

## Speech of Comrade Pollitt (Great Britain).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Inside the Labour Party the differences of opinion are manifesting themselves so rapidly that it is almost impossible to keep pace with them. If one contrasts the strong position that the Labour Government occupied in September 1929 when it was able to impose a 6% wage reduction in Lancashire, when it was able to carry through the Young Plan; with the situation in which the Labour Government finds itself in to-day (and I will give my views later on as to why it is not thrown out) we see what a tremendous change has taken place in Britain during the last eighteen months. This Labour Government has pursued one of the most callous policies of social fascism that can be found in any capitalist country. Its wage reducing manoeuvres have been most dastardly. They have succeeded in reducing the wages of 500,000 cotton textile workers, 260,000 woollen textile workers and 150,000 South Wales coalminers. By its policy in regard to the coalfields (and the mining industry is still the basic question for British capitalism) it has split the Miners Federation from one end of the country to the other. Everyone of the 13 coal districts is working on different agreements expiring at different times, with different conditions and different wage rates. The possibilities of united action on the part of the miners have been destroyed by this Labour Government after generations of struggle and suffering to build up national unity, to get national wage scales and strike action.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

One or two organisational factors in regard to our Party.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

One final word in regard to the task against opportunist passivity which is associated with the name of Comrade Horner.

Comrade Horner as a leading comrade in our Party and

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

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