

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BUREAU OF THE R.I.L.U., HELD ON AUGUST 17, 1931

*Discussion on Comrade Lozovsky's Report.**

THE CHAIRMAN, COMRADE GERMANETTO, declares the meeting of the Executive Bureau open. Comrade Abolin, the Secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, has the floor.

ABOLIN: Comrades,—The preceding speaker, Comrade Lozovsky, dealt yesterday in his long speech with the basic questions of the French T.U. movement, in connection with the activities of the minoritarians. I wholly agree with his estimation of the situation, with his conclusions, and support the questions he put to the reporters. I will add very little.

I will touch upon three points only.

Firstly, a few words as regards the general estimation of the reports made by the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. I think that it will be interesting for the French comrades to learn the opinion of a worker of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, even if he repeats to a certain extent what was already mentioned by other comrades. Secondly, I think it necessary to emphasise some lessons of the Russian revolution and Russian T.U. movement, which are essentially important for the French T.U. movement. And, thirdly, I shall deal in more detail with the conditions of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. As to this latter question, the enemies of the U.S.S.R. spread a good many lies and slanders, and sometimes, as can be seen by the example of Comrade *Perignon*, mislead even the separate representatives of the workers. You remember how Comrade *Perignon*, after having by the way acquainted himself with two factories which he visited in Moscow, made a rash conclusion that the conditions of the French working class are better than those of the Soviet proletariat.

The reports "on the situation and work" of three French federations, led by the minoritarians, i.e., dockers, food workers and state railway workers, were on the agenda of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. The comrades minoritarians have not at once consented to make such reports to the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U.

* Comrade Lozovsky's report was published in the last issue.

During our first talk it took several hours of discussion before the leaders of the minoritarians consented to our proposal to make these reports. In one of the articles which I read in the oppositional press of the minoritarians I found an absurd statement saying that the invitation of the leaders of the minoritarians to Moscow by the R.I.L.U. should be considered as a wish of the R.I.L.U. to change its policy. And so they have come here with this wrong standpoint; not to make reports, but to judge.

There a statement was made saying that they were not going to make any reports on the situation and work of their federations. They, then, have come to discuss with us only the general questions of the French T.U. movement and to bring a charge against the R.I.L.U. and the U.G.C.L.

We told the comrades that the whole work of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., and of all sections of which the R.I.L.U. is composed, is conducted on the basis of the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. These decisions were collectively worked out by the delegates from all countries on the basis of the consideration of the experience of the world revolutionary T.U. movement, were unanimously adopted at the World Congress of the R.I.L.U., and are, therefore, obligatory for the Executive Bureau as well as for all the sections of which the R.I.L.U. is composed. Therefore, we intend to carry on a discussion not of the correctness of the decisions adopted by the Congress, but on the way these decisions are being carried out by them. We told them that proletarian democracy consists just in the collective working out of decisions in order to unanimously and fraternally carry out those decisions afterwards. No fighting proletarian organisation can exist without unity of will and unity of action. We told the comrades that the best and most desirable thing to do is to solve controversial questions of the movement on the basis of discussing the concrete activities of the federation. This method of discussion, namely, the consideration of the concrete questions of activities, paying attention to the peculiarities of the environment, may lead us to the adoption of

some decisions of a political character, while a general abstract discussion of the problems "in general" would hardly enable the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. to make any concrete conclusions from the conditions existing in France.

And, finally, we told the comrades that we were interested not only in their articles, statements and declarations of bald "principles," but in concrete deeds. We warned them that we should judge not by words but by deeds.

The comrades who arrived here have, after long arguments and objections, recognised the correctness of our considerations and consented to make reports to the R.I.L.U. on the situation and work of the three federations which they are leading.

How have our reporters fulfilled these pledges of theirs? I think unsatisfactorily. They passed over in silence the question of their carrying out of the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. They never referred in their reports to the decisions of the Congresses of the R.I.L.U. I am not sure that they acquainted the broad membership masses of their unions with the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. Having heard their reports, having analysed their speeches and statements here at the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., I am convinced that they not only did not strive for the carrying out of these decisions, but, on the contrary, that they in every way hampered their realisation.

Comrade Boville, who is unfortunately absent to-day, made the following characteristic statement at the meeting of the Executive Bureau. "You are studying prospects, you are planning methods here. They are effective here in your country. They may be also effective in other countries. But for us, as a rule, these prospects and methods are ineffective."

What is the meaning of such a statement made by Boville? Boville is reviling beforehand the decisions of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., if they are not such as Boville wants to have them. He knows that they will not be such as he would like. Boville knows that the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., which is on guard of proletarian democracy, will never pass decisions that will not suit the will of the majority of organisations affiliated to the R.I.L.U.

Comrades, I would like to remind you of the report of the All-Union C.C. of T.U., which I made a few months ago to the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. In our report to the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. we rendered an account as regards each point of the decisions of the Fifth Congress. We, the representatives of the Soviet trade unions, heard the criticism of the represen-

tatives of other sections of the R.I.L.U., which was very valuable for us, and accepted all the directives of the R.I.L.U. We perfectly well understand that the power of the world revolutionary movement consists just in our having the unanimous will to carry out the decisions we had collectively worked out.

We may argue at our congresses, but we are all of us obliged to carry out the decisions adopted, be it Soviet trade unions, or the C.G.T.U. or separate federations, whatever their political views are. Therefore, *we want a quite clear answer to the question of the attitude of the minoritarian comrades towards the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. and of the way they are carrying out those decisions.*

The Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. is not an arena for juridical manoeuvres and various machinations of intriguers. Not a single honest proletarian, not a single genuine proletarian organisation will ever give mandates to their representatives, authorising them to manoeuvre at the meetings of the supreme organ of the revolutionary T.U. movement, at the meetings of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. And in what a hostile and caricature way do the minoritarians treat the most important question of the revolutionary movement—that of the unity of will of the organisations—opposing in the wrong way the unity of will and action to the independence of an organisation. Comrade Boville said in the same speech, a part of which I quoted here: "I refer to Monmouseau, Racemond, and to many others. I knew them as very important persons, as persons to whom the proletariat would listen. But to-day they are irrecognisable. Being used to obedience and fearing to wander from the line they have become automatons," and so on and so forth. I will not repeat here the various epithets Comrade Boville applied to our comrades leading the C.G.T.U.

The accusation of automatism and absence of initiative of all those who have firm political views, who seriously pledge themselves to proletarian class discipline, who understand the whole seriousness of class struggle, used to be the favourite method of all opportunists, of all those who waver, who are afraid of responsibility, who want "freedom," not in order to actively participate in the class struggle, but to desert the front of struggle. Boville's accusation of the French leading comrades just recalls, in this case, those accusations which the enemies of the working class have poured and are pouring on the Bolsheviks. Such accusations reflect the hatred which the spineless people feel towards irreconcilability, and which the petty-bourgeois elements feel towards the

representatives of the most consistent of all the classes—the proletariat.

All of you know that the Soviet movement is an instance of the movement of the numberless masses of proletarians who are carrying on one common political line with the Communist Party and are executing in closed ranks the colossal task of socialist construction under the conditions of the intensification of class struggle within the country and with the hostile capitalist environment outside. We, the Soviet trade unions, say, openly before the whole world, that we are proud that the huge proletariat of our country has a unified firm will to execute the decisions it has collectively worked out. Who of you will venture to say that the members of the Soviet trade unions are automatons? You saw some of our factories and works. I don't know what your opinion was after having visited our works, but I hardly think that you would venture to declare that there you saw automatons. All who come here, be it representatives of the capitalist world in the person of Lord Astor, etc., be it our friends—workers, even belonging to various political tendencies—social democrats, social-nationalist, non-party men, or Communists—all mention the tremendous creative mass activity of the proletarian masses of the Soviet Union. The unity of line has not only not hindered but, on the contrary, it has secured our widest carrying out of proletarian democracy, attraction of new millions for the active participation in the political, economic and cultural life of the country.

I shall give, comrades, by way of information, a few figures of the activity of the trade unions of the U.S.S.R. We have an elected active group who work at the factory and shop committees and amount to 1,335,000 persons. This active section is the organiser of the economic, social, cultural and all other kinds of various work conducted by the Soviet trade unions. Apart from the elected T.U. active section, 2,270,000 persons, who comprise the volunteer "active," take active part in the enormous work of the Soviet trade unions. Thus the membership of the T.U. "active" alone in the U.S.S.R. amounts to 3,600,000 persons. So you see, comrades, what a number of people are able to apply their activity, creative genius on condition of the carrying on of the general line of the Party and of the Soviet T.U. movement. You will have the opportunity to check my statement at any factory of ours, at any works.

Compare these figures with the characterisation Comrade Boville gave to the "active" of his Federation. Comrade Boville said that his Union is a small one, but that it has many militants. "This," he said, "is the power of our Union, but it is also its weakness, as many dissatisfied ambi-

tions remain." A rather nice "mass activity," if one has to complain of "dissatisfied ambitions" of the "active," taking into consideration that less than 1 per cent. of food workers are organised in the French Unions of Food Workers! There are about $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. organised in the Food Workers' Union! 99 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more should be organised. These masses should be prepared for class struggles. But there can be no actual defence of the vital interests of the masses, no activity of the masses—under the policy of the minoritarians, though Boville maintains the monopoly of the minoritarians on the representation of the activity and vital interests of the masses, pushing aside the communists, active leaders of the C.G.T.U. This is what activity means, according to Boville's opinion, and is what activity means—in the conditions of the carrying out of the unified line of the Soviet T.U. movement.

So you can judge, then, which creates better conditions for the activity of the masses: a unified line, collectively worked out and unanimously carried on, or the disorganising policy of the minoritarians, disputing the will of the majority.

It jarred on my ear when the minoritarians present here talked of the activities of the French T.U. movement, chiefly in connection with their own demonstrations, speeches, and actions. The collective whole, the organisation—disappeared in their speeches, and I involuntarily thought: what, then, is the Food Workers' Union? Is it Boville? Is the Railwaymen's Union Rambaud and some other comrades working directly with him, or is it a live, creative organisation?

Speaking of activity, of the attraction of the masses for leadership, I must most sharply emphasise the absolutely wrong estimation of the rôle of the youth in the T.U. movement, made by Boville. "As to the youth," he said, "I have already told you that the youth can work miracles on the political field, but are not adapted to the trade union ground." With such an attitude towards the young cadres it is impossible to train new strata of militants, who are needed for the solution of enormous tasks which are confronted by the French Labour movement. There is a different attitude towards the youth in the Soviet trade unions. Take any of our elected organs, be it the Presidium of the All-Union C.C. of T.U., the Central Committee of one of our 44 Unions, or a rank and file elected T.U. organ—we secure everywhere the active participation of the youth. We cannot repeat Boville's statement with regard to our Soviet youth, we cannot say that our youth do not suit for work in the trade unions. On the contrary, our congresses, our conferences, have repeatedly noted the great activity of the youth

and its fruitful rôle in the work of the trade unions. We have the right to pride ourselves upon our youth. In our Soviet trade union movement the representatives of youth very often successfully carry out leading work. Is it correct to say that the French T.U. youth are absolutely unsuitable for T.U. work? Do other comrades support such an opinion? I think that this opinion is slanderous as regards the French youth.

Out of the three co-reporters here, one was the representative of the youth. I do not know the opinions of other members of the Executive Bureau, but I consider the speech of this young comrade at any rate not worse than Boville's speech. I think that this comrade showed his good knowledge of the Federation and of its tasks (one may agree or disagree with him, this is a question of policy, a question of a definite point of view), and as regards his political and theoretical level and ability to put and to deal with questions, his report was better than that of Boville. Isn't it so, comrades?

I must note one more particularity: no mention was made in your reports, comrades minoritarians, of the working women, of the rôle of the working women in the movement, but there are about 40 per cent. of women amongst the French proletarians. We have got a smaller number of women workers, comrades; there are only 29 per cent. of women amongst the workers in the U.S.S.R. and, none the less, there are 12 per cent. of women amongst the responsible workers of the All-Union C.C. of T.U. The chairmen of six Committees of trade unions, each of which unites several hundred thousand workers, are women workers. We have 18 per cent. of women on the Committees of all the trade unions, 20 per cent. of the women are on the shop committees, and the rôle of women in the Soviet T.U. movement is very great. The Soviet working women are the powerful reserve of T.U. cadres. We are drawing these new fresh strata of working women into general work. And we have not to complain of "dissatisfied ambitions."

Comrades, only on condition of an attentive attitude towards new forces, promotion of genuine revolutionaries from the rank and file masses, listening to their opinions, working shoulder to shoulder with them, supporting them in their work and promoting them to more and more responsible posts—only on these conditions is it possible to create a powerful trade union "active" which will be able to cope with the most complicated, most difficult and most responsible tasks confronting the working class.

What is the class content of the reports of the minoritarian leaders? Who will applaud Boville, Dambaud, etc.?

You attacked the line of the R.I.L.U. and C.G.T.U., you tried at all costs to discredit the French Communist Party before the world T.U. movement. You denied the fighting capacity of the French proletariat. You—with the exception of Comrade Engler, who referred here to some instances of the fighting capacity of the proletariat—have declared here of your distrust in the forces of the French proletariat, you denied the successes it achieved, you denied the consolidation of its revolutionary spirit. You stood up for the sham peacefulness of French imperialism, trying to lull the watchfulness of the world labour movement. You tried to rehabilitate the leaders of reformism, saying that the latter have led very good strikes, whereas the trade unions, led by the Communists, have not had such good strikes. Your blows were directed against the Communists, against the majority of the C.G.T.U.

I ask you, comrades, who declares against Comintern and the R.I.L.U. and carries on the policy of discrediting this world revolutionary proletarian organisation? In whose interests are these speeches, this attack?

I ask in whose interests is it to lull the class consciousness, to crush the belief in the forces of the proletariat, to belittle the success of the proletarian struggle and of socialist construction?

The task of the revolutionary T.U. movement is to help the proletariat to sense its own forces, to teach the workers how to link up each step of the struggle for the concrete every-day demands with the basic, fundamental tasks of the proletariat.

Do you think, comrades, that with us, in Russia, there were few failures, few smashed strikes—prior to the victory of the October Revolution? The revolution of 1905 was drowned in blood. We recall mass shootings of the workers' strikes and demonstrations. I think there is no necessity to explain how Tzarism fought against the working class. But had we, the workers of the Russian trade unions, we, bolsheviks, ever declared at the meetings that the proletariat—as Boville stated here—was dormant, that it could not succeed in the revolutionary struggle? We have never had such a disgrace. We were constantly preparing the proletarians for the future revolutionary battles; we showed them their power proceeding from the analysis of each strike. And even in the defeats we could recognise the power and might of the working class. After the revolution of 1905 we did not join with the Mensheviks who were saying, "We should not have taken up arms." On the contrary, we derived lessons from this revelation for the future victories of the proletariat. Do you think, comrades minoritarians, that we, with our unshaken faith in the

forces of the working class, were wrong? The October Revolution gave an answer to this question.

And are the Russian workers better than the French ones; is their origin or blood better? Certainly not. The fact is that the Russian workers had leaders who, contrary to the minoritarians in France, had faith in the forces of the proletariat and taught the proletariat to carry on revolutionary class struggle. I ask, in whose interests, in the interests of which class, are those speeches aiming at the distrust in the forces of the French proletariat, under-estimating the successes of the French proletariat? In the interests of French imperialism, in the interests of the whole international bourgeoisie. This is an indisputable fact.

How do the French bourgeoisie estimate the forces and revolutionary power of the French proletariat? Why, France had in 1930 25,000 gendarmes, and in 1925 there are 43,000.

(Lozovsky: It is in order to strengthen democracy.—Laugther.)

(A voice from the Hall: In order to strengthen T.U. democracy, in particular.)

Is it because the proletariat is dormant, feeble and impotent, as the minoritarian leaders would have it?

A few words on war. Comrade Lozovsky spoke very eloquently and convincingly enough yesterday. Comrades minoritarians, you state that there will be no war, as the bourgeoisie of France and of other countries are so afraid of the Soviet Union that they will not venture to declare a war on it. Why do you know this? What are those competent sources from which you derived your information of the plans of the French General Staff and of the General Staffs of other capitalist countries?

Is it a fact or not that the term of military service in France has been increased at present to 28 years of age as against 25? I am speaking of the general terms of service. Is it true or not? The general term of military service in France used to be to 25 years and at present it is to 28. And we must take into consideration the mechanisation of the army, the enormous development of military training in this army, its being armed with the newest achievements of war technique, etc. And Boville tells us here La Fontaine's fables!

Is it a fact or not that the French Government and the French vassals are supporting the Russian White-Guardists, Generals Miller, Lukomsky, etc., and openly encourage the work of these elements directed against the Soviet Union? Is it a fact or not that the French Courts, basing on forged documents, support the claims of all kinds

of suspicious criminal elements—to the economic organs of the U.S.S.R.—preparing for an economic blockade of the Soviets? It is just in France at present that such vile insinuations against the U.S.S.R., as the article of the Russian ex-millionaire, Ryabushinsky, who once tried to smash the Russian revolution by means of famine, could appear. You remember what Ryabushinsky had written in the "Revival," issued in Paris: "There is not an undertaking in the whole world," Ryabushinsky wrote, "which would not be more justified economically and more profitably than the liberation of Russia. Having spent one milliard roubles, mankind will get the profit of not less than five milliards, i.e. 500 per cent. of interest, with the prospect of the further increase of profit by 100-200 per cent. yearly."

Have not you, comrades minoritarians, been interested in the trial of the "Industrial Party" and mensheviks which proved to the whole world the war manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie against the U.S.S.R.? Don't you know that "Torgprom" jointly with the General Staff of France had even fixed the concrete date of the beginning of intervention against the U.S.S.R., which was intended at first in 1930, and then—in 1931? What would have happened if we and the proletariat of the world had followed you in ignoring the war danger? A war would have broken out, that is what would have happened, comrades minoritarians.

We can observe everywhere the colossal growth of war preparations. A series of necessary diplomatic and other measures of the capitalist powers, aiming at the organisation of a bloc of States against the U.S.S.R.—can be observed. We see the steadiest pressure on Germany, the object of which is to draw Germany into the sphere of active anti-Soviet influence. And, under these conditions, what else can we call your attitude towards the question of the danger of war against the U.S.S.R., if not the attitude of reformism directed, objectively or subjectively—this does not matter in the given case—to the support of the General Staffs in their preparations for an intervention against the Soviet Union? You not only do not draw the attention of the working class to the question of war preparations, you not only do not strengthen the watchfulness of the proletariat and its struggle against the war combinations of the imperialists. On the contrary you would have the proletariat helpless and passive in case of war, and ignorant of the ways of struggle against war in case it breaks out, despite the wishes and interests of the working class. In your statements as regards a war against the U.S.S.R. you are literally repeating those of the reformists as regards

the alleged "red imperialism" of the U.S.S.R.

Further, you said here that the reformists had conducted splendid strikes while the communists and federations led by the latter have not led such strikes. But, comrades, this is mere echoing the tunes sung by the bourgeoisie: a few instances showing why the bourgeoisie praise the reformists. The "Revue Politique" and the "Parlementaire" write that the "initiative of doctrinal proposals was taken up by the workers' organisations which does credit to syndicalism." "Bulletin Quotidienne," organ of the Metallurgy Committee, writes that the T.U. organisation of C.G.T. has under the present conditions shown sagacity and reasonableness, thus making a happy contrast with the old intolerance." The bourgeoisie praise the reformists, and so do you.

Comrades, you should understand that there is no reason for the bourgeoisie to have agents who exercise no influence of the workers. The bourgeoisie is interested in allowing the reformists to win some strikes. In France the bourgeoisie have still got necessary reserves for it.

And now I ask you, comrades, what is the class meaning of your reports? Who will applaud you if these reports are published in France? I think that the bourgeoisie and not the revolutionary elements of the French, working class will applaud you. This is definite.

Such is the exact meaning, in the terms of class struggle, of your long reports. Your attacks on the R.I.L.U., direct as well as indirect, isolated facts which are seldom true, and chiefly wrong and distorted but carefully selected against the majority of C.G.T.U.—all this is the basic content of your reports to the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., entitled "On the situation and work of the federations."

And what did not you mention? You did not mention the prospects of the revolutionary struggle in your federations, the growing of the crisis. You made no mention whatever of the struggle of the immediate demands of the French proletariat, as they are formulated by the C.G.T.U. I shall not enumerate those demands here. You must know them yourselves. In a word, you avoided to mention all the fundamental questions of trade union work.

You were talking very much, you were talking in a general way, not concretely—of the originality and of the specific conditions existing in France, in the French T.U. movement. According to your opinion — the R.I.L.U. denies the singularity and complexity of the situation of T.U. movement in France. But such a view is nothing else than insolent mockery of the work and decisions of the R.I.L.U. You must be acquainted with that decision which was adopted

by the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. on the report of the C.G.T.U. at least. There these particularities were pointed out, — that France was later than other countries affected by the crisis, that there are present reserves of the bourgeoisie and the possibility to shift the burden of the crisis to the toilers of the defeated countries by means of utilising the Versailles Treaty of 1919 and utilising the profits of the robbery of colonies, and that the French bourgeoisie are able to bribe certain strata of labour aristocracy, and that there are harder conditions of struggle against reformism and difficulty in exposing reformism, taking into consideration the experienced and aggressive bourgeoisie.

I will not give an account of this resolution here, I only ask that you concretely add to this characterisation, what are your concrete corrections or additions. You have not set forth a single remark. You only alluded to the singularity which the R.I.L.U. did not take into consideration. You must agree that under such conditions it is difficult to fruitfully carry on a discussion. If you had been able to make concrete corrections, — we could have discussed them? The tasks formulated in this resolution of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., the characterisation of the situation in France,—do you dispute this? You have not mentioned anything concrete. What then, are you disputing, what point, which statement? In this resolution the necessity was stated of preparing for a counter offensive of the proletariat on the bourgeoisie, the methods of this offensive are pointed out. Boville said that the methods of the R.I.L.U. do not suit France. And what does suit? Why don't you give your concrete proposals? Because you have not got revolutionary methods, and those methods you have—you are ashamed to speak of.

Why I, a representative of the Soviet trade unions, began to speak of the singularity and particularity of the French T.U. movement. Why it is just I, the representative of the Soviet Trade unions, who, may be, knows France badly, began to speak here of the singularity of France, which should be taken into consideration. Because, comrades, much was said once of the particularities in the development of the revolutionary movement in Russia, all kinds of parties took advantage of these theories as well as various reactionary elements of the Russian labour movement. I will not remind you of those old quarrels of ours. But I wished to remind you only of the fact that Lenin and other comrades who worked together with him had to use much energy and force in order to smash the unscientific argument of those who stated that the laws of development of capitalism in Russia were fundamentally differ-

ent than those in the West, who rejected revolutionary Marxism and consistent revolutionary struggle, under the pretext, that the "schemes" of the West European movement could not be shifted to the Russian ground, that they were, perhaps, very good for France, for Germany or England, but were absolutely unsuitable for Russia. They invented charges against Marxism, stating as if Marxism mechanically shifts methods suitable in certain conditions to quite different surroundings, and behind the screen of this slanderous, unfounded charge—they ignored the international community of the tasks of the proletariat and were carrying on a struggle against the revolutionary movement. The bolsheviks had to strike a heavy blow on these theories of originality. And only because we have been armed by the revolutionary method of Marxism and rejected the unscientific reactionary talk of the laws of capitalist development and laws of proletarian struggle in Russia differing from those in the West,—we could be able to win a victory.

The experience of our revolution proved that the law of development and lessons of the international proletarian struggle are very useful to the Russian labour movement.

And now, when Boville said that the R.I.L.U. adopted good decisions for itself and that those decisions were suited perhaps for the work in other countries but were absolutely unsuitable for France,—I heard in his speech the echo of the old Russian "people's party," "economists," backward reactionary elements of the Russian labour movement whom it was necessary to crush in order to be able to realise the revolution. One should not forget that in those times Russia was the stronghold of reaction. To-day—the rôles have changed; to-day, France rightfully plays the rôle of the stronghold of world reaction, the rôle of an international gendarme. You know this better than I do. And to-day, these old theories—crushed on the Russian ground, on the ground of Russian revolutionary movement—are being revived by Boville for France.

Comrades, we are taking into consideration the experience of the world T.U. movement. That is why the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. and the French T.U. movement should fight those reactionary Boville's theories with zeal and vim. Only having rid themselves of these theories—having crushed these reactionary theories—the French trade unions will be able to prepare the proletariat of France for the forthcoming revolutionary battles.

Comrades, the "theories" of Boville, and of his supporters are in the interests of those who are fighting against the revolutionary methods of

class struggle, against the way of October, they are in the interests of those who attempt to split the unity of the world T.U. movement on a national base, they are in the interests of those who dislike the revolutionary theory of Marx and Lenin.

We, the workers of the Russian trade unions, referring to the experience of the Proletarian Revolution in Russia, are telling you; the revolutionary theory of Marx and Lenin has been checked in the practice of millions and millions, and it secured our victory in October. Are you prepared, comrades, to march together with us on the way to October, — Comrade Boville, Rambaud and those who are with you? It depends on you. Remember — you will never change the laws of revolution. We will not stop our struggle against those who fight the line of the R.I.L.U. and the organisation of the united front on the basis of class struggle. We will not stop our struggle against these "theories" of originality. We will struggle for the teaching of Marx—Lenin, against the theory of the independence of economic struggle of the proletariat from the political struggle, against the theory of "neutrality" and "independence" of trade unions, against the theory of peaceful particularities of the French bourgeoisie, against the theory of the somnolency of the French working class, against all other anti-proletarian theories which are growing in French soil. We will fulfil our duty of proletarian revolutionaries who know that there can be no revolutionary struggle without a revolutionary theory.

And, finally, the third and last part of my speech in which I will touch upon the condition of the working class in the Soviet Union.

Comrade Perignon said at the meeting of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U.: "We understand and appreciate the enormous work done by the Russian revolution, we do not forget about those difficulties which it had to confront and which it has been confronting up to the present. We are sure that these difficulties will be overcome. Believe us, that after we have returned to France we will not belittle your achievements,—just on the contrary." Comrade Perignon, we don't want everybody to exaggerate our achievements. The proletariat of the Soviet Union, its trade unions, its Party and Government are creating socialist society, — are doing the work on a world historical scale of utmost importance. And believe me, comrades, minorities, we know what we are worth and absolutely need not your condescending opinions, moreover as these opinions, it seems to me, are insincere.

We have met here in order to tell the truth to

one another. And so, Comrade Perignon tries to establish this "truth." "The observations,—he says, "which we have made during a few days of our stay in Moscow, allow us to state, and the members of the Executive Bureau who are aware of the state of things in France (at any rate they must be aware of it) cannot help knowing that the living standards of an average French worker are higher than those of his comrade in the U.S.S.R."

Is this statement of Comrade Perignon based on the study of the conditions of workers in the U.S.S.R.? Is it not superficial and crude, and therefore wrong, tendencious?

I refute Comrade Perignon's statement and wish to prove this to the minoritarian comrades from France.

First of all we must make more precise the following: what average French worker does Comrade Perignon speak about? He evidently does not speak of a colonial worker, the brutal exploitation of whom allows the raising of the general living standards of the worker of the Metropolis. I will refer to a few examples illustrating the conditions of labour in the French colonies,—founded on French sources. During the thirteen years of the rôle of French imperialism, the population of Equatorial Africa has decreased from 4,950,000 in 1914 to 3,335,000 in 1927, i.e., by 33 per cent.

André Gide writes about the French Congo: "The country is going to the dogs. Miserable poverty due to which all kinds of diseases are spreading is to be felt everywhere. Three-quarters of illnesses from which the natives are suffering (except the epidemics) are caused by undernourishment."

And here is the testimony of the French writer, A. Londres, concerning the construction of a railway from the capital of the French possessions, Brazzaville, to the ocean, — which was carried out by means of the mass destruction of natives, "17,000 dead bodies were needed in order to construct 140 kilometres of the railway."

Comrade Perignon obviously does not speak of these workers, though I think that when a representative of the French proletariat makes a speech at the meeting of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., he should pay attention to the workers of all the possessions of France.

We, the Soviet trade unions, have achieved in this respect the full liquidation of the cursed inheritance of Tsarism. We make no difference between the Uzbek, Turkmen, Kirghiz workers or the peoples of far Siberia and the native Russian worker. We understand the necessity of a radical improvement of the conditions of the whole proletariat of the whole country, irrespect-

ive of national origin. We achieved the following: the network of sanitary-hygienic, medical, cultural, social institutions, the institutions for the protection of labour, etc., have been extended at present to the remotest districts of our vast country, being set up even in such places in which there existed no notion of such institutions prior to the Revolution (Samoyeds, Tunguacs, and other peoples living in the remotest parts of the Soviet Union).

But Comrade Perignon does not speak about such things.

Comrade Perignon obviously did not think of foreign workers. In the organ of the General Confederation of Labour of the 25th of December, 1930, these "defenders" of the workers' interests, write the following instead of a Christmas gift: "It is necessary that the authorities should assist on a wider scale than in 1926 and 1927—in the visiting of foreign workers."

The Socialist deputy, Chastané, has written in "Peuple" of the 10th January, this year, as follows: "We are certainly internationalists and will remain such, but is it not painful to see how in some localities foreign workers continue to work while the French ones are already suffering from unemployment? We repeat, we do not even think of affecting in some way or other the foreign workers, of course, not, — but ours is quite a natural care to secure daily bread at least for our folks." So when this Socialist talks of "our folks," he has not in view the foreign workers employed in France. When the minoritarian, Perignon, was speaking, had he in view those foreign workers? I think not. This "not" follows from the whole conception of the minoritarian, from the conception of the Socialist reformists who are internationalists only by words. With us here Negroes, Germans, Englishmen— are members of the Moscow and local Soviets. We have elected them. With us all the workers are equal, and while I am characterising the conditions of the workers in the U.S.S.R., I am constantly taking into consideration the foreign workers whom we not only do not ill-treat but for whom we create the conditions of maximum well-being, sharing with them everything we possess.

Comrade Perignon evidently does not speak of the working women of France either, who make 40 per cent. of the French proletariat. It is well known that the wages of this huge army of hired labour in France are still approximately half as small as the wages of men workers.

Comrade Perignon was hardly thinking of the young workers either, for you did not mention them at all in your reports. And the subject of the reports was the question of the "situation and work of the Federations."

Therefore I must declare: your method is absolutely inadmissible for the R.I.L.U., for the staff of the world revolutionary T.U. movement.

But I state that even according to your method, i.e., comparing the conditions of the workers in the U.S.S.R. with those of the workers of the metropolis, with the native French workers, that is, minus foreign workers, women and youth,—your conclusions are wrong, they are based on your not knowing the facts and follow from your political attitude which is in its essence a reformist one.

Comrade Boville has still recognised two lines: in the U.S.S.R. there is a tendency of a constant increase in wages, in France there is a tendency of the decrease in wages. This is right. According to some data at our disposal and which we can deal with in more detail if necessary, the real wages of a worker in the Paris district, the centre of France, have been reduced by 17 per cent. as against the pre-war wages. With us the real wages of the workers increased by 170 per cent. as against the pre-war wages. If we take the average wages,—I take into consideration also the workers of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Eastern Siberia, as well as young workers, working women, foreign workers, etc.—the nominal wages have during the last three years only increased by over 30 per cent., making on the whole 39 roubles 25 copecks in 1928 and 90 roubles 60 copecks in 1931.

This increase was taking place still more rapidly in separate branches of industry; in the coal industry the wages during the last three years increased by over 50 per cent., in black metallurgy by 32 per cent., in railway transport by 40 per cent. Comrade Boville is not present here to-day, but he should be interested in the food workers. From 1925 to 1928 the food workers' wages increased by 42 per cent., and from 1928 to 1931 by 20 per cent. more. And you must bear in mind that the increase in wages took place simultaneously with the introduction with the 7-hour working day and 5-day working week at the enterprises.

Have you such a tempo of the growth of nominal wages? If we compare these figures with the pre-war level we shall see that these are things which it is difficult to compare. For instance, a worker in the food industry used to earn prior to the war 20 roubles on the average, now he gets on the average, 86 roubles 50 copecks. All our industrial workers used to get on the average 25 roubles, and to-day they get 90 roubles 16 copecks. I have figures concerning separate trades, but I shall not quote them here. If the comrades are interested in separate branches of industry—I can acquaint them with these figures.

Comrades, not only the nominal value of the wages is important for a proletarian. His living standards, the real wages, all those commodities which he may actually use—are important for him.

Take, for instance, unemployment. Has it any significance for the conditions of the working class?

I think it has enormous significance, for unemployment leaves a definite part of the workers without the necessary means of existence.

(Lozovsky: And presses on the wages of others.)

Unemployment presses on the wages of others. The fear of unemployment, uncertainty as regards "to-morrow" makes a worker put by some money, if possible, and economise, cutting down even the most necessary expenses. And this should be called the best case. The worst case is that when a worker remains jobless—he simply dies from hunger. We have examined here the data on unemployment in France. According to our materials out of 30,000 towns and villages of France—the municipalities grant benefit to the unemployed only in 200 towns, and this benefit is smaller than the minimum wages even. More than this, the French reformists whom you are praising so much take pains in order to cut the miserable dole granted to the unemployed. The instance of the "theoretician" of the Socialist party, Déat, shows the baseness of these betrayers. Déat writes as follows: "Down with the unemployment insurance, it only brings about the corruption and degradation of the working class, who will get used to receiving money without any labour." And to crown his nastiness, this blackguard adds: "Instead of granting unemployment benefit would not it be better to compensate the manufacturers who were affected by the crisis?"

With us in the Soviet country unemployment does not exist. The increase in the number of people who get wages in the U.S.S.R. is as follows: In 1926, 10,990,000; in 1930 and 1931, 16,010,000. The number of industrial workers employed directly in industry is growing in the following way: In 1926, 3,265,000; in 1930, 7,462,000; in 1931, 8,868,000. We have no unemployed at all. On the contrary, we are confronting the problem of training cadres, of drawing new cadres into industry. In a worker's family there is now not only one worker-wage earner, but the other efficient members of the worker's family are also employed.

We had the possibility to put on a big scale the question of the drawing of women into industry, into all branches of national economy, for we are creating the necessary conditions for the

emancipation of women. So, for instance, in 1917 we had only 14 crèches, and in 1929 we had already 1,433. During the last three years this figure has greatly increased. If we take into consideration the crèches in towns and in villages as well as the seasonal crèches, we shall see that in 1931 we succeeded in embracing 1,590,000 children by crèches.

The maintenance of a child in our crèches is wholly at the expense of the State. Has it any significance for the budget of a worker's family? Does it exercise any influence on the real wages? A toiling woman, as a rule, used to give birth to a child at home, without medical aid. Only well-off people could have medical aid. This year 90 per cent. of our working women in towns had their confinement in hospitals where they, as a rule, have medical treatment free. Has it, comrades, any significance for the real wages of a worker's family?

We have a wide network of maternity homes, consultations for children, where care is taken of the health of a mother and child, advice is given and necessary dietetic foodstuffs distributed. And all this is given gratis. Has it any importance for the worker's budget?

U.S.S.R. is the only country where the toiling women get leaves for eight weeks before and six weeks after confinement, receiving full wages during this period of time. I will not enumerate the privileges the toiling women have in the Soviet Union. I wish to tell Comrade Perignon that it is impossible not to take them into consideration while speaking of the real wages. I ask the comrades to acquaint themselves with our institutions catering for mother and child. (Tormasova: Especially as one of them is in this building.) (Palace of Labour.—Ed.).

Young workers (I speak of persons aged from 15 to 17 years) are completely occupied by studies. The duration of the working day for persons aged from 16 to 18 years, should not, according to the law, exceed six hours. This is the actual working day of the persons aged from 16 to 18. In 1913 they worked 9 hours 45 minutes, in 1929 5 hours 20 minutes and in 1931 4 hours. And these 4 hours are devoted by our youth to study.

I ask the comrades whether the free education of children and grants for the adults have any significance for the budget of a worker's family or not?

Over 1,206,000 persons are studying in 1931 at the factory apprenticeship schools. These are the schools which are attended after the elementary 7-year schools and where the theoretical studies are combined with productive labour. The State has spent in 1931 alone, 300,000,000 roubles on these factory-schools. 364,000 toilers

and their children study at our schools and universities, and the majority of them get grants. 715,000 toilers and their children are studying at the technicums. And if you bear in mind that the workers and peasants who study at the universities of the U.S.S.R. are, as a rule, given grants amounting approximately to the average wages of an industrial worker, and have all the other privileges and advantages (in the department of municipal, sanatorium, medical and similar privileges) the same as the workers employed in industry,—you will understand the rôle of the school in the cause of the improvement of the conditions of the working class. Do these figures show that the workers of the Soviet country have fewer opportunities for the satisfaction of their requirements, than the French workers? How many hundred thousand workers study at the universities and institutes of France? Or perhaps the French workers do not wish to become engineers or physicians? We have created a new type of a higher school, a factory higher technical school, a school-factory. We have got such factories, such works, where all the workers without any exception are occupied by studies, where a worker may become an engineer without leaving his job. Has it any significance, comrades, for the characterisation of the conditions of the working class in the U.S.S.R.?

We have many adult workers who were unable to finish their studies at the middle schools, but who want to study, whose thirst for knowledge is great. We set up workers' faculties, which prepare these workers for entering universities. This year 331,000 toilers are studying at the workers' faculties, they all get grants, are provided with flats and food on the part of the State.

Further, as regards the liquidation of illiteracy, I think that we shall soon surpass France. According to the data at my disposal, France occupies fourteenth place amongst other countries as regards literacy; there are nine illiterate soldiers in a hundred. These are data for 1924. Where, then, are your bourgeois illiterate? These have been the illiterate toilers. And in Russia we have the following figures. The calculation is also made on a hundred. And I shall take, not soldiers, but everybody aged from ten to very old men and women; out of 100 persons in 1920, 32 were literate, in 1926, 40, and in 1931, 70 in a 100 were literate. These are the big strides we take. This year we have already 70 per cent. of literate people, counting from children aged 10, including Kurghises, Turkmens, Usbeks and other peoples who had no literacy at all prior to the Revolution.

In France the number of children embraced by the elementary school decreased by 3.1 per cent.,

and we have introduced this year compulsory elementary education all over the country. The growth of the contingent of pupils is as follows: In 1914-15, 7,800,000 children studied at the elementary and middle schools; last year, 14,000,000, and this year, if we add the apprentices-adolescents, 20,000,000 are studying. What do these figures prove? These figures, comrades, tell that we shall very soon have no illiterate persons, and with you the percentage of pupils is decreasing and illiteracy growing all over the country. And we succeeded in achieving the provision of the children in the overwhelming majority of schools with hot lunches and the poorest children get footwear and clothes.

Finally, has it any significance for the real wages of a worker that in a country with a population of 160,000,000 nearly 70,000,000 persons study at all kinds of schools and universities? Can we say now, as Comrade Perignon said, that the Russian workers require less than the French ones?

Let us take the questions of social insurance. The Soviet social insurance is extended to all toilers without any exception, and irrespective of the character of work and the duration of this work. In 1913, during Tzarism, only one-sixth part of the workers were insured, and that only partially, against sickness. In 1927, 16,000,000 were insured, in 1930, 13,600,000, and in 1931, 16,030,000. Social insurance is carried out at the expense of the State and the employers, without any deductions from the workers' wages. The budget of social insurance in the Soviet Union amounted to 474,000,000 in 1925, 2,173,000 in 1931, and will be not less than three milliard roubles in 1932. These funds are at the disposal of the insurance committees, elected by trade union congresses, i.e., they are at the disposal of the workers themselves. And our social insurance is the fullest of all existing at present as regards its dimensions. An insured worker gets his full wages in case of sickness, from the first day of illness till his full recovery, or until he is passed over to an institution. A worker receives medical aid free, as well as free medicines. An insured woman worker, as well as wife of an insured worker, gets benefit for suckling her baby until it is nine months old, and also things necessary for the care of a newborn baby. If we take all kinds of State financial support for the improvement of the social and cultural conditions of the workers in the U.S.S.R. (social insurance, deduction from profit, free municipal service, housing, education, protection of health, public nourishment), then during two years (1929 and 1930) the respective State funds for workers and employees increased from 3,372 million to 6,571

million roubles. In 1931 these funds will amount to 9,969 million roubles. I will note only the work of our health resorts and rest homes. We confiscated the palaces of the Tzars, the magnates of capital and of the aristocracy. In these palaces we organised health resorts and sanatoria for the workers and peasants. This year over 900,000 toilers will be sent to these sanatoria and health resorts; 124 persons in each thousand of metal workers were in the sanatoria and health resorts during this year alone, 135 in each thousand of miners, 108 in each thousand of chemical workers, 114 in each thousand of transport workers, Comrade Rambaud. These people live in the sanatoria, health resorts and the rest homes, getting during their holidays full wages, food at the expense of the State, and passage at the expense of the insurance organs. Our workers have dietetic nourishment, milk kitchen, special night sanatoria, where the workers come after work, and so on, and so forth.

I ask you, comrades, have over two milliard roubles of social insurance, which are at the disposal of the committees elected by the trade unions, any significance for the real wages of the workers, or not?

We have the seven-hour working day; 92 per cent. of all workers will have the seven-hour working day this year. We spent 240,000,000 roubles on the protection of labour. We will spend this year over a milliard roubles on the workers' housing, etc., etc. Thanks to all this, the children's death rate became twice as small as compared with the pre-war time, and the death rate of adult persons decreased by 36 per cent. Is this an indication of the improvement of the conditions of the working class or not? Each year 3½ million of new bolsheviks are born in our country. (Laughter.)

The population increases by 3½ million each year. And how many will it make in five years, comrades? In five years it will make one-third of the population of France. (Laughter.) I could name other figures, too. We have over 4,000 workers' clubs belonging to the trade unions. Many of these clubs are huge palaces. We have 92,000 branches of the clubs, Red Corners, as we call them, a network of libraries, a huge network of physical culture institutions, etc., etc.

We have the widest network of the workers' press in the world, beginning from central editions and ending with factory newspapers; we have a two million army of worker-correspondents, etc.

But if we take all this into consideration, how will it be possible to make the conclusion of the better conditions of French workers? Public

relief, absence of unemployment, social insurance, teaching of children and of workers themselves, free medical aid, sanatoria and health resorts, special maternity homes, etc.—all this created those pre-requisites for the grandiose competition on the front of socialist construction, in consequence of which the “Electrozavod,” which you visited, as well as a number of other factories and works, executed the Five-Year Plan in 2½ years, and so we will execute the Five-Year Plan on the whole in four years.

Comrades, speaking about the conditions of the working class, I think it is necessary first of all to take into consideration the political régime. In the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat, where the theatres, palaces, libraries, museums, everything which our country possesses, is in the hands of the working class, such a fact should be taken into consideration. It is impossible, while estimating the conditions of the working class, to pay no attention to such a fact as the dictatorship of the bourgeois or the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Is it possible to forget, when comparing the living standards and conditions of labour of a French worker and of a Soviet worker, that fundamental decisive fact that in the Soviet Union the State power is in the hands of the working class, while the French State is a weapon of imperialist robbery, a weapon of struggle against the workers, and of suppression of the labour movement. The Soviets are a powerful force in the hands of the proletariat and peasantry, who are successfully creating a new society, the socialist society, in which, as Marx said, there will be no exploitation of man by man, there will be no classes. Do you think, comrades minoritarians, that the Russian revolution could win a victory and not be suppressed in floods of blood, as your “peaceful” imperialist France has eagerly wished this; could secure the existing standards of the material and cultural welfare of the toilers and create all the necessary conditions for the really gigantic prospects on this field—without the powerful force of the Soviets, without the apparatus of the workers’ State?

The Soviets are not a screen for the fooling of the masses, like the French representative organs. The Soviets are not the organs of French parliamentary chatter, under the cover of which the imperialist bosses carry out the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. No; the Soviets are full-blooded, sovereign organs of the proletariat and peasantry, securing the actual participation of each toiler in the administering of State power. The Soviets are not a play at democracy. Soviet democracy is the most progressive democracy in the world, for it is the democracy of the for-

merly exploited majority — the workers and peasants. The Soviets are the school of the political growth of toilers, which can be compared to nothing else in the world. If you had attended, say, the last Sixth All-Union Congress of the Soviets, you would have been convinced of the enormous political growth of the rank and file workers or peasants. You would have seen on the tribune of this supreme organ of proletarian power not the parliamentary rascals, professional politicians of France, but 100 per cent. workers from the bench, peasants who have left their ploughs and tractors to come to the Congress, the representatives of peoples living in the remotest parts of the U.S.S.R. You would have been surprised at the wisdom of State outlook, with the profound understanding of general State affairs, and with the broad prospects characterising the speeches of those who were but recently miserable and oppressed by the machine of the Tzarist, bourgeois State. You would have understood then the grandeur of the proletarian dictatorship, its inexhaustible resources, its invincible power.

The Soviets are an organisation which does not hinder and is not afraid of the development of the proletarian self-criticism of the mass activity of the working class and of social organisations, as the defenders of bourgeois democracy, the reformists, including the syndicalist leaders, are slandering about this. On the contrary, the Soviet system presupposes, according to its class essence, the development of proletarian publicity, the development of proletarian democracy and self-criticism. Tell me of another State in which the organs of State power would have been under the constant effective control of the factories and works, in which the factories and works would take over patronage of the organs of power, as is the case here, daily check their work, actually participate in determining the policy of these organs of power and influence the composition of these organs, etc. Nothing like this exists in the world, because such things can take place only in the country in which the proletariat is ruling.

And if we still suffer from a number of shortcomings, if we still need many things, and are imperfect in many respects, the cause of this is not the lack of democracy in our country, not the impossibility to radically improve and influence the State apparatus, but the absence of sufficient flexibility, culture and ability to utilise the richest opportunities present in the Soviet system, in the socialist system of managing economy, in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In a word, the Soviet State secures by means of its apparatus, its colossal resources and power,

the true realisation of the requirements and demands of the workers' activity, and thus stimulates the further progress of proletarian democracy.

Yes, we have the right to pride ourselves upon our State, upon our government, which is the stablest in the world, upon the Soviets which have become the greatest factor of international proletarian revolution.

And what about the proletariat being sure of the morrow? The proletariat of the U.S.S.R. know that they work for themselves, that each day and hour of their work improves their conditions and that in five years their living standards will be much higher than to-day. This fact also cannot be ignored. This causes courage, sureness, this creates the possibility of cultural flourishing, political activity, and this enables the proletariat to further its great cause which calls forth the admiration of even such inveterate bourgeois and aristocrats as Lord and Lady Astor.

We do not deny that we have quite a number of difficulties, and of very great difficulties. We have never tried to prove that our workers are already living in paradise. But you would have the right to reproach us only on the following conditions: (1) If these were difficulties of a degrading order, difficulties of a system regressing politically, economically and culturally, difficulties which we were concealing, and (2) If we were not struggling against those difficulties, and if they were not decreasing. But there is no need to prove to you that you have got neither the first nor the second ground for a charge against us, and will never get it. We are experiencing the difficulties of growth, despite capitalism which is fatally stricken with the sickness of a decline. Is not the fact of the U.S.S.R. developing at a tremendous rate at the moment when the capitalist world is affected by the most severe industrial, agricultural and financial crises growing into a political crisis, the best proof of this? Further, we are vigorously and with ever-growing resource overcoming these maladies, inevitable in a growing organism, these difficulties of growth. Only a hopeless idiot could think that the October revolution would be able to liquidate at one stroke the centuries-old backwardness of Russia and in the course of the struggle against the intervention of capitalist powers which destroyed priceless values in our country—achieve at once an earthly paradise. Neither absolutely naive people or our enemies can make such claims to us.

You, who lay claim to the honorary title of the representatives of French workers should understand that our difficulties proceed from the conditions of class struggle.

We are carrying out our great cause under the conditions of desperate resistance on the part of all the class enemies of the proletariat, the world bourgeoisie and its hirelings, who are constantly putting spokes in the wheels of socialist construction.

This is in short why I object most sharply to Comrade Perignon's statement supported by Boville, as regards the advantages of the conditions of the French workers over those of the Soviet workers. And I ask, Comrade Perignon, if you study the figures, if you acquaint yourself a little better with our country, and throw off any prejudice, will you still maintain in France that a French worker lives better than a worker lives in the U.S.S.R.

And if Comrade Perignon ventures, after all this, to insist on his statement, I must categorically declare that the representatives of the minorities, who boast of their contact with the workers—take into consideration the interest not of an average French worker, not the interests and living conditions of the working class in France, but the living conditions of the workers' "aristocracy," corrupted by the bourgeoisie. In such case, he, Perignon, proceeds from the conditions of those whose caste interests are represented to the detriment of the interests of the French proletariat—by the betrayers of the working class—the reformists of all shades. But, Comrade Perignon, the Soviet proletarians who have no relationship with the French reformists—would not listen to a comparison with such elements.

And what is the political meaning of Perignon and Boville's statements? Does it mean that the French proletariat is out of the way of the revolution? It is clear to everybody that the bourgeoisie would comment precisely like the above-mentioned statement, and reformism would commend these statements as the evidence of the minorities to the conditions of the workers in the Soviet Union,—if such statements as Perignon made here were published in France.

Comrades, is it true that the laws of revolution are not similar for all countries, that such a revolution which was made by the Russian workers is impossible in France? We take into consideration the necessity of flexible tactics, but we state that a revolutionary should not only speak of those particularities but should also speak of the basic laws of revolution. The laws of revolution act with inexorable force, for such is the nature of class struggle. Nobody, even Boville (laughter) can stop the wheel of history. The proletarian revolution will win a victory in France as well,—with you or against you. It is you who should make a turn and not the R.I.L.U. It depends on you, with whom are you—whether

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

you will win a victory together with the revolutionary masses in France, or the rise of the revolutionary wave will sweep you away. For a revolutionary, for a worker in the revolutionary

T.U. movement, there can be no higher task than that of preparing the workers everywhere and under any conditions for the future victory of the proletariat all over the world. (Applause.)