

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 1. No. 17

16th Dec. 1921

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

POLITICS

Is the Russian Revolution a Bourgeois Revolution?

by *Karl Radek*.

(Conclusion.)

In April 1918, in a speech by comrade Lenin, the Soviet government attempted to define our next tasks and to point out the way which we now designate as "The new economic policy". It attempted to conclude agreements with the capitalists and to transform private capitalism into capitalism controlled by the proletarian state. Comrade Lenin said that we must learn from the trust kings how to reconstruct our industries. At the same time the Soviet government had to act in just the opposite manner in the country, where the prerequisites for Socialism were not present. In order to obtain grain it had to arm the workers and the village poor, and to form village committees against rent-profiteering. Capitalism which had been destroyed by the war had not left us sufficient means for the exchange of manufactured articles for grain. The Soviet government was not yet sufficiently fortified, and was in control of too weak a machine to be able to get grain by means of the tax in kind. The peasants, who had thrown off the yoke of the large landowners, the Czar and the bourgeoisie with the aid of the workers, wanted no restrictions set upon their freedom. They desired a free stateless life, with no obligations to the workers' and peasants' government. The grain producers were willing to exchange their grain only for the greatest possible part of those goods which were still in the country; this would have injured the state, the working-class and the poor villagers.

But the third class, the bourgeoisie did not want to hear of limitations either. It refused to accept the compromise with the Soviet government, as offered by Lenin in 1918. With the aid of the world bourgeoisie, it had begun the fight for life against Soviet Russia. During the summer of 1918 the united Russian bourgeoisie declared at one time to Lithuania, another time to Poland, a third time to Esthonia, then to the Ukraine and Germany respectively, that thanks to the protection of German imperialism it was not compelled to accept the compromise, with the Soviet government. After the Czecho-Slovak uprising, particularly after the Allies had defeated Germany, the Russian bourgeoisie, basing its hopes upon aid from the Allies, started the most bitter struggle against the Soviet government. It refused to lease its enterprises because it hoped to retain them as its property. In order to make it possible, therefore, to carry out the new economic policy, it was necessary to knock the bourgeoisie down not only in law but in fact. It had to be knocked on the head in a two years' war.

We had to prove to the bourgeoisie and to world capital that the Russian industries belonged to the proletarian state and not the bourgeoisie. We had to do this before we could make use of the bourgeoisie in the further development of production. The war inevitably brought about a complete nationalization. This nationalization was brought about not only by the necessity of destroying the ruling class and ending its political power, which was based upon economic power; we had to nationalize for other reasons also. We had to nationalize

because it would otherwise have been impossible to carry on the war begun by the bourgeoisie. Our unlimited centralization was nothing more than the stripping of the whole country in order to obtain all the industrial products necessary for carrying on war. As comrade Lenin rightly states in his pamphlet on the tax in kind, the military measures led to military Communism in the cities, and to requisitioning in the country, that is to grain-plundering for the support of the army and the cities. Was there any other possibility of getting a sufficient amount of metal and of grain which we needed for the war? We could not possibly have left our limited stores of manufactured goods to the discretion of the speculators. And how could we possibly have left grain to be taken care of by the tax in kind, when we lacked the necessary government apparatus for computing this tax correctly? The grain stores of Central Russia (until 1919 Siberia and the Ukraine did not belong to us) were so small that it was not possible to obtain any surplus whatever; moreover the peasants could receive nothing in return for this surplus on the free market, if there was any, because all the manufactured goods were confiscated.

Outside of the political, strategic and economic necessity for the policy of war Communism, there was another social-psychological factor. If even at the beginning of the revolution the victor-class could not leave the material sources in the hands of their enemy and thus enable the bourgeoisie to lead a life of luxury in a legal manner, how then could the proletariat have possibly done this at a time when Russia was one big battlefield, when the workers and peasants had to undergo so much suffering in order to be victorious in their fight against the bourgeoisie? Was it possible, at a time when the hungry and freezing women workers were sewing coats for the army day and night and under poor light, to permit beautifully lit and rich displays in the stores to mock the suffering fighters by showing them how well the bourgeoisie lived and enjoyed life? This was impossible! The Soviet government had to institute the Spartan manner of living, because it was the only one which corresponded to the gray soldier coat of Soviet Russia.

War Communism was a contradiction to the structure of Russia and its economic relations. War Communism was a contradiction as far as the land was concerned; in the cities however, the possibility of success was not altogether excluded. If the world revolution had come as early as 1919, before the disarming of the European working-class took place, or even in 1920, during our advance towards Warsaw, the reconstruction of the Russian large industries as a whole on the basis of state ownership and according to our economic plans would not have been historically impossible. The Soviet government could then have thought of retaining the large industries as a whole in its own hands, because it could have received the necessary machines from the European workers. Even in case the world revolution had not been victorious on a European scale, even if we had only conquered Poland and then stood armed at the gates of Germany, it would not have been altogether impossible to force the bourgeoisie to accept a compromise with us after we would have gotten the means of production from the world bourgeoisie for our state industries in European Russia, in return for concessions in the bordering regions of Russia, — Siberia, Caucasus and Turkestan—and for the right to develop production in these distant regions on the basis of concessions.

What would then have been the social relations in Russia under such circumstances? All the industries and means of transportation would have been in the hands of the workers.

The land would have been in the hands of the peasants. The reconstructed industries would have made it possible for the proletariat to relinquish the requisitions in the country, and to receive grain partly through the tax in kind and partly by exchanging goods with the state industries. This would have been no Communism, but it would have been the most significant step in the transition towards Socialism; it would have led the way towards great progress in electrification, and towards creating the necessary conditions for the advance of the peasantry towards a higher collectivistic system of production.

In this we did not succeed. The long drawn-out civil war has weakened us economically. Now that it is at an end we cannot proceed in industrial production although our compromise with the world bourgeoisie is advantageous to us. The uncertainty of our foreign relations gave the bourgeoisie the opportunity of getting greater concessions from us and of starting the negotiations for concessions under conditions which were less favorable to us. We must therefore first permit the restoration of the small and middle sized industries on the basis of lease. This will of course restore a part of the Russian bourgeoisie. We are compelled to grant concessions under less favorable conditions. We must grant concessions in Central Russia; we must permit foreign capital to start those factories running which are already there, instead of developing those productive sources which have not yet been used. Our present task is to retain the main industrial undertakings in the hands of the workers' government. We are consciously preparing ourselves for co-operating with the bourgeoisie; this is undoubtedly dangerous to the existence of the Soviet government, because the latter loses the monopoly on industrial production as against the peasantry.

Does not this signify the decisive victory of Capitalism? May we not then speak of our revolution as having lost its revolutionary character? Were all our efforts and the whole three years' struggle a futile sacrifice?

We shall begin with this last question. The whole course of development has shown that the bourgeoisie would not have had to become our lessees, if we had not beaten them on the economic field, if we had not expropriated them, because they were owners of the means of production. If we had not beaten them there would be no talk of concessions. But if as we have said, our economic policy of 1920 was necessary for our victory, it was also a necessary condition for our new economic policy.

How has our new economic policy affected class relations? In the country, our policy of requisitioning could only have been a transition policy. Even in case the world proletariat had been victorious we would have relinquished it. On the industrial field our present concessions are only temporary transition concessions; by this we certainly do not mean that at the end of a year we shall again confiscate the newly accumulated goods. Our economic policy is based upon a longer period of time, but it is a transition policy nevertheless. Our goal remains the same—the industries in the hands of the workers' government. But just at present the government industries constitute only a part of the total industries; they only form a narrow foundation for the proletarian government. What does that mean? It means that we have retreated; that we are holding those positions only which are necessary to maintain the power of the workers and peasants.

Does that signify that the revolution is a non-Socialist one? No! It only signifies that the victorious working-class is not able to carry out its program completely, not even that program which in Russia, a petty-bourgeois country, seems theoretically possible. But the class which must retreat because of the great resistance of the other classes, in our case because of the resistance of world capitalism which is not yet overthrown, does not cease to be the victorious class, the ruling class. When the Czarist regime which was a government of large landowners was compelled to make concessions to capitalism, so that the bourgeoisie became the ruling economic class, Czarism itself did not cease to exist and the large landowning class did not cease to be the ruling political class; neither did Russia cease to be a country of half-serfdom. Should the bourgeoisie of Europe attempt to hinder the revolution by submitting to state capitalism and even to workers' control, it will not cease to be the ruling class. We now come to the last question. It is not a question of the character of our revolution. The revolution was consummated by the working-class and will go down in the annals of history as a Socialist revolution, even though the Russian working-class may temporarily be defeated. We are rather speaking of the outcome, the result of the revolution.

Will the Bolsheviks retain their power under the conditions of the partial restoration of capitalism and the production of goods by the peasants? Our enemies point out that economic

relations determine the political ones, and that economic concessions like the ones we grant to the bourgeoisie, must lead to political concessions.

This so-called Marxian ABC has nothing in common with Marxism, because it is abstract and considers neither time nor space. Should world capitalism constantly gain power in the course of many years, and the revolution constantly weaken, then the working-class must in the long run be defeated. But when a large landowning class in Russia made economic concessions to the bourgeoisie, it nevertheless continued in power for quite a long time. It is true that the economic concessions were followed by political concessions and finally by the capitulation of the large landowning class. But the reason for this lies in the fact that the large landowning class was the end of a decaying branch of development; it was a dying class. From this point of view the bourgeoisie is the historically deteriorating, dying class. That is why the working-class of Russia can refuse to make political concessions to the bourgeoisie; since it is justified in hoping that its power will grow on a national and international scale more quickly than will the power of the Russian bourgeoisie.

The history of the Russian revolution establishes the fact that it was the first Socialist and the first proletarian revolution. It is a proletarian revolution in a petty bourgeois country. For this reason it will distinguish itself from the proletarian revolutions in countries like England and America by the fact that after a long struggle followed by the seizure of power the working-class of these countries will be able to carry out their programs much more quickly than we have been. Ours is a proletarian revolution which under unfavorable inner and outer conditions advances like every other revolution. But it is a proletarian, a Socialist revolution; the tradition of October is the program of the world revolution.

October is not the anniversary of the Comedy of Errors in which, as the Mensheviks claim, the working-class unconsciously became the tool of another class. It is the anniversary of the beginning of the great international proletarian revolution. Even now when we are fighting in our defensive positions, we count the sacrifices of our struggle and can say with absolute conviction and ease, "We followed the right road in October and the victory is ours".

Japan and the Washington Conference

by Sen Katayama.

Just now the world press is busy with the Washington Conference. What will be the outcome? Many predictions and conjectures have already been ventured and discussed. All are partisan in nature and in many cases bigoted and biased. Although most of them pretend to be fair and impartial, one can see at once by reading a few lines whether they are pro-English, pro-American, pro-Chinese or pro-Japanese. But what I wish to say in this article is pro-Communist—from the standpoint of a Communist. However, being a Japanese I may appear to other nationalities pro-Japanese. This is inevitable, because I know Japan and the Japanese better than a non-Japanese.

The Washington Conference was initiated by Harding for the purpose of preparing world opinion for the coming world war. It is intended to convince the American people that war with Japan is something inevitable. The Washington Conference is a smoke screen for the American masses to conceal the real aim and purpose of American capitalism and imperialism and to prepare for the next war centered in the Pacific.

One of Harding's chief objects in calling the Washington Conference is to do away with the obnoxious Jap-Briton alliance. Will the Conference accomplish it through the pressure of public opinion supported by the press of the English-speaking countries? The alliance is a great menace to America. But it is indispensable to Britain as well as to Japan. During and after the war of 1914-18 it was the greatest necessity to England and in spite of the English public, press and some spokesmen denouncing it as an obstacle and prejudicial to the welfare of England and to the cultivation of a closer friendship with America, British Imperial statesmen felt the need of some such alliance with Japan. Lloyd George still wants it, but he does not like to lose the American "dollar friendship". Thus he suggested a triple alliance of England, America and Japan. The Washington statesmen flatly rejected this idea.

Why does England want the alliance to continue? This rather awkward question never appeared in the English press. England won the war and gathered the largest booty and above

all crushed her deadly rival—Germany. But lo! There arose a still greater rival than the one she had just annihilated—America. For the first time in the history of modern England, the Englishman began to fear Uncle Sam. Not only has his pound been shrinking, but he has also lost his long-maintained naval standard. He cannot retain the two-power standard in naval strength. Thus the recent war weakened England's position as a naval power. Moreover, it has grave difficulties in Ireland and India. England cannot by any means lose its American friend, but at the same time it is not well assured of its safety in losing Japan's friendly relations. It means immediate danger of weakening its grip on India which is at present in a most revolutionary condition. For the sake of India alone it can not afford to trade the alliance for a vague American understanding, unless Uncle Sam cancels the debt that John Bull owes him. There has been much talk about a British-American alliance. Those who hold the idea of the white domination of the world will support it full-heartedly. But the English statesmen are shrewder than the sentimentalists of white supremacy. They see that this alliance practically means the submission of the pound to the dollar.

The abrogation of the Jap—British alliance will certainly weaken Japanese imperialism. It would mean that the path of the Indian revolution would be easier than it is at present. However, the loser by the non-renewal of the said alliance would be England rather than Japan. Japan would have to submit to the American policy in the Far East, but that does not mean that it would be beaten in the coming war. Besides, non-renewal of the alliance does not necessarily mean war. Japan can wait until the alliance of white domination is broken. For, as Trotsky predicted, England must meet the dollar in the oil supply. England will not yield to the gradual shrinkage of the pound without a struggle. Thus English statesmen have a very hard task in the diplomatic sphere. England can scarcely retain both the friendship of the dollar and the alliance with Japan. But at the same time it cannot very well expose itself to the danger of strengthening the already unmanageable Indian revolutionary movement by gaining the hostility of Japan in siding openly with America. Its possessions on the Pacific are great and many. Australia and New Zealand cannot as yet stand on their own feet without English protection, and its sphere of influence in China will be weakened rather than strengthened through its friendship with America.

But if the Conference is successful in destroying the said alliance in some way or other, what will be the prospect in the Far East? Japan will not take up arms against America single-handed. Supposing America and England agree in the joint exploitation of China, ousting Japan and crushing its aspirations in the Far East, which, from the American standpoint, I think impossible. But supposing this to be the case, then China will be more thoroughly exploited by the combined power of the dollar and the pound. Naturally enough this will not satisfy the Chinese statesmen, although China asserted before the Conference that it is prepared to accept and apply the "Open Door Policy" to all parts of the Chinese Republic without exception.

It is already sufficiently awakened to utilize the Shantung affair to its advantage and make it a national educational issue. It will not be satisfied with driving out the Japanese alone, the English and French will soon have to follow. This will be a chance for Japan to regain its prestige in China. The Conference may repudiate the Lansing-Ishii agreement regarding Japan's special interests in China, but the geographical, radical as well as linguistic advantages remain all the same. If America becomes the master of exploited China, as it already is of Cuba, Haiti and Mexico and to some extent of Central and South America, the Chinese will use the same weapon against it as they successfully used against Japan and already threaten to use against England if it does not give up its alliance with Japan! The chief and most effective weapon against an aggressive power is the boycott of its goods. Japan will make good use of such an opportunity. Its people can speak Chinese without much difficulty and can travel inland as a Chinese and above all trade without the Comprador (intermediary) on whom foreign merchants are almost invariably obliged to depend—even in the treaty ports!

The Washington Conference will accomplish nothing but will accelerate the next war. It may agree on some sort of slowing-down in the competitive naval race, but that means very little. For the next war will not depend much upon big ships but on submarines, airplanes and gas. As I have already intimated the conference is an American organ used to crystallize the war sentiment against Japan and represent it as the Prussia of the Far East.

The Washington Conference will not solve any of those grave problems hanging over the Pacific—such as the immigration question, racial discrimination, and the exploitation of China. No power concerned will ever be able to solve the problems of the Far East by conferences or even by war. But as long as the capitalist system continues, war will remain the only method of liquidating such disputes.

A very curious phase of the present Conference is the representation of the Far Eastern countries. Japan is, of course, fully represented while only part of China is represented. The southern half of China is not represented at all in spite of the vigorous protests from the Canton Government of Sun Yat Sen, while Russia is entirely ignored. The Far Eastern Republic as well as the Soviet government demanded representation but Harding ignored both. Of the nine nations at the Conference only two, China and Japan, are from the Far East. All others are mere intruders in the Far East. To discuss the Far Eastern problems at such a conference is at first glance ridiculous and any agreement will never be satisfactorily carried out. The Russians, Siberians and Chinese of the south will object and will not consider themselves bound to anything which the Conference may decide. China is the greatest market in the world. Every nation wants it as its own market. But since they all want it, they will have to come to some kind of an agreement. A joint exploitation of China would be the best solution of the problem. But America is a newcomer which has not as yet established any share of influence. Although the Americans have rich concessions they cannot utilize them on account of the prior concessionaires.

China is now well divided among the different nations—Japan being the latest intruder. Thus the powers want that Japan get out of China. But it will not get out as quickly and easily as some desire. It will say that it will get out if the English and the French get out of Hong Kong, Wei-wei-Wei, Cochin-China and Annam which places the latter two before a disagreeable alternative.

There is some hope of avoiding the coming conflict, namely, the progress of the Russian Revolution. Soviet Russia is now successfully recuperating after long and weary civil and foreign wars. The Russian Revolution is not static. It has been advancing successfully in all directions. Japan has also been profoundly influenced by the Russian Revolution. Workers and peasants are deeply impressed. The fall of the Czar and the Kaiser together with the defeat of German militarism made the Japanese workers and peasants see that their militarism is also not invulnerable. The yellow labor unions have changed into red or revolutionary unions and demand control of industry. A Japanese Communist Party has been formed and is working hard in spite of the rigid police and gendarmerie oppression. Strikes, sabotage and labor demonstrations of gigantic nature are occurring from time to time with increased force and success. They will not be led into a blind alley as easily as in the past.

Japan as a whole has been awakened politically and socially. The people to day hate militarism and above all conscription. Evaders and slackers are increasing enormously every year. Even the youths of the upper and middle classes, who until the last war desired to become officers as the best calling have begun to evade conscription. For the last few years the army authorities have been having a hard time in getting recruits for military colleges and academies. In the last few years so many young and promising officers have left the service, that the authorities adopted a rule which will deprive those who resign of their military position and pension if they do not have due reason for resignation.

Until very recently, even discussion about reducing the army or navy was a crime and constituted lese majesté, because the commander of the army and navy is His Majesty—The Emperor! But today reduction of armament is very popular; there is a movement against it led by the ex-minister of justice. "The Japanese people have at last come to realize that militarism will not do much for the welfare of Japan, and now they discredit militarism", wrote the chief editor of the *Oriental Economist*, Mr. Tanzan Isibasi. He added, "If the white peoples knew the real present thought of the Japanese youths, they would surely change their attitude toward Japan".

The Japanese militarists will try hard to convince the people of the inevitability of the coming war. But the youths and workers as well as the peasants will not be misled by them as in the past, because the living corpses of present Europe bear evidence to the awfulness of war. They are already looking toward a new light that shines from Russia. Japan underwent its own political revolution sixty years ago conducted entirely by the youths of that period. The youths of today are awakened to the task of a second revolution—the social revolution.

Two very conspicuous events were recently reported from Japan. One is the assassination of Zenjiro Yasuda, the greatest banker and multimillionaire of Japan, by a labor agitator, because he refused to contribute toward the fund for the labor hall. And still another—Premier Hara assassinated by a railway worker. The revolution of 1868 began with the assassination of Premier Ii Tairo of the Tokugawa Government who was then the sole ruler of Japan. The Japanese youths, workers and peasants will meet the demand of the new age which has been successfully inaugurated in Russia. Our youths and workers will readily adopt Communism and the Soviet system just as their forefathers adopted capitalism sixty years ago. It took over half a century for the French revolution to travel over to Japan. "But the Russian Bolshevik Revolution", as Lenin said, "will reach Japan with wireless speed". No one predicted the French revolution nor the Russian revolution. Social revolution of today is a world-wide movement and my prediction, therefore, is not a fantastic but a scientific revolution based upon solid social and economic factors. The capitalistic war, if it comes, will not retard or change the course and progress of the social revolution in Japan, as elsewhere. In all probability the capitalistic war will come sooner than the socialist revolution, because the workers and youths have only started to organize and have as yet little power and influence. As I said above, the Washington Conference will accelerate the future war, thus accelerating the fall of capitalism and imperialism.

The Central European Crisis

by Paul Louis (Paris).

The crisis in Central Europe places the French, German and English proletariat before a vast problem.

The crisis in truth was not born yesterday. It is one of the most lasting and striking results of the world war.

The German Communist Party has never ceased to protest against the specious peace of Versailles which organized the dismemberment and the ruin of Germany to the advantage of French and English capital. But it has been at the same time denouncing German capitalism which, after having contributed in large measure to the breaking out of the world war, is trying now by all means to shift the resulting burdens upon the working masses in the Reich.

The French Communist Party and, before its organization, the minority elements that later joined it, have protested against the treaty of Versailles. The characteristic feature of this treaty is that it was imposed by force, that it created several Alsace-Lorraines by a transfer of certain peoples from one domination to another, and that it exacted from Germany heavy reparations at a time when the latter was deprived of some of its most essential resources.

The English proletariat, on its side, has never ceased to demand a revision of the Versailles pact. It protests against the territorial as well as the economic clauses.

The English and French bourgeoisie behind Mm. Clémenceau and Lloyd George saw in the war precisely the same opportunity as the large industrial associations of Germany: a means of enrichment. These large industrial associations had hoped to rob France of its iron mines in the East and its coal mines in the North, and England of a part of its colonies and its merchant marine. Then German capitalism would have enjoyed hegemony in the world market.

The English bourgeoisie that wholeheartedly entered the war and that saw in it an instrument of its future supremacy outlined for itself this triple aim: to replace Germany on the Bagdad line, to wipe out the merchant and military marine of its adversary, to remove the competition which the Rhine-Westphalian region offered to its own iron and steel industry.

The French bourgeoisie, still dominated by the memory of Napoleon, was seeking military satisfaction above all. But its ranks included more modern elements that were aiming at economic power. At the same time a serious problem came up: who would pay the war expenditure, the French or German bourgeoisie? The French bourgeoisie, which during the years 1914-1918 was making every effort to avoid paying any state taxes and to shift the heaviest burden on the masses, declared, "Germany will pay", which in its view meant that Germany would pay both the war expenditure and the reparations.

The entire military and nationalist caste is ready to grasp any occasion for a recommencement of the war upon some official pretext. There are Junkers on both sides of the Rhine. The annexation of the left bank of the Rhine and the occupation of the Rhine still have partisans in Paris, and the Bloc National which corresponds to the Pan-Germans has not yet renounced

its ambitious schemes. If French troops did not occupy the Rhine last May, it was because Briand felt the opposition of his allies and also the agitation within the French proletariat.

To-day the eternal problem comes again to the surface under a new aspect. The Reich and the big German industries declare their incapacity to pay the sums demanded by the Allies. German capitalism defends itself with great energy against the imperilling of its property privileges. It has grown rich at the expense of the working masses which it has exploited and it intends to keep for itself alone all the profits realized. But at the same time that it is exploiting millions and millions of men and is envisaging light-heartedly the bankruptcy of the State, in the illusory hope of not being affected by it, the German bourgeoisie is creating an abyss in the world market, in the center of Europe. The fall of the mark redounds to its benefit for the moment because it can pay salaries much inferior to those of France and England and because the state of exchange itself allows it to exploit its slaves until it is satiated. But its artificial prosperity is highly precarious.

To produce it needs raw materials and it has to buy these materials not in marks but in dollars or in pounds and it also sells its future production. Millions of Germans cannot live any longer on the starvation wages they are receiving—and the revolutionary menace is thus again growing.

The English bourgeoisie is suffering the consequences of the fluctuations in the mark. On one hand German industry offers the English competition more formidable than in the past; and unemployment across the channel is increasing alarmingly. On the other hand, Germany closes its own market to England because the mark is too low. And the more Germany issues paper money to cover its deficits the more the mark will sink. Every fall in the value of the mark creates a new danger for Great Britain. That is why the London Cabinet desires a revision of the financial agreements before that of the pact of Versailles.

But French capitalism has other aims. It dictated the peace at the point of the sword; it will not allow anyone to touch it. It says, "Germany will pay, Germany must pay". If Germany does not pay, French capitalism will put its armies in motion and will seize new territory. It feels that its prestige with the petty bourgeoisie and the peasant who adhere to the Bloc National and who would refuse to pay all new taxes is at stake. It is therefore trying to force the latter into the ranks of the proletariat.

One can see what separates the French and the English bourgeoisie. The latter tends to a *rapprochement* with German capitalism in order to save it by mutually agreeing to exploit the German proletariat. German capitalism is conjuring up the financial difficulties that menace it and the collapse which seems inevitable after the period of prosperity. English capitalism in saving German capitalism, hopes thereby to restore the market of the Reich as well as all other markets, and to postpone the revolution in Central Europe. English capitalism is dreaming of new ventures to mask its own impotence to restore industry.

These are some aspects of the problems that present themselves and that the workers of France, Germany and England ought to ponder. The present crisis is for all of them a step nearer to the revolution.

Political Parties in Australia.

by F. W. Wilkinson (Adelaide).

Australia, owing to its geographical position, is considered relatively unimportant in international affairs. A study of its economic and political evolution, however, presents many interesting features and some useful lessons to students in the proletariat movement.

In pre-war days, Australia was considered the last word in political democracy—possessing institutions which functioned to keep the class—struggle strictly within the bounds of bourgeois legality. Strikes were exercised by legislative enactment and the establishment of Federal and State Courts of Arbitration; the submission of industrial disputes to mediation was made compulsory and trade-unionism received the blessing of the bourgeoisie. It was a model democracy, where the exploiters govern—as Engels pointed out—directly through the agency of universal suffrage. 2,844,862 persons out of a total population of 5,247,019 have the franchise—the acme of the bourgeois conception of citizenship. 1,410,044 of the Voting population are women, whose support is much sought after.

Australia's chief industries are agriculture, mining and sheep and cattle raising. The fact that it is far removed from

the centers of world trade has retarded its development as an export manufacturing country. However, there is a large volume of manufacture for domestic consumption; hence in proportion to the total population it possesses a fairly large industrial proletariat. There exists a big export trade in wheat, wool, frozen meat, hides and mining products which more than balances the volume of imports. As in other capitalist countries, production has been centralized, resulting in congestion in all the big cities, thus denuding the country of its rural population. This centralized industry explains the large support given to the Labour Party by all the town constituencies.

The economic development of the country is reflected in the composition of its political parties. Thus there exists the Country Party representing the agrarian interests, which holds the balance of power in both the Federal and the Victorian Parliament and possesses many seats in the New South Wales and Queensland legislatures; the agrarians are represented by 222,622 agricultural holdings from one to 50,000 acres in size, forming a compact class with bourgeois private property instincts opposed to the Communist program of social revolution. The liquidation of their resistance is a problem for the Communist Party to solve and calls for the drawing up of an agrarian program.

10 % of the country's population, the financial and industrial capitalists, possess 70 % of the country's wealth the remaining 90 % only 30 % of the wealth. Exploitation as in European countries is organized on a scientific basis. The position of the working-class at the present time is very bad owing to the widespread unemployment and high cost of living. Taxation has increased and at the present time stands at a high level.

Prior to the formation of the Communist Party last December the Australian Labour Party was the only political expression, of the proletariat, acting as its vanguard and firmly resting on the trade-unions for support—being in fact merely the political form of the organized working-class. Early in 1914, it obtained control of the Federal Government, having big majorities in both the House of Representatives and Senate, after having defeated the Liberal Party, the only opposition it had to fight at that period. The rural vote was responsible for its victory, as it got the support of a large percentage of the country electors together with the united trade-union vote from the big industrial constituencies. A large section of the former support has been lost owing to the rapid rise and growth of the Country Party. This support was previously given and received at the price of the Labour Party's development as a working-class body, as many concessions had to be granted to the petty-bourgeoisie to retain it.

The A.L.P. appeared to have a golden future ahead of it, for besides the Federal victory, it had majorities in all the State Parliaments, with the exception of Victoria. This State has not experienced the bliss of a Labour government up to date, except for about five days, when the party was used in the fight of the bourgeois parties for the political plums of office. The worker's economic position during that period was considered good as compared with other countries—in the eyes of many Australia was a worker's paradise—the absence of a proletarian revolutionary political party may be taken as a proof of the lack of sharp divisions in the class-struggle. All attempts that were made to form, one were liquidated, those in existence being small bodies quite apart from the general mass of workers and devoid of influence. The I. W. W., as an economic organization exercised an influence quite out of proportion to its numbers, being very weak, but did splendid work, however, in propagating the principles of revolutionary industrial unionism, until its suppression by the bourgeoisie during the war, when its most stalwart fighters were imprisoned for terms ranging from 5 to 15 years on a framed-up charge of arson. They were recently released with one exception, through the findings of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the cases.

When in office the Labour Government was looked to as a means of emancipation and its supporters entertained high hopes of it leading them into the Promised Land via Parliamentary democracy. It was the happy hunting ground for political aspirants seeking a career on the backs of the working-class and in the course of its history has been responsible for quite a number of cases of "personal emancipation" (the present Prime Minister is an ex-umbrella mender, at one time carried his swag in the Australian bush, and at the present time is the workers most bitter opponent) owing to the non-revolutionary nature of its program and policy. The war however, radically transformed the situation. At the outbreak of the war the workers were pledged to the "last man and last shilling" by the Labour Prime Minister, Andrew Fisher, and

his successor endeavoured to consummate the pledge by the introduction of conscription for the European Charnel-House, resulting in the party being split in twain. Most of its parliamentary members were expelled, placing the party in opposition in all the Parliaments with the exception of Queensland. The conscription fight proved to be the most bitter in Australian history—forcing the people into two hostile camps with the most bitter antagonism. However, the proposals were rejected, mainly through the support given by the agricultural constituencies—the farmers voting solidly in the negative, owing to their fears of being without sufficient agricultural labor for the farms and the harvest.

The Liberal Party is a strong organization representing the large exploiters of labor and supported by the bourgeoisie and a big section of the rural community. It was the chief advocate of the conscription proposals, forming a Coalition Government with the renegades from the Labour Party. The Hughes Coalition Government formed after the referendum proved to be the most bitter enemy of the revolutionary section of the proletariat, passing special legislation to suppress the I. W. W. and keep down the militant workers. Many of the best fighters were thrown into prison for anti-war propaganda under the "War Precautions Act", hundreds were deported from the country and every effort made to crush anyone raising a voice against the wholesale slaughter in Europe. The removal of the Hughes Government from power is one of the things foremost in the minds of the Australian workers at the present time, many believing that a Labor Government will result in many of their present troubles being removed.

The inevitable reaction from the war occurred in 1917 and expressed itself in a huge strike involving thousands of workers and tying up all the main industries of the Commonwealth; following the attempted introduction of the Taylor system into the railway workshops at Everleigh, New South Wales. It was a most important industrial upheaval with far-reaching effects. Hundreds of workers were victimised, their places being taken by scabs who volunteered in thousands to break the strike which was defeated, due to the scab recruiting and to betrayal by labour leaders.

The successive defeats of the striking unions did much to further the cause of industrial unionism. The lessons of the 1917 strike can be taken as the background for the recent endorsement by the Melbourne Trade Union Congress, representing 700,000 trade-unionists, of the principles of revolutionary industrial unionism and the evolution of the necessary machinery for its establishment. The A. L. P. Conference held in Perth in 1918, passed a resolution demanding a settlement of the war by negotiations in the face of great opposition at that time. The general election which followed the Armistice resulted in the Labour Party suffering a big defeat in all parts of the Commonwealth. The labour strongholds of Adelaide and Brisbane were lost to the party, Nationalists winning both seats.

The position to be taken up by the Communist Party to the A. L. P. at the present time is complex, many Communists insisting upon the necessity of attacking and smashing it. This policy is, however, bound to fail as the A. L. P. still retains the support of the majority of the Australian workers, and is moving towards the left, in response to the militant influences within the trade-union movement. The New South Wales Trades and Labour Council, representing all the important unions in that State, is supporting the policy of the Communist Party, the secretary being a member of the Executive of the C. P. At the same time however, the unions affiliated to the Council are also affiliated to the A. L. P. The C. P. exercises an influence in the working-class mainly through the work done in the trade-unions.

In N. S. W. it has done fine work among the unemployed, demonstrations being organized, and through the agency of the Labour Council much Communist propaganda being disseminated.

The Communist Party in Australia is still in the initial stages of its organization, the stronghold of the C. P. being Sydney. The problem of C. P. organization is difficult, and success is conditioned by the attitude taken towards the Labour Party, which is reformist, but still has strong militant influences within its ranks and possesses the confidence of most of the Australian toilers. The Party's publication of Lenin's "Left Communism" created a profound impression and has helped to clear up many misconceptions in the problem of Communist organization, specially the relationship of the C. P. to the A. L. P. The Australian position is in many respects (notwithstanding the experience of Labour Government) similar to the English one and calls for the use of the widest political generalship in building up the C. P. to be a revolutionary instrument capable of taking the leadership and direction of the proletarian masses in the coming revolutionary epoch.

ECONOMICS

Germany's Declining Industry

by E. Ludwig (Berlin).

The black first of December on the Berlin Stock Exchange is being followed by other black days and weeks. The short-lived rise in the dollar exchange, which after its first fall at the end of November jumped to 230 marks to the dollar, has been wiped out in a new decline. At the present time the dollar is fluctuating around 165, which represents a decline of about 150 points in a few weeks.

The catastrophe of the mark's depreciation has been followed by the catastrophe of the mark's rise. The stock quotations, which were driven up thousands of per cent by the wildest speculation, are now falling since their support, the dollar, is on the decline.

The fact that for the first time in years bank failures have occurred demonstrates how profoundly shaken the Stock Exchange really is. At first the "Pfälzische Bank" with about 100,000,000 marks capital and reserves in Ludwigshafen closed its doors because of foreign exchange speculation on the part of its Munich agents. The next to collapse was a bank in Düsseldorf with losses aggregating at least 200,000,000 marks. The depositors of the bankrupt banks are now at the mercy of the giant banking enterprises.

It would, however, be incorrect to explain the Stock Exchange crisis and bank failures as the result of merely the state of the conflict between England and France and the moratorium negotiations. Of course, the possibility of a postponement of Germany's reparations payments furnished the initiative for the collapse of the Stock Exchange rise. This change for the worse on the Stock Exchange is the forerunner of a decline in the well-being of Germany's entire industry. Now after the false splendor of the high dollar quotation has faded, the exhausted body of German industry stands exposed in all its nakedness.

Of course, "the situation is still good"; the factories are still very busy. "The increase of prices of industrial products is still going on", according to the "Berliner Börsenzeitung" of the 9th of December. But this "still" with which the financial writer instinctively speaks of the contradiction between increase of prices and rise of the mark, demonstrates the collapse of the present wave of industrial activity. The premonitory creaking of the timbers in the economic structure can be more clearly heard in the report of the Prussian Chambers of Commerce on the economic situation in November. It states that, in general, in spite of industrial activity a slowing-down is everywhere making itself felt.

The decisive factor which led all branches of industry to fear a change in the economic situation even before the Stock Exchange crisis—in the feverish days of November—was the continual rise of prices and the scarcity of raw materials. Both of these phenomena are present not only in those industries which depend on foreign countries for their raw material supply and which therefore were seriously affected by the high dollar exchange of the first half of November, as for example, the textile industry, but also make their appearance in the domestic raw material market, above all the coal market.

The change in the foreign exchanges must under these circumstances have grave consequences. The raw materials bought previously depreciate in value and the German "dumping" at the same time comes to an end. English competition, of late, has been able through radical price-cutting to seriously hinder this "dumping" even when the mark was very low. The manufacturing industries are also complaining of the scarcity and increase of prices of raw materials, as for instance, the porcelain earthenware and paper industries. Scarcity of raw material, especially of coal, is especially noticeable in the mining and iron industry, as is shown by the following excerpt from the Chambers of Commerce report:

"In November the coal scarcity, particularly of coal of the better grades, made itself felt to a serious degree. . . . No improvement was recorded in the provision of the pig-iron industry with the necessary quantities of coal. . . . The price of pig-iron was increased on the 1st of November. . . . The machine industry was very active and many firms could not accept all orders since they could not obtain raw materials at a reasonable price. . . . The price of the finished product could

not keep step with the developments in the raw material market. The number of new orders began to decrease somewhat about the middle of the month. However, the factories are still completely occupied with the filling of old orders. . . . In the locomotive industry there is still employment for several months. The railway car industry has sufficient old orders to keep it going for some time, but new orders have considerably decreased in number on account of the uncertainty in the market due to the price movement. . . . In the electrical industry the domestic orders for future needs have continued to come in, in some quarters even grown in volume, but in other quarters have begun to decrease. . . . The electric lamp factories found it very difficult to obtain the necessary raw and half-finished materials on account of the high prices and the fact that only future deliveries were guaranteed. . . . The shipyards are also suffering from a grave scarcity of raw materials. . . . The cutlery industry was satisfactorily busy. The quantities of steel demanded, however, were only in part delivered.

"The metal prices attained on November 8th, on account of the depreciation of the mark, the highest level of the year."

While the costs of production were thus through the increase in the price of raw materials continually rising—on December 1st the price of coal was raised to about 700 marks the ton—and the selling price was thus compelled to continually increase, a completely opposite movement was taking place in the world market. The English coal price was sharply cut and the price of iron and steel in the world market also suffered severe reductions. German competition is becoming more and more difficult. In fact, the export of iron finished products from Germany has not increased, in spite of the depreciation of the mark.

Of late, the transport crisis has been added to the increase in the price of materials and the scarcity of raw materials. The report of the Chambers of Commerce shows that all industries are suffering under a lack of the required car space. In the Ruhr region alone the shortage of cars was in November 1921 100,000 greater than in the corresponding month in 1920.

The very shortage of domestic raw materials, which are not immediately dependent upon the financial difficulties of the Reich, especially the coal scarcity, shows that the beginning crisis is more than a crisis due to the foreign exchange situation. It shows that the underlying cause of the crisis is the decay of German capitalism. Although there are to-day in the Ruhr district 550,000 miners—27,000 more than on December 1, 1920 and 160,000 more than in 1913—the production of the first eleven months in 1921 was only 86,037,610 tons as against 105,449,295 tons in 1913 and 91,204,234 tons in the last war year, 1918. The figures on the production of the underground workers per capita per working hour clearly demonstrate how much the efficiency and productivity of the mining industry has receded. In August, 1921 it was 116 kg. as against 113 kg. in August 1920 and 116.2 kg. yearly average for 1920, while in 1913 it was 136.3 kg. and in 1919, 124 kg. That shows a continual decrease in efficiency in spite of a gradual increase in the total production up to September 1921, as compared with 1920. In October a decrease in the total production of 70,000 tons was recorded and in November a decrease of 280,000 tons.

The impoverishment of the German workers, the source of all the profits arising out of the industrial activity following upon the fall of the mark and the failure to replace or to repair the mining equipment worn out in the reckless mining production of the war is now beginning to react on German industry itself. The production capacity of German capitalism is being curtailed because its production efficiency has been lowered. Because of the lack of coal, twenty blast-furnaces are cold, although the inquiries for pig-iron are far beyond their production capacity even if they were operating at full blast. "Many factories are facing a partial shut-down to-day, because they can no longer produce as a result of a lack of important iron shapes", according to the report of the Chambers of Commerce.

Many divisions on the state railways have only three days' coal reserve, the freight traffic is in confusion and the express-train service has had to be curtailed. This represents a return to the worst times of the war and post-war period.

The profit policy of German "big business" which exports coal and, in order to obtain control of the railroads, cuts off their coal supply, only intensifies the contradictions inherent in present-day German capitalism which are leading to a crisis.

The working-class is about to enter upon a period of want. The period of "good business" was for the working masses a time of ever-increasing prizes of growing misery. In spite of the nominal wage increases of many trades, they have not been able to keep the pace set by the rise of prices. While Ger-

man wages have risen at most 1300—1400 % since 1913, prices have jumped at least 3000—4000 %. The cost of living index of the government statistical bureau, which gives only an incomplete average of the price-increase conditions in Germany, rose from 1146 in October to 1397 in November. That represents an increase of 22 % as against October, of 48 % as against January and of 58.2 % as against November, 1920.

In these times of the bitterest want and of the worst increase of prices, the wave of high production threatens to collapse. Soon there will appear unemployment, then the employers will resort to their usual practice, shutting down their factories and through wage reductions reducing the workers' standard of living still lower, in order thus to be able to tide over the crisis.

In order to emerge from this period of panic, German capitalism will work for the pledging of German industry to foreign capitalists more ruthlessly than ever, in order that the allied governments grant them a moratorium. It will press with all the resources at its command for the carrying through of the provisions of the Wiesbaden Agreement.

Struggles are going to commence, more serious and more extensive than any this winter has yet seen. The joining of the working-class into an united front, which the Social Democratic lackeys of class-justice are seeking to hinder, will in the misery of the days to come, in spite of all obstacles, become an unavoidable necessity.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Present Condition of the English Trade Unions.

by Coates (London).

Prior to the war the English trade-unions had a total membership of something less than 4,000,000. During the war, owing to the enormous increase in the cost of living, and the consequent pressure upon the workers to unite for the obtaining of the wage increases necessary to maintain their living standard, the trade-unions practically doubled their membership.

In the early days of peace, as trade was good and the government made some show of keeping its wartime promises, the working hours were reduced even below what had always the goal of the British trade-union movement—the 48-hour week. Many well-organized unions succeeded in having their hours of their members reduced to as low as 44 and even 42 per week, and the railway clerks even pressed for a 38-hour week. In addition to these gains, substantial advances were made in other fields. The government, fearing the dread spectre of Bolshevism, yielded to almost every demand of the workers without putting up much of a fight. The employers, as well, were demoralized by the insecurity of governments in general all over Europe in the post-war period, and did not offer much resistance to the demands of the workers. However, the temporary prosperity was purely artificial. This artificial prosperity came to a sudden end with the setting-in of the world crisis. The capitalist class immediately began to attack the shorter hours won by the workers. Big employers in various industries quoted cases in which they had lost contracts, owing to the longer working week in other countries. It is necessary here to mention that unemployment aid was granted to practically all unemployed at the close of the war.

At the same time that the capitalists attacked the length of the working week, they also advanced against the unemployment allowance, which was reduced by 25 %. They alleged that many workers would prefer to loaf on unemployment pay rather than accept employment at wages paid for so-called unskilled workers. The capitalist class displayed considerable skill in their attack, first dealing with trades least able to put a good resistance and after having won the first round, fighting one industry after another one at a time.

Having won a victory in the hours question the employers next turned to wages. In their second attack, the employers were aided by a very clever move on the part of the government. The mines and railways were still under government control and were to be returned to the owners in August of this year. The government, however, removed control from the mines at the end of March with the object of dividing the miners and the railwaymen. The miners fought splendidly but the strike was broken and they had to accept terms which represented a living standard less than the pre-war level.

The collapse of the miners was a signal for a general wage reduction. Undoubtedly unions to-day are as a whole considerably weaker than they were two years ago. Owing to

widespread unemployment men in work are very loath to risk employment by striking. Tens of thousands who flocked into the unions during the war were not trade-unionists by conviction, and when the test came they deserted the colors. At the same time, the allowances still paid to unemployed are considerably higher than any paid in pre-war days. In addition to allowances paid by the state, the local authorities have been granting supplementary support. The latter, however, must soon come to an end, as many of the local authorities are on the verge of bankruptcy.

The general situation in England to-day thus falls under three heads.

1—The trade-union movement is still very large but with practically exhausted funds.

2—Unemployment is widespread with a tendency for the unemployed to organize themselves nationally, demanding from the government trade-union rates of wages while unemployed. 3—A growing paralyzation of industry.

There is no doubt that the government sees the red light. The government knows that the one hope of the return to normal conditions in England is to reestablish the Continental and world markets. If foreign markets cannot be reestablished and should chaos in Europe continue to increase, it is difficult to see any other development in England but an uprising. At the same time, it is useless blinking the fact that, owing to the traditions of the last few hundred years, the British have a profound respect for what they call "Law and Order". Many hold that a Labor Party government will first have to come into power before the question of the Social Revolution will be one for immediate consideration. The first Labor government will undoubtedly be strongly to the right, but circumstances will drive it to the left in order to mitigate a growing general misery.

The policy of the Communists in England. Communists should be inside the local Labor Parties, Trades Councils, trade-unions and the National Labor Party, seeking election to various official positions, showing the masses on every occasion the wisest steps to take and advocating a revolutionary but sane policy. The time has passed in England for mere theoretical expositions of general Communist principles. The policy of the Communist Party must be the application of Communist principles to the working-class problems of to-day.

The Italian Syndicalist Union

by * * *

The U. S. I. (Unione Sindicale Italiana) was born in 1907 of a split in the C. G. L. (General Confederation of Labor). The Italian Socialist Party and together with it the C. G. L. was then developing like the French and Spanish Socialist parties, etc. in the direction of ministerialism. The revolutionary members of the unions who would not bear responsibility for such policy separated themselves from the C. G. L. and organized their own revolutionary syndicalist union, the Unione Sindicale Italiana. Its membership quit at the same time the Socialist Party without, however, forming a political party of their own.

Contrary to the French syndicalists, the membership of the U. S. I. held a position of extreme intransigence during the war. A small group of war enthusiasts led by the Ambris was forced to leave the U. S. I. They organized the Unione Italiana del Lavoro (Workers' Union) with a small and constantly dwindling membership although it recently turned one more to the left.

In 1919 the U. S. I. decided to join the Communist International and sent one of its most prominent members, Armando Borghi, to Moscow to the Second Congress of the Communist International. He reached Moscow too late to participate in the work of the Congress, but when the resolutions adopted were shown to him he declared that with a few minor exceptions the U. S. I. could subscribe to them. Later he added that the U. S. I. being anti-parliamentary could not participate in political elections despite the attitude of the Congress. Then Borghi protested in the name of the U. S. I. against the participation of the representatives of the C. G. L. in the organization of the provisional International Council of Red Unions, since there already existed in Italy a Trade Union—the U. S. I.—that had joined the Comintern.

After his return from Moscow Borghi defended before a small group of his friends the view that there existed no obstacle in the way of co-operation between the Comintern and the U. S. I. and that the latter should remain a member of the Third International. However, he had no opportunity to represent this view before a larger audience, for shortly after his return

from Moscow he was arrested and was imprisoned for many months. After his release from prison Borghi changed not only his attitude to the Comintern but also his views on Soviet Russia. Whereas, before his arrest, he gave a very favorable account of all he saw in Russia, he now in all his speeches attacks Soviet Russia and the internal and external policies of the Russian Communists most bitterly.

Within the U. S. I. there exist two tendencies that differ widely in the question of international affiliation—a fact that may possibly lead to a split at the next Congress to be held in January or February. While the Anarchist wing will have nothing to do with the Communist International, consequently also with the Red Trade Union International, which they consider under the complete domination of the former, the Syndicalist wing adheres to the resolutions passed by the Congress of the Red Trade Union International. The Anarchists who deny on principle all political influence in the unions, attempt, nevertheless, to impose upon the U. S. I. their own political view, and to get possession of the leadership.

In the Summer of 1921 the U. S. I. sent representatives to the Congress of the Red Trade Union International with instructions to take part in the work of the Congress, but to vote for its policies only if they did not prejudice the autonomy of the unions and allowed their complete independence from any political party. In no case were the representatives to vote for breaking affiliation with the Red Trade Union International. The question was to be decided by a general congress of the U. S. I. The two representatives of the U. S. I. at the Moscow Congress belonged to the Syndicalist wing and thought the resolutions of that Congress perfectly acceptable. Nevertheless they declared this to be their personal opinion and not that of their union.

At the Convention of the National Council of the U. S. I. held in the early part of October, a resolution on international affiliation was adopted that did not at all clarify the situation. The resolution was neither definitely for nor against affiliation with the R. T. U. I. On the other hand it demanded the calling of another World Congress outside of Russia to escape the influence of the Russian Communists. This Congress is to revise those Moscow resolutions that treat of the relations between the trade union and political Internationals.

The Anarchists are going to introduce a motion at the next Congress of the U. S. I. that the latter break with the R. T. U. I. and start the organization of a new Trade Union International. The probabilities are that the majority will vote to remain in the Moscow International. It is questionable whether the Anarchists will continue their membership in the U. S. I. after that.

In the question of a united proletarian front, i. e. the union of the C. G. L., the U. S. I., and the Railroad Union, (in Italy the railroad men have an organization independent of the C. G. L.), the U. S. I. takes a negative stand, its Syndicalist wing for tactical reasons, its Anarchist wing for reasons of principle. The Syndicalists criticize the Communists for having demanded, in their propaganda for a united front, that the members of the U. S. I. leave their unions and join the C. G. L. According to them there could never be any question of the members of the U. S. I. individually joining the C. G. L. even if the latter had not decided to leave the Moscow International in order to rejoin the International of Amsterdam. Had the C. G. L. remained in the Moscow International the U. S. I. would have demanded that the three organizations, without dissolving, co-operate in a joint working association. Taking into consideration the present situation the U. S. I. is prepared to unite with the Communist Unions. However, the resolution of the National Council upon this question flatly refuses the mediation of any political party. The resolution of the Red Trade Union International demanding that all organization amalgamate with larger ones, is considered, even by those Syndicalists who adhere to the decisions of the Congress only as a recommendation and not at all binding.

The contrast between the two tendencies in the U. S. I. is also evident in the case of the two members of the union elected to the last Parliament after having been nominated as candidates by the Socialist Party with the aim of their eventual release from prison. The Anarchists defend the view (which found an echo in the resolution adopted by the National Council) that it is incompatible with the strictly antiparliamentary principles of the U. S. I. for any of its members to represent a political party in Parliament. The Syndicalists, on the contrary, see therein no reason for the exclusion of the two members, since the union allows in its ranks adherents of various political parties provided these members accept revolutionary methods and sanction direct action.

The resolution of the Anarchists was adopted by a large majority of the National Council; it is, however, no indication of the relative strength of the two tendencies, since the vote was counted according to delegations contrary to the procedure at a General Congress where votes are counted according to membership. The entire membership of the U. S. I. is about 150,000 of which a considerable majority adheres to the Syndicalist wing.

It is impossible to foresee the result of the next Congress. At any rate the question: "For or against affiliation with Moscow" is clearly foreshadowed in the differences within the organization and will inevitably lead to a split though perhaps not at the coming Congress. The petty-bourgeois Anarchist wing will form its own organization. The revolutionary Syndicalist wing will take a definite stand for an united proletarian front, having already accepted it in principle.

RELIEF FOR RUSSIA

For the Suffering in Russia.

An influential group of Greek intellectuals have signed the following appeal for starving Russia, published in the official organ of the Communist Party of Greece, "Rizospastis".

Maxim Gorki, spiritual father of all literature and with him the most representative intellectual workers of the world, have addressed a moving appeal to the intellectuals of all countries independent of their social and political opinions and invite them to assist in the European and American organizations which have as their object the saving of that part of the Russian people which on account of poor climatic conditions is otherwise doomed to die of hunger.

The most terrible disaster has descended upon this immense and heterogeneous earth where to-day the human mind is attempting its most ambitious flight. We do not need to discuss the events in Russia or whether these events are acceptable to all of us. Posterity will judge them when it will have at its disposal all the facts. It would be criminal to discuss at a moment when millions of human beings are in danger of death. At this moment when the funereal cortege of death passes before us, let us respect Russia's sorrow and let us think only of the horrible scourge raging over that distant country.

We Greek intellectuals as well as the spiritual children of Dostoevsky, Tolstoi, Gorki, Andreyev and of all the other Russian masters who have aided us to see artistic truth and the path of civilization more clearly. We cannot refuse to recognize all the sacrifices which the Russian mind has never refused to make for the deliverance and the purification of humanity. We, the Greek intellectuals, must now repay a part of our debt at the time when cruel nature is toriuring Russia.

Our country, as all other civilized countries have already done, must aid these people in danger of death by starvation. Russia, which is doing all in its power with the aid of the civilized world to neutralize the disastrous effects of a rigorous climate, will no doubt be able to extricate from the terrible situation in which it now finds itself. But we Greek intellectuals, as all disinterested men, are obliged to show our devotion and must not behind in the great moral work undertaken to save the Russian people, tormented and killed by hunger.

Even enemy countries and lands where opinion is against the Soviet regime are doing all in their power to relieve Russia. Our country is passing through difficult days. Poor, ruined by war, it can not be of much material aid to Russia, but our moral assistance, independent of political opinions, ought to be given without stint.

All you who have drunk of the spiritual milk of Russia and have been guided by the Russian flame, all you Greek intellectuals who recognize the necessity for human mutual aid, do not forget what we owe to Russia and how much poorer our ideas and our feeling would be if we had not known the Russia of great writers and of great creators.

C. Palamas, S. Porfiras, J. Griparis, C. Theotokis, P. Chorn, G. Xenopoulos, Paul Nirvanas, S. Melas, Z. Papantontou, Sikelianos, D. Voutiras, Costas Paroritis, C. Varnalis, M. Avgeris, Pavlides, N. Kazantzakis, Galatia Kazantzakis, D. Tangopoulos, Ph. Yiofilis, Fteris, Thomopoulos, A. Veakis, Papayoryiou.