

# Unity for Victory\*

By JACQUES DUCLOS

*The Communist*, January 1936

[*After warmly greeting the assemblage at the Palais de la Mutualité in Paris, Jacques Duclos declared:*]

Our Comrade Zyromski was right in just reminding us that the unity of the working class is not something to be lightly treated. The unity of the working class is a decisive task to which we must devote ourselves with all our forces. We have the deep conviction that it is necessary to build unity on a solid basis, unity capable of resisting all blows, unity capable of leading the workers of France to emancipation. Unity can be established only on the principles of the class struggle, and in order to show this better, permit me to comment on some recent history.

It will soon be fifteen years that the working class of this country was split. In fact, it was at the end of December, 1920, that the Congress of Tours took place at which the split was completed. I shall not dwell on the debates at that Congress. It is sufficient to recall that the Socialist minority, by refusing to submit to the decisions of the Communist majority, caused the split.

The problems posed at Tours dealt with an experiment which was in the process of unfolding itself in the Soviet Union, and a balance sheet of the policy maintained during the war of 1914-18, and which may be designated under the term *war socialism*, was also involved.

In its essence, it was a question of knowing whether a policy capable of leading the proletariat to victory was to be applied, whether a policy which could only lead to defeat was to be smashed.

Today, when the problems of unity rise before us, we do not have to make this balance sheet of methods which stood in opposi-

---

\* Speech delivered on December 2, 1935, at the joint meeting of the Communist and Socialist Parties. Jean Zyromski, Secretary of the Seine Federation of the Socialist Party, preceded Duclos.

tion to each other at the Congress of Tours and which, since then, have shown their true merits.

## TWO METHODS

Fifteen years ago, the methods of the Russian revolution were the subject of harsh criticism; the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a means of wiping out counter-revolution and of developing real democracy was condemned, and the collapse of the colossal social experiment which was being worked out on one-sixth of the world was prophesied.

Today, facts show that the experiment has succeeded. It is not for us Communists to be vain about it even though we could do so with some justice, but it is a matter of drawing up a balance sheet of the victories gained in the U.S.S.R. so that the working class can see what method is capable of leading it to victory over the bourgeoisie.

The Soviet experiment has delivered the goods, from this time on it must be judged in this light, and even bourgeois persons can not hide their astonishment before the grandeur of the accomplishments achieved there in every sphere of activity.

The method of the Bolshevik Party, of the Communists, has resulted in the taking of power by the working class, in the disappearance of capitalist profit, and in the final disappearance of the fascist menace.

Even more, the Soviet Union, as Comrade Zyromski has just emphasized, is a decisive factor in the defense of peace. It is the bulwark of peace throughout the world. (*Applause.*)

One can go a step further. It can today be said, in the light of what has happened in the U.S.S.R., that socialism has emerged from the domain of theory and has entered the domain of reality. It can be said that the socialist mode of production and socialist culture are showing their superiority over the capitalist mode of production and capitalist culture. In truth, we Marxists, who know that the socialist mode of production will result in the fashioning of a better humanity, see this great country in which is being molded under our very eyes a type of new men who does not toil merely to bring dividends but in order to make life more joyful and more beautiful. (*Applause.*)

A new civilization has been born of tremendous historical significance, a civilization which can be the pride of the proletariat of the entire world. And if I say that the Communists can be proud of

such a balance sheet, I will make sure not to lessen the pride which every worker has the right to feel, as he sees that his class has shown the road of the future. (*Applause.*)

But, alas, against this record which fills us full of pride and hope there is another path that I wish to describe, for thus all of us can see what the working class must avoid if it is not to be defeated. We refer to what occurred in Germany since 1918, a time during which workers' councils prevailed in that country.

The problem of the proletarian revolution in Germany has been raised. Need I say that if a proletarian government, such as that of the Bolsheviki, had been established at that time in Berlin, the history of the world would have been entirely different?

But German Social-Democracy had its own special ideas about "the transformation of the capitalist regime into a socialist regime". Its real concern was to save Germany from Bolshevism at any price. Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg fell, the victims of this policy, and it can be seen that faced with the choice between the dictatorship of capital and the dictatorship of the proletariat Social-Democracy chose the dictatorship of capital.

On the contrary, when we defend bourgeois democracy against fascism, we say very clearly that the day when the choice must be made between the dictatorship of capital, carried out under the democratic form, and the dictatorship of the proletariat, our choice will be swift, for we stand for the dictatorship of the proletariat which signifies a tremendous increase of democracy for the people. (*Applause.*)

In making its choice, German Social-Democracy assured the maintenance of capitalist privileges, the maintenance of the structure of the regime, and it led to the conclusion that when methods of class collaboration succeed in triumphing among the working class, defeat as well as division is inevitable. To sum up very briefly, class collaboration splits the working class, while revolutionary struggle unites it. (*Applause.*)

By abandoning the objective of establishing a proletarian government, German Social-Democracy prepared a tragic future for the working class which it split by ranging the workers under the influence of the policy of class collaboration against the revolutionary workers.

We know where that leads us. This sad and unfortunate experiment divided the working class and permitted Hitler to come to

power. That is why we must consider a similar situation, and when we go forward toward unity, we must not practice the policy of the ostrich which sticks its head in the sand when it feels the approach of danger.

When each of us asks what tomorrow will bring, it is indispensable that the working class of our country should know the results of these two methods, the path of the U.S.S.R. and that of Germany and Austria. The first, the policy of class struggle, led to victory. The other, that of class collaboration, led to fascism, to defeat. As for us, we want victory, not defeat. (*Applause.*)

#### UNITY OF ACTION LEADS TO UNITY

It is fortunate that we can often say: "There is no evil without some good." The tragic, sad experience of a country such as Germany, fallen under the grip of Hitlerism, has made the working class of France and of all countries feel the necessity for unity in a direct way. It is this which in a large measure has helped the workers to understand the necessity for unity of action. Our Communist Party, which for thirteen years has struggled with all its might to achieve unity of action, was happy to see the working class of France come together to fling back the fascist attempt of February 6, 1934. We have been happy to see unity of action achieved in France which permits Socialist and Communist workers to find themselves united, as brothers in the common struggle against the common enemy.

It is to the credit of us, the Communists, that we used every means to unite the workers on the same battle front, and it is because we have achieved unity of action, because we have learned to know each other in action, because we have fought against the enemy shoulder to shoulder, that it is today possible for us to speak of complete unity. (*Applause.*)

The idea of unity is penetrating the consciousness of the workers. It is taking possession of the masses to the extent that the fallacy of reformist methods and class collaboration has become clear. Many workers who sincerely believed that the transition from the capitalist world to the socialist world would take place without class battles now see this clearly; it is in proportion to the disappearance of these illusions, in proportion as the idea that the bourgeoisie will not commit suicide penetrates the consciousness of the workers, that unity marches forward. Unity cannot for one moment be conceived

as based on a program of class collaboration but only on a revolutionary program! (*Applause.*)

#### OUR DRAFT CHARTER

We have shown that the united party of the proletariat must adopt the socialization of the means of production and exchange as its goal. We have made clear that this can be realized only by the conquest of power through relentless struggle against the bourgeoisie; we have made clear the necessity for the destruction of the state, which we know is the instrument of domination by one class over another class. That is why the proletariat must destroy the state when it takes power and build its own state. (*Applause.*)

This struggle for the ultimate aims of the proletariat cannot be separated from the defense of our immediate demands, and when we make this clear in our Charter proposal, we do so in the best tradition of Marx who, in his *Value, Price, and Profit* clearly stated:

“If the working class would retreat in its daily conflict with capital, it would deprive itself of the possibility of undertaking any movement of greater scope.”

In our Charter, we take up not only the defense of the interests of the proletariat, but also the demands of the peasantry, the intellectuals, the petty bourgeoisie – of all those social groups which we wish to win as allies in the struggle against capitalism.

Finally, we have posed the problem of international affiliation, to which I will return, and we have also pointed to the fact that the United Party must work for the achievement of trade union unity.

Our Charter was written in May, and since then appreciable progress has been made in this direction, inasmuch as the Congress of Trade Union Unity is soon to be held, from which will emerge a United General Confederation of Labor.

On this point, I wish to say with all respect to the independence and autonomy of the trade unions, that we cannot fail to look forward to an indispensable contact between the Party of the working class and the trade union organizations.

At this time, for example, our Party asks the two trade union federations and the Socialist Party to issue jointly a proclamation stating very clearly that if the fascists attempt to seize power, the workers will answer with a general strike. Unfortunately these proposals, which, it seems to us, are an absolute necessity, have not yet

received results. But I am sure that the Socialist comrades who see the Labor and Socialist Internationals periodically meet together with the International Federation of Trade Unions [Amsterdam International] are the first to understand the correctness of our position on such a question.

Finally, we have shown in our Draft Charter that the United Party must break with the policy of class collaboration, and we have made clear that none of its members may participate in a capitalist government. (*Applause.*)

The text of the Socialist Party's proposal, published in *le Populaire* on November 21, says "that the United Party could not seek participation in the government in the bourgeois society".

We think that such a position is not sufficiently precise and is therefore unacceptable. We must reject all participation in a bourgeois government. (*Applause.*)

No participation in a capitalist government, because its acts, in truth, carry out the interests of the bourgeoisie. That is clear. That is plain.

As I know that in certain circles there is incorrect comment on the work of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, I should like in a few words to make our position clear.

With all our might we are against such a policy which has cost and is costing the working class so many sorrows. (*Applause.*)

And when the Communists speak of a government of the People's Front, which incidentally is not an inevitable step, they mean a government constituted under the conditions of a political crisis, when there is a revolutionary upsurge among the masses which the bourgeoisie cannot hold back. We do not mean, believe me, a government of participation of a parliamentary character, but a government which will fight energetically against fascism and reaction, which will not yet be a government of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but which could be a sort of preface to that. (*Tremendous applause.*)

We categorically reject any participation in a parliamentary government, even if it is given the name of government of the People's Front.

There is another problem on which our Draft Charter is categorical. That is the problem of the defense of the bourgeois state in case of imperialist war, a problem on which we pronounce ourselves against the "sacred union" which chains the working class to

the chariot of the bourgeoisie and divides it. (*Tempestuous applause.*)

And you very well know that we Communists have always declared that when the working class cannot stop an imperialist war, when it cannot succeed in holding back the criminal hand of capitalism, then all its efforts must be thrown into transforming the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war. (*Tempestuous applause.*)

In our Draft Charter we have also shown that we support the emancipation of the colonial peoples and the oppressed national minorities.

Finally, we have made clear that our conception of the Party is based on democratic centralism, so that it will be able to carry out its historic mission. The Party must be neither a club nor an academy filled with gossips who are incapable of acting. The Party must be, in short, the organized vanguard of the proletariat. (*Tempestuous applause.*)

The Party, in our opinion, must be conceived in such a manner that all members have the same beliefs on fundamental problems, so that there exist an indispensable ideological unity.

We have followed up our proposed Charter with the program which the United Party proposes to accomplish in power. Here is involved a program which, the day following the taking of power, the United Party could begin to carry out. And it is evident that if we speak of this program, it is because we clearly see the problems of the taking of power.

For every Communist, the idea of power is in no way lost in parliamentary considerations, from which not all who nevertheless use the formula, "All Power to Socialism!" have extricated themselves. (*Applause.*)

Therefore, we believe that we must be precise and clear about the United Party, so that each person will not be able to interpret the formula of workers' power in his own way and so that it is known what we want and where we are going.

[*At this point Jacques Duclos gives information on the state of the discussion of the committee of unification which has existed since the announcement of the Draft Charter, on May 29 last, and he brings up one of the most important problems in the question of unity.*]

## THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

When we examine this problem, the experiences of the revolutions in the U.S.S.R. and in Central Europe cannot be considered as a negligible quantity by the working class of France. If the working class of these countries, exercising its own creative genius, has found forms for the carrying out of its dictatorship, it necessarily follows that it has as its principal duty the elimination of the bourgeoisie from all the organs of power, and that they have thus naturally been led to a break with bourgeois parliamentarism.

The Socialist Party stresses the differences between the workers', peasants' and soldiers' councils of the Russian revolution and those in Central Europe and the revolutionary committees in the Asturias. I must say that I do not perceive the fundamental difference between the Workers' Soviets of Petrograd in 1917, fighting with arms to take power, and the revolutionary committees of Soviets of the miners of Asturias also fighting with arms against Spanish reaction. (*Applause.*)

The workers', peasants' and soldiers' councils, by rallying the various social strata, which made certain the victory of the proletarian revolution, constitute the base without which it is impossible seriously to conceive the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We cannot even try to connect this conception with that of bourgeois parliamentarism.

That is why we think that general formulae are not enough. We have the duty of concretely posing this all-important problem for the future of the working class, and therefore it is necessary to say that the dictatorship of the proletariat can be conceived only under a form which assures the dominating position of the working masses, which in the U.S.S.R. is achieved by Soviet power. On this point, permit me to examine a problem which in our opinion is important. It concerns the defense of the Soviet Union, which we think must be included in the charter of the United Party.

## THE DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

I say to you very clearly, with all the frankness which we can use among ourselves, that we cannot fail to write into the charter of the United Party of the proletariat the defense of the first Socialist fatherland. (*Applause.*)



I am happy to see that in this hall there is a truly moving unanimity for the building of a proletarian wall of defense around the Soviet Union. (*Applause.*)

Our friend Zyromski has just paid enthusiastic homage to the Soviet regime; he declared that the abolition of the capitalist regime had been achieved there, and he used the term “proletarian state” to characterize the Soviet state.

This statement makes me very happy, but I would like to note that in the Socialist Party everyone does not speak like Zyromski, who has just saluted the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R.

Citizen Lebas, who writes, “We deny that it [the Bolshevik state] is building socialism”, declares very clearly that “the Bolshevik state is not a state of workers and peasants”.

Thus, we are far from having a united opinion on the balance sheet of the Soviet Union, as I drew it some time ago, and you will understand how surprised I was when I read under the same signature: “It is a question of knowing whether, while we too have the desire of achieving socialism, we are not taking the risk of suffering a similar setback – in other words, to fail – in imitation of Bolshevism in Russia.”

This, unfortunately, is not the sentiment of only a single voice. From the pen of a Socialist Party member we read that “the U.S.S.R. is in the process of establishing, in the classical style of Bonapartism, the new privileged class of ‘specialists’ and of ‘qualified cadres’.” In the same organ, *Combat Marxiste*, we read that the first proletarian state is “a state which is the enemy, ravisher and torturer of the workers, oppressor of the laboring masses in its own territory and a foreign body in the workers’ movement on the international scale”.

And while Zyromski, a few minutes ago, speaking in the name of the Socialist Party, recalled with emotion the declaration of Jules Guesde demanding that we set a guard around the Russian revolution, I remembered that a member of his party could write: “What the Communist Party calls ‘the defense of the U.S.S.R.’ and what we ourselves call the defense of the Bolshevik oligarchy, is in contradiction to the safeguarding of peace.” (*Combat Marxiste.*)

Comrades, I will not pause to read other citations, but you will understand why we ourselves demand that such contradictions on essential problems must cease to exist.

Moreover, we believe that the United Party must be informed by its press as to what is going on in the Soviet Union, whose defense is understood so much the better since this party sets as its goal the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat, the need for which is now recognized by the Socialist Party. And, whether one wants it or not, when one speaks of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there is before him the majestic example of the Soviets, which absolutely nothing can take from the thoughts of those who, desiring the freedom of the proletariat, also desire the necessary means for the victory. (*Prolonged applause, ovation.*)

That is why I am sure that I am reflecting the sentiment of all comrades in demanding that such things should not be possible in a United Party. (*Applause.*)

#### INTERNATIONAL ENTENTE AND ACTION

Now I wish to examine the second problem: the International.

It is, naturally, necessary that the United Party should adhere to an International that carries out policies identical to its own. And the fundamental principle of the United Party must be the struggle against all opponents of unity, wherever they may be.

Moreover, I wish to congratulate the S.F.I.O.\* of the Socialist Party on this point, because it has long since informed the Executive of the Labor and Socialist International that it favors international unity of action.

Also, on this point I must also declare that by a sort of topsy-turvy democracy, it is the minority that makes the law in the Labor and Socialist International, and it is, in fact, the five Socialist Parties of Great Britain, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and Czechoslovakia which, opposed to international unity of action, prohibit the Labor and Socialist International from accomplishing what you want, what we all want, international unity of action. (*Applause.*)

What can be done with the [British] Labor Party? we are asked.

I myself know that the Labor Party is one of those which has opposed and is now opposing international unity of action. I have had the opportunity recently to hear the Secretary of the Italian Socialist Party, Pietro Nenni, reproach, in terms that were courteous

---

\* French Section of the Labor and Socialist International.

but firm, certain English comrades for the anti-unitary attitude of British Laborism.

Can we say that on the international scale we are serving unity of action by maintaining an approving silence about the Labor Party, or, on the contrary, do we not believe that we serve unity of action by combating all those, whoever and wherever they are, who do not want unity of action? For we ourselves know that we can never create the complete unity we desire without unity of action.

Let us not forget, comrades, that if we can speak of unity today, it is because we achieved unity of action more than a year ago. What is true here in France is true, too, on the international scene. (*Applause.*)

Definitely, to combat the enemies of unity of action on the international scale means to combat those who want to perpetuate the split by maintaining barriers between Socialist and Communist workers; it means to oppose those whose splitting policy is the direct result of their refusal to practice a policy of class collaboration.

We who say clearly that decisions on an international scale must be applied according to the actual situation in each country declare clearly that without international discipline, the working class cannot hope to achieve victory over the bourgeoisie. (*Applause.*)

And, comrades, it must be said that from this point of view the text of our Socialist friends published on November 21, was, so to speak, silent on international questions. The supplementary text published on November 27 was a little more detailed; but I have the feeling that on this question there is much to be discussed, just as there is much to be discussed on the problem of the defense of the Soviet Union and the attitude that must be taken toward the first proletarian state.

We are so much the more ready to discuss, on our part, for we are proud to belong to an International whose unceasing efforts for unity we salute, and we believe that the United Party cannot fail to adopt a position which will condemn all those who wish to perpetuate the split in the working class.

For, fundamentally, those who wish neither unity of action nor organic unity as a consequence are those who wish to prevent the working class from getting together on a revolutionary platform; they want to keep a reformist point of view predominant among the

masses. Here I should like to quote from an article by Max Dormoy, which reads:

“Let us speak clearly: it is impossible to conceive of our separation from the English Labor movement with which we have so many ties.”

No one demands a separation from the Labor Party. What is necessary is to refuse to follow the leaders of that party who are against unity of action.

And Comrade Dormoy added: “The Labor Party is on the eve of taking power and constituting a workers’ government.”

That is not our conception of taking power. That is not how we understand a workers’ government. (*Applause.*)

Unity can be achieved only on a revolutionary platform, and when Dormoy does not wish to see the fight against the anti-unitary policies of the Labor Party, it is because he does not really want to place himself against the policy of class collaboration followed in England.

The same problem presents itself in relation to the Scandinavian nations, and, in brief, it can be said that the Socialist Parties which favor participation in bourgeois governments are opposed to unity of action without fearing the consequences which might follow from the splits, the responsibility for which is their own.

It is by taking account of all this that the question of affiliation to an international organization in which the United Party would carry out decisions without neglecting the concrete peculiarities in France must be conceived.

Here are our Party’s terms on this question:

The United Party works in strict harmony with the international organization and profits by the experience of the labor movement in other countries. The international organization, while avoiding direct interference in the internal affairs of the United Party, must give helpful aid to it in the theoretical struggle against political opponents and for the application of decisions taken by the leading congresses and organs of the International.

#### DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

I want at this time to discuss the last question concerning the organization of the Party. The political line is fixed by the mass of supporters and not by a few parliamentarians in the Party. (*Ap-*

*plause.*) Each member of the Party must conform to a discipline freely agreed upon, to be determined by the democratic principle which is the law of the majority. That is why discipline must be the same for the deputy, for the elected as well as for the rank-and-file militant. (*Prolonged applause.*) The parliamentary fraction must not direct the Party. The Party must be directed by its central organization, the direct representatives of the Party. (*Lively applause.*)

The United Party of the proletariat is not an electoral party in which everything is done with an eye to elections. No doubt, it must participate in elections, but it is the Party of struggle of the laboring masses, a Party imposing on all its members, not an external discipline, but demanding of all, with penalties for violation, the carrying out of a fixed policy, because the worst of all would be a separation between words and deeds. (*Applause.*)

It would not be enough to repeat a few revolutionary formulae from time to time, if we do not have a Party which requires its members to conduct themselves as revolutionary fighters at the head of the masses, how can we dream of defeating the bourgeoisie? (*Applause.*)

That is why we must have a very clear conception of the United Party of the proletariat; we do not want many parties within one party. We want one single party, based on principles accepted by all; a party in which final decisions would be carried out by all. (*Applause.*)

This, to our mind, is how the organizational problem of the United Party presents itself. Without ideological unity, the party of the proletariat is reduced to impotence, to struggles which tend to paralyze action, and in such a situation, it is impossible to have a party capable of accomplishing its historic task: the overthrow of the capitalist regime. (*Applause.*)

This is how our Communist Party treats this question in the plan submitted to our Socialist friends – or rather, Socialist brothers. (*Applause.*)

The United Party defends the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels, enriched by the theoretical developments of Lenin and Stalin. In order to be able to overthrow capitalism, and to establish Communism, the United Party creates a centralized structure. All decisions are taken after a perfectly free discussion. The decisions are obligatory for all under pain of penalties.

To be a member of the Party, it is not enough to announce oneself in accord with the aims and the methods of the Party; we must work to apply all decisions of the Party and to pay dues regularly.

The leading organs in the various groups will be elected by general assemblies, conferences, and congresses and they will be expected to give periodic accounts of their activity to their electors.

The decisions of the leading organs of the Party will be obligatory upon the subordinate groups.

The central organ of the Party will direct the entire Party, including the parliamentary group and the press, and will have as its task to see that everybody carries out the decisions. Ideological unity, a necessary condition for the ability to struggle, is indispensable for the Party. Journalists, speakers, and writers of the Party must carry out the same policy: the policy of the Party.

The working class, in order to unite, must free itself from the influences of the capitalist enemy. That is why only those can belong to the United Party who have decided to take part in the class struggle, to fight in the vanguard of the toiling masses of the country, under the flag of the proletarian revolution, under the flag of proletarian internationalism, under the flag of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We want a single party, able to lead the working class. Unity is not a pre-electoral combination, nor is it a question of agreement between headquarters. It is a question which, in fact, involves the future of the working class. (*Prolonged applause.*)

It is because we believe that the Socialist and Communist workers must discuss every problem which is of interest to them, which is of interest to all of us, that we are taking part in this public discussion on unity.

A meeting such as this evening's is very useful; it is going to permit worthwhile discussions in the Socialist Party as well as in the Communist Party.

#### FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION

That is why I could not do better than to hope that similar meetings should be held elsewhere, so that the problems of unity can be examined in all their clarity before the comrades of the two parties in an atmosphere of friendliness such as surrounds us tonight.

As for the Communist Party, we are ready to discuss in all our fractions and units the text of the plan of our Socialist friends to-

gether with our own Draft Charter of Unity; and we are also ready, if the Socialist Party wishes it, to furnish it with our proposals on unity so that it may be discussed in the Socialist branches. While the hearts of the workers in the Socialist Party and Communist Party beat in unison with the same united will, it would be well that there be organized among them discussions on unity in the working class.

I am sure that these proposals coincide with the beliefs of all the comrades here, just as everybody, I am no less certain, is in accord with us when we propose that the Committee of Unification publish the stenographic report of its debates, which would be an extremely important element of information for the discussion. Our fraternal discussion this evening shows what can be done everywhere, and that is why, comrades, we can say that everything which encourages the workers to discuss with an understanding of the issues involved will advance the great cause of unity.

In continuing to discuss, we must tighten more than ever the unity of action between our two parties against the enemy that menaces us, against the fascist leagues, against the decree-laws, for the defense of peace.

Just as we are able to speak today of total unity, because we have achieved unity of action, so each new step which we take on the road of unity of action will hasten the march towards unity; that is why, in concluding, I hope to see, leaving this magnificent assembly, militants more courageous than ever in the fight under the banner of united action, militants more courageous than ever in achieving unity of struggle against the French Hitlerites, militants ready to do everything to hasten the awaited hour of the reconstruction of unity.

We are in the process of laying the solid foundations on which will be built the unity of the working class of France, unity for struggle, unity for victory. We have shown, for our part, a certain number of problems which must be discussed without flinching; for the worst thing of all would be to create a caricature of unity which would then lead us to new splits, to defeat. But we desire unity to conquer our enemies, we desire it not only to defeat fascism but also to make socialism triumph in the land we love and which we want to deliver from the vile dictatorship of the financial powers. (*Applause.*)

That is why, knowing full well that I reflect the sentiments on both sides, certain of the triumph of the great cause of unity under the flag of class struggle, I cry with all my might:

Long live the unity of the working class of France!

Long live the future and great United Party of the working class of France!

*(Tremendous applause.)*