policy for Britain.

But when it comes to the policy of the I.L.P. on economic struggles—for example, the present cotton strike—this is what the I.L.P. has to say: "The I.L.P. must continue to encourage resistance to wage-cuts and the tyranny of the employers, but must also point out to the cotton workers that they are doomed by capitalism, and a thorough-going to Socialism is the only hope of the workers."

There is in the I.L.P. a revolutionary policy

group whose only line of action against war is to blow up the munition trains and ships lying in the docks. This is the kind of propaganda they have been bringing forward in London in speeches and articles, but the simple question of instructing their I.L.P. members who are members of trade unions to refuse to handle these munitions, to get a one-day strike or a ten-minute protest strike has never been brought forward.

Just a few remarks in regard to the tasks of our Party in the united front movement. There are many dangers confronting the Party as far as carrying out the united front from below is concerned. The chief danger, of course, comes from the right, but despite this our biggest task is to wage relentless war on the sectarian elements in the Party. At the Plenum of our Central Committee, the following was stated regarding the united front:

“The supreme issue now confronting the workers is the struggle against imperialist war, the taking of the offensive against all war moves and the beating back of the starvation attack, which is part of the war offensive. Therefore, the urgent and imperative task before the Communist Party is the organisation of a broad united front of the working class and the mobilisation of all forces for a decisive advance of the entire Party.”

This was contained in the June resolution of the Plenum of our C.O.

How is the Party to carry out that task? How is the Party to mobilise its forces to carry out what it declares to be the most urgent and imperative task before the Party?

First, to overcome the sectarian tendencies

which prevent us from carrying out the united front work and activity; secondly, to take the initiative for developing the united front activity and action to effect our end; thirdly, to convince our entire Party that the united front is not a phrase and fetish but only a concrete way in which the workers can fight against the capitalist offensive and develop a mass movement; fourthly, we must make a determined effort to win the rank and file of the I.L.P., at the same time to avoid creating the impression that there are no fundamental differences between our Party and the I.L.P.

We must also explain why the C.P. cannot drop the right of criticism when engaged in united front work.

Finally, on this question comes the question of the popularity of our language. The sooner we begin to understand how to say what we want to say in ordinary language, the more effective will the whole line of our propaganda become.

Now some remarks about economic struggles, our work in the trade unions and the question of the fight against unemployment.

In 1931 our Party participated in many economic struggles and made many mistakes which led to a complete distortion of the line of independent strike leadership and organisation. Comrade Kuusinen referred to some of them, particularly the South Wales example, where a self-appointed committee of about twenty Communists called itself the Central Strike Committee of South Wales. However, as a result of the criticism of the Comintern and the R.I.L.U., decisive changes were made and these are now being put into effect. In our experience this year

we are now trying to find a way to apply independent leadership that has a mass character to it. The experience of a whole series of struggles this year have brought out the necessity of the utmost flexibility being utilised in order to be able to win every bit of contact in developing the strike leadership. Some interesting factors have come out of an analysis of the strike struggles which we must take into consideration in formulating the correct slogans of the fight. One of the most interesting things in England, so far as economic struggles and the resistance of the workers is concerned, is the fact that on some aspects of rationalisation, the fight is more bitter than when it is a fight against wage-cuts. For instance, the magnificent fight of the Lucas workers was the fight against the Bedaux System. The London busmen's resistance, which will probably take the form of a strike in the end of September, is not primarily against the threatened wage-cut. The new rationalisation scheme for the railwaymen, which in nine months will put 30 per cent. of them on the streets, is what the railwaymen are mainly fighting against, and this fact of relentless opposition to rationalisation is very important. And in Lancashire to-day, although the wage-cut is playing an important part in the fight, the central feature is the resistance of the workers to the More-Loom System because the weavers understand that it will put 50 per cent. of them on the streets.

And if we understand this, then in formulating our slogans, they must always take into account this factor.

I will not give all the figures in regard to the progress of the economic struggles in England

during the last two or three years, but just a few examples: There were 250 strikes from January to July, involving 150,000 workers, and 905,000 working days lost. This is not taking into consideration the new situation in Lancashire, and strikes in London at present.

One or two remarks in regard to experience in a few economic struggles. The Lucas strike was incorrectly referred to by Comrade Kuusinen, the real mistake not being brought out; but he may have the wrong information.

What was our mistake in the Lucas situation. It was of a two-fold character. First, our comrades began to argue as to whether to form a new union or not, instead of concentrating all their resources on building an organisation within the factory, within each department, and linking this up with a factory committee; the second mistake, made by the C.C., was in not building up the M.M. and in not recruiting members to its ranks during the course of the strike, but rather concentrating on the question of building factory contacts and a committee.

The basic mistake was the mistake of getting discussions and arguments going as to whether a new union should be built or not, instead of the mobilisation of all our energy for the building up of factory, department and union organisations that would have formed a real mass revolutionary trade union opposition in the Lucas factory.

Take another strike—the London Lightermen. We had not a single contact with these men when the strike began. The question was how to get this contact. Finally, comrades were

selected to go down and try to get some idea of what the lightermen's conditions were, to get the story written up in the "Daily Worker," and then try to get the "Daily Worker" among the strikers. This was done and the "Daily Worker" was sent to the chairman of one of the lightermen's locals and this man, who had never had any use for the paper before, took it to a meeting of 500 strikers, read the story to them and the strikers said: "That is the only paper which has told the truth about our fight." That gave us our first break. As a result of the interest aroused by that first story, we were then able to build up a big influence, and in two of the most important branches a special meeting was organised at which twenty lightermen joined our Party. In one of those branches we still have a big influence. But the important thing was the rôle that the "Daily Worker" began to play among a number of workers who had never heard of the paper before.

Now with regard to the strike of the Lancashire weavers. Our Party is very weak in the textile areas. This year some special concentration has been made on Burnley, which we looked upon as being the storm centre of any struggle which would take place in Lancashire. Some weeks ago we had nine Party members and eleven workers who were sympathetic to the Party in this town. Concentration had been made on the decisive mill, but we had not succeeded in getting new members into the Party from that factory. We did succeed, however, in widening the influence of the Party in that factory. However, eighteen weeks ago in a little place called Earby, the employers demanded another cut of 7½ per

cent. Some 400 workers came out on strike. Our comrades went into that village and were received with definite hostility. Our comrades were told: "We want no Communist agitators here. The strike is being run by the union and it can be won by the union." After seven weeks, our comrades had so continued the struggle that they not only broke down all hostility against them, but were able to call out five other mills in this place. We succeeded in getting meetings of the strikers in each of these mills and in electing a rank and file strike committee from each one of the five mills in Earby. The strikers then asked for the use of the Weavers' Institute for a rank and file strike meeting; the union officials said they could not have it; the comrades organised a march of all the strikers who forcibly took possession of the Weavers' Institute, and had it ever since. It was a little strike, but it was the first spark which set into a flame in Lancashire, where 200,000 workers are out at present for five weeks.

I will give another example. In Burnley the employers posted a notice of reduced wages; the union called a strike with the belief that the workers would not respond. Twenty per cent. of the workers there are unemployed; the Means Test has wrought havoc in every home there, and the union leaders thought that if there was no response, it would give them an excuse and mandate to sign a wage-cut agreement with the employers, with whom they were already negotiating. To their astonishment, and to the astonishment of the Party, every weaver in Burnley came out on strike, and in doing this, we can say that the decisive factor was undoubtedly played by the Party in organising, on the day before the strike,

a meeting at which 5,000 Burnley weavers participated.

At this meeting the line was given as follows: the union leaders are calling you on strike; they do not believe that you will strike; we call upon all the weavers to strike in the mills and to mass-picket these mills. The next morning the comrades went on the picket lines, and one of the most important results was that all struck work, and these strikers approached our women comrades who were working in the mills and asked: which mills shall we go to picket? And for two days, under the leadership of our comrades, under the leadership of our Party—this is an undoubted fact—every mill in Burnley was picketed until every mill stopped.

This complete stoppage immediately brought a new situation throughout the whole Lancashire textile industry, and in every other textile town talk began to be heard of all being out together.

Subsequently a strike was called on August 27th and 200,000 of the weavers in Lancashire are now out on strike. By the end of this week scores of spinning mills will have to close down and that will make 100,000 spinners. In another three weeks 200,000 spinners are due for a wage-cut. If the spinners will now join the ranks of the weavers, that will be a power that nothing in Lancashire can defeat, and the job of the Party and the revolutionary opposition is to bring forward this slogan in the sharpest and most convincing manner possible in order to bring about such a position.

As the strike develops there is, of course, the danger of government intervention. We must

be on our guard against this. We must utilise all our influence in the union committees and particularly developing independent strike meetings and getting from these meetings provisional organisations that can lead to effective committees of action which in turn can lead to an all-Lancashire Conference of elected strikers from the meetings of the strikers themselves to appoint an authoritative independent strike leadership which is really representative of all the strikers. The Lancashire strike is one of the most important strikes which have taken place in England, the consequences of which will be felt throughout the entire country. Our small Party was able to collect £350 for the Lancashire strikers in the first three weeks. In one week it has also collected seven tons of foodstuffs from the workers in London and sent three motor lorries from London to Lancashire. This is arousing great enthusiasm from the workers along the whole lines of route from London to Lancashire.

Now I want to speak on some of the lessons which have resulted from these struggles.

First, we must continue to make war on the conception that independent leadership and united front activities can be separated, and make it clear that the independent leadership and activities we speak of is not the leadership and activities of a handful of Communists, but is the independent leadership and activities of the masses and not of a few Communists or supporters of the Minority Movement. And when once that conception can be got across to the entire Party and the M.M., then the whole line of methods of approach will undergo a whole change.

I want to bring forward a controversial point.

I bring it forward, not to counterpose it in any way to work in the factories or to the objective we all have—the election of representative strike committees as a result of meetings in factories or mills—but I bring it for consideration out of the strike experiences. This point is the line of approach on the question of strike strategy.

What are the chief lessons of the boilermakers' strikes of 17 weeks, of the lightermen's strike of 7 weeks, of the miners' strike in South Wales, of the response of the London busmen; and what is the chief reason for the tremendous strike movement in Lancashire? In my opinion it is the under-estimation by our Party of the authority and importance of the trade union branches and the decisive rôle these trade union branches play in struggles.

If we have in Lancashire at present, as a result of activity in the mills and unions, on 4 of the 36 union committees, Communists or members of the revolutionary trade union opposition, we would be able to write a different story so far as that strike is concerned at present.

In South Wales there is the mining village, and the centre is the lodge. We talk to the miners in the pit. This is absolutely correct, and we must increase our work to get pit committees—the most cardinal principle must be factory organisation, but we must not be blinded to the fact that, while doing that, that miner with whom we are discussing the question of wages will say: What is the Lodge Committee going to do; and what is the Lodge Committee going to say? And unless we make a sharp turn in understanding the trade union branches and how to use them, we are

going to neglect one of the most important methods to use, so far as carrying out strike activity is concerned.

I therefore hope that this question will be given the attention which it requires.

Now with regard to the question of work in the reformist unions. I would like to strongly support the thesis which gives added emphasis to this question and also the speeches of Comrades Kuusinen and Thaelmann where they dealt with it. Again I want to make it clear that I do not stress the decisive importance of this work in England from a trade union standpoint or from a viewpoint of being opposed to work in the factories, but from the experiences of life itself, because we hold the view that there can be no successful mass work in the factories independent of the mass work in the trade unions and vice versa.

Our policy must be to make the workers convinced that we want to make their union branches and committees powerful weapons in their fight when once they take them into their own hands. Wrong formulations on this question of the trade union movement which have given the impression that we are out to smash and disrupt the trade union movement have placed weapons in the hands of the Amsterdamers. Our task is to win the masses of the trade union members and speculations as to whether we can win the whole union or the branch only conceals the refusal to work in the reformist trade unions and prevents any work from being carried out in these unions. Objectively, this sort of speculation is merely capitulation to the trade union bureaucracy. We must realise that there are tens of thousands of

workers in England and other countries who though not yet ready to join the Communist Party are ready to work and help carry out the policy of the revolutionary trade union opposition. And those workers have to be organised; they must be developed and made the basis of a mass revolutionary trade union opposition.

Regarding the question of work in the trade unions. We endeavoured to make an improvement of work in this connection, and this is seen in the fact that in the last months we have been able to get 19 of our leading comrades in the engineers' union, who were expelled, reinstated, and a leading comrade in the Stevedores' Union reinstated and on the Executive Committee of that Union. Other examples of our trade union work can be seen in the fact that since January to the end of July of this year, 57 trade union branches passed resolutions and sent them to the "Daily Worker," protesting against the action of the Japanese in Shanghai, and this means that scores of others must have passed them and did not notify the papers; that 19 branches of the Engineers' Union protested against the attack on the Soviet Union made in their journal; it is seen in the fact that a delegation of 71 was sent to Amsterdam, principally trade unionists; and it is seen in the attendance of trade union branches now taking place in the united front trade union conference.

What are the weak sides? At the Newcastle Congress, opening on September 5th, out of 700 delegates, we have got only 4; at the recent miners' conference, we had 1 delegate; at the recent conference of railwaymen we had only 1; and it lies in the fact that in Lancashire we have

not a single member on one union committee throughout the whole of the textile centre; it is seen in the fact too that in January of this year, when the question of work in the reformist unions was discussed, out of 81 of the leading comrades present, when they were asked how many were active in the trade unions, only 13 could show they were active, and if that is the situation on the top, we can have a good idea what it is like below, but figures indicate an improvement this year so far as work in the unions is concerned.

One or two words in connection with the revolutionary trade union opposition. Many sharp criticisms which are absolutely justified can be levelled at our Party for its neglect in developing the mass revolutionary trade union opposition, but what do we find in this respect? We find as a result of experiences that we cannot develop the Minority Movement in a strait jacket. Just one or two facts to prove this. In South Wales we have an unofficial union of the tinsplate workers. This movement has the support of 62 branches and runs a monthly paper called the "Workers' Voice." In the engineers we have another unofficial movement which is known as the Members' Rights Movement. This movement has succeeded in getting our comrades reinstated. It is supported by 120 trade union branches and 4 area councils of the A.E.U. It also publishes a monthly paper called the "Monkey Wrench," which has a circulation of over 5,000. Among the London dockers, for the first time, we have established a London port workers' unity movement which is now rapidly developing. This movement publishes two monthly papers with a circulation of 900. With the busmen, the

whole of the line that has been carried out, has been carried out by the busmen's militant groups and they have the support of 27 of the most important garages. 4,500 copies of the last issue of their paper were sold in 3 days in the garages and trade union branches. Among the printing workers militant groups have been established. This movement also has a monthly paper with a circulation of 3,000.

The lesson that we can see is that these movements are developing according to the concrete circumstances which face these particular types of workers in the respective industries, and, secondly, that the call of unity as expressed in so many of these names is bringing many sections of workers which have hitherto been outside our ranks nearer to us and the job now is to have the perspective for continuing the campaign to consolidate them wherever possible on a district and national basis. And we ought to be able to find some name which will be more suitable and applicable to English conditions.

One or two words on the fight against unemployment. Comrade Thaelmann said that in Germany the Prague resolution had practically been a dead letter. This is true also in Britain. In Britain we have an unemployed organisation with 386 branches and a dues paying membership of 50,000, but we have not yet been able to convince our comrades in this organisation, with all its possibilities, that it must become the fighting core for the carrying out of broad mass activities against unemployment and the development of broad unemployed councils. The thing which has held the unemployed organisation back from doing this is the fear that it will be liquidated.

On the contrary, I contend that if the N.U.W.M. could have taken the initiative for the drive forward in carrying out the Prague resolution, it would have become a more powerful organisation than heretofore.

What is the weakest part of the fight against unemployment in Britain? It is the fact that, although we have the unemployed organisation of 50,000 paying members, it is largely an organisation of unemployed workers who have been unemployed for many years, and we have failed to draw into the organisation these hundreds of thousands of skilled and semi-skilled workers who have close ties with the trade union branches, who have been unemployed, for the first time in their lives, and are outside the influence and scope of our organisation.

The lessons of last autumn must be learned when demonstrations at which unemployed and employed workers participated took place we did not draw them in—but we still have good connections with workers inside the factories. This means we lost tremendous opportunities for making a fight against unemployment, not only a fight of the unemployed, but a fight of the whole working class movement, and particularly a fight of the trade union movement and a presentation of demands for the finding of work. Not only this aspect but every other gives the Party opportunities for bringing out its whole revolutionary lines.

One last point. I do not propose to speak in regard to the anti-war campaign because one of the other comrades will give a separate report on this on the special item on the agenda dealing

with it, but I want only to say that, whilst the Party made many big improvements in the anti-war work, we did not succeed in stopping a single ship or munition train, nor did we succeed in getting one short protest strike.

The resolution of our C.C. Plenum in January gave the line for the Party's work in the immediate future for the strengthening of the mass movement of resistance and the overcoming of the Party isolation from the masses. The most important questions dealt with were the following :

First, the methods and tasks of carrying out revolutionary mass work.

Secondly, the necessity of combining our revolutionary political line and leadership with tireless detailed work in the factories, unions and exchanges, in relation to the concrete situation and issues.

Thirdly, from this work to develop a revolutionary mass organisation that would have its permanent expression in the Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition.

Fourthly, as the red thread running through all this work, to build up the Party through continuous recruiting and the building up of the circulation of the "Daily Worker."

Four districts were chosen for concentration so as to carry out this resolution—London, South Wales, Lancashire and Glasgow. Further, every leading member of the Party was instructed to be attached to some factory cell and to some local Party organisation and the whole of this work was to be checked up and controlled by the District Committees and the Pol-Bureau. It is now possible to give an estimation of what has

been done in the six months concentration period.

First, we can say that there has been a marked improvement in nearly every phase of the Party's work. Secondly, there has been better preparation and participation in local struggles and particularly in economic struggles. Thirdly, that the Anti-War Campaign and the winning of trade union support represents active achievement in that direction. Fourthly, definite results in increased influence in some factories and in some unions.

These results, comrades, are only small but they point the way for the whole Party and in this respect I would like to give particular experiences from these districts which show the work of this concentration. First, I want to take a miners' village in South Wales. Here we had a Party cell of four members. This cell had very little influence in the pit in the village but after the discussion of the resolution, the cell began to apply the line of that resolution to its work. It took up a number of questions in that particular pit and analysed them. It formulated demands. It took up questions which we had formerly considered beneath us. For instance, questions in regard to timber and another question in regard to piece work. It wrote all this up in an article which was published in the "Daily Worker" which was afterwards distributed among the miners in the pit. As a result of this first step the management was compelled to rectify grievances which had been outstanding for some considerable time. As a result of this concrete activity, two new members were recruited to the cell. The cell asked the "Daily Worker" to give them a whole page in the "Daily Worker"

stating that they would supply the material for it if we would publish it. The "Daily" said that it would. 36 dozen copies of the issue which had this special page were sold. Our pit cell has now increased to 11 and we have bigger influence in this pit than we have had since the formation of the Party as far as this area is concerned.

Secondly, an example from Glasgow. We had no contact whatever among the Glasgow dockers in December. In fact definite hostility to our Party expressed itself. After discussion a new approach was made. The comrades were able to find out one or two grievances of the dockers in this particular place. Use was made of a letter sent by one of the dockers from Odessa. This was printed in thousands of copies. It caused a lot of excitement. At a special meeting of the dockers we had made some contact for the first time and recruited one or two members into our Party. As a result of that first meeting of 1,000 the dockers were not only able to take up some of the grievances on the Clyde, but they also elected a delegate to come to the U.S.S.R. This cell now issues a dock paper.

A further example from London, from a railway depot cell. This railway depot, where we had a Party cell of 14, is very important for the transport of munitions. Within the last three months we succeeded in recruiting three new members. The cell had been able to take up a number of simple questions which a year ago every comrade in that cell would have felt were beneath his notice.

For instance, a broken window in a dining-room—an insignificant thing—still we took the

question up. The matter was put right, and that led to other questions.

A comrade elected to a railway depot committee was able to utilise this to get grievances settled; a comrade running for a position got 405 votes, an increase of 100, the highest vote recorded in that depot; our factory paper started with a circulation of 200 but has increased in the last two months by 200; we were able to get a delegate to Amsterdam Congress and collected all expenses to send the delegate, and now we have a very big influence in one of the most important railway branches attached to that depot through which passes munitions from one of the biggest munition dumps ready for transmission abroad.

Perhaps to some Parties represented here this is insignificant, but to our Party they represent great improvements, and we must convince the Party that this can be done throughout the whole country providing the whole membership can be mobilised.

What are our weaknesses in the last six months? First, the Party has not increased its membership, but, on the contrary, it has failed to retain all the new members recruited at mass meetings. Out of this question has emerged an interesting point — where recruits have been gained from factory cells, we have not lost one member, but where recruited from big mass meetings, through insufficient attention to them, through a light-hearted attitude on their part in joining the Party, we have not been able to retain a large number that joined; thirdly, while the Party work in the economic struggles improved,

we have not been able to build up the revolutionary trade union opposition.

The circulation of the Party paper has been static. These weaknesses represent a warning signal to the whole Party to orientate itself at the earliest possible moment. The reasons for this weakness are: only 25 per cent. of the Party members are actively carrying out the resolution: the majority remain in the old sectarian rut. There is the most urgent need for convincing the whole Party of the importance of taking up these concrete demands — what we call in England “small issues,” and in taking them up, we must understand how to combine them with our revolutionary line of propaganda, with the presentation of the revolutionary way out of the crisis. The whole Party does not yet understand this question of concrete daily work. This work alone is not going to advance the Party if it has with it no mass contact, no mass character, and we in the Party who are in contact with the masses know this.

This, roughly, is the outline of the January resolution, its achievements and reasons for our shortcomings.

Upon the next tasks of the Party. These are now the fight against imperialist war and armed intervention against the Soviet Union. Second, the fight against the National Government, intensified offensive, economic campaign, unemployed work, fight against the Means Test, social service cuts, and against repression in the colonies, and especially India and Ireland, and in connection with these countries, our Party has seriously lagged behind the requirements and the demands

of the situation, because in England, so far as Ireland is concerned, in every important industrial centre there are tens of thousands of Irish workers whom we can win in the great imperialist fight against what is taking place in Ireland so far as the National Government is concerned at the present time.

The third task is the fight against the offensive of the employers as expressed in the attack against the textile workers, the bus and tube workers, the miners and the railwaymen.

Fourth, the urgent need for the development of a broad united front of the working class against hunger and war.

Fifthly, the development of revolutionary trade union opposition in the factories and unions

And sixthly, to use the same phrase again, the red stream that runs through the whole of these tasks is the recruiting for the Party in the cells and in the local unions, and the building up and strengthening of the Party and the "Daily Worker."

Finally, comrades, in looking back over the progress of our Party since the XI Plenum we can state that the Party has made some progress, that with the help of the International we are breaking through the isolation which has for so long characterised the Communist Party of Great Britain. We are making the first beginnings of the turn. Why do we say this? Is it because we are in a self-satisfied mood? Of course not. We say it only to emphasise the possibilities which confront our Party if only these small beginnings can be taken up by the whole membership to show what the whole Party can do. Why must we speed up this work? Because during the

next three months we are going to see in England the biggest attacks that have ever taken place. We are convinced that there will be the biggest mass movement than has ever occurred in the British working class movement. We must concentrate our efforts to win the leadership of this movement and avoid the mistakes which were proven by the bitter experiences of last autumn when we had the mass movement under our influence but were not able to lead it and to keep it. By profiting from these experiences, understanding the deadly urgency of the fight against hunger and war, our Party is pledging itself at the XII Plenum to carry out its heavy and responsible tasks with redoubled energy and to see that the line of the E.C.C.I. is carried out. We must profit by the mistakes and criticism of our Party which were revealed to us last December and I want to say while these are only first beginnings, they are beginnings of a permanent character and will give the International a guarantee and assurance that the Communist Party of Great Britain understands how to fulfil its duties in this hour of emergency.

## THE SITUATION IN U.S.A.

(Reprinted from No. 17-18 "Communist International.")

JACK PRINGLE.

**C**OMRADE Kuusinen in his report and thesis very correctly points out that the relative stabilisation of capitalism has come to an end. Comrade Stalin in his political report to the XV Congress of the C.P.S.U. predicted this, he declared :

"Out of the partial stabilisation of capitalism there grows a still acuter crisis, the growing crisis destroys the stabilisation—these are the dialectics of the development of capitalism in the present historical moment."

In the United States the correctness of Comrade Stalin's statement is brought out by the following: During the last three years all activities in the country have dropped 51 per cent. According to bourgeois figures, comparing the average for June, 1929, with June, 1932, industrial production has decreased to 48.7 per cent., automobile production to 42.7 per cent., car-loading to 48.2 per cent., department store sales to 60.7 per cent., and steel production as low as to 19.8 per cent., while industrial employment dropped to 57.7 per cent. These figures indicate the general trend in the economic life of the country. Actually the situation is even worse. Added to this, the financial crisis, which has begun, and is shown in the government deficit of 3 billion dollars, the Finance Reconstruction Corporation, that pours 4 billion dollars into the big banks, R.R. and big corporations and finally the Glass Bill, which opens inflation. *The gold standard of the American dollar is in danger.*

In previous crises, the ordinary cyclical crises, when there was no relatively high monopolistic character, American capitalism's return to a new cycle was accomplished through the increase and renewal of basic capital, machinery, technique. In the present crisis such attempts were made only in chemical and war industries. In all industries, including war, the capitalists are increasing speed-up tremendously, lowering the wages of the working class, as the only means of cheapening expenditure of production. The total payroll of the workers in three years declined 61.9 per cent.

Because of the highly monopolistic character of American capitalism, through which they are able to buy and sell at their own monopoly controlled prices, the colonies are robbed of their raw materials, the farmers in the home country of their products, and the workers and farmers through the relatively high selling prices of the commodities.

The huge number of bank failures (over two thousand in 1931, around 500 in the first two months of 1932) wipes out the savings of large sections of the workers and farmers, and the petty-bourgeoisie, high taxes destroying the farmers and the petty-bourgeoisie.

The deepening and the broadening of the crisis has placed tremendous burdens on the toiling masses of America, has served to smash the prosperity illusions, the faith in American capitalism which existed during the period of relative stabilisation, that the Social-Fascists and the A.F. of L. use; delivered a smashing blow to the theory of American exceptionalism,

developed by the renegades, Lovestone and Pepper.

The American bourgeoisie is putting the burden of the crisis on the backs of the toiling masses, has cut the wages of the workers to approximately 50 per cent. in all industries during the last three years, 15,000,000 are unemployed and about 10,000,000 working two or three days per week. The "stagger" system\* becomes a national policy of the Hoover Hunger and War Government. The hardest hit are the Negro masses and particularly the Negro workers. They are the first to lose their jobs, and have their wages cut. The much-vaunted "independent American Farmer" is now becoming a pauperised peasant.

The working class and the toiling masses are arising against the offensive of the bourgeoisie. The economic struggles against the offensive of the bourgeoisie, are becoming an offensive struggle, and are carrying in it, political elements against the bourgeois system in its entirety. The number of strikes, and the militancy of the strikers in them, has increased. This can be shown by the heroic struggle of the 40,000 miners of Western Pennsylvania, in which our Party and the National Miners' Union played the leading rôle; by strikes in the textile industry, needle trades, shoe, food, agricultural workers (best workers in Colorado) and isolated strikes in the steel industry in Warren, Ohio, led by our industrial union, etc.

Also by the National Hunger March to Washington, which involves hundreds of thousands of

---

\*The system of organising shifts or turns of employment, i.e., a system of organised short time.

workers all over the country, State Hunger Marches to legislative bodies, bread strikes and street struggles, between the unemployed and the police, in such large industrial cities as Chicago, St. Louis, Detroit, Cleveland, New York, etc. Anti-war demonstrations in Washington, Chicago, Seattle, huge mass demonstrations on May 1st. And recently in San Francisco, a demonstration of 1,000 workers against shipping of ammunition to Japan. One of the most important characteristics of these struggles is that we see unity of the Negro and white workers, unemployed and employed in action and struggle. A march of war veterans to Washington involving 25,000 ex-soldiers, showed a revolutionary character, which was inspired by the National Hunger March in December. The war veterans were composed of unemployed workers, pauperised farmers and bankrupt petty-bourgeois elements. Although this march had all the characteristics of a spontaneous mass movement, the Party played a definite rôle in organising and leading the ex-servicemen. Republican Congressman, Hamilton Fish, chief red-baiter, declared: "The veterans' march to Washington, from the big industrial centres such as Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, New York, Philadelphia was inspired largely by the Workers' Ex-Servicemen's League."

In the North-Western States farmers are rising in masses, and conducting militant struggles by methods of strikes, demanding higher prices for their commodities. They are stopping trains and trucks containing food. This is, objectively, a revolutionary movement of the farmers, against the robber policy of low monopoly buying prices,

that should, and has to be, supported by the Party and the working class. In addition to this movement of the masses, we see the movement among the teachers, as in the case of Chicago, they are organising marches and demonstrations demanding back pay, which has not been paid for 10 to 12 months; strikes of the tax-payers refusing to pay high taxes; movements of depositors of the closed bankrupt banks, etc.

All these movements among the masses show the revolutionary upsurge, and the tremendously favourable objective conditions, for broadening the organisation of the masses, on a basis of the united front from below, in the struggle for their daily needs and demands; for mass unemployed councils, red trade unions in the shops, and opposition movements inside the reformist unions.

These favourable conditions show the great mass movement, and the possibility of developing it to a higher stage. Up till now, our Party has not been fully successful in achieving these aims. Why? *Primarily because of its narrow sectarian approach to the masses, its isolation from the masses.* This is clearly demonstrated in our participation and leadership of some of the outstanding movements and struggles of the masses. For instance, the National Convention of the Red National Miners' Union, which was held on the eve of a new wave of mass strikes of the miners, not only did not make preparations for coming struggles, but did not even sense the coming struggles. In the veterans' march on Washington, the majority of the Pol-Bureau voted against the mass march on Washington, and under-estimated the readiness of the masses

to struggle by this, and proposed a sectarian measure instead—a delegation from a few industrial cities, as a substitute for the mass revolutionary movement.

During the veterans' march, the Party did not understand the character and composition of the marchers, and made appeals only to the workers, in the march. This prevented the mass mobilisation of support for the marchers by the broad masses, farmers, etc., and gaining the leading rôle in the march.

Our central organ, the "Daily Worker," interpreted the veterans' march in a different manner every day—one day it declared we are friends of the marchers, and the next day it declared, we support the movement of the workers' Ex-Servicemen's League.

The effect of the crushing burden of the crisis was felt most acutely by the Negro masses. The bourgeoisie have increased all forms of national oppression, increase of terror, lynching, as well as intensifying attempts to isolate the Negro masses from the white workers, and by the strengthening of Jim Crow segregation, etc. This situation places the necessity of strengthening our fight against increased oppression of the Negro masses more sharply before our Party, and especially of developing a systematic struggle against all remnants of white chauvinism, both in the ranks of the Party, and among the masses. Although our Party can show some success in the field of work among the Negro masses—Scottsboro, Camp Hill, struggles of the unemployed in Chicago, Yekenin trial, etc., we are still isolated from the broad masses of Negroes. For example, in the present election campaign, our Party has

nominated a Negro candidate for vice-president. This fact caused a big stir among the Negro masses. How did our Party utilise the good response of the Negro masses to the Communist candidate? We have mostly confined our campaign to agitational speeches, and have not as yet connected the everyday struggles of the Negro masses in the South and North with our election campaign struggle. Although one of our central slogans in the election is "*equal rights for Negroes, and the right to self-determination in the black belt,*" we have not developed concrete struggles around this central slogan. However, wherever attempts were made, as, for instance, in the 1st Congressional District in Chicago, where Comrade Newton, a Negro comrade, is a candidate against De Priest, a Negro Republican, we were able to get support from the Negro masses. 8,000 Negro workers participated in a demonstration against De Priest under our leadership. We have a first beginning of the struggle against Negro reformism in Chicago.

The majority of the Negro proletariat is entirely unorganised. The American Federation of Labour has refused to admit Negro workers into the trade unions for years, and in places where they were forced to organise the Negroes, they built Jim Crow Locals. The immediate task confronting the Party is to develop the struggle in the South among the Negro masses, to mobilise the white and Negro proletariat in the North, to support and to *lead* the struggle around the central demand and to make a special effort to draw the Negro proletariat into the Trade Unions, Unemployed Councils, etc. And finally to

develop Negro cadres and leadership in the mass organisations. What is true of our secretarian approach to the central demand for "Negro rights and the right to self-determination," is also true of our slogan "Against Hoover Wage-Cuts" and for "Unemployed Insurance." Our Party does not concretely apply these slogans to the daily concrete situation, in the shops, and among the unemployed, and does not mobilise on the basis of united front action. For these reasons our election campaign is not embracing the wide masses.

Under the pressure of the growing radicalisation of the masses, the reactionary leadership of the A.F. of L., the Musteites, the Socialist Party, etc., are driven to more and more "left" manœuvres, and they have also increased their activities among the masses because of our weaknesses. Whereas the officials declared a year and half ago at the Vancouver Convention of the A.F. of L. :

"It is the opinion of the Executive Council, that compulsory unemployment insurance legislation, such as is now in effect in Great Britain, and Germany, would not be suitable to our economic and political requirements here, and unsatisfactory to American working men and women."

Recently at an Executive Council of the A.F. of L. in Atlantic City, these same bureaucrats declared :

"If relief is not provided, men and women will be forced to return to the primitive ways of getting food for themselves, and their children. People do not starve by tens of

millions, when they see plenty around them."

The Socialist Party is likewise engaged in zig-zag "left" manœuvres. Paul Blanchard, one of the leaders of the "left wing" of the Socialist Party writes :

"Thomas moved definitely to the left in the Milwaukee Convention and the majority of the Party moved with him. The Party elected a more vigorous National Executive Committee, it adopted a more friendly policy toward the U.S.S.R., and it laid the ground work for more militant activity in the labour field by appointing field organisers for important industrial areas."

The Muste group, which in the year of 1931 led one-third of the strikes, is especially dangerous in this situation. The Muste Group originated as a progressive opposition group inside the A.F. of L., and later undertook independent leadership in strike struggles, and is now entering the political arena, trying to become a nucleus for a sort of American Independent Labour Party. The Muste Group have entered the field of the unemployed work and organised Unemployed Citizens' Leagues in a number of cities. They organised large numbers of unemployed in the city of Seattle in the State of Washington. This movement is spreading to other cities on the basis of "self-help of the unemployed," thereby removing the burden of relief from the government — a typical class-collaboration scheme. On the political field it supports the Independent Labour Party in West Virginia, and the Farmer-Labour Party in Chicago; while in Seattle and Tacoma, Washington, it is putting up independent local candi-

dates. There is also a flood of capitalist demagoguery.

Our Party was unable to successfully and concretely expose and defeat these enemies in the ranks of the working class, in the everyday struggles. While attacking the hypocrisy, demagoguery and betrayals of the Social-Fascist leaders mercilessly, we must patiently persuade and convince workers who are still following the Social-Fascist, Muste, in a comradely way, especially in the unions of the A.F. of L. of the correctness of our position, on the basis of common united front struggles, especially in the shops against the capitalist offensive.

Comrade Knorin spoke here of the necessity of co-ordinating the struggles of the workers, on the streets, with their struggles in the shops and leading them to a higher political level. We have yet to learn this in the United States. In connection with this I want to deal now with the strikes of 35,000 miners in Illinois and 10,000 in Indiana.

On April 1st, 1932, the coal barons in Illinois and Indiana closed the mines to force a wage reduction, and introduce rationalisation schemes. The bureaucrats of the United Mine Workers' Union of America signed an agreement, with the coal barons, to accept a wage-cut from £6 10s to £5 a day. The miners rejected this agreement twice by ballot in referendum, although they had already starved for five months. When the bureaucrats declared that the agreement would be enforced and the mines would open on this basis, the miners responded with *mass strikes*, involving 35,000 of the 50,000 miners employed in Illinois. Our Party and the rank-and-file

opposition movement developed a wide campaign against the wage-cut agreement and against the bureaucrats. How the miners greeted our programme of struggle is best shown in the following facts: John Walker, Illinois District President of the U.M.W.A., who came to speak for a wage-cut in Johnson City, was met by miners and their wives with stones, and driven out of town. A sub-district president, Edmondson, addressing a meeting in Royalton, was beaten by the miners and taken to hospital, while the speakers of the rank and file committee were enthusiastically greeted wherever they appeared to speak.

Although the present strike is not under the leadership of our Party and the rank and file opposition, we are a serious factor there. At a conference in Donald, called by the Mustéites and local bureaucrats, our proposals were rejected, but on the same day, in the same town, *ten thousand miners voted unanimously for our programme*. In Bellville, at a conference of representatives from 28 branches of the reformist unions, a committee of action of 15 was elected and a Communist elected chairman of this committee. In the present situation, in the strike, the main task confronting us is to set up *broad rank and file strike committees in every mine*. We must take over the leadership of the strikers, and consolidate the strike, uniting the struggle of the employed and unemployed miners and their families, against wage-cuts, for immediate relief of the unemployed, and lead it to a higher stage, giving a definite political character to the situation. To consolidate the strike organisationally, and lead it successfully to victory, it is necessary

to extend the strike to the mines still working. This is now taking place in Illinois, where 20,000 miners marched on Franklin County where the miners are still working. They clashed with the police. Over 100 miners were wounded in the battle with the police. Six aeroplanes brought national guards to the strike area. There is a small civil war going on at this moment in the Illinois coal fields. Two miners have been killed on the picket lines. These struggles of the miners are of tremendous importance. It shows the growing militancy and revolutionary upsurge of the masses. It proves again that the emphasis placed on work in the reformist unions by the Plenum can be successfully applied if the correct united front tactic is utilised.

In Indiana, we have a similar situation, where an equally militant struggle is carried on by the miners. In these struggles, our Party is bringing forward the election campaign, and exposing the rôle of the state and local government. One of the leaders of the miners' strike in Illinois, is a Communist candidate for lieutenant-governor of Illinois. However, in the wage-cuts in the steel, railroad, stockyards and other industries in Chicago district, the Party was unable to mobilise the masses for the struggle. This is explained by our isolation from the big shops, our sectarian approach to the masses, a lack of understanding of the concrete conditions of the workers in the shops, and of personal daily contact with the workers. It is in the big shops, where we are weakest, where we have not made contact with any large group of workers. To acknowledge this shortcoming is not sufficient. We must change this, and the whole Party, must turn its

major activities to the big shops. It is essential for us to strengthen our work in the reformist unions, *yet the main task of the district is to organise Red unions among the unorganised workers in steel, stockyards, etc., who form the greatest majority of the workers.*

In the course of the struggle, the Party in the Chicago District grew and developed. In August, 1930, we had only 73 cells with 776 dues paying members, in June, 1932, we had 221 cells with 2,488 dues paying members. The actual membership in the district is over 3,000 with Party organisation in 71 cities. In February, 1931, we had 8 shop cells with 47 members. In March, 1932, we had 35 cells with 206 members. These figures show *the weakness of the Party in Chicago because it is not rooted in the shops.* The outstanding problem confronting the Party in the factory and trade union work, is the proper application of methods of work enabling our comrades to connect themselves with the masses and develop activities and struggles. It must utilise the revolutionary spirit of the unemployed organisations and develop daily systematic planned work around the shops, primarily *inside* the shops.

To really change the present situation in the Chicago District, get rid of sectarianism, establish the Party in the workshops, trade unions and develop daily work among the factory masses, the Party must transform its present methods of work outside the factories, and concentrate on the basic factories. Without this change there can be no Bolshevik Party.

# FOR A COMMUNIST PARTY OF IRELAND

TROY.

**C**OMRADES,—In the political resolution the present period is characterised as the end of the period of capitalist stabilisation and the ushering in of a new period of wars and revolutions, and, in such a period, a series of revolts against imperialism, in the colonies and the countries oppressed by imperialism, will inevitably take place. Not only in the most advanced countries can we speak of a new revolutionary upsurge. In Ireland, where in 1916 the Dublin uprising was one of the sparks heralding the commencement of a period of revolutions which was to sweep Europe, we can see a new upsurge among the masses, which has its roots in the struggle against their terrible conditions and against British imperialism.

Under what conditions is this revolutionary upsurge taking place? In the first place, under the conditions of a severe economic crisis, which, because of the backwardness of the economic development of the country owing to the policy of British imperialism, has had terrible consequences for the masses of workers and small farmers. In the industrial North-East Ulster, which British imperialism split away from the rest of the country in 1920, the two main industries (shipbuilding and textiles) are in a catastrophic condition, and over one hundred thousand workers are unemployed. In the Irish Free State there is a deep-going agrarian crisis which has been intensified by the "economic war" of British imperial-

ism which is reflected in declining trade, and has rendered about one hundred thousand workers unemployed, and plunged the mass of small farmers into poverty.

On top of the effects of the economic crisis there is also the burden arising out of the imperialist domination of Ireland. The Irish masses are burdened by two governments which between them cost forty million pounds a year. Secondly, three million goes to the British Treasury in payment of land annuities. There is also the sum of two million pounds paid annually in pensions for the British forces that formerly occupied Ireland: soldiers, police and judges, etc.

Under these conditions the anti-imperialist movement is developing. The Cosgrave Government, the government of the big industrialists, the Anglo-Irish capitalists and ranchers, in the face of this upsurge introduced the Coercion Act. The Revolutionary Workers' Groups (the Communist organisation in Ireland), the Irish Republican Army, the Labour Defence League, the Friends of the Soviet Union and all similar organisations were banned. Under all these things, under the pressure of the crisis, under the unheard-of unemployment, under the misery of the small farmers and agricultural labourers, a situation was created so that when the elections took place last February the Government of Cosgrave, which had been responsible for the acceptance of the Treaty of 1921, was swept out of office and the national-reformist, De Valera, became the head of the Irish Free State.

Immediately De Valera was elected a situation became evident where we could see that the small

Versailles between England and Ireland was beginning to totter. The end of capitalist stabilisation was being demonstrated in Ireland.

De Valera repudiated the payment of land annuities, the payment of the pensions and the oath of allegiance to Britain, and a very sharp conflict is taking place between the Irish Free State and British imperialism.

The conflict with British imperialism is not only over the payment of the sum of five million pounds, but over the question of Ireland as a war base for British imperialism, of Ireland as a strategical position in the war plans of British imperialism.

Lloyd George, in the House of Commons, said : "We had the experience of the war when the coasts of Ireland were the deadliest trap for our ships. If the coast of Ireland had then been in the hands of an independent sovereign power, we might have been done for, and we are not now going to take that risk." Lloyd George thus clearly summed up the kernel of the aims of British imperialism regarding Ireland.

The British National Government has declared an economic boycott on the Free State by means of a 20 per cent. tariff on Irish exports to Britain and Northern Ireland, and when it is realised that 90 per cent. of the export trade of the Free State is with Britain, the severity of this blow can be understood. By this means Britain hopes to force De Valera to capitulate, and by striking at Free State agriculture to force the small and middle farmers to oppose De Valera. De Valera, if he is to aid the Irish manufacturers, must squeeze from British imperialism financial concessions, and at the same time extract from the small

and middle farmers the land annuities, while refusing to better the miserable social services or extend unemployment benefits.

The abolition of the oath of allegiance is an important question among the others figuring in the conflict between the Free State and Britain. If the Free State can abolish this oath it will strengthen the contradictions between Britain and the Dominions, and seriously weaken British prestige in the colonies and especially in India.

The De Valera Government not only is conducting a struggle with British imperialism. In home affairs it conducts a most reactionary social policy. The removal of the oath of allegiance is used by the national reformist, De Valera, for the purpose of canalising the growing discontent and anti-imperialist movement into constitutional channels. He says to the left-wing republicans, to the Irish Republican Army: "If we remove the oath of allegiance to the British King, you can go into our Parliament and act in a constitutional way; there is no necessity to carry arms; you can pass laws and act as nice peaceful citizens."

In addition, De Valera, while refusing payment of the land annuities to Britain, says to the small farmers: "You must pay the land annuities to the Irish exchequer; you are not going to get out of them simply because we are not going to give them to Britain." De Valera will use the land annuities and other sums withheld from Britain to aid in balancing the budget, reduce income taxes, aid the manufacturers and aid the exporters of agricultural produce. This policy he carries on under the slogan of "building a new social order in which nobody will be allowed to go hungry while there is food in the country."

. But the secret police, which have a most infamous name among the Irish masses, are still retained by the De Valera Government; the police and military have been used against strikers, and for evicting small farmers who could not pay rents or land annuities. The hundred tariffs introduced by De Valera has burdened the masses with a rising cost of living.

Experience shows that besides social-democracy (the Irish Labour Party and trade union bureaucracy) we have another enemy in the form of national reformism. The national reformists in Ireland are able, behind the smoke-screen of combatting British imperialism, to conduct a reactionary social policy. This confronts us with the task of exposing the wavering and hesitation of the De Valera Government in the conflict with Britain, exposing their hypocritical republican phrases, and leading the proletariat, agricultural labourers and small farmers in the struggles for their social demands. At present the movement against British imperialism is growing very rapidly, and the masses have taken up our slogans: Not a penny tribute to British imperialism; neither oath nor empire.

Inside the ranks of the I.R.A. there is taking place a sharp differentiation. The fighters in the I.R.A. are increasingly beginning to realise that the national reformists are not the people who are going to conduct a relentless fight against British imperialism. They have seen, for instance, the statement of De Valera's Government in reference to this anti-imperialist fight—that it is prepared to accept some sort of association with the British Commonwealth of Nations, with some recognition of the King of England as head.

While not coming forward openly and saying that he is no longer willing to carry on a fight for an independent Irish Republic, De Valera is putting all this in the background, and by confirming the demands of the masses around the question of the oath and the land annuities is thus trying to liquidate the anti-imperialist movement and to consolidate the position of the manufacturing capitalists.

The mass pressure has resulted already in De Valera having been forced to grant a concession to the small farmers in that he has granted a moratorium for all past debts on the land annuities for one year.

The working-class movement is developing. In many of the towns unemployed demonstrations are taking place, in centres where the Revolutionary Workers' Groups have not yet penetrated. Generally, we can see a big upsurge of the masses that is rapidly assuming the same proportions as the great mass movement which existed during the Anglo-Irish War in 1918-1921. But, on the other side, the big export capitalists and ranchers are getting afraid now. They are beginning to see that this movement is developing too far. They fear they will lose the British markets. They are conducting a policy of economic repression of the masses, and several large firms have already thrown out their workers, and they are developing a new semi-fascist organisation under the leadership of an ex-member of the Cosgrave Cabinet.

A few words on Northern Ireland, where the position is somewhat different. Here we have a very deep crisis. In the shipyards, for instance, where 25,000 workers were employed, there are

now only 3,000 workers who get jobs. In the textile industry, which formerly employed something like 100,000, now only 20 or 25 per cent. of these workers are fully employed in the factories. The movement of the masses is growing. During the time of the imposition of the Means Test very large demonstrations embracing thousands of workers were held in Belfast. Only last week a demonstration of 10,000 workers took place on the question of the fight of the relief workers for better conditions.

In this regard, a very important thing is taking place. This is the fact that almost for the first time in history we see Protestant workers and Catholic workers demonstrating together. This is an exceptional thing in Belfast, where religious antagonisms are very bitter and have often been used by the bourgeoisie to instigate bloody riots. British imperialism has used the religious antagonisms of the Orange and Catholic workers as a basis to crush the anti-imperialist movement, and the coming together of these workers now in common demonstration is one of the most significant things taking place in Ireland. It means that the main base of British imperialism in Ulster is disintegrating.

In this situation, the Revolutionary Workers' Groups (the future Communist Party of Ireland) have a tremendous problem. They have the task of mobilising all the anti-imperialist elements—the workers and small farmers, the revolutionary petty-bourgeois elements — for a determined struggle against British imperialism; of developing the economic battles of the workers so as to expose in practice the social-reactionary character of the De Valera Government, and, most impor-

tant of all, the task of organising in Ireland a Communist Party as the only Party that will lead these struggles to a successful conclusion.

It is necessary in this situation in Ireland that we create a broad united front of all the anti-imperialist elements, conducting a relentless struggle against British imperialism; to broaden the struggle and push it beyond the stage set by De Valera to a fight for the complete independence and unity of Ireland, under an Irish Workers' and Peasants' Republic. We have the task of building up a mass Trade Union Unity League in order that we may be able to gain the leadership of the economic struggles of the workers.

In the present conflict with British imperialism, the main task of the Revolutionary Workers' Groups is not only to actively participate in the movement against British imperialism, but to obtain the leadership of this movement and drive it beyond the stage of national reformism and the petty-bourgeois republicanism: to make it a mass movement of the toilers against British imperialism and for the overthrow of Irish capitalism.

This is the tremendous task facing our Revolutionary Workers' Groups, which as yet are numbered, not in thousands, but in hundreds. In connection with this, there are tendencies of saying: "We are too weak to lead such a movement; too weak to organise such a united front, and, if we do organise such a united front, because of our weakness, the leadership will go out of our hands; we shall not be able to control this movement." These tendencies we must fight very vigorously against. There must be no question of saying we are too weak to lead the movement, because it is only when we deter-

*minedly set the objective of capturing this movement and leading this movement, that we can build up a mass Communist Party in Ireland in the course of the struggle.*

This, comrades, is our main task, and while, as yet, we have not got a Communist Party in Ireland, we believe—and the comrades in Ireland will pledge themselves—that at the XIII Plenum of the Communist International we will present, for acceptance, the Communist Party of Ireland, with already many victories in proletarian struggles and the anti-imperialist fight to its credit.

## "BOLSHEVIK HISTORY" SERIES

*A Series of Short Sketches Dealing with Various  
Aspects of the Pre-War Experiences  
of the Bolsheviki*

BOLSHEVIKS ON TRIAL.....	10c
BOOK PUBLISHING UNDER TSARISM	10c
ESCAPE FROM THE GALLOWS.....	10c
PROVOCATEURS I HAVE KNOWN..	10c
THE STRIKE OF THE DREDGING FLEET, 1905.....	15c
UNEMPLOYED COUNCILS IN ST. PETERSBURG IN 1906.....	15c
THE REVOLT OF THE ARMoured CRUISER "POTEMKIN".....	10c
FROM THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION TO THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION..	25c
BOLSHEVIK SMUGGLERS.....	10c

---

## "BRIEF BIOGRAPHY" SERIES

IVAN BABUSHKIN— <i>Friend of Lenin</i> ..	10c
Y. M. SVERDLOV— <i>The First President of the Republic of Labour</i> .....	10c
KAMO— <i>The Life of a Great Revolutionist</i>	10c

---

*Order From*

**WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS**

P. O. Box 148, Sta., D.

New York City

