

Berlin International Conference Number.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

~ INTERNATIONAL ~

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 26. No. 2

12th April 1922

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III. — Postal address Franz Dahlem, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III
for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

Owing to technical difficulties, we have been unable to issue the "International Press Correspondence" during the week April 2nd-9th. This number is devoted exclusively to the Berlin Conference of the Executives of the three Internationals and contains the more important speeches and resolutions of the Conference insofar as they are available for publication at the time of going to press. We shall print the remaining documentary material in our next number.

The Results of the Berlin Conference of the Three Internationals.

by Karl Radek.

** The Conference of the three Executives which was brought about to discuss the question of calling a general International Workers' Conference against the robber plans of Genoa, has disbanded without being able to decide upon the convocation of this World Congress. At a time when the representatives of the capitalistic Robber States are meeting in Genoa to confer about a new means of plundering the world, the international proletariat has not summoned up sufficient energy and resoluteness to demonstrate jointly against international capitalism. That is the first result that must be established, established with deep mourning. And since this result is brought up, we must simultaneously establish why it is that the Conference is impossible at this particular time. The accepted joint resolution of the three Executives establishes the reason for the failure of the proposal for a World Congress when it says:

"That the representatives of the Second International have reported that they consider it impossible to prepare for a general conference during the month of April, and during the time of the Genoa Conference."

Thus this statement explains in bare words that the Communist International and the Vienna Working Union saw no obstacles in the way of the immediate convocation of the World Congress, but that the opposition of the Second International frustrated the plan.

The reason for this attitude of the Second International is easily understood if it is known that this organization, representing one section of the proletariat, refused absolutely to take up the slogans of the demonstration which was to take place instead of the World Congress and to raise the cry "Down with the Versailles Peace!"

How can this be explained? The three strongest parties of the Second International are: the English Labour Party, the Belgian Workers' Party and the German Social Democrats. Who doubts that the German Social Democrats are against the Versailles Peace? The Versailles Peace is not only a strangling rope for the German proletariat, but also a Damocles sword suspended over the Government belonging to the Social Democrats. The German Social Democrats would very willingly demonstrate against the Versailles Peace, but the Labour Party and the Belgian Workers' Party do not permit it. They do not permit it out of consideration for the Entente Governments and for the German Government. Although the latter is collapsing under the pressure of the Versailles Peace, it does not dare even to broach the question of the Versailles Peace at the Genoa Conference. Thus, considering the vetoes of the reformist parties of

the Entente Countries, the German Social Democracy does not dare of its own accord to protest against the Versailles Peace. Just as the German Government was filled with hopes by the whispered promises of the English Ambassador Lord d'Abernon, so the German Social Democracy's efforts were centered on postponing the conference as far as possible. Only it should not take place now, not during the Genoa Conference. "Perhaps in the Summer", they said. All attempts to make other reasons for the refusal of the present conference as important as this main reason, are merely an exchange of falsehoods. When the question of Versailles was presented, the representatives of the Second International declared peremptorily that they would leave the Conference at the attempt to broach this question; at no other question, only at the question of the Peace of Versailles. And that is clear enough.

The representatives of the Second International naturally had other reasons too, for their attitude. But these were not the ones which caused the postponement. Who would believe that a certain Wels was opposed to the conference because of boiling indignation at the bad treatment of the Social Revolutionaries or Georgians, although he had no fault to find with the occupation of the latter by German troops in the year 1918? But everyone knows that the German Social Democracy refused until now, in economic fights, in tax fights, to sit at the same table with the Communists, and together with them to fight for the alleviation of the burden which is almost crushing the proletariat. The fear that it would be necessary to draw a lesson from the international united front for Germany's problems was the second reason why the German Social Democracy nursed the idea of frustrating the conference. And the representatives of the Labour Party made no secret of the fact that they fear the united front with the Communists, because the Communists in the English Trade Unions, in the coming large economic struggles—strengthened by the international united front—can disturb and break the policy of the trade union bureaucracy.

Consideration for international victorious capital, and consideration for its own policy of coalition with the bourgeoisie, yielding to the capitalist offensive, the fear that this policy can be disturbed by the international united front—these were the reasons for the efforts of the Second International to dissolve the Berlin Conference.

The Second International succeeded—as was already said—in hindering the immediate convocation of the World Conference of the proletariat but—and this we establish as the second result of the Conference—it did not succeed in destroying the begin-

nings of the united front, modest as they may be. It had to consent to the appointment of a Committee of the representatives of the three Executives, whose task it is to prepare for the calling of a World Congress and other conferences. It has to agree to call together as early as April, international demonstrations against the offensive of capital, against the Genoa robber conference, for the recognition of Soviet Russia, and against the strangling reparations policy. That is not much. But even that could only be accomplished by the spontaneously formed block of the Communists and the Vienna International, who jointly defended the idea of the united front. With a coarseness which is peculiar to it, the Berlin "Vorwärts" in its morning issue of April 6th reports that at the conference the Second International had taken up the joint declaration "in a certain measure, out of politeness to the Vienna Working Union". The Second International will undoubtedly do everything in the future, as it did at the Conference, to sabotage every concrete attempt to transform, in action the impulse given by the International Conference. But the conference of the three Executives has already shown that when the Communist International and the Vienna Working Union honorably and resolutely defend the thought of the united front, the attempts of the Second International to sabotage will run aground for a long time to come. They will run aground not because the Communist International and the Vienna Working Union can overrule by majority vote any decision of the Second International, but because by their very attitude they manifest the ardent will of the proletariat for the united front.

The Communist International openly abandoned every attempt to cause the Berlin Conference to frame nice sounding and far-reaching conclusions. It knows very well that the big promises to the Second International are not worth the paper they are written on. It is not a question of the promises that the Second International could make, but of the pressure upon it of the working masses, which will express itself most emphatically in the urgent questions of the proletarian necessities of life. The Communist International intentionally did not begin an offensive at this conference against the unheard of deeds of the Second International during and after the war. Only when the Second International tried to take the offensive against the Communist International, did the Communist International delegation make a counter attack which sufficed at least to hold back the Second International so that it did not to shatter the Berlin Conference. There is no doubt that the holding back of the Delegation of the Communist International will be considered a concession by many of our comrades. The delegation knew that. But it had to say to itself "We are the representatives of

the fighting movement of the proletariat". The successful fight of the proletariat is impossible without its unity for the defence of the interests nearest to the proletariat. The proletariat will not assemble to speak sharply about the past, or to pronounce screamingly the demands of the present. It will assemble in order to express most decisively its will for a united front. It will judge the parties not by what they say but by what they do. And therefore our holding back and moderation were the sharpest form of attack on the Second International. Our moderation showed that we were forming the united front not as a parade for one day, but as a tenacious fight for the setting up and the preservation of the united front. The quieter and more prudently we show this to the working masses in the future, the more will all the attacks of the Second International against the united front of the proletariat recoil to its disadvantage; this is the slogan of the Communist International in the given historical situation. We have declared ourselves ready to participate in the united front, even with those who for eight years abandoned the interests of the proletariat. Since we maintain this idea quietly, firmly and without a waver, we shall be capable of setting up the proletarian united front, even against the Second International, if it tries to disturb this united front. That is the result of the Berlin Conference.

When we conceived this idea of the united front, it was very clear to us that the idea could not be victorious in one hour, one day or even one month.

When we conceived the idea of the International Congress, the road to the international united front was shown us. This road proves to be impossible at the present time, but the idea of the united front has shown itself so strong, that the Second International, which in the year 1921 gave it a serious setback, when it was first expressed in Germany through the "Open Letter" of the Communist Party of Germany, can now only sabotage it in an underhand way. The idea of the united front is beginning to go into effect, and it will go through. This assurance strengthened the conference for all the Communist participants, in spite of the slight practical results of the first attempt. And we should not in the least undervalue the fact that since the idea of the united front was substantiated at the conference, it convinced the representatives of all shades of opinion in the Communist International of the justness of the idea of the united front much more than theoretic discussion could have done. It can be stated that the delegation of the Communist International gave its unanimous endorsement to the joint resolution, which is undersigned by its representatives.

Speech of Comrade Radek at the April 2nd Session of the Berlin Conference.

In our declaration we did not put any conditions for the convocation of the International Conference. We accepted the invitation of the International 2½ which stated that it was to be an conference for action; we stood upon the position which it appears the Vienna International desires to leave. We forego an accounting for the past, not because we want to remain silent upon what must be said but for the simple reason that we realize the need of the hour, the general situation of the world proletariat and say that it is senseless to begin at this moment with recriminations; it is now necessary to think of what we want to do.

The representative of the Second International, Vandervelde, considered it necessary to draw up a balance. He did it with the same voice, with the same gestures which we saw in Basle ("Quite right"—the Communist delegation) when he as leader of the International swore to lead us into the fight against war, and we were carried back by the pathos of Vandervelde's voice for a moment to the time when we believed in the warmth of his voice and we forgot for a moment that this voice was drowned by the roar of cannon. If Vandervelde desires it, we will draw up an accounting of these last 8 years—an accounting which will perhaps break up this conference but will not sound very pleasant to this former royal minister of Belgium. He has forgotten the sea of blood, he has forgotten the mountain of corpses, he has forgotten all the misery of the world. This accounting does not exist for him. After this he comes to us and says, "A little faith, a minimum of faith, a grain of faith—and if you do not give me this confidence on credit, we have nothing to discuss in common." And we tell Citizen Vandervelde face to face, Noth a farthing's worth of faith! We have paid for this con-

fidence by the fact that we today face each other as enemies and must seek the path to an understanding. And when you come to us with your sweet phrases of confidence, we answer you with a plump "No!" Confidence for what? For the war? Confidence for what? For the Peace of Versailles which you as a Belgian minister signed? Confidence for what; for whom? You speak in the name of an organization. This organization does not only consist of little Belgium. Confidence for the English occupation against which the Labour Party only fought in words? Confidence for all your crimes against those crimes of which the representative of the 2nd International has not spoken here today? The Social Revolutionary Tchaikin has published documents on the murder of 26 leaders of the Caucasian proletariat by the English political police. The names of the murderers have been published. Has Citizen Tom Shaw asked in the English Parliament, "What of these murderers, of General Maleson, of General Thomson?" And then you say, "Confidence?" The Second International asks that, among whose representatives here today there sit members of the German Social Democracy?

We ask, where is the court of all the three Internationals which sentenced the murderers of Rosa Luxemburg and the murderers of Karl Liebknecht? ("Quite right!"—the Communist delegation). They were sentenced by the Extraordinary Court of the Guards Division in Berlin, and when you dare to speak of the Russian courts, we say to you, hands off before they are not washed of the blood of Rosa Luxemburg and Liebknecht (Stormy applause by the Communist delegation) and of the blood of Leviné, who was not murdered on the street by bandits, but sentenced to death by your courts (turning to the German Social Demo-

crats) as you sat in the government relying on the confidence of the masses which you have abused. But when you say, "If that is so, what do you want of this Conference; what purpose is there in making tactical manoeuvres?" And I will coolly and categorically tell you what we want. You came to this conference because you were compelled to. You were the instrument of world reaction, and now if you want it or no, you must become the instrument of the struggles of the proletariat. We sit down at the same table with you, we desire to fight alongside of you, and this fight will decide whether it is to be a manoeuvre, as you say, of the Communist International or will become a current which will unite the working class. Your action will decide what our action means. If you fight shoulder to shoulder with us, with the proletariat of all countries, — fight not for the dictatorship of the proletariat; we do not believe you are capable of it— but for a bit of bread; fight against the further devastation of the world, then the proletariat will come closer together in this struggle, and then we will judge you not for your dreadful past but on the basis of new facts. As long as these are not at hand, we coolly enter into these negotiations and into mutual action with the profound distrust, with the conviction that you will fail us ten times in this struggle.

But we want to attempt to fight together not out of love for you but on account of the terrible need of the hour moving us and which compels you to negotiate here in this hall with the same Communists whom you have treated as criminals.

And now for the further conditions of Citizen Vandervelde. What you have attempted to do here was a sharp attack on the part of the Second International in an endeavor to frighten us and the Vienna International supported it willy-nilly and with a heavy heart. I speak of the conditions which the gentlemen of the Second International raised and I believe you will not give my answer all the publicity in the world.

Conditions! Citizen Vandervelde said, "You speak of the Treaty of Versailles." He said that he feared the discussions of this question might help Stinnes. The German workers cannot buy a shirt and Citizen Vandervelde regards the fact that international capital will fatten itself on the misery on the German proletariat with a carefree heart. He fears that Stinnes will become richer. As is well-known Stinnes is allied with Soviet Russia and perhaps will finance the Communist International. (Laughter on the part of the Communist delegation.) M. Vandervelde did not clearly say whether he desires to speak about the reconstruction of the world like Poincaré, without touching the Versailles Treaty, or if not, what is the meaning of his remark concerning Stinnes. I am not enough of a diplomat to understand that. (Laughter—"You have shown that!") I have shown that, quite right. Then I ask, does the Second International want the question of the Treaty of Versailles put on the agenda of the Conference or not? It would be very interesting to see the German Social Democracy as a member of the Second International vote against the consideration of the Versailles Treaty by the International Conference; probably in the hope that Lloyd George will revise the Treaty of Versailles.

Now I come to the other conditions which were put to us. With the great love which Vandervelde always displays for the small and oppressed peoples, even when they live on the Congo, he asked us, "How can you appear at this Conference when the ghosts of murdered Georgia and the Ukraine appear and ask, 'Cain, why hast thou murdered us?'" I will clearly tell Citizen Vandervelde why we murdered this Banquo. As for the Ukraine, it is not murdered, it lives, it is very strong, it fights alongside Soviet Russia and only the ghost of the Petlura government, which was kept alive by gold injections of the Polish general staff and now begs for life in Paris and of the Second International, disturbs the slumbers of Vandervelde. He may calm himself. The Ukraine lives, it is healthy, although it is hungry and it will fight together with us for the reconstruction of Russia and for the recuperation of the Russian and the Ukrainian peoples not as a border state but as a part of the Soviet Federation.

As far as Georgia is concerned, I emphatically state to the representative of the Second International and above all to the English delegates—**Hands off Georgia! You did not protest when the Georgian Government slaughtered the workers and peasants of Georgia under the protection of English guns!** (Protests and interruptions.) Our Tcheka agents are not talented writers. The Georgian Secret Service, however, was careless enough to leave behind a book written by M. Djugeli, commander of your National Guard, and in this book Georgian democracy is so represented that we will submit this book to you at the next conference in order that you may learn how the Georgian state was built up with blood and iron. And when you ask why we—and now we say it openly—helped to overthrow the Georgian Government, we will answer you out of the documents which the Georgian

Government was careless enough to print. The information which Gegetchkori, Georgia's Foreign Minister, gave to Aleixieff reads, "We have helped the Whites; we have not only suppressed the Bolsheviki at home but have fed your White officers and sent them to you." If the Conference desires to appoint a small commission for the investigation of the authenticity of this document, we will gladly lay it before you.

He concluded with a most pathetic appeal: "How can you come without the Social Revolutionaries! How can you come without these good internationalists, who are affiliated with neither the Second nor the Vienna International, but stand under the protectorate of the Second and ask for admittance into the Two-and-a-Half?" We have the honor of having with us in this assembly the former president of the Russian Constituent Assembly, Tchernoff, as a journalist, and I believe that if you desire to discuss the Social Revolutionaries with us, there are enough of their representatives within reach. It is not necessary that just those must appear at this Conference who attempt to murder the leaders of the Russian Revolution with a revolver in their hand.

Permit me to leave the field of polemics and put the question as it really is: We proposed a Conference in agreement with Vienna International for the preparation for action. We said to ourselves that a debate over disputed questions, over methods, will certainly not assist the action. If the differences can in any way be ironed out, that can only be done in the common struggle which will build the bridge between the various sections of the proletariat. If you desire to sabotage this Conference of action and have an international Conference of discussion, we say to you, you give the proletariat stones instead of bread. But we are not accustomed to evade a discussion. Then we will clear the table at this conference. We will then lay the history of the last eight years before you and demand your opinions thereon. We will remind the German Social Democrats who cry "Hands off the Social Revolutionaries!", of the fact that the militants of the Soviet Republic have been suffering in the Bavarian prisons for three years, that workers are in German prisons for the March action. We will ask then, what of the assassins of Dato, whom the German Government, in which your representatives sit, delivered over to the Spanish hangmen for half a million pesetas to be distributed among the Berlin police at whose head there is a Social Democrat? And we will see what your answer will be. (Wels—Germany: "Ask Eberlein!") Noske did not murder 15,000 workers; Eberlein did—the whole world knows that. We will draw up accounting for each country. For if we were sinners, you are the representatives of a dozen parties, worshipful gentlemen, whose sins exceed anything imaginable. We then say in conclusion, we propose a conference of action, a conference to decide ways and means. What must be done at the present moment when capital is uniting not to reconstruct the world but to pillage the whole world so that the capitalists can again establish their rule? What are we going to do against unemployment; what are we going to do against the lock-out wave? That is our programme. If you desire discussion, we are ready to discuss with you. However, in order to satisfy the refinement of Vandervelde, who keeps Flemish autonomists in jail and to calm the delicate Wels as to the fate of the accused Social Revolutionaries, we say, "Show that you are better than we. Propose to us the exchange of your holy Russian terrorists against the militants of the Bavarian Soviet Republic and the participants in the March action ("Bargaining!"). Whoever speaks of bargaining is a man without brain. I will so answer you that you will forget that word. (Uproar.) We therefore say to you, if you want to break up the conference, you have the liberty to do so; you will bear the responsibility. If you want a congress to consider action, we are ready for it. If you want a congress in which at the same time there should take place a discussion of the methods of proletarian struggle, we are also ready for that. We are ready for a conference in any form. There is one thing, however, we will not permit—that people should put conditions to us; people to whom we put no conditions although nine-tenths of the proletariat have the greatest distrust to them.

I say, if you put conditions to us, conditions which must be fulfilled before we can attend this conference, we answer, we will reject these conditions. When we approach nearer one another in the common struggle certain consequences will follow which need not be promised beforehand; for they will follow from the common struggle and therefore we advocate the common struggle.

I repeat: We have accepted the initiative of the International 2½ and we ask you, do you maintain the proposal which was made to us in the January appeal or do you retract it and set up new conditions? If you do so, we are confronted with a new situation and we will consider this new situation. We came here on the basis of your appeal. (Stormy applause by the Communist Delegation.)

Verbatim Report of Serrati's Speech at the April 5th Session of the Conference.

** Comrades! The Italian Party finds itself in a singular position at this Conference. The Italians have come here as guests. They have been invited ostensibly because the contemplated Conference could under certain conditions be held in Italy, That appears rather strange. Pardon me therefore if I have to speak somewhat plainly about conditions. What is the reason of the invitation to the present Conference? Why have we had the meeting in Frankfurt? Why do Vienna, London and Moscow, appear at this Conference? Is it perchance merely because Comrade Adler had a personal desire to call this Conference? Or, what is more likely, what conditions have compelled the calling of this Conference?

What is to be the character of the Conference. Is the point in question of a moral or political character? Have we come here merely to make mutual recriminations, in order to judge each other, or have we come here in order to do practical work? My dear Comrades! We have not come here to judge each other. We have each and all made mistakes and it is even possible, that those (addressing Comrade Vandervelde) who are here today in the capacity of judges have more faults to record than those who stand as the accused (Hear, hear!) Errors have been committed by the accused (the speaker turns to the representatives of the Communist International) but here we may say: the errors which have been committed *were errors for the Revolution*. Faults have been committed by those who today wish to judge; but these faults were committed in the service of the bourgeoisie. Today the bourgeoisie wishes to restore again what it has ruined; it desires to reduce to nothing the gains which the working class have acquired as the result of years of fighting. The bourgeoisie is taking up the offensive. The proletariat finds itself today on the defensive. The situation is the same in all countries, in the imperialist countries as well as in the democratic countries. Particularly is the situation the same in the democratic countries.

Vandervelde has undoubtedly a good position. In Belgium there is only a weak Communist movement, and it happens that even the Communistic Belgian workers have voted for Vandervelde. The unity of the workers' movement in Belgium is an accomplished fact; it is not threatened. An equally favorable situation prevails in England. In other countries, however, things are different. There the question of unity has become one of the most vital importance to the proletariat. In France we have the split. What would be the consequence were it to spread further? The consequence would certainly be that the Belgian proletariat would also have to split and a further consequence would be that the German worker must starve, in order that bourgeois rule in Europe should be restored and upheld.

We must not therefore give up the idea of unity, but we must endeavor to carry out this idea more and more. With regard to Belgium this much can be said: that there the Civil Guard is winning a continually increasing influence and that it is becoming a danger to the fighting workers of Belgium. In all other countries the reaction is becoming more acute and its conduct today is just as violent as the conduct of the bourgeoisie during the war. Therefore for all of us without distinction a united front is indispensable.

What answer is made thereto? One is answered in the first place that this is a moral question. The speech which Macdonald delivered this morning was of extraordinary interest. But we have to formulate the problem differently, we have to ask ourselves, are we a meeting of moralists or a meeting of politicians? One can certainly say that the moral and the political are dependent upon each other. But this interdependence in some respects involves a little of demagoguery. How has it been in peace? Has the war perchance been conducted with moral means? The right of peoples to self-determination has been spoken of by the bourgeoisie, although one knew that this was a lie. In great struggles there will always be given situations in which one is not able to manage without such things and in which one must use the means which circumstances dictate. This applies also to the Terror. We admire the French Revolution although in the French Revolution the guillotine was brought into use. We should therefore consider the question not from the moral standpoint but from the standpoint of **historical necessity**. The Russian comrades are in this position; and if we ourselves had been in the same position as the Communists since 1917, we might perhaps have done the same thing and adopted the same means and methods as the Communists in Russia. One cannot bring legal actions against history as history. That is a futile undertaking.

Now to the question. What conditions are placed before the Third International by the London Executive? First the preliminary question. Under what assumptions were these conditions submitted? Indeed if Russia were strong then one could immediately understand that conditions would be submitted to the Russian Communists, to the Communist International; then it would be understandable that one would form certain suppositions before the invitation to the General Conference would be accepted. But today the Third International and with it Russia is met with certain conditions at a time when Soviet Russia is in a fearful position, when the international bourgeoisie after it had attempted to subdue Soviet Russia by arms now endeavors to do so by means of **peaceful penetration**, by a method which in its nature and effects is much more abominable than the means which the international bourgeoisie has previously used without avail against Russia. The question must now be raised: **Is it not our duty to defend the Russian Revolution; (Cheers)** under certain circumstances to defend it against the Bolsheviks themselves. This situation must be taken into consideration. The international proletariat must also be quite clear as to the present situation in which these conditions were put forward by the Second International.

Now to the conditions themselves. One condition reads that civil liberties be restored within the country, that the Social Revolutionaries be granted unlimited right to free propaganda, and that ordinary legal proceedings be taken against the arrested Social Revolutionaries. Could the Bolsheviks accept that? Yes, or no? The Bolsheviks have already before this Conference done something and I can only express the hope that the moment will come in which the Bolsheviks will form a coalition with the Social Revolutionaries, with the Mensheviks, a coalition for the defence of the Russian Revolution. If we have this prospect in front of us then we cannot just simply lay down conditions, but we must understand the facts of the case and act according to our judgment and not put forward stipulations which render the whole situation more difficult.

The Bolsheviks have, I say, already done something before this Conference assembled. The Socialist Parties of Europe have for about a month been bombarded with despatches from the Right Social Revolutionaries in which it was declared that if the International did not immediately intervene it would mean that death sentences hung over the arrested Social Revolutionaries and they would be fully carried out. Today our Conference is assembled and yet none of the arrested have been executed. Why not? Because the Bolsheviks in their own interests cannot permit the passing of death sentences and their carrying out. It is our duty to show to the Bolsheviks how these interests are continually increasing. For this reason we must not proceed in such a way as the Comrades of the Second International desire.

But further. It is said that there exists in Russia the Tcheka. There is something of the spirit of the Tcheka prevailing at this Conference; there are representatives at this Conference, who here on other ground are inclined to adopt similar methods as the Tcheka. If the Tcheka exists in Russia then it uses the means which are common to every revolution. A Revolution cannot be likened to a young maiden gliding along daintily clad, but it has to reckon on the means and possibilities lying to hand as they serve the purpose of the Revolution. Lenin stated some weeks ago that the methods of the Tcheka are to be altered (Cries: "Only the name!") These measures depend less upon the will of the Communists than upon the given situation. If today the death sentences against the arrested Social Revolutionaries have not been pronounced and carried out, if the methods of the Tcheka are altered it is because the inner condition of Russia today is different from what it was hitherto.

The question now arises: What shall we adopt? Shall we cause the Communists to return to their previous path or shall we not much rather attempt to meet them and bring them to a course which corresponds to the wishes of this Conference.

With regard to Georgia the point in question is the demand for the right of national self-determination. The Zimmerwald Conference first proclaimed the principle of national self-determination. Vandervelde in the face of the Zimmerwald Conference declared "*We will prevent the coming of peace and we will prevent the realization of your principle*". Today protection of the right to self-determination is demanded in view of the situation in Georgia. Why is that demanded? Peradventure because the Socialist Party of Georgia happens to be a section of the Second International? I will not give an answer to this but

only declare that the right to national self-determination can very well be discussed from a Socialist standpoint although its content is in fact not entirely Socialist. With the demand for national self-determination we come to disunity instead of to unity, to the formation of fresh national contrasts instead of setting them aside; we set up new frontiers between the various countries instead of removing them and on this account the demand for national self-determination can well be disputed. We also know that this formula "A people's right to self-determination" is employed by the diplomatists, by the politicians of the Entente in order to bring the small nations into the service of Entente Imperialism.

If the right to self-determination is to have any meaning, then the problem must be applied not only to Georgia, but to Armenia and to Persia. Besides the right of self-determination of nations has not only been discussed after the conclusion of the war and been made the subject of Socialist discussions, but this question was discussed previously, because at that time the small states were all becoming tools in the hands of the Imperialists if they were not already so. With Georgia is involved the problem of a century, a problem which cannot be solved by any kind of Commission that we choose to set up. If we speak of Georgia and the right of national self-determination, then this problem applies not only to the countries of the Near and Far East, but also to Upper Silesia and Schleswig-Holstein. Why not self-determination for the peoples of Upper Silesia? Why not the right to national self-determination for the people of Schleswig-Holstein? Why not the right to national self-determination in Algeria or in the Belgian Congo? If one will but go into this problem it will be seen that it cannot be so easily handled, but that it is a question connected with other untouched problems.

It is true that it is a great problem. In the case of Georgia it concerns a country which is ruled and governed by Socialists and which has been invaded by another country which is likewise ruled and governed by Socialists as they are called. In these circumstances we cannot as has been said solve such a question in the course of 14 days but this question must form a topic for the international work of the proletariat, an item in the program of work which will be laid down by this Conference succeeds in establishing a united front of the proletariat; only if it serves this purpose is it in a position to deal with the Georgian question, as it must be dealt with from the proletarian standpoint (Enthusiastic applause).

I recollect in this connection a decision of the Italian Party which in this respect finds itself in complete accord with the French Socialist Party, which belongs to the Vienna Working Union, in which it was said that no kind of conditions are to be laid down, that none of the three Executives or the three International Organisations shall place any conditions before the other organizations. We cannot deal with the question apart from its international aspect, but the question must be dealt with in the area of international relationships.

With regard to the third condition which the Second International wishes to submit to the Third International. Vandervelde has asked: Do the Communists wish to infect us? I put forward the counter question: Are we to be afraid of this infection? I personally am quite sound and have no anxiety; I am also of the opinion that if the workers, movement is healthy and it is healthy — one need have no fear, no anxiety on account of this infection. Moreover the Belgians have less cause than anyone to be anxious; much less than all others because in Belgium there is no Communist movement. One must also remind the Belgians that they have not protected themselves against the poison of the "Union Sacree", against the poison of social peace at the time when in the interests of the fatherland and its defence the poison of the bourgeoisie was injected into the hearts and the heads of the workers. At that time the Belgian Socialists did nothing to counteract it (Cries: "Cachin is in the same boat!") Yes Cachin is in the same boat, and moreover belongs to the Third International. He finds himself in the same boat as the Belgian Socialists.

This poisoning through social peace is still working today with pernicious results among the parties of the Second International.

On the other hand the Communists have no right to make any reproaches against the Parties of the Second International, for they also have elements among them which have taken the poison of social peace. This state of infection is not yet overcome today.

With regard to the question of cell building with which the Bolsheviki are charged. This is nothing else but the renewing of an old tactic which was already adopted before the war. Always when one desired to propagate certain definite ideas, groups were formed which organized and discussed how this propaganda was to be carried through. The Communists have done things which have at time been blameworthy; but one must put the question: When will group forming be more fruitful, when we have a united proletariat or when the proletariat is split as it is split today? I give the Bolsheviki this praise — that before all they are good politicians, who were able to surmount the most difficult circumstances in Russia. As good politicians the Bolsheviki will recognise that at present there exists quite a different situation from that which obtained two years ago. They must know that the purpose of the international unity of the proletariat can be no other than the salvation of the Russian Revolution. We want to save the Russian Revolution and the Bolsheviki want to save the Russian Revolution. The Bolsheviki and all of us need the unity of the proletariat today more than ever. Therefore we need not fear the danger of group forming which Vandervelde apprehends.

Comrades, I have said what I as an Italian have to say from the point of view of the international situation and from the standpoint of the international proletariat. The opinion which I have expressed is not only my personal opinion but also the opinion of my party. The Italian Party Executive has lately adopted a resolution which is in the spirit of the speech I have just made. This resolution was brought in by myself and Treves, who as is known belongs to the Right Wing. This example should show you that in this difficult international situation we must create the unity of the proletariat if we want to fulfil our Socialist task.

Lastly, I wish to ask the following: What will happen if the General Conference is held and what will happen if it does not take place? If the General Conference is to be held we can agree upon its basis and its aims and then this Conference will be a means of deliverance for the proletariat. If the Conference does not place, then it means in reality a victory for Imperialism, a victory of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat. The bourgeoisie during the war attempted to strangle Socialism, to kill it. But Socialism has remained. Shall what during the war was impossible now happen? Shall Socialism now after the war, be strangled and killed by the bourgeoisie perhaps for decades? According to my conviction, we have every reason to agree for common action, for action which does not shut out existing principles and theoretical differences but which has to fulfil quite definite tasks, that is to say all those tasks which arise from the difficult economic and social position of the proletariat, including all those tasks arising from the existing Peace Treaties, and lastly, the great task of discussing ways and means of meeting the existing menace of war. In this sense I direct my appeal to the Russian Communists as well as to the German Majority Socialists, for both have (it may sound absurd) the same interests. Their opposition to international capital is at bottom the same. In Russia we have the penetration of international capitalism and the attempt to overcome Bolshevism by undermining from within. In Germany we have the attempt of international capitalism to get hold of the means of production and to load the burdens of the war more and more upon the German workers. From this point of view we must come more and more to joint action, and therefore we have to consider how the great action can be brought about. Upon us lies great responsibility if the conference fails. **We must, realizing the extraordinary difficulties of the Proletariat, join hands and do everything in order to bring about the General Conference.** (Lively applause.)

Passages from the Speech of Comrade Radek in Reply to Ramsay Macdonald at the Session of April 5th 1922.

** My answer is divided in two parts; the first deals with the speech of Ramsay Macdonald; the second is the reply to the official declaration of the Second International which does not conform with Ramsay Macdonald's speech. Macdonald's speech tempts a detailed, discussion because one can argue with Macdonald without losing one's temper. The honesty and conviction of Macdonald's statements permit us to discuss them with complete calmness. We do not consider Macdonald's speech as a part of the tragedy but as a part of the tragi-comedy of the proletariat. When Vandervelde spoke we heard the echo of Paris. "The Treaty of Versailles must not be placed on the agenda because Stinnes must not be assisted. . . ." From the declaration of the Second International we see that it sticks to the agenda of the invitation but on the other hand does not want to put the Treaty of Versailles on the order of business. It would be very interesting to find out from the representatives of the German Social Democratic Party if they agree to the omission of the reparations question at a conference which is to deal with the situation of the international proletariat. (Interruption by Wels—Germany, "We have already discussed that time and again!") Have you nothing to say upon the Treaty of Versailles? (Wels, "That is your logic!") Rely upon it, we will later discuss that in all frankness. Ramsay Macdonald dealt with Georgia. All his charges—and he admitted it to me in a private conversation—are a repetition of the slogan of the liberation of small peoples, whom England always liberates as long as she does not possess them. We, however, were the biting wolves who devour small peoples. I would like to make a few statements of fact in this connection. Ramsay Macdonald does not speak as a representative of the Independent Labour Party for the latter sits at the table of the Vienna Working Union. He is not here as the latter's representative. Notice how the Labour Party speaks of the Irish question. "The Irish coast should be neutral in order not to be used as a maritime base against the British Empire". You believe that you must bring before this Socialist Conference what lies deep in the heart of every Englishman. Your Party supports the independence of Ireland. I have established this fact. If that is so, permit me to say that you are for freedom as you understand it, as the English working class unconsciously understands it, as it understands freedom under the influence of four centuries of English Imperialism and as the latter's unconscious accessory. Therefore Ramsay Macdonald has overlooked certain small but rather important facts in his speech which was full of pretty words with which we became acquainted during the entire war as a part of the artillery of English Imperialism. He has overlooked what is at the bottom of this dispute over the small nations. For him there exists an England which is always for the small peoples when they do not belong to England. And there is another state which has devoured small innocent Georgia. They once were called border states and when Czarism still ruled in Russia Ramsay Macdonald never thought of doing something for his wards. Only after the death of Czarism did English Imperialism begin to concern itself with the border states for it desired to control the ports of entry to Russia, Riga and Batum. That is the story of the border states which Ramsay Macdonald makes a Socialist affair. It is sufficient to ask Macdonald why, since he was already before the war a member of the Second International, did he never demand the independence of Georgia when Czarism still ruled? Why, if it is a principle of Socialism to free an oppressed people, did he not call for the independence of Georgia when it was a downtrodden land? Are you acquainted with the history of the Georgian fight for freedom? The present proponents of this question are the members of the deposed Menshevik government of Georgia. They are men, none of whom advocated the independence of Georgia up to 1917; men who were Pan-Russian patriots. Tseretelli fought so hard for Great Russia that he as a Minister advocated the death sentence during the 1917 June offensive. (Hear, hear!) He can himself judge what moral right he has to make an accusation. We have a right to speak from a moral standpoint, but not those who fought in the front against the workers' republic. You wanted to root out the Bolsheviks with fire and sword. If anyone laughs at that statement. I will read your declarations and also cite General Alexieff who describes how you sheltered White officers and took them under your protection. I have the secret documents of the Menshevik government which we took from it when it fled. ("The genuine secret documents?") Yes.

Shall I read to you from the book which was published with an introduction by your Foreign Minister, those passages where Djugeli makes the following statements, "My Social Demo-

cratic Party and Government were ordered by the British General Thomson to haul down the red flag from the government house. I was opposed to it, but my Party has not remained true to the red flag. And I do not agree with the decision of my Party." Georgia was small and weak. Georgia could not remain neutral and your government leaders understood that. Djordania said in a speech. "And if we have to choose between Eastern fanaticism—that was the Russian Revolution—and Western civilisation, we decide for Western civilisation." Now Western civilisation is an extraordinarily good thing, comrade Tseretelli, but not only are such beautiful things as democracy part of Western civilisation, but the British General Thomson considers as a component part of Western civilisation the petroleum wells of Baku. And a not so very unimportant firm, the Royal Dutch Shell, behind which there stands the British Admiralty, looks upon the Baku oil wells with greedy eyes. And this eagerness of the English for oil was very great. You know very well that the question of oil was not only of some importance for the small Georgian people but also for the great Russian people and the Russian working class. To-day one of the comrades of the Second International called out, "Fine naphta-communism!" (interruptions). When Citizen Abramovitch introduces Socialism, he will do so without naphta (Laughter). Citizen Abramovitch will probably use the volcano of his indignation and enthusiasm as fuel (Laughter). This reference to the oil wells shows that the desire of the Georgian people for independence is of very recent date. The defending attorneys overlook that. However, if you think deeper than the present moment, if you think of more than the negotiations, but desire to examine the matter closely, you must then say, there is no formal principle when we consider this state as the result of the first wave of the revolution, when we think of future struggles. Then there is no other way of considering the matter but the following: **Does it maintain a position of the world revolution or not?** That is the question and when good Ramsay Macdonald comes and brings with him in his suitcase all the tracts of the humanitarian English liberals without knowing that they are only a concealed form of imperialism, that does not change the given fact.

Comrades, we will not come to an agreement upon these fundamental conceptions in any conference. The proletariat of the West will on the whole understand our policy. When they, driven by the course of events, themselves make a revolution and will undergo all the hardships of this revolution, they will only then understand us. We will not convince you by propaganda that all that is called self-determination of nations is not self-determination at bottom. We will not bridge over the chasm between us by propaganda. As Adler and Bauer correctly said and as we have been repeating for the past year, **the working class in now on the defensive.** These questions can only be solved by the experiences of the common struggle.

The general conference proposed by the Vienna Working Union is to serve this purpose and therefore this theoretical discussion has only aim: To mark off the limits, to say beyond this point there is no unity and to discuss that upon which we can find a common platform. I repeat: when I said to Vandervelde, no confidence, I did not say that for polemical reasons. I said it because it is good to say at the beginning of an action in what relationship we stand to each other. We cannot give you this confidence, but in spite of that we say, the situation is so bad that your workers will not ask whether we have confidence in each other but demand a common struggle.

Now for the concrete conditions. I declare: **We are calling a conference which is to consider the misery of the working class and ways and means of a defensive struggle against the capitalist offensive.** You have not discussed a single question, not put up a single conditions for this fight against capital. You have, however put conditions to us, but if you believe that you can set us conditions, you are mistaken. However, I say frank, we will attempt to come to an agreement for the minimum possible, without any party putting conditions to another. I will discuss the conditions which you have set up. The first is the rejection of cell tactics. I believed at first that the cells in questions were those of Moabit and Butirki. We would gladly discuss that. Since the representatives of the English Party do not gladly study the documents of other parties cell tactics appear to be some sort of horrible beast. What were and are cell tactics? At the Second Congress of the Communist International we discussed the trade-union question. **We placed ourselves on record as**

against any attempt at splitting the trade-unions. This resulted in a break between a part of our comrades and ourselves. The so-called Left Communists, the K.A.P. (German Communist Workers' Party) withdrew from the Communist International, mainly because they demanded: Splitting the trade-unions, the building of new trade-unions, and we replied to them, **the replacement of the reformist spirit of the trade-unions by a revolutionary one.** If you should demand of us that we renounce this struggle, we would answer with a clear "No!". Your reformist tactics have brought the trade-unions to the point where a member of the English trade-unions writes: "The English trade-unions are exhausted to the last farthing; they are also spiritually exhausted." We will fight against the reformist spirit in the trade-unions as long as we exist. I now ask the members of the Social-Democratic Party: Have you not fractions in the German trade-unions? Do you not put up lists in the elections for trade-union posts? And do not the German Independents do so as well? We fight the splitting of the trade-unions out of love for you, but because we know that it would weaken the strength of the working class. That is the declaration which I consider necessary to make here upon the question of cell tactics.

The second question raised here is the appointment of a commission of delegates of the three Executives for the examination of the situation in Georgia and in countries with similar conditions, in order to arrive at an understanding between the Socialist parties. We agree to this condition which actually is no condition at all. Probably the Second International will also

be ready to discuss the question of the attitude of the Labour Party to the question of India and Ireland.

The third condition is the demand for the liberation of the prisoners who are in jail because of political crimes and for the assurance of their right of defence by the control of International Socialism. Citizen Vandervelde seems to have a great desire to defend these people before the revolutionary tribunal in Moscow. I know, he is only actuated by... noble motives. We can promise him that we will speak up with all our heart for granting of him the right of defending the Social Revolutionaries.

Comrades, I repeat once again; We accept no conditions. This questions is for us not one of polemics and the further intensification of our differences. As for myself it is a question of how we can arrive at general conference over all the obstacles in the way. To-day Bauer proposed that we should not let this conference dissolve without **calling upon the proletariat for a joint demonstration against the Genoa conference**, which is merely a new attempt at exploitation and not at reconstruction. We support this proposal wholeheartedly. Abysses still separate us from one another. The question is, how can we overcome them. The proletariat will not be united at this table where we make declarations and hold up to one another our past. **The struggle of the proletariat will decide the united front.** You can call the Communist International as many names as you like. One thing is certain, **our struggle**—it could have a thousand times underestimated the length of the road—**was fought in the interest of the working class.** And therefore we are for the **united front of the proletariat without conditions.** (Great applause.)

Joint Resolution adopted by the Berlin International Conference.

** The Conference is agreed that as desirable as the amalgamation of the class organizations of the proletariat is, at the present moment there can only be joint conferences for joint action with concrete aims by the various movements represented at the Conference. Therefore the Conference proposes that the Executives give their consent to the **appointment of an Organization Committee of Nine**, whose business it shall be to organize preparations for further conferences of the three Executives, as well as for Conferences on a larger scale, which will include parties not affiliated to any of the three international organizations. Every Executive is at liberty to appoint its representatives according to its own judgement. **In this Organization Committee there will be no majority decisions;** it is to give expression to the common points of view of the three Executives, in so far as they at a given time exist.

The Conference considers it expedient that the Organization Committee should undertake to bring about a **non-binding discussion between representatives of the International Trade Union Federation (Amsterdam) and the Red Trade Union International**, to examine the question of how the reestablishment and maintenance of the **united trade-union front** can be secured on a national and international scale. The Conference takes cognizance of the declaration of the representatives of the Communist International, that in the time against the 47 Social Revolutionaries all those desirous of defending them will be admitted, that, as was already published in the Soviet press before the Conference, in this case death penalties will be out of the question, that the discussions of these cases are public, consequently the representatives of all the three Executives can be present as hearers, and will be permitted to take stenographic notes so that they can make a report to their respective parties.

The Conference recognizes that each of the three Executives declares itself ready to receive the material on the Georgian question which has come to light from various sources, and submit it to close examination. The Conference commissions the Organization Committee to compile the results of this examination and to make a report to a later conference of the three Executives.

The Conference declares that the representatives of the Second International made the assertion that they consider it impossible to make arrangements for a general conference during the month of April, and also during the sessions of the Genoa Conference. The Conference is also in principle unanimous on the necessity of the **quickest possible convocation of a general conference.** The Executives undertake the duty of informing their respective parties of the progress which the idea of the general conference made in Berlin and they will confer upon their members of the Organization Committee power to bring the deliberations of the calling of a general conference to a definite result.

As the organization a general conference in the course of the current month is possible for the above-mentioned reasons, the present conference declares it a necessary duty to give immediate expression to the **united will of the international class-conscious proletariat, in an international mass-action against the offensive of international, imperialistic capitalism.** The Conference therefore calls upon the workers of the world to powerful mass-demonstrations, if possible unitedly, during the Genoa Conference on April 20th, and where this is not possible for technical or organizational reasons, to demonstrate on May 1st:

For the eight hour day!

For the fight against unemployment, which is rising beyond measure due to the reparations policy of the capitalistic powers!

For the united action of the proletariat against the capitalistic offensive!

For the Russian Revolution, for the famine-stricken in Russia, for the establishment of political and economic relations of all states with Soviet Russia!

For the creation of the proletarian united front in every country and in the International!

(This resolution is signed by the representatives of the Three Executives.)

Final Declaration of the Delegation of the Executive of the Communist International.

The delegation of the Executive of the Communist International, after grave misgivings decided to agree to the joint manifesto prepared by the Vienna Working Union. Its misgiving was first of all, caused by the fact that the Second International absolutely refused to support the slogans of workers' demonstrations, and the annulment of the Versailler Treaty, and thus a large international workers' movement has remained in the background, far behind the demands of the clear-sighted Western European Liberals. This does not lead one to believe that the Second International is really willing to fight against the danger of a new Versailles peace in Genoa, and is really ready to use every means of fighting against the capitalist offensive.

In spite of that, the delegates of the Executive of the Communist International decided to agree to the joint resolution, although the attempt to call an international workers' conference during the Genoa Conference was frustrated by the opposition of the Second International.

The delegation of the Executive of the Communist International, in spite of all these grave misgivings, agreed to the resolution in order not to impede the slightest progress in the direction of the united front, but to further it. For this reason it has at this preliminary Conference, abandoned the demand for the investigation of the murder of Rosa Luxemburg, Liebknecht,

Jogiches, Leviné, and other accompanying phenomena of the civil war in Germany. For this reason, it did not bring to light, at this preliminary Conference, the role of the Social Democratic Parties in the persecution of the Communists in Latvia, Poland, Jugoslavia and Hungary, and reserves the right of demanding from the Commission of Nine the appointment of an Investigation Commission for these and similar cases. For this reason, it did not demand from the German Social Democrats at this preliminary Conference the liberation of the proletarian workers of Germany. For this reason also, at this Conference, it did not demand the investigation of the attitude of the Labour Party toward Ireland and the colonies, and it reserves the right of bringing up all these questions in the future, for it is convinced that without a break with the coalition policy of the bourgeoisie, which is at the bottom of all these shocking occurrences, a real united front of the proletariat is impossible.

The delegation of the Executive of the Communist International has decided to agree to the joint declaration and the weak beginnings of an united front, which have been given expression in it, with the firm conviction that **the course of events will compel the proletarian masses to fight, and will teach them to force their reformistic leaders to change their policy, if they do not want to be pushed aside by the proletariat.**