

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol 9. No. 44

PRESS

30th August 1929

CORRESPONDENCE

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

Tenth Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

Full Report.

Continuation of the Discussion on the Reports of Comrades Kuusinen and Manuilsky.

Seventh Session.

6th July, 1929 (morning).

Comrade PIATNITSKY (E. C. C. I.):

Comrades, I will probably bring a discordant note into the discussion. The comrades who have hitherto spoken here dealt with theoretical questions about the nature of Fascism, or with other great political questions — capitalist rationalisation, Left orientation of the masses, — and if they spoke at all about the Communist Parties, they only mentioned the Central Committees. I want to go down a little lower and to show what the basis of our Parties looks like, and how C. P. organisations of the capitalist countries are working, because I hold the view that political questions cannot be separated from organisational ones. It is only by combining correct policy with good organisation that the C. I. sections will be able to do justice to the tasks imposed on them.

How can the growing influence of the Parties be consolidated? By good work on the part of the Party organisations, by close contact with the masses. What is the best way of establishing this contact? By communist work in the workers and peasants mass organisations (factory committees, trade unions, workers co-operatives and sport organisations, I. R. A., Free Thinkers organisations, W. I. R., provisional organisations, mainly strike committees, anti lock-out committees), by the work of Party nuclei in enterprises.

Then I want to show here how the Communist Parties have worked hitherto in the enterprises. I must remind you briefly that prior to 1924 — in spite of the Third Congress of the C. I. passing a detailed resolution on the organisational question in which the necessity of re-organising the Parties on a factory nucleus basis was pointed out — these directions were not put into practice. It was only in 1924 that the orga-

nisation of nuclei in enterprises was taken in hand in some countries where the Party is legal. Till then, the organisations were constructed according to the territorial principle, according to the residential district of the Party members. Owing to this fact, the C. P. organisations did not differ from the organisations of the Social Democratic Party. I will give you official statistical data of the Communist Parties. According to the statistics of the C. C. of the Communist Party of Germany, we had in 1925, 1,384 factory nuclei and 110 street nuclei; in 1926 — 2243 factory nuclei and 1928 street nuclei; in 1927 — 2107 factory nuclei and 2597 street nuclei; in 1928 — 1556 factory nuclei and 2461 street nuclei. What do we see? Street nuclei which started their existence in 1925 with 110, reached 2461 in 1928. In 1925, the C. P. of Germany had 1384 factory nuclei, whereas in 1928 this number increased just a little (1556), although in 1926, the C. P. of Germany had already 2243 factory nuclei. The number of factory nuclei was reduced during this period, whereas the number of street nuclei increased in the C. P. of Germany.

In 1927, there were in Germany 549 local Party organisations with nuclei, and 480 in 1928. Thus, the number of local organisations based on factory nuclei was reduced. In 1927, there were 1963 local organisations without factory nuclei, and 2358 in 1928. Instead of the number of local organisations based on factory nuclei increasing, we witness a reduction.

The organisations of the C. P. of Germany in big industrial centres, such as the Ruhr, Halle-Merseburg, the Lower Rhine, instead of strengthening their position in the enterprises and organising more Party nuclei, retrogressed, the number of factory nuclei in 1928 going down in the Ruhr to 123, in Halle-Merseburg to 63 and in the Lower Rhine to

60. Out of 27 districts of the C. P. of Germany, in 22 the number of Party nuclei in enterprises was reduced.

It is interesting that what we witness in the German Communist Party, is repeated also in the other Parties.

In America, there were 166 factory nuclei and 452 street nuclei in 1927. In 1928, the number was 111 and 468 respectively. Here too the number of factory nuclei decreased, whereas the number of street nuclei increased.

In Czechoslovakia, there were 1301 factory nuclei in 1926, and 1013 in 1927; in 1928 — 954. The number of street nuclei in 1926 (street and so-called village nuclei together) was 2500; in 1927 the number of street nuclei only was 663; in 1928 669; as to so-called village nuclei (they give them this name because it sounds important, they are just ordinary Party organisations in villages) their number was 3187 in 1927, and 3083 in 1928. These so-called village nuclei embrace mainly workers employed in urban factories and works, but resident in the adjoining villages. These communist workers are not members of Party nuclei in the factories.

What about membership in these nuclei? what is the percentage of Party members co-ordinated in factory nuclei? In this respect, comrades, the state of affairs is very unsatisfactory. I will give you the statistics of 19 districts of the C. P. of Germany for 1927 and 1928. The percentage of industrial workers in the C. P. of Germany is considerable, members employed in factories and works constitute, I am sure, not less than 60% of the membership. How are these members represented in factory nuclei; (Remmele: How did you arrive at 60%? The percentage is much bigger).

Comrade Remmele, if you think that the percentage of Party members employed in factories and works is even higher than 60%, as stated by me, the figures which I will give here, will seem even more insignificant.

In 1927, 15% of the Party membership belonged to factory nuclei. In 1928 — 12% (I take round figures). In 1927, 47% of the Party membership belonged to street nuclei, and 42% in 1928. Local organisations, which had no nuclei, had in their ranks 31% of the Party membership in 1927, and 43% in 1928. Thus, the number of Party members belonging to street nuclei was reduced from 47% in 1927 to 42% in 1928, i. e. by 5%, because part of the Party members went over from street and factory nuclei to Party organisations where nuclei do not as yet exist. These figures apply to 19 out of the 27 districts of the C. P. of Germany. If we take the older districts of the C. P. of Germany, the percentage of Party members belonging at present to factory nuclei will be 18, and in some districts, as for instance in the Ruhr, it is 38%, in Upper Silesia it is 34%, in the Saar Basin 33%, in Erzgebirge Vogtland 24%, in Berlin-Brandenburg 25%. I must also point out that in the Berlin-Brandenburg Party organisation, 60% of the Party membership belonged to factory nuclei in 1926; in the course of two years the percentage was reduced from 60 to 25%. The reduction of the percentage of Party members belonging to factory nuclei in 1928, is not a purely German phenomenon, it applies to all the Parties.

In America, factory nuclei had in their ranks 1638 Party members, and 1224 in 1928; the number of members in street nuclei was 8115 in 1925, and 9461 in 1928 (in connection with the crisis in the C. P. of America, the number of Party members has probably decreased now).

Let us take Norway. The C. P. of Norway has 5208 members of whom only 999, namely 19%, belong to factory nuclei.

In Czechoslovakia, in the industrial centre Bruenn where 80% of all industrial workers are to be found, 10% of the Party membership belong to factory nuclei. If I remember right, 15% of the Party membership belonged last year to factory nuclei. In Prague, 18% of the Party membership belong to factory nuclei. In the Vitkovitz works which employs 19,000 workers and which should be the most important citadel of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia, 500 communists are working, but only 126 Party members belong to the nucleus.

France. We have very little information about the C. P. of France, but we can see from the few data at our disposal culled from official Party reports, that the Party had about 56,000 members in February 1928, including 17,448 in factory nuclei, which constitutes 31.15% co-ordinated in 898 factory

nuclei. In April 1929, at the time of the VI Congress of the C. P. of France the membership of the Party, according to the report of the C. C., amounted to 45,000 only 24% of whom belonged to factory nuclei.

Such is the picture of the work of the Communist Parties in the enterprises. What should be done, comrades, in view of this state of affairs? One should certainly remove from street nuclei all Communists employed in factories and works, compelling them to join the nuclei in the enterprises. In enterprises where no nuclei exist, communists detached or removed from street nuclei, should form factory nuclei. Let us take, for instance, the Vitkovitz works which I have already mentioned. Only 126 communists of the 500 employed in this gigantic works belong to the Party nucleus. The remaining 374 Party members belong to street nuclei in their residential districts where no broad basis for Party work exists. If they all belonged to the factory nucleus, our work among the 19,000 men and women employed in this important works would be given an impetus. Unfortunately, the Vitkovitz works is not an exception.

In what factories and works are communists employed? I am giving below a characteristic statistic concerning the C. P. of Germany which covers 15 out of the 27 Party districts. This statistic can also be very well applied to all the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries.

(The number of Party members employed in factories and works is taken as 100):

Party members employed	In enterprises with:						
	Up to 50 workers	up to 100	up to 500	up to 1000	up to 3000	up to over 5000	
in 1927	36.13	11.39	21.56	8.79	14.37	8.09	2.77
in 1928	39.—	11.42	18.76	9.59	12.81	3.10	3.21

This table shows firstly, that the mass of the membership of the C. P. of Germany (79%) were employed in 1928 in factories and works employing up to 500 workers, and secondly, that in 1928 compared with the preceding year, the number of Party members employed in big works and factories, with the exception of enterprises employing up to 1000 workers and over 5000 male and female workers, has decreased.

That the majority of members of Communist Parties in the capitalist countries are mainly employed in small and medium enterprises, is also confirmed by the statistical data of 1929 of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia. (The number of Party members employed in factories and works is taken as 100):

8.2% of Party members are employed in enterprises employing up to 50 workers,

67% of Party members are employed in enterprises employing up to 50—100 workers,

20% of Party members are employed in enterprises employing up to 100—1000 workers,

1% of Party members are employed in enterprises employing over 1000 workers.

There are of course communists also in big and even very big enterprises, but not in all of them by far. The Party nuclei are conspicuous by their absence in the biggest enterprises of the most important industries, and where they do exist, they are very small and not up to the mark, because they are left in most cases without leadership on the part of the higher Party organs. The Communist Parties must strain every nerve to penetrate into the biggest enterprises and most important industries. They (the Communist Parties) must pay special attention to Party nuclei in the big enterprises.

I will deal now with the work of street and factory nuclei. To judge by the number of members in street nuclei, one would think that they are carrying on a gigantic work. But unfortunately, all the data at our disposal tell us that in their work they do not differ in the least from the old residential organisations. Just like the former residential organisations, most of them are passive, except when Party campaigns are taking place. It is very characteristic that as soon as a Party campaign has to be organised, the Party Committees mobilise

the members of factory nuclei in order to strengthen the work in the street nuclei. Of course, I do not mean to say by this that there are no street nuclei which work well. Taken as a whole, they work badly, they meet seldom and wake up only on the eve of big campaigns (elections) and Party conferences.

The work of factory nuclei is not much better. I can see that some comrades are not pleased with what I am saying about the work of street and factory nuclei. Of course, if I dealt with the nucleus work of every factory and works separately, I would point out that there is a nucleus in this or that works which is working admirably, for there are really in every country factory nuclei which do wonders. But I am only giving you a picture of the general situation, that factory nuclei are working inadequately on the whole, is a common phenomenon. (Remmele: To listen to you, one would think that no progress is made in Party work).

This is not so, comrade Remmele. Already the fact that Communist Parties have begun to work in enterprises, have already factory nuclei, which was not the case in 1924, means success. The Communist Parties had considerable influence on the proletariat even when the basis of the Party was the residential organisation of the Party members. But all the big events of the last decade, since the establishment of Communist Parties, have shown that it is impossible to consolidate organisationally this influence without the existence (and of course good work) of nuclei in enterprises and communist fractions in workers mass organisations (trade unions, factory committees, etc). Take, for instance, the revolutionary events of 1923 in Germany. If the C.P. of Germany had at that time established close contact with the workers in factories and works and had been aware of the mood of the workers (especially if the C.P. of Germany had been pursuing then a correct revolutionary line), the issue of the events would have certainly been different. The Communist Parties are, of course, progressing, in spite of the inadequate work of most of the factory nuclei. But if the nuclei worked better in the enterprises, the Communist Parties would be even more successful. This is what I mean. I do not in the least minimise the successes of our Parties. I will show you presently that factory workers are coming themselves to the Party committees to ask them to organise meetings in the factories. With a few exceptions, factory nuclei meet as a rule very seldom — once a month or once every two months. Factory nuclei work very inadequately among the workers of the respective enterprises. How could one otherwise explain the strange thing that factory nuclei did not know that strikes had begun in their enterprises. There have been such cases. (Neumann: very seldom).

I have given many such facts in my articles on Party construction.

There were cases quite recently, during the elections to the factory committees in Germany, which proved that Party nuclei were not familiar with the mood of the workers, that nuclei were opposed to independent lists of candidates put up by the Communist Party and trade union opposition, and that the workers compelled them to put up such lists.

I will describe you the state of affairs in the factory nuclei of the C.P. of France. In the few factory nuclei which the C.P. of France possesses — and you have seen that according to the official statistics of the C.C. of the C.P. of France — only 24% of the Party membership belong to factory nuclei — there is a big percentage of attached members. If we take as 100 the 24% of Party members who belong to factory nuclei, the members attached to these nuclei constitute 21% of the Party membership, i. e. over 1/5th of the members of factory nuclei. Who are these attached members? They are comrades who either do not work in enterprises, or are employed in very small enterprises. We have in many cases a state of affairs that two to three members of the factory nucleus are employed in the factory, whereas the remainder are attached members. In a state of affairs when 1/3 or 2/3rds of the nucleus members are attached to the nuclei, it is but natural that the nuclei either do not study the questions which concern the given enterprise at all, or go into them very seldom, because these questions can hardly interest the attached comrades. In the capitalist countries, the avenue to factories is closed to them.

Considerable success was achieved in the preceding years in regard to the publication of factory newspapers. These newspapers played an important role in the mobilisation of the masses and in spreading communist ideas among the workers. These newspapers have serious defects. Nevertheless, they played an important role. According to the rather scrappy information at our disposal, there were 170 factory newspapers in Germany in 1926; 300 in France; 40 in America and 24 in Great Britain; the latter are published regularly and have a big edition.

In 1928, the factory newspapers were no longer published periodically. Their publication coincided mainly with the campaigns. The number of the newspapers decreased in all countries. According to information re Czechoslovakia, 60 factory newspapers were published there in 1926; 806 in 1927 with a total edition of 80,000, whereas now their number has been reduced by approximately one third. And yet, in as far as work in enterprises is becoming more and more difficult owing to the terrorist methods of employers and reformists, these newspapers are an important factor of propaganda and communist mobilisation of the masses. Our big press — the editors present here must not feel offended — is very tedious and has not a big circulation. Do these newspapers reach the masses? Certainly not, if we take the masses who are reading, let us say, the Social Democratic press. Factory newspapers can reach and do reach all workers employed in factories and works, and they are also read by Social Democratic workers. If these papers are well conducted, if economic demands are linked up with political demands, these newspapers can be an invaluable factor.

Do the C.C.'s of Communist Parties and Party Committees take an interest in these newspapers? It cannot be said they do. Instead of increasing their number a hundred times, in many places their number is being reduced. Much more attention should be paid to the make-up and publication of factory newspapers. Even in countries where Communist Parties are legal, factory nuclei are obliged to carry on an illegal existence owing to the terrorism of the employers. Factory newspapers, leaflets, etc., provided they be well drawn up and adapted to the workers of the respective enterprise, can make the work of the nucleus among the workers of the enterprise much easier. By the bye, why are factory nuclei doing such unsatisfactory work? I think that in spite of the old Social Democratic traditions which consisted in Party work being carried on — and unfortunately this is still the case in many places — entirely in the residential districts of the workers (party organisations were constructed for work in the residential district of the Party members) which is interfering with the work of the Communists in the enterprises, — factory nuclei could after all do better work in the enterprises, if Party Committees paid more attention to their work. Everyone admits that one must work in enterprises, but when it comes to deeds, when some Party campaign must be carried through, Party Committees generally organise it in the residential districts of the Party members, through the street nuclei, and not in the factories or works through the factory nuclei. Recruiting members is generally carried on thus: Communists go from house to house or stand at street corners and recruit members for the Party. What is the result of such recruiting? The result is that the new member has been registered in the Party but has not been made a member of the nucleus of the factory where he is employed; he has not been drawn into Party work, no attention has been paid to him, with the result that many new members recruited in this manner very soon leave the Party.

I have already given once data concerning the recruiting campaign of the French Communist Party. In one big recruiting campaign, it managed to secure several thousand members. The recruiting took place at big public meetings. The new members left their addresses in the Party Committees, the French C.P. did not know a long time what to do with them, where to fit them in: should they be organised into factory nuclei, should they be sent to Party nuclei in enterprises where new members are working, or should they be co-ordinated in organisations on a residential basis. When they were asked to report themselves in the Party Committees, at least one third of the new members did not turn up. If the recruiting of Party members had taken place in factories and works through Party

nuclei which would have paid attention to the new members, would have given them literature and would have drawn them into Party work, they would not only have stayed in the Party, but through their work in the enterprises would have been strengthened, and contact with the masses established on a wider scale. Needless to say that workers brought into the Party through the nucleus of the enterprise where they are employed, are better known than workers recruited through a house to house canvass and at meetings. One of the reasons of the constant fluctuation of members in the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries, is not doubt the mode of recruiting Party members.

Comrade Manuilsky said correctly in his report that if you want to learn how to carry on campaigns, you must go to the French Communist Party, but if you want to consolidate the results of the campaign the French Party will not teach you anything, I quite agree with him on this point. The C. P. of France is an adept at conducting big campaigns. But who is conducting these Party campaigns? "L'Humanite" and the Parliamentary fraction. It frequently happens that deputies go to their constituencies without preliminary notification of the local Party organisations, without the co-operation of these organisations. They organise public meetings, etc. I am of course not against Party organs and deputies participating in Party campaigns. On the contrary, such is their bounden duty. But these big Party campaigns must be carried on by the whole Party, by all the organisations including the factory nuclei of the Party. If on the other hand, big campaigns concerning important questions are carried on quite apart from the Party nuclei, the latter are bound to be passive. I have already pointed out that in many enterprises the workers have compelled the factory nuclei or the trade union opposition to put up their own list of candidates, whereas many nuclei have remained passive in such an important matter as elections to factory committees in which all the workers in the enterprise participate. I could give a whole series of facts published in Party documents on this subject, but I will limit myself to a couple of them. It was possible to call conferences of non-Party workers at the initiative of the Berlin-Brandenburg organisation of the C. P. G. before May Day and immediately after it. Such conferences of representatives of enterprises could not have been called, if it had been very difficult or impossible to carry on Party work in the enterprises. It is not only in Germany that Party work can be carried on in factories and works.

Conferences of non-Party workers were held in factories and works in Paris before May Day. Comrade Manuilsky has already pointed out in his report that owing to these factory conferences it was possible to carry out full strikes in a number of enterprises of the metal, woodworking and building industries on May Day. Could such results have been achieved without these factory conferences?

Here is another characteristic fact which should be mentioned everywhere. I mean the case of the expulsion of comrade Niederkirchner, chairman of the Plumbers Section of the metal workers union of Berlin. After his expulsion, a big campaign was organised in factories and works among metal workers by the Communist fraction of the Metalworkers Union and the Party organisations for annulment of the expulsion. This was a right and proper campaign, and all the other Communist Parties must learn how to carry out such campaigns. How was this blow warded off? The communists of the Plumbers section called a metal workers conference which was attended by 293 representatives of 151 enterprises, including representatives of 27 of the biggest enterprises of Berlin. The conference represented 111,153 workers. Doesn't this prove that we can work in enterprises if we set our mind to it.

Here are, what I would call, characteristic quotations (which I already mentioned) from "Partei Arbeiter" No. 4, p. 100, 1929 (this is a special periodical of the body of active workers in the German Communist Party). I would like to say that such "Partei Arbeiter" should be published by all our Communist Parties. Although the periodical has a number of defects, it is an excellent paper on the whole:

"In the Pillaw and Block firm in Dresden which employs about 1500 workers, our nucleus and the first

chairman of the workers council were against our new tactic in the factory committee elections, and did not want to put up their own list of candidates. But when, by means of a leaflet, a preliminary general workers meeting was called, which was attended by about 500 workers, it came to pass that the factory workers, almost without exception, voted for our list and against the list of the reformist leaders, with the result that our list was the only one in the enterprise. Comrades in the nucleus were surprised at this success."

(Remmele: We have a dozen of such facts.)

This proves that one can work in factories.

(Remmele: And who is denying this?)

Those who do not give an impetus to this work. I have proved by facts that Party work in enterprises is inadequate. Here is another characteristic quotation from the same "Partei Arbeiter":

"Leaflets were published also in the Hartwig and Vogel chocolate factory in order to mobilise all the workers. A number of these leaflets came into the hands of the workers of the Petzold and Aulhorn firm, another big chocolate factory, with the result that delegates from this factory came the next day to our Party committee with the demand that a general meeting should be called also in their factory in order to put up an oppositional list of candidates. Our comrades in this enterprise remained passive in this affair."

What does this prove? What I have been saying since 1924, namely, that Party work is possible in enterprises. We are frequently told that it is very difficult to work in enterprises because communists are dismissed. But do communists really imagine that the class struggle can be carried on without sacrifices?

When Communist Parties are struggling not only against the whole apparatus which is under the control of the State, but also against reformist and yellow trade unions and Social Democratic Parties, sacrifices are inevitable. What happens if even all the Communists have been dismissed from a factory? The next day our Party Committees must endeavour to send there other Party members, or they must send the dismissed comrades to the gates of the factory in order to meet there those who are in sympathy with us and to organise them into a new nucleus. This is the only way that our work can be done, that we can consolidate organisationally the ideological influence we already possess. Of course, all of us know these truths, and yet Party work in factories and work is still very inadequate, as shown by figures and facts.

(Neumann: One should not give only the dark side of the picture.)

I have spoken and do speak very often about the bright side of our Party work in general and the excellent work of some Party nuclei in enterprises. If it were not for the excellent work in some factories and works, probably the people who say and think that it is impossible to work in enterprises would be right. The re-organisation of the Communist Parties on a factory nucleus basis can after all record a certain amount of success compared with previous years, just because excellent work is done in some factories and works.

(Neumann: No-one among us thinks that it is impossible to work in factories and works.)

Comrade Neumann, if you think that there are no such Communists in the C. P. of Germany — and it is one of the best C. I. sections — this does not mean that there are no such people in other C. I. sections.

I think nevertheless that not all the members of even the C. P. of Germany are convinced of the necessity and possibility of working in enterprises, otherwise how could one explain that only 18% of the Party membership employed in enterprises belong to factory nuclei. We have in Germany a considerable number of revolutionary representatives in the factories and works of Germany about which I will say a few words later on. There are trade union representatives in the German factories and works among whom are also our Party members.

Other mass organisations are also beginning to work in factories and works. I ask you, how will you lead all this work in the enterprises, if you are not going to have strong, capable and tried Party nuclei in the factories and works? There are certainly factories in Germany with revolutionary factory committees but no Party nuclei. What should you, German comrades, have done in these cases? You should have taken up immediately the organisation of such Party nuclei, otherwise it will be difficult to lead the work of the revolutionary factory committees. I am very much afraid of a repetition of the experience of 1923, when the C. P. of Germany had enormous, one can say even exceptional, influence on the factory committees in Germany. They were then independent of the reformist trade unions. They were revolutionary organisations compared with the reformist trade unions (it was only after 1923, when the German reformists saw the revolutionary role which the factory committees were playing, that they converted many of them in the course of the last few years into organs of class collaboration), but did the C. P. of Germany have Communist fractions there at that time? Did the C. P. of Germany lead the factory committees through the Communist fractions? If it had led them, Brandler would not have had to call together the functionaries in Chemnitz and ask them if one could and should act or not. If the then C. C. of the C. P. of Germany, headed by Brandler, had called together in October 1923 the Communists from the enterprises or had called workers conferences with representatives from enterprises, the question "to act or not to act" would not have been decided in a negative sense. But at that time the C. P. of Germany was inadequately connected with the factories and works.

(Remmele: This is quite true.)

I am afraid, comrade Remmele, that the C. P. of Germany might again let the leadership of revolutionary factory committees slip out of his hands. I am afraid, in this respect of a repetition of the experience of 1923. Am I justified in this? Yes, I am, for if there are no communist nuclei in enterprises, if communists in factory committees, trade unions and other mass organisations are without Party leadership, this will mean that Party committees will not be able to lead mass organisations through communist fractions and will not be able to consolidate organisationally the ideological influence which the Communist parties have on the working class.

I will deal now with the question of revolutionary representatives. Prior to the Congress of the C. P. of Germany much was written, and at the Congress itself much was said, about revolutionary representatives who must be elected by factory workers. We here were not quite clear as to their role, as to who is to lead them. On comrade Ulbricht's arrival, we asked for information about the role and functions of these revolutionary representatives. It seems that the institute of revolutionary representatives in enterprises must work under the leadership of the factory committees. It must be the organ through which revolutionary factory committees will have their tentacles in all shops, departments, etc., of the enterprise. I am only afraid that the organisations which already exist in the enterprises and those which are to be formed will begin to compete with one another and will bring chaos into the work. If there is a revolutionary factory committee, and side by side with it, an institute of revolutionary representatives not connected with it, the latter will be an unnecessary organ because it will have no constant work, which means that it can lose its influence on the workers. But in factories and works where the factory committees are reformist while the revolutionary representatives are under the influence of the C. P. they must be set against the reformist factory committees, and with their help one will have to act against all organs in the enterprises which are in reformist hands. I shall be very glad if the German comrades would define the functions of the institute of revolutionary representatives in this manner, because I am an enemy of all organisations which are formed only to exist on paper. Every organisation must have definite functions, but if it has no such functions or if there is no longer any need for them, it is better to dissolve it, for such organisations are only wasting the time of comrades who belong to them.

I will deal now with the role of the Party nuclei in factories and works and with the role of factory newspapers in periods of illegality. Where can we get in contact with the workers when Communist Parties have been driven underground, if not in the factories and works? Regardless of all

difficulties and of the efficiency of the spying system of the employers, there is no such force which could prevent communists distributing leaflets in factories and works, exchange views with workers at the bench in the factory itself, at the factory gates or when they go together to work or after work, when they are together with the factory workers in trains, etc. The chief base of Communist work in times of illegality, can and must be only the factories and works.

What is the state of affairs in Rumania and Yugoslavia? The C. P. of Yugoslavia and Rumania had no factory nuclei, which means that they had no connection with factory workers before they became illegal. If they have not lost all contact with the workers, this is only due to the fact that some of the trade unions have remained with them. Although these unions are not working very adequately, our Parties have been able to keep up through them some sort of a connection with the factories and works. If I remember right, it happened in Rumania that during the peasants' march on the capital, the miners organised a "smychka" with them regardless of and without our Party. That our Party was not connected with them is a fact. If the C. P. of Rumania had small nuclei in the factories and works, could Communists have been driven from there? The Yugoslavian and Rumanian Communist Parties must do their utmost to co-ordinate the Party members employed in enterprises into factory nuclei and must begin to publish factory newspapers and leaflets. Thereby they will re-establish the connection with the factory workers. The Yugoslavian and Rumanian example must be taken into consideration by all the C. I. sections, because the accentuation of the class struggle noticeable throughout the world is bound to increase reaction. The May Day incidents in Berlin have shown that Social Democrats who, by words, have been always setting against the Dictatorship of the proletariat of the Bolsheviks in the U. S. S. R. the "pure democracy" of the West, have suppressed the central organ of the C. P. of Germany, which made of course the leadership of the Party and the working class very difficult.

By the bye, as I have come to speak on Germany, I want to find out how the central organ of the C. P. of Germany was published when it was suppressed. I was told — and I would like the German comrades to confirm it — that the "Rote Fahne" did not come out regularly every day after its suppression.

Here is another fact. The Red Front Fighters' Bund has been suppressed. The leaders and rank and file of the Bund and of the Communist Party of Germany declare that the Red Front Fighters' Bund exists, that they defy the proscription. But there is the illegal "Rote Front" which you could not issue allegedly for the reason that you had no money. A Party which has 125,000 dues paying members, a Party with colossal influence on the German working class, could not find means for the publication of an illegal central organ of the Red Front Fighters. Had the publication of the Red Front Fighters appeared regularly, it would have shown to the broad masses of workers who are incensed over the outlawing of the organisation and who are very well disposed towards the Red Front Fighters, that it really lives.

I will now take up the work of the local Party organisations. Do you think that if the local Party organisations, district committees, Party committees and sub-district committees would be sound organisations, that if they would function properly, such a state of affairs in the factory nuclei would be possible? It seems to me that there is no need to expatiate on the matter and that anyone of us would readily reply that these organisations did not work as they should have, because if they had worked properly they would not have chiefly occupied themselves with the publication of posters and the circulation of handbills, but would have chiefly devoted themselves to the establishment of intimate contact with the nuclei, the factories. They would have worked there perhaps to the detriment of the vast quantities of circulars which are being distributed. But they have not worked along these lines, and if they have, the work was badly done. Why do they work badly?

They are excessively centralised which renders the initiative of the local organisations difficult, which kills their initiative. The local Party organisations are waiting for instructions from the centre. The idea of the local organisations is that when the centre will give them instructions, they are sure to make no mistakes and that they will not be accused of deviations.

If they will receive instructions from the centre then they will start to work. But since resolutions and instructions are frequently late, the Party organisations are kept in suspense and do nothing or very little. This situation must be altered. The Party organisations must not wait for instructions from the centre on each given question, but should work within the confines of the general directives outlined by the Party Congresses and the decisions of the Plenums of the C. C. independently. How will they be able to receive instructions from the centre in case of great events if they will be cut off from the centre? Self-initiative must be developed by the local organisations. Moreover, for the sake of economy, posters, leaflets, circulars, etc., are published in the centre and then sent to the locals. But as the post is sometimes late and the material is not delivered in time, and now and then the railway and post officials destroy or throw away the posters, the locals remain without them. In addition to that, if manifestoes are written in the centre, they contain only general issues. If the local organisations would write their circulars, perhaps they would be bad, but with all that they would take local conditions and local issues into consideration. Such manifestoes and circulars would be ten times more useful than the posters and manifestoes which come too late from the centre. That is a fact. But since the centre does everything and everything is centralised, what is the result? The central apparatus are very big, employing 50 to 200 men, while colossal industrial districts, with very few exceptions, have not a single salaried worker in the Party and sub-district committees. This is fact. Let the comrades tell me that it is not so and I am prepared to admit that I am wrong.

Now a few words concerning the membership fluctuation in the Parties. Here are some figures concerning a few of our Parties. I take the statistics of previous years to show the extent of the membership fluctuation.

In the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia there were in 1924 138,996 members. In 1925 the membership was 93,220, in 1926, 92,818, in 1927, 138,000, in 1928, during the VI Congress of the C. I. 150,000, and towards the end of the same year 91,000. In 1929 the organisation has only 81,432 dues paying members.

(Ulbricht: That is not true. It is absolutely wrong. It is Jilek's invention.)

Comrade Ulbricht, firstly if I remember right, Jilek was not at the head of the Party in 1924, secondly, we are taking the official figures given by the C. C. of the Czechoslovakian Party in the reports to its Congresses.

In 1926, for example 26,801 people joined the C. P. Cz. Added to the 93,220 members of 1925, the membership in 1926 should have been 120,021. But we find that the 1926 membership was only 92,818. This means that 27,203 members withdrew from the Party in 1926, which is 402 more than the newly joined.

In the Communist Party of Great Britain the membership in 1925 was 5,000; in April 1926 it was 6,000; in October 1926 — 10,730; in January 1927 — 9,000; in March 1928 — 5,556. In 1929 the membership is according to some figures, 3,500, and according to others, 4,000. British comrades, are these figures correct?

(Campbell: They are correct.)

In the French Party there were in 1924, 68,191 members; by the end of August 1925 the membership was 83,326; in 1926 it was 65,230; in 1927 — 56,010; in 1928 — 52,526. In 1929 it is only 46,000. During that period the Communist Party of France launched several membership drives. In 1926 it took in 5,000 new members, in 1927 it took in 2,500 members in connection with the membership drive in the campaign against the military bill. But with all that the membership of the French Party has been diminishing from year to year.

The Communist Party of the United States accepted in 1923 6,532 members; in 1924 — 8,456 members; in 1925 — 4,100; in 1926 — 2,731; in 1927 — 3,257; in 1928 — 2,452. All in all, 27,168 people joined the Party in the course of five years. But in 1929, the membership of that Party is from 9 to 11,000.

From the report of the Berlin-Brandenburg Party organisation at the district Party Conference of April 1929, we find that it accepted in 1928, 6,087 new members, and that 4,965

withdrew from the Party. This means that the membership of the Berlin-Brandenburg organisation has increased only by 1,122 as it lost a good many members.

I am not giving any statistics concerning the German Party as its membership has in the last few years remained stable (124,000 dues paying members). This of course does not indicate that there is no fluctuation in the organisations of the German Party.

Is this membership fluctuation in the Sections of the Communist International something accidental? If the Party organisations will work properly and look after each member that is accepted, most of them will of course remain in the Party. Of course, a certain number of members falls out when moving from place to place, etc., but this does not explain the fluctuation in the Party membership. If the Parties would undertake the task of increasing their membership and keeping the members by all means, they would be able to do so and increase their membership. The increased membership they would be able to use in the work of the Party organisations, as well as in the mass organisations. It is only by looking after the new adepts that this fluctuation can be diminished. Is that possible? It is. We are told that it is the opportunists, people who are afraid of difficulties, etc., that leave the Party, while those remaining are 100% revolutionaries. But in the following year some of those who are called revolutionaries also withdraw. An explanation like this is too shallow. It must be admitted that there is fluctuation in all Communist Parties, a thing which must be combated, and it must be combated by means of better work on the part of the local Party organisations. Workers who join the Communist Party regard that organisation as a revolutionary Party which champions the interests of the working class and is capable of leading the workers. They expect to find in the Party organisations constant activity. But in most cases they do not find that. I analysed the data given by the C. P. G. in the pages of the "Communist International" after the VI Congress of the C. I. concerning the causes prompting members of the German Party to leave the organisation, and what happens to these ex-members. (This data is elaborated best by the German Party.) I found that it is chiefly the young Party members who leave the organisation because of the unsatisfactory work of the locals. In time of big campaigns they help the Communist Party. This means that they do not go to other parties and they consider the Communist Party their own. During the recent elections in France, at least 300,000 workers helped the French Party in the election campaign. But these people do not join the Party as the Party organisations cannot interest them with necessary and useful work.

What must be done in order to decrease the fluctuation? Of course I cannot give you a prescription which would be good for all times. There is no doctor who never makes a mistake. It seems to me that the adoption and carrying out of the points I am going to indicate would help the local organisations in combating this evil. I suggest that:

1. Instead of giving paper instructions to the local Party organisations, it is necessary to send live instructors for a considerable length of time. If instructors are sent for three days, and it happened in Germany that an instructor came around, saw that something was wrong, told the Party committee, the higher body, about it, and went away, not much good comes out of it. Instructors should remain for some time in the local organisations and actually try to help to arrange their work.

2. It is necessary to look after the carrying out of decisions. We have excellent decisions, there is nothing that can be criticised, but how many of them are carried out? I think that it is high time to control the carrying out of decisions and to see how they are carried out. It is better to pass fewer resolutions, but to carry those that have been passed into operation.

3. The best people should be put at the head of the local organisations. However, now the best people are kept in the centre. There they sit in the apparatus and write and despatch lifeless paper instructions.

4. It is necessary to call periodical conferences on the question of Party structure, on a national, district, and sub-district scale.

5. It is necessary to teach in all schools of the Sections of the C. I. subjects on Party structure. At the present time

these schools teach all kinds of nonsense, they even teach oratory, but do not teach on the subject of Party structure.

6. It is necessary to distribute properly and expeditiously the Party forces. The situation in the Parties now is such that active members are over-burdened and have so much to do that their work cannot be of benefit to themselves or to the Party.*

(Neumann: Quite right.)

At the same time, from 30 to 60% of the Party members are passive and do nothing. I do not propose that they be expelled as many are inclined to do, I merely suggest that Party duties be properly distributed amongst members, so that no comrade would have more than two duties. (Under illegal conditions of course they may have more).

(Manuilsky: The same happens in the Comintern apparatus.)

Comrade Manuilsky, I will be very much obliged to you if you will help to carry out in the Comintern apparatus what I propose.

7. It is necessary to improve and strengthen the leadership given by the Party Committees through the Communists and Communist fractions in the mass labour organisations.

Now as to the question of cadres. The comrades always complain that we have no cadres. But it is my impression that they think that cadres can come down from somewhere or other, from the skies. How are cadres formed? Cadres are created in organisations which act, which work. In Parties where there are no cadres it means that these Parties do not work properly. That is quite obvious. Do you think perhaps that all that is necessary is to send comrades to school and to teach them Communist wisdom in order to develop cadres, and that no practical experience is necessary? The necessary cadres cannot be secured this way. I do not mean to say that I am opposed to schools. On the contrary, I am in favour of teaching on the subject of Party structure in the schools, I always maintain that schools are necessary. But the comrades must understand that the schools alone cannot give us the necessary cadres. The schools must train the comrades who already have some practical experience. In this connection, the experience of the C. P. S. U. is worth consideration. Up to 1917, we Bolsheviks had some two or three schools abroad. The comrades attending these schools were many years in the Party engaged in underground Party work in tsarist Russia. The Russian Bolshevik cadres were forged at practical work. I think that two thirds of the workers of the old Bolshevik guard had no opportunity whatever to study and to finish Party schools or courses. This, however, does not mean that the cadres of the old Bolshevik guard were bad workers.

There is another bad feature in the Sections of the C. I., and that is that our cadres, the few that we have, are people who have come to us from the Social Democrats. Why have the Communist Parties to this day not yet started to work among the workers in the factories and mills? Chiefly because these cadres are former social-democrats who want to be revolutionaries, who really are revolutionaries, but who still suffer from the old traditions and the old social-democratic experience. They argue: we have managed 30—40 years without work in the factory nuclei, why must we now change our methods of Party work? In the old organisations built on the residential basis, with a membership of 50 to 150, fewer active workers were necessary than now when in the factory and street nuclei there are in most cases not more than from 3 to 50 members. In each nucleus there must be at least one experienced active worker. The more poorly the Party nuclei work, the more inactive they are, the less hope is there to secure the necessary cadres for the Communist Parties. All energy must be exerted in order to overcome this vicious circle. Without intensive work of the nuclei, the local Party organisations, the Communist fractions in the mass organisations, the necessary cadres will not be formed. There must be no division of Party workers into political, organisational and practical workers, which exists in many Sections of the C. I. at the present time. All political workers, including newspaper editors, must work in the nuclei, in the local Party organisations. By this the activity of the Party organisations

will be raised and the necessary cadres will be formed. The new cadres which we are now in need of, and which would approach this work in a new way and would be able to cope with the new tasks confronting us, the revolutionary tasks, can be taken from the Young Communist Leagues. These Leagues must give us new cadres.

Now as to the work of the Y. C. I. and its Sections.

What has the VI. Congress of the C. I. decided concerning the Y. C. I.? It decided:

"The Congress instructs the Young Communist International to examine the question of the tactics and the methods of work of the Young Communist International, with a view to embracing larger sections of the working youth, to adopting more varied methods of recruiting.... Further:

"In those places, where young workers are not eligible for membership in the trade union it is necessary to proceed to organise, under the leadership of the Young Communist Leagues, special youth societies, the object of which shall be to fight for the economic needs of the proletarian youth."

(From the Theses of the VI. World Congress on the International Situation and the Tasks of the Communist International. § 39.)

How much has been accomplished during this year of what I have just said? We have figures to show that the Y. C. I. has not only done nothing towards the carrying out of the decisions of the VI. Congress, but that matters are now even in a worse state than they were prior to the Congress. Here are some of the figures.

The Young Communist League of Czechoslovakia had at the time of the V. Congress of the Y. C. I. 12,789 members; now it has only 10,000 — on paper. In reality, it has only 5,000 dues paying members. This figure (5,000) is even mentioned by Comrade Khitarov in his article in the "Pravda".

The Young Communist League of Germany had 20,000 members at the time of the V. Congress of the Y. C. I. Now it has 22,000 — a slight increase.

The Young Communist League of France had 10,000 members at the time of the Y. C. I. Congress. Its membership now is 8,000 — which is a decrease.

The Young Communist League of Sweden had 14,600 members at the time of the Congress, and now it has 14,652. Here it would seem that matters are not so bad. That is a peculiarity of the Swedish Party. I cannot go into the history of the Swedish Party and Y. C. I. at the present time. The comrades know that themselves.

The Young Communist League of Great Britain had at the time of the Y. C. I. Congress 1,400 members, and now only 900.

The Young Communist League of America had at the time of the Congress 2,480 members, and now 3,479.

The Young Communist League of Austria had at the time of the Congress 1,300 members, and now its membership is 1,000.

The Norwegian League had 3,000 and now it has 2,800. This proves that not only have we failed to move a step forward since the Congress, but we have actually gone backward.

I will now compare the Y. C. I. membership with the respective Party membership. In Germany there are 125,000 dues paying Party members, and 22,000 Young Communists. In Czechoslovakia the respective figures are 81,432 and 5,000.

(Khitarov: And where was the Party?)

I will still speak about that, Comrade Khitarov. You need no think that I am criticising the Young Communist organisations only.

In France the Party has 45,000 members and the League 8,000. The Swedish Party has 20,000 members and the League 14,652. The American Party has 11,500 and the League 3,479.

The British Party has 4,500 members or 3,500, and the League has 900 members.

The basis of the Young Communist Leagues can and should be wider than that of the Parties. The Young Communist Leagues have the vast reserves of young workers, who have no social-democratic traditions, to draw their forces from. The Y.C.L.'s can teach them Communism more easily than the Parties which have to deal with adults who are poisoned with the venom of social-democracy, reformism, catholicism, etc. The Communist Parties in accepting new members, put forward certain conditions, but the Y.C.L.'s can and should accept the young workers into their organisations without any conditions. However, the basis of the Young Communist Leagues is not becoming wider, but narrower. The working methods used by the Y. C. I. must be changed. The Y. C. I.'s must reach the young workers everywhere — in the school, the factory, the evening school, the sport ground, the singing and musical societies, the tenement houses, and finally the Christian, Socialist, Catholic and similar youth organisations. The youth go to the Christian Socialists, the Catholics and Liberals, because they want to find a field where to use their energy. They want to do something, they want to learn. The Y. C. I. must endeavour to draw over these youths, to absorb them. They have no traditions and it will depend on the organisations which they join now as to what they will be in the future. Urgent steps must be taken in order to improve the mass work of the Y. C. I. and its Sections. The Communist Parties will get no cadres unless the Young Communist Leagues will produce them. How narrow the basis of the Young Communist League is even in Germany may be seen from the fact that over 60% of the membership of the C. P. G. formerly belonged to the Social-Democratic and independent Social Democratic Parties and up to 1928, only 2.57% or 1,916 people had been transferred from the Y. C. L. to the Party (in 19 districts with a membership of 76,649).

Are the Y. C. I. and the Y. C. L. organisations alone to blame for that? No, not by any means. The Communist Parties devote very little attention and do not do any Y. C. L. work. Moreover, the Young Communist Leagues have often had to help the Comintern to correct the policies of the Communist Parties not only on Young Communist work, but on all work in general. If our Communist Parties would devote greater attention and energy, if they would give more assistance to the Young Communist Leagues in their work, the latter would become a wide reservoir for the Parties. The Y. C. I., situated in Moscow, cannot work in Germany and elsewhere. By this I do not mean that the Y. C. I. is not to blame for the bad state of affairs in the Y. C. L. organisations in the capitalist countries. The Y. C. I. is responsible. I am not against the Y. C. I.'s dealing with politics, I am not in any way opposed to its consideration and solution of Comintern problems as a Section of the C. I. Neither am I opposed to the Y. C. I.'s being a militant organisation. On the contrary, this is absolutely necessary. But that does not free it from the duty of working among the masses of young workers. It does not free the Y. C. I. from seeing to the work of the Young Communist organisations in all broad youth organisations, wherever young workers are to be found. If it is necessary in the interests of winning over the young workers, we may even go to the Christian Socialists and Catholic and liberal youth organisations. In brief, the Young Communist organisations must work wherever young workers are to be found; but the position of the Y. C. I. was hitherto entirely different.

There is nothing to keep the young workers from joining the Young Communist organisations. Communist Parties must devote greater attention to the Y. C. L.'s than hitherto. In 25 districts in which the Communist Party of Germany has 105,000 members out of a total of 125,000, only 843 belonged in 1928 to the Y. C. L. The Y. C. L. of Germany has 22,000 members. Can these 843 Party members lead the German Y. C. L.? We cannot believe that all of the 843 Party members are active. By no means. There are surely passive members amongst them. That is insufficient. The Y. C. L. must be given more attention and time. Are we going to have a respite of 10 or 15 years that the Communist Parties pay so little attention to the work of the Young Communists? We must not forget that class battles may begin quite unexpectedly, any day. Then it will

be too late to try to improve our Y. C. L. work. We must therefore take all necessary steps right now to ensure that the Y. C. I. makes a change in its working methods.

When I speak of the shortcomings of the Communist Parties in their Y. C. L. work, I do not mean to say that the E. C. C. I. is not to blame for the poor mass work done by the E. C. Y. C. I. The E. C. C. I. did not persist, it did not verify, it did not assist the Y. C. I. in adopting new working methods, such as the VI. Congress of the C. I. called for. The Y. C. I. is given absolutely inadequate guidance by the E. C. C. I. I say this not because I want to accuse anybody in particular. But the time has come when the question must be seriously raised so that the work and methods of work of the Y. C. I. may be changed. The Y. C. I. must be a militant organisation, it should take part in the affairs of the Comintern just as the other Sections of the C. I., it should help the Comintern in its struggle against the opportunists, against the Right wingers, against all those who do not carry out its policies, but it must devote some of its time, the greatest part of its time, to work in the factories, to work among the young workers.

Comrade Khitarov said here yesterday that the Y. C. I. called out representatives of the national Y. C. I. organisations, received reports from them, and gave them instructions showing them that they did not sufficiently work among the masses, etc. That is very nice. But you have not done everything, Comrade Khitarov. When leaders of the Communist Parties make mistakes, you Y. C. I. members demand their removal, you insist upon certain organisational measures. That is alright. But why have you not removed leaders from the national organisations who perchance accept good resolutions, who are orthodox 105% or perhaps 120% Communists, but since they cannot work among the masses they cannot be at the head of the national youth organisations. Remove a few of such comrades from their positions, replace them by others, by better people, by comrades who know how to work among the masses. I listened very attentively to what you said yesterday, but you said nothing about any change in the leadership of the national Sections of the Y. C. I. on the principle of securing good and skilful work among the masses.

(Khitarov: The Young Communist League is an educational organisation, don't forget that.)

Yes, the Young Communist League is an educational organisation. It must educate the youth by more than one method, the method of accepting good and sound resolutions within a narrow circle of members. It must educate the broad masses of the youth. Is this education unnecessary in the broad masses of young workers? If the Y. C. L. will not educate them, the bourgeoisie will do it. Until now, you have been educating only a very small circle of comrades who do not work among the masses or work badly.

Now as to work in the broad mass non-Party organisations. Much has been said here about the mass organisations. But I want to point out that as yet, we have no Communist fractions in all these organisations. These mass organisations are not yet properly guided by the Communist Parties through their fractions. Wherever such fractions exist, they work badly. The mass organisations themselves are not yet everywhere real mass organisations. Let us take the I. R. A. It is a mass organisation partly only in Germany. In the other countries, it is by no means a mass organisation as yet. This is a fact. As to the trade unions, even in Germany the Party Committees did not adequately guide the Communists working in these organisations. However, it is not difficult to work successfully in trade unions. This is illustrated by the successful trade union work in Germany in the metal, mining and factory workers' unions. I have already pointed out how energetic work was done in the factories against the expulsion of Communists. This shows that it is possible to work and all that is necessary is to have the knack of doing it. If the Communist Parties will work as they should in the unions, I am convinced that they will secure invaluable opportunities of being more closely linked up with the broad masses. For this, it is necessary to give better guidance to the Communist fractions wherever such exist and to undertake their organisations wherever they are still absent. Until now, this has not been done to a sufficient extent.

I will go into detail of Communist trade union work in two countries only — Italy and China.

I want to tell you that we workers of the E. C. C. I. are badly informed on what is going on in the Communist Party of Italy at home. We do not know with what success they perform their difficult task, by what ways and means they reach the working masses, etc.

As far as I know, the Italian comrades have not yet done and are not doing one very important piece of work, they do not work in the fascist unions. Here is what the resolution of the V. Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. said on this question. It said that

“a most vital constituent part of Bolshevisation is devotion of attention a hundred times greater than hitherto to our work in the existing social-democratic and other unions (yellow, national socialist, Christian and fascist). Only under such conditions will the monopoly of the reformist leaders (the labour aristocracy and labour bureaucracy) really be broken in the unions.” (Translated anew.)

I am afraid that this decision has not been carried out. Of course we did not demand from the Italian Communists to capture all fascist unions. That is impossible, it is very difficult. We know very well that the workers join the fascist unions not because they want to do so, but because the economic and political situation drives them to it. The Communist Party must therefore work in the fascist unions.

Now as to China. The Resolution of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. on China, said among other things, that:

“Many leaders of the Chinese labour movement in the past thought that it is necessary to restrict or stop entirely the sending of comrades to the reactionary unions as they become corrupted there. That may be interpreted as a refusal to work within these unions with the object of their demoralisation, and the winning over of the workers belonging to them. Without entering the apparatus of the reactionary unions appointed by the military authorities, our comrades must work among the masses of workers belonging to those unions.”

Thus, there is a decision. This decision the Chinese comrades surely know. The red unions of China had a large delegation at the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. which participated in the drawing up of the resolution which I have just quoted. That delegation surely reported on the decisions of the IV. Congress of the R. I. L. U. I believe that these decisions have already reached China. But why do the Chinese comrades still waver on the question as to whether to work or not to work in the Kuomintang unions? What is the result? The Red unions are small units, and the Kuomintang unions are mass organisations. In the red unions there are the Communists, in the mass unions the Communists are lacking and the Kuomintang people are masters and can influence the workers as much as they like as there is no or practically no Communist work being done there. Is that Bolshevik tactics? I think no. On the question of work in the Kuomintang unions I shall still speak when the trade union question will be under consideration. It was said here that the Communist Party of China can be compared with the C. P. S. U. It works under great difficulties, etc. Of course, that is true. It works under extremely difficult conditions. Our Party never had to work under such conditions.

(Interjection: Under worse conditions.)

The C. P. S. U., or, as it was formerly called, the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks), worked under very bad and difficult conditions. It, too, experienced executions, not as many of course as in China. It, too, was confronted with physical extermination and hard labour, etc. But the Russian Bolsheviks never lost their contact with the workers. The working class was the basis of our work. The Bolsheviks always worked in the factories, no matter how difficult that was. And despite all difficulties confronting the Communist Party of China — in speaking of that Party the comrades always speak of the difficulties and the heroic role which that Party played and will still play in the revolutionary movement — we must point out its defects. The Communist Party of China has not a sufficient proletarian base at the present moment. It has practically no basis among the workers. As we

find in a “Pravda” article written by Comrade Tsui Vi-to, a representative of the Chinese Party in the E. C. C. I., the C. P. S. has now 133,655 members, of whom only 3,435 are workers scattered in 30 towns. The cadres of the Chinese Party are therefore members of the petty-bourgeoisie. That is true of the centre as well as the locals. The Party works badly in the mass labour organisations. The Chinese comrades must be told to work in those organisations. I am not an expert on China, I merely read the reports of the Party, receive information from the comrades who have come from China and who saw what the Party is doing there, and I hope that the Chinese comrades will speak on this question. I shall be very glad if the Chinese comrades will tell us whether I am wrong. The Chinese comrades must leave this Plenum not only with a clear solution of the question of fascism and the role of fascism, they must leave here with the conviction that the Communist Party of China must work in the working class, that it must be based on the workers, that it must work in the Kuomintang unions, that it must get in new members and elect comrades to the leadership who will be able to work and who will perform that work regardless of all difficulties.

I have taken much of your time, but I believe that the comrades have themselves realised that we must utilise all possibilities at our disposal. If anyone will come out here and say that everything is being done, that everything is alright, not much significance should be attached to that. No matter how well they work, they can work a hundred times better. (Applause.)

Comrade FORD (U. S. A.):

In my opinion the American question should receive considerably more attention here, than it has, from Comrade Kuusinen and also from Comrade Manuilsky. We must point out to the American comrades not only the results of the American Commission, but the X. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. must make known its position regarding the results and the situation in the American Party. The political consequences should be shown to the Party membership as an enlightenment to the Party, we must make it known that the question of factionalism will not be tolerated.

Take for instance the rising struggles in America, the strike waves that have swept the south and are sweeping America in general. These have taken place primarily because of the effects and results of rationalisation on the American working class. Particularly is this so in the South. But rationalisation is not only having its effects upon the American working class but at the present time is leading American imperialism to further decay and contradictions on an international scale; it was therefore correct that we analysed the American situation as not being exceptional in regard to the international situation.

Our strike waves in the South have brought forward the question of the Negroes in America. And here we have come face to face with the problem of the Negroes in the American class struggle. Here our comrades have great tasks before them in overcoming the question of white chauvinism among the white working class — in the South in particular. For this reason we should give more consideration to the American question in the discussions of the X. Plenum.

I want now to pass on to the question of the colonial situation. In the speeches of Comrades Kuusinen and Manuilsky they have not dealt sufficiently with the question of the events which have taken place since the VI. World Congress in the colonies. Take the mass movement in India, where hundreds of thousands of workers are mobilised in strike waves in opposition to the offensive of the bourgeoisie. Yet India seems to be separated from us as by a Chinese wall. There must be some causes for this and some reasons. At the X. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. we should point out why we have so little contact with India, why it is so small. Why strikes do not take the proper trend and are not sufficiently under revolutionary influence.

I think we do not give sufficient attention to the question of China. Comrade Piatnitzky this morning made some criticism regarding China. I would ask Comrade Piatnitzky to