

masses and cause them to shrink from ruthlessly defending their vital interests, which at the same time are the vital interests of the German nation. The terrorist sentences pronounced by class justice will not break the revolutionary fighting spirit of the working class. On the contrary, they arouse in the heart and brain the most powerful spiritual and moral forces, which will one day not only sweep away the terrorist justice and its upholders, but also the rotten state and social order, which provides the soil from which this terrorist justice must inevitably spring.

IN THE COLONIES

Cawnpore Victims of Labour Imperialism.

Case Against Mr. Singaravelu Dropped.

By Evelyn Roy.

The four prisoners condemned by the Judge at Cawnpore to four years' rigorous imprisonment on the charge of "seditious conspiracy" for having attempted to organise a political party of the Indian working-class, have now been denied the status and rights of political prisoners, hitherto accorded them. Thinking perhaps that the world has forgotten these victims of Labour Imperialism and Bureaucratic tyranny, the Indian jail authorities have reduced the four prisoners to the status of ordinary criminals. Though an Appeal against their condemnation is still pending, and though up to now they have demanded and been given certain privileges, such as the right to wear their own clothes, to buy their own food, and to receive a few comforts from their friends, now even these ordinary concessions are denied them, and they are being forced to eat regular prison food (un-speakably bad in India), to wear prison clothes, and to perform prison duty.

Will the British proletariat, so jealous of its own liberties, permit this added insult to the great injury already done by convicting these four students and workers in the cause of proletarian emancipation? Their only crime is having advocated the full social, political and economic emancipation of the Indian workers and peasants by the organisation of a political party based on certain fundamental economic demands, such as the right of Indian labour to organise in its own defence and to strike when necessary, the recognition of trade-unions, an eight-hour day; a minimum wage with insurance against illness, old-age and accidents; protection to woman and child labour, — in fact, the very things that the British Labour Party claims for its adherents in Britain, together with the right of free self-determination of the Indian people. These demands have been damned by the Cawnpore Court as "conspiracy to overthrow the sovereignty of the King-Emperor in India."

It should be noted in this connection that the case against Mr. Singaravelu Chettiar, one of the co-accused in the Cawnpore case, who was prevented by illness from appearing in court with the rest, has been quietly dropped by the government. What is the reason for this withdrawal of the prosecution at the eleventh hour? The case was scheduled to come up on July 1st, and Mr. Chettiar actually went to Cawnpore to appear before the Court, where he was informed that proceedings against him had been suspended. It now appears that he has in no way changed or modified his views, nor expressed any regret or apology for his actions. The government reserves the right to resume prosecution against him whenever it sees fit. Thus they keep the charge hanging over his head like a Sword of Damocles.

ready to use it against him at a moment's notice, at the same time refusing to proceed with the case at once. The reason is plain. Mr. Singaravelu is a very able lawyer, versed not only in the technicalities of Indian courts, but in his rights as a British subject as well. He knows exactly what right he has to advocate a change of government which shall benefit the Indian working-class as well as the Indian bourgeoisie. He has sufficient money and friends to enable him to fight the case to a finish and to force the reversal of the entire Cawnpore judgment against the other four. He has already cited 100 witnesses in his defence, in Madras alone. Evidently Mr. Singaravelu is not a man to be easily crushed by a mock-charge of "seditious conspiracy" which no regularly constituted Court of Law would uphold on the kind of evidence tendered. Mr. Singaravelu is a person of All-India and even international reputation, being known as a Marxist and champion of the Indian working-class since the days of the first All-India Trade Union Congress. Evidently, he is not a person to be trifled with. He would give undesirable publicity to the case and to the methods of British justice under a Labour regime. Hence it is very easy to see why the case against him has been allowed to drop without removing the charges against him. It is hoped to avoid further undesirable publicity while at the same time stopping his mouth and preventing any further activities, by "letting Mr. Singaravelu off."

But it should at once be demanded, "Why is Mr. Singaravelu let off when the other four, not more guilty than he, if guilty they be, are languishing in prison, condemned to four years' servitude on the charge of "seditious conspiracy", for taking a less prominent part in the attempts to organise Indian labour than Mr. Singaravelu, who is the founder of the "Labour and Kishan Party of Hindusthan", and the Editor of the "Labour and Kishan Gazette." It was to Mr. Singaravelu that the majority of the letters, written by M. N. Roy and used as the principal evidence in the trial, were addressed. Mr. Singaravelu has never made any secret of his ideas, nor of his international sympathies and affiliations.

Therefore, in view of the hasty retreat of the Government, it may be seen how unjustifiable was the Cawnpore verdict, and how necessary it is to push the case of those already condemned to the final Court of Appeal, in order to obtain a reversal of the infamous decision against the four victims of Indian governmental tyranny and of British Labour Imperialism.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Communication from the Balkan Communist Federation.

In view of the great difficulties which the Balkan Communist Federation has in carrying on its work, owing to the prevalence of martial law in the Balkans, it has for the time being transferred its headquarters to Moscow.

The Presidium of the Federation requests that all future communications for the Balkan Communist Federation (letters, news papers, magazines etc., as well as material and manuscripts for the "Bulletin" of the Balkan Communist Federation) be sent to the following address:

Georgi Dimitrov,

Moscow,
Tverskaya 36.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 59

19th August 1924

Editorial Offices: Langegasse 26/12, Vienna VIII. — Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX.
Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 64, Schliesstach 29, Vienna VIII.
— Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

The V. World Congress of the Communist International.

Speech of Comrade Zinoviev on the Trade Union Question.

(Twenty Ninth Session)

Comrades, The Trade union question is of enormous importance. If there were to remain any lack of clearness in this question, it would have an enormously injurious influence upon the whole movement.

A good deal has been heard at this Congress of the necessity of Bolshevising the parties, of remaining true to Leninism. We would prefer to hear less about Bolshevising the party, but to see the essence of Leninism itself studied more deeply, especially regard to the trade union question.

Bolshevism is against splitting the trade unions.

The standpoint of Leninism in the trade union question is to be seen most clearly in its tactics. You are aware that the first split between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks occurred in 1903, that is more than 20 years ago. The Bolsheviks have acted quite differently in the trade union question. In spite of the various splits in the political organisations we have neither before, during, or after the revolution caused a split in any trade union. (Interjection of Radek: "Quite true!") This must give us cause to think. Our trade unions even after the revolution were still, to a considerable extent, in the hands of the mensheviks and in spite of this we have done everything in order to avoid a split. Later on when the Mensheviks represented a very important fraction in the trade unions, the Party did everything possible to capture the trade unions from within without splitting them.

If therefore you wish to understand the Bolshevist tactics you must not forget this fundamental fact: During the course of 25 years whilst there were a number of splits in the political organisations (the Mensheviks called us professional splitters) there was not a single split in the trade unions, neither when we were the minority nor when we had the majority. Therein lies one of the fundamental facts of the history of the Russian Revolution and of the history of Russian Bolshevism.

Whoever calls himself a Leninist, whoever desires to Bolshevise the Party (it seems to me that Schummacher claims to desire this — God preserve us from such a Bolshevisation) — will not split the trade unions. This would on the contrary mean supporting the Mensheviks, although Schummacher may regard himself a "Leftist". We have already seen many such "Leftists". If I am not mistaken Schummacher was here three years ago as a representative of the Independent Socialist Party. Now however he acts as if the International was not left enough for him. (Interjection of Radek: "That is often the case.")

If you wish to speak seriously of Bolshevising the parties you must take note once and for all: the struggle for the unity of the trade union movement is one of the characteristic features of Bolshevism; that is shown by the practice of Russian Bolshevism over a period of 25 years. We have not split a single trade union. Why? Perhaps because we were so fond of the Mensheviks or perhaps because we regarded the trade unions as a sacred and untouchable form of the movement? No, but solely for one reason, because we regarded the trade unions as a centre around which the mass of the proletariat, the whole working class gathered.

Not long ago in the German party it was: Enough of the Trades Unions, we want a "new form" for the labour movement, and these comrades really thought that their good will was enough to find a new form with ease. That is all they wanted — only no Bolshevism! The trade unions were not discovered by Grassmann, D'Arragona or Legien they are the historic form of the mass organisation of the proletariat under capitalism. You can't suck a new form of the labour movement out of your fingers. We have a new form of mass organisation of the workers (beside the trades unions) and that is the Soviets. But that is such a form as cannot be called into life at any moment. At the second world congress we had a special resolution on the conditions for the creation of Soviets. Read them through again. There

you will find exact information as to when it is possible to proceed to the formation of Soviets. This is on the eve of the revolution, that is, when they constitute the germ of a workers' government in the form of a proletarian dictatorship. In the Soviets we have therefore really a new form of the labour movement. But they cannot be formed at any time, only on the eve of revolution. There is no other form of the proletarian mass movement.

The factory councils are gradually becoming a new form of the labour movement within the trade union movement. But the trade union remains, remember, also after the victory of the proletariat, after the wresting of power by the proletariat, an extremely important organisation. That, at any rate, has been proved by the, until now, sole victorious revolution, the Russian revolution.

It would therefore be extreme frivolity to talk as if we could, at will, just because we wanted, create a new form of the labour movement, and neglect the old form, up to now the sole one. Comrade Lenin taught us that the trade union movement, in spite of all the betrayals of social democracy, represents the historic form of the combination of the whole proletariat in one organisation. That is the reason for the efforts of the social democratic leaders to destroy the unity of this movement and drive the communists out of it. That is why we said, at the 3rd and 4th world congresses, that the social democratic leaders have an interest in destroying the unity of the trades unions, but that it is to our interest to preserve that unity. This form of the labour movement will render us good service, not only during the struggle for power but also after the capture of power. Lenin often said that had we not had the unions behind us in 1917, the dictatorship would not have lasted months but some years. It was the trade unions that facilitated the organisation of production, of the Red army and of much besides.

Leninism in the trade union question means: Fight against a split in the trades unions. We do not say that as a bit of diplomacy against the social democrats, but because it comes from the deepest springs of Leninism.

Victory is Impossible Without Mass Organisation.

Leninism consists above all things in the recognition that irreconcilable Marxism is unthinkable, without the mass organisation of the proletariat, for a Marxism without mass organisation is no Marxism, and can never lead to victory.

Yesterday we celebrated the memory of the Paris Commune. But we want a victorious commune, we want the victory of the proletariat. And for this the combination of the whole of the working class is above all necessary.

At the 4th world congress we declared — and it still remains true — the more the social democrats recognise, that the working class, in the depth of its soul is with us, that we shall inevitably win the victory, the more they recognise that we are nearing revolution, the more they try to split the trades unions. They think: If the organisations of the working classes are already falling into the hands of the communists, we must see to it that they only get fragments and splinters of the trade unions, not the unions as such, which would become irreplaceable weapons in their hands.

When we look at the English and German trade union movements, which are still in the hands of social democracy, it is difficult to believe that the unions can ever again be of service to the proletarian revolution. Nevertheless, they will be of service. The Russian unions were not one jot better when they were still in the hands of the Mensheviks. But when the decisive moment came, we defeated the Mensheviks. The discipline, the love of organisation, all the good, which for decades had been piling up in the trades unions, all this became in the hands of the communists, an irreplaceable weapon of the Russian revolution.

Therefore no-one who thinks seriously of the proletarian revolution, of the winning of the majority of the working class, can lightly handle the question of the unity of the trades unions. The bolshevising of the party is the policy of an honest fight for the unity of the trade union movement, and the incessant struggle for communism within the unions. The more the social democrats provoke, the stronger we must manoeuvre, the more we must close up our ranks in the unions, the stronger must we work within the unions. Why? Because our class comrades are to be found in the unions.

A frivolous comparison has been made here: As the bourgeois state can only be won by violence, so the trade unions can only

be won by violence. There is no sense in this analogy. The bourgeois state is distinguished from the trade unions in this, that the unions consist of our class comrades, that is of workers, who in spite of their aberration, in spite of their sometimes objective anti-revolutionary effect, can and will, at the decisive moment, take the right turning.

"Schumacherism."

In the German party there has been much talk of a new trade union policy. What does this policy consist of? "Schumacherism". It is only a pity that in our German party there are not whole Schumachers but also half Schumachers who defend the same wrong policy less consequently. It is better when we have a whole Schumacher before us and can discuss the whole question.

Schumacher represents the view that a whole philosophy separates us from the social democrats; therefore he thinks we cannot remain in the same unions with them. Of course a whole philosophy separates us from the social democrats. They are the lackeys of the bourgeoisie, and we are communists. Who does not understand that? It did not need a Schumacher to discover that. Or it is said: These dogs, these social democratic leaders are provoking us, in order to throw us out of the unions. We must therefore leave the unions. But just for this reason they are dogs, just for this reason they are lackeys of the bourgeoisie to provoke us and split the unions. We are not therefore sentimental dreamers, but straightforward proletarian revolutionaries, and can say: Dog remains dog, lackeys of the bourgeoisie remain lackeys of the bourgeoisie. We must hold out in spite of all, in order to win at any price, the majority of our class comrades in the unions, i.e. in the organisations which are still under the leadership of these accursed lackeys of the bourgeoisie (but which will not always remain so). The time is coming in which we shall win the majority of the workers in the unions. However much it may cost, we will not give up the winning of this section of the working class.

The Mensheviks in Russia were just such lackeys of the bourgeoisie, they wanted just the same to push us out of the unions. We fought the same fight. We said: The greater the provocation, the more we must hold on to remain in the unions, and in spite of all, to win the majority of the workers. In the Comintern there were always elements who wanted to lead us another way. Already in the 1st and 2nd world congresses there were voices, they were partly comrades from England and America, who said: "We do not wish to remain any longer in these unions." Lenin fought against them like a lion.

Now these comrades say: "We are all Leninists, but we want to go out of the reformist trade unions, we want to create a new form of the labour movement, a whole philosophy separates us from the old unions. But comrades, we stand here and we can none other. (Applause.) The policy of the Comintern is that Work in the unions as they are. Lenin understood how to send the first workers of our party, the first founders of our party into the reactionary unions, which had been founded by General Gendarmes, he even sent them into the unions which General Subatoff had founded, only to draw the workers into our circle of influence. I must admit that the Dissmanns and the Grassmanns, the D'Arragonas, and the Gompers are just such gendarmes, they are reactionaries. We know this gang; objectively they are no better than General Subatoff. But as we went into these unions to win the majority of the workers, we must also remain in them. General Subatoff-Grassmann and Subatoff-D'Arragona unions, if we do not do this, it means that we only want to win the majority of the workers with words. Or perhaps you really want to win, you do not know how. You cannot win the majority if you do not stay in the unions. Then you only pour your water into the mill of these gendarmes. Schumacher may consider himself a lion, in reality he is playing into the hands of Grassmann and Dissmann.

No Compromise in the Trade Union Question

We can allow no compromise on the question. The Comintern must speak out clearly: We must remain in the trade unions. All Schumacherish arguments rebound against Leninism. They prove the truth of our policy. Why do the social democratic leaders expell us? Because they are afraid we might win the majority of the workers. If there is a question on which the Comintern might lose its head, it is just the trade union question. If there is any question which can wreck our German party, it is the trade union question. (Loud applause.)

Today a comrade said to me: By some communal election or other, we had suffered a defeat. Naturally every defeat, however small, is unpleasant to us. But we do not belong to those revolutionaries who require of their comrades always and at any price, a victory; we know that there must also be defeats. But as communists we also know that in spite of defeats we must continue the struggle. But if the Leninist stand-point does not find firm footing in the German party, if the Leninist work does not appear clearly in the trade union work, — that will bring such a defeat as we shall not be able to stand.

I must explain that the opposition in this question is not an "academic" one. Some communist "academics" try their very best to deepen every false step which we make, but the danger in the deviations in the trade union question is, that it is also made by good workers, and that is dangerous.

It is humanly comprehensible, that the workers clench their fists when they hear even the names of Grassmann & Co., and that hungry workers buy milk for their children rather than pay membership fees which go into the hands of social traitors. I can feel with them. But as a member of our class, as a member of the world party, as a class comrade, such a worker is not right. He must recognise that it is necessary to pay this fee, to win this organisation accessible to every worker, that it is necessary to remain in it, and that we can only win it from within. If we do not do that, our whole programme remains only on paper.

Comrades, what made us most anxious at the time of the German discussion of this question?

We understand that after the October defeat, after the Saxon comedy a crisis was inevitable. That is not so dreadful that we cannot make it good. But when the party as such, and very good workers who form the basis of our party, have no clear line of action on the trade union question, that makes us extremely anxious. And the party cannot follow a communist line, if it has not a clear line in this question of all questions. There must be no lack of clearness here. It is not a question of words but of compromise, and we must be absolutely clear on this question.

The Frankfurt resolution of the G. C. P. is theoretically right, it is the foundation of a right Leninist policy in the trade union question, but as every book has its own particular fate, so every resolution can have its fate, it may remain a paper resolution. We have spoken about it a good deal with our German comrades, with the best proletarians of Europe. They have many strong sides, but their weak side lies to some extent in this, that they have not yet fought out in the depths of their soul the trade union question. They have not yet conquered this question. They are still considering whether it is not opportunism to remain in the trade unions. Comrades, this inward battle must be fought to a finish.

Schumacher appeals to a whole series of resolutions from the transition period of the G. C. P., from the time of the vacillations, when the attitude to the trade union question was being taken up. That there were vacillations is not so dreadful. It was the time of moulting. But when these vacillations last for years it becomes a misfortune for the party. Schumacher's arguments prove nothing. We hope they are theoretically overcome in Frankfurt. It only remains to overcome them in practice.

When talking to a Berlin comrade, one of those proletarians who form the foundations of the party, I got the impression that he was to some extent ashamed before the masses, because we remain in the social democratic unions. In the undertaking in which he is working there are 30,000 workmen employed. Only a few thousands are organised in trade unions. Now he is ashamed to stand before them and say: You must go into the social democratic unions. These 30,000 he considers very good workmen. No, comrades, we know the masses well, we have had to do with thousands, yes, millions of workers. We already know those masses who say: "You don't get me into the trade union, it has no sense to go into that show. They sometimes make very radical gestures, but they often do not go into the party, and remain far removed from the revolutionary struggle. Then comes the moment when they say: "Where was the party when we went wrong? It is there to set our mistakes right!" Of course we cannot carry out the revolution without these 30,000, but we must convince them that it is necessary to remain in the unions. If we do not that, then we cannot destroy the bourgeoisie order.

The German party must be absolutely clear on this question. We can forgive many mistakes, but this question can become a mill-stone about our necks; there where we should swim, this stone will drag us to the bottom, we may perish, if we have no clear understanding on this question. If the representative of the Schu-

macher tendency maintains that he speaks in the name of 20,000 comrades, that makes a sort of local patriotism, and we know these local isolated unions from the time of Legien, at that time the same number was mentioned.

We hope that of these 20,000, 19,000 will go with the Communist International when it has chosen a fixed line. With the rest we must part for a time, we can make no concessions. Schumacher is also a soldier of the revolution; the party has decided that he must carry this decision through, not only in form but in practice. I do not think that the German party will put up with Schumacherism for long.

Schumacher and his followers say: We also do not preach leaving the trades unions, we also do not say "Come out of the trades unions". We only (!) advocate the formation of independent unions, and the watch-word of the "Industrial Unions". We believe that the party must support this watch-word. — Is that so? Does Schumacher think us so simple that he believes we do not know what it is about, if he says it in different words? He wants to bring us before such facts as will disturb the line of the party in the trade union question.

Back to the Trade Unions!

We must collect those workers who have left the unions with the one watch-word: "Back to the trade unions! Yes! Back to the reactionary, anti-revolutionary menshevik trade unions, back to the unions which are still under the leadership of social democrats! Back to these unions to create in them a rallying centre for our powers. If we do not make this demand and carry it through, then we are only revolutionary talkers, then we will never destroy the bourgeois order, then we will never seriously gain the majority of the workers. Here is not the place to joke, we do not believe in the truth of the words of the representative of the Schumacher policy, who says: "We do not advocate leaving the trades unions."

What Schumacher proposes is nothing else than a policy of secession, and objectively his meaning is: Out of the labour movement as it now is, with all its weaknesses, and that means: Out of the working class as it is. We do not wish to make ourselves any illusions: We cannot form our own great trade unions in Germany. Even if we could form them, we could not carry on a successful economic campaign with them; and if we wanted to do so, we should lose it. The result would be that the workers who are fleeing from the unions would stream back to the social democrats.

Cherish no illusions! The workers' councils represent a new form, but the trade unions remain even after the revolution, as we have seen from the Russian example. The Soviets are a new revolutionary form of the labour movement, but you cannot create them every day, they can only be formed when revolution stands at the door. The real form of the present labour movement, which Marx and Lenin valued as such, is the trade union movement with all its faults and weaknesses, and with all the advantages which it offers to social democracy.

Absolute clarity must be reached on this question. If Schumacher does not give way, then he can no longer belong to the Comintern. If he unites 20,000 workers to lead them out of the unions, to take them away from the united front tactics, he robs us of 20,000 class fighters, instead of throwing them into the scale against the social democrats. At best he neutralises, splits, them off, and makes them into an enemy force over against us.

There can be no Question of "Marriage" with the Amsterdamers.

Now the second question, what is to be our attitude to the Amsterdam International Federation of Trade Unions? In my opinion, this question is of secondary significance. Comrade Bordiga maintains here, that the plan of certain negotiations with the Amsterdamers would give the whole movement an "extreme right" character. In comparison with the so-called ultra-left wing we have often been reproached with a "right" position. At the 3rd world congress Lenin said: "I am speaking as a right-winger against the offensive theory". Good, you may call us right-wingers, we are not afraid. The real left Leninist wing is always there, where the workers are. To win the great masses of the workers from the social democrats, that is the real revolutionary orientation of Leninism.

The "Memorandum" of the German delegation, which we saw today for the first time, has been mentioned here. We do not know exactly when it was written. We beg the congress not to judge our views on the basis of this memorandum. In this memorandum the point of view of the Russian party is not

expressed. If you wish to know our point of view, we are ready to set it forth, but the memorandum is false. It says that we are striving for a "marriage" with the Amsterdamers. I am afraid that was written by those comrades who have prepared such a "Marriage" in the Saxon "Labour Government". The question is put in the following way: One of two things: either union with the Amsterdamers, or out of the trade unions.

But think, there is another way of putting the question. Ask the Russian Mensheviks. With them we had really no "marriage", but we also did not retire from the unions when they oppressed us. We won the unions not in 20 months but in 20 years. If you wish for such directions as will guarantee you victory in 20 months, we cannot give you such: whoever undertakes such a thing can only be a charlatan. But we know that, in spite of all, we shall win the majority of the workers. If we do not manage that, then there will be no proletarian revolution.

Of a "marriage" with the Amsterdamers there can be no question. We saw such a "marriage" last year with the social democrats in Saxony, but not in the Russian revolution, there we shall never see it.

One more reason which must move the German party to think this question through consequently, if it at present still has objections to certain negotiations with the Amsterdamers, I believe that is not out of international, but out of purely inner party reasons — it is because our party in Germany is not fighting out the question of unity in the trade unions.

I was talking with a few comrades, and it seems to me that some of them are thinking: Let the Russian unions join up with Amsterdam, we have nothing against it; but do not let them force us in Germany to work in the social democratic unions. Can such a point of view be regarded as an international point of view? Not in the very least. If the Russian unions were to go over to the Amsterdamers without the R. I. L. U. that would be a real capitulation of the Comintern and of the R. I. L. U. and that we will never do. Our Russian trade unions are Leninist unions, and they do not act as Russian unions but as a part of the Red International of Labour Unions, and carry out what the international decides. The German comrades must consider this question, not from the purely German but from the international point of view.

The Winning of the Trade Unions is Progressing too Slowly.

At the congress we see three groups of delegates: Delegates from countries where the communists already have the majority in the unions, as for example France. In this case it is fairly easy to make a resolution for union with the reformists: the reformist minority can give way to the majority.

To the second group belong countries in which we have no important influence in the trade unions. Here the comrades are more or less indifferent to the question at issue. To the third group belongs Germany and to some extent Czechoslovakia, where we have no certain majority behind us, but where we are nearing it, and where a sharp struggle is taking place between the communists and the social democrats. Here the question is most difficult. We see that. But these difficulties cannot be decisive in the matter.

The proposal from the Russian delegation is both from the international as from the national point of view, perfectly right.

Comrade Bordiga says and it is repeated in the memorandum, it would be our moral death if we should make the suggested proposal to the Amsterdamers and they should refuse it. That is a curious standpoint. We make our class enemy a proposal and he refuses it — does that mean that we are morally defeated? How is that? Let us take an example from civil life. The Russian Soviet Government proposed disarmament to the international bourgeoisie, the international bourgeoisie refused it. Was that a moral defeat? Suppose we should declare to the social democrats that we are in favour of unity in the trade union movement and they should be against it, would that be our moral death? No, not at all. Read once, how the yellow "Vorwärts" in Berlin rages against that unity in the unions in its international dimensions. Why? Because these gentlemen are afraid it may be a blow against them. That may become anything only not a blow against us.

How Did the R. I. L. U. Originate?

Further it says in the memorandum, the German delegation and the whole German party spoke against the foundation of

the R. I. L. U. at the time, but if it is founded, it must keep the old forms. That is not right. You know the history of your own party very badly. Not the German party, but Paul Levi, was against the foundation of the R. I. L. U. That is a very different thing. The German party was with us for the foundation, and the R. I. L. U. was founded at a time when it seemed as if we should break through the enemy front in a direct attack, and soon win the unions. I can very well remember the foundation session of the R. I. L. U. The session was participated in by D'Arragona in the name of the Italian delegation, and by Robert Williams in the name of the English delegation, and some delegates introduced amendments to the resolution. We can even mention the fact that at that time a Spanish professor came to us in Moscow, and said: "I am a reformist, but the Spanish workers are communists, and they demand that I join the 3rd International". We answered him: "As long as you are not a communist you cannot be taken into the communist international". Such times we had then. It was at a time when we thought that we should in the very shortest time win the majority of the workers. You know, comrades, that the movement calmed down later. All the problems, all the tactical difficulties of the Comintern during these five years, are due to this, that the development went on much more slowly than we had thought. The social democrats have become to some extent stronger even in the unions. Now we must fight them in a much slower much more difficult way. That is the new thing that you do not wish to grasp.

Something New in the English Trade Union Movement

We are asked what there is new in England. The left wing is new, which is of course no left wing: that is only a delusion.

Think of it, comrades, England is the land with the most developed labour movement. Wynkoop was perfectly right when he said that the English labour movement was in this sense the decisive one. In England a new chapter is beginning in the labour movement. We do not know exactly where the mass communist party in England is to come from — whether it is to come from the door of Stewart, Mac-Mannus, or through another door. And it is very possible, comrades, that the mass party will come through another door perhaps, we must not forget that.

What is now happening in England is of no less historic importance at least than the events in other lands.

I have already said to the German comrades: "It is quite natural, that we all cling to our own party, our own organisation. I also cling to Leningrad. Other comrades bring examples from Ludwigshafen, and Hamburg. Comrades, we have all a great respect for Ludwigshafen, Hamburg and Leningrad, but I must say openly that London also has its significance, and a not less one than the above mentioned towns.

What is now happening in England is of world wide historic importance. If we are not blind we must see that. Otherwise we would have to found a German-Russian, or only a continental international. We founded something quite different, however, we founded a world international, a world party. Therefore the German comrades may not say: "What business of ours are the Russian or the English unions?" They are our business because they form an important part of the present labour movement.

What is there new? This, that the Amsterdam international is beginning to fall to pieces, that in the English labour movement an extremely important process is beginning.

I have no illusions. I am convinced that the English left are not, of course, revolutionaries, that they are not better than the "left" German social democrats. But that they are there is a very important thing. We must understand that, otherwise we shall create no proletarian mass movement in England, and also not accomplish the proletarian revolution.

There is now a proposal being made to the Russian trade union movement. Now I ask, has this question any significance, if only for Russia and England? Yes, and that a very great one. The answer which the trade unions give here in Moscow, will have great consequences in London.

How ought we then, to answer? We must answer as the standpoint of the whole international demands. There are people who think that we are guided here by some of other diplomatic considerations. That is nonsense. MacDonal and his guards are afraid as of the devil, of the English movement approaching us. If it says in the German memorandum that this approach

hinder us in the mobilising of the masses against the experts' report, that is such holy innocence that I cannot even find any objections against it. Quite the contrary, comrade Eckert. You who have collected so great a parliamentary experience in Saxony (amusement) should not expose such holy stupidity. Do you really think that Macdonald or Graseman or "Vorwärts" sincerely believe in an alliance between us? That will be such an alliance as will lose these gentlemen a good part of their electors.

On the contrary! The first question which we should put to these gentlemen would be the following: "Now, gentlemen, what do you think of the Experts Report?" We will put them against the wall, we will force them to answer, we will tell them what the policy of the Amsterdam International in the question of the experts' report looks like. Their policy is the policy of 1914. It is only a continuation of the social betrayal with other means. It is the same betrayal of the masses as on August 4th 1914. These gentlemen want to settle the question in secret. At the moment when we can put the question in international dimensions, they do not want to, will be in a tight corner.

The arguments of the German comrades are false.

All the arguments, then, of the German memorandum are artificial arguments.

One hindrance only remains in the way of our German comrades, that in the depths of their own party, they have not yet given up Schumacherism. We must be grateful to the Amsterdam International, if only for this, that it gave us the opportunity to put this question once more before the German party at a world conference. We have nothing more to say to those who believe that it is really a question of "marriage" with the Amsterdamers. I wished for a "marriage" with them I would deserve to be shut out of the door, at least that is what I would do to the man who was striving for such an alliance.

We wish to use our weapons as the class war demands. This demand at present is, that we try in direct ways, to preserve the unity of the trade union movement, and to win the majority in them. Formerly we hoped to win by a direct attack, but that was not successful. Now we must ask ourselves the same question, but approach our end along a slower path. We must win at any price! He who is for the work in the trade unions of his own land, will be just as sincerely for the unified policy in international measures. That is quite clear, that he who has stomach-ache in national affairs, will also have it in international ones. (Amusement: quite right!)

Only then does one write a memorandum on the "marriage". I believe that this episode must be absolutely wound up. I am not afraid that that will injure the German party. That is an illusion. The moment we really spread the watchword of unity in the trade unions among the masses, it will be much more difficult for the social democrats to carry on such a shameless fight against you, as they now do. If only the question can be put really internationally.

Only on one point do I agree with our German comrades, and that is that the question is not sufficiently prepared, and that we cannot get it through the masses in a few weeks. There they are right. The matter really must be prepared. We may not create

a unified front only from above. That we have already seen, we must carry on a campaign of preparation for months among the masses. If the German comrades are with us in that, every difference disappears at once. It must certainly be decided that we prepare the ground among the masses, that we should organise propaganda on an international scale for unity in the unions, that we should now call meetings throughout the world, prepare the ground, and only then begin negotiations. There is no hurry. But we must not forget there is something new here. For that reason we are here, for that reason we are leaders, for that reason we wish to be leaders, to see things already in the germ. After two years every duffer will understand it. But the tendency is already clear, we must already undertake something new.

We will prepare the ground, we will go to the masses with the watchword of unity. We have nothing to fear. Should our enemies shut us out, we will answer with a mass campaign for unity in the unions, in England, in Germany, in France, in the whole world.

In the memorandum it says the workers have a certain distrust for a manoeuvre-policy which gives no immediate results. That is not true. The workers are not children. They know that the class war is a war which needs strategy. The workers understand that very well. I give only a small example. Everyone who knows the psychology of the present-day Russian worker knows that our policy enjoys a popularity in no region so great as in the region of our foreign policy, that is just there where we are manoeuvring against the enemy. The masses like that. They say to themselves: Our party can manoeuvre, it can trick the enemy, and so defend our interests. I think it is also the same in Germany. It often happens that the leaders try to put their mistakes on to the masses. The masses very well understand our policy against the anti-revolutionary leaders of German social democracy.

We must reckon internationally with Schumacherism. Our policy must now consist in an energetic winding up of Schumacherism, not only in the German party but also in the whole international. There are great impediments. The bourgeoisie is still strong. It will surely break to pieces but its present collapse must not be exaggerated in order not to create illusions. The matter is not so simple. The bourgeoisie is stronger than we, it will collapse, we shall defeat it if we make no stupid mistakes. But the greatest danger for the German party today is in undervaluing the strength of the bourgeoisie and of the social democrats. We understand the revolutionary feelings, the psychology of the German workers. Without them there would be no Communist International. But that is not enough. We must be real disciples of Lenin, we must see the strength and the cunning of the German bourgeoisie and not undervalue them.

Well, enough of Schumacherism, nationally and internationally. We are considering certain steps with regard to the Amsterdamers, but we will not say that must lead to "marriage" with them. We do not challenge you to an "extreme right" course, as comrade Bordiga said, But we challenge you to go forward against the bands of the bourgeois lackeys, to the winning of the majority in the trade unions, not only nationally, but also internationally. (long and tempestuous applause).