Is the Russian Revolution a Bourgeois Revolution?
by Karl Radek.
(Conclusions.)

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 that 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 peasant governments. 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.

- 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 Estonia, 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 Czech-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 bourgeois industries for 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 the war. As comrade Lenin rightly states in his pamphlet on the tax in kind, the military measures led to the liquidation of the independent elements in the cities, and to repositioning in the country, that is to say, plundering for the support of the army and the cities. There was any other possibility of getting a sufficient amount of metal and of grain which we needed for the war. It was possible to 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 producers of Central Russia (and 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? Every worker had a stake in what was going on and every producer was willing to suffer 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 richly displayed 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 great conditions of the time.

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 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 own industries in Europe. 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 peasantry. The commercial and industrial industries would have been permitted the possibility 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 and most beneficial for the proletariat. It has 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 can communicate in industrial production only through our tradesmen with the world. Bourgeois are advantageous to us. The uncertainty of our foreign relations gave the bourgeoisie the opportunity of getting greater concessions from us and of starting, the 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 to the bourgeoisie. The Russian bourgeoisie is a continuation of our old tradition. We are co-operating with the bourgeoisie; this is undoubtedly dangerous to the existence of the Soviet government, because the monopoly on industrial production as against the peasantry.

Does this signify the decisive victory of Capitalism? May we consider it 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 compelled them, because these were their true 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 class war policy. Even in cases in Central Russia, we must reoccupy the feudal landholdings. But the condition of the peasants was that the one who held the landholdings was forced to make concessions to the bourgeoisie, so that the bourgeoisie became the ruling economic class, and the countryside was impoverished. This was called "the revolution.

Our economic policy is based upon a longer period of time, but it is a transition policy nevertheless. Our goal is the same — the industries in the hands of the workers' government. But just at present the government industries constitute only a small part of the whole national production 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 conditions of the great resistance of the other classes, in our case because of the resistance of world capitalism which is not yet overcome, does not cease to be the victorious class, the ruling class. When the Czariat government was a government of large landowners was compelled to make concessions to capitalism, so that the bourgeoisie became the ruling economic class, Czariatism 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 capitalist country. Should the bourgeoisie having lost its 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 in the workers' state, and the events in the Russian 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 Bolshevik 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 in the conditions 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 concessions 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 different from the political concessions 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. This is why the bourgeoisie has advanced to make political concessions to the bourgeoisie; since it is justified in hoping that the new, more powerful class 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 other countries, which are only by fact the political realization of the large landowning class. 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. This is why the bourgeoisie has advanced to make political concessions to the bourgeoisie; since it is justified in hoping that the new, more powerful class will grow on a national and international scale more quickly than will the power of the Russian bourgeoisie.

October is not the anniversary of the Comedy of Errors in which, as the Mensheviks claim, the working-class unconditionally became the superiors of the bourgeoisie. 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 t he 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 been made, but the fact remains that they 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-American, pro-Japanese, or anti-American.

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 the ground for the next war centered in the Pact can refuse to go through 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 an obstacle and prejudicial to the welfare of England and the livelihood of the working class, the close relations between the 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 statement 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 shyer and more secret and more subtle enemy—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-powers position he has traditionally occupied since 1907 if it means 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 friendship. 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 cannot afford to trade the alliance for a vague American understanding, unless Uncle Sam can serve England as John F. Smith and many Americans and many Englishmen believe. But this belief is the product of the white domination of the world which will support it full-heartedly. But the English statesmen are shrewder than the sentimentalists of white supremacy. They see that the abrogation of the Japan-English alliance practically means the submision of the pound to the dollar.

The abrogation of the Japan-English 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 after the Far Eastern troubles that definitely will 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 same fate as the United States. England will not be able to withstand 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. This is the same time that an English cannot very well expose itself to the danger of strengthening the already unmanageable Indian revolutionary movement by gaining the hostility of Japan in this way with America. Its possessions in the East Indies are great and many, 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 is more likely to happen than to be the case, then China will not 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 announced before the Conference her intention to open all the “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 retain 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 main power in the Far East, Japan will lose her influence in the Pacific and above all in the Yangtze Valley. The Chinese can assert their independence and their right to self-determination. Japan can no longer use the weapon of terrorism against its neighbors and its government has to be responsible for its acts. The conference can make Japan lose all chances of 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 the Chinese and Japanese statesmen are almost invariably obliged to depend—even in the treaty ports!

The Washington Conference will accomplish nothing but accelerate the next war. It may agree on some sort of slowing-down in the competitive naval race, but the outcome will be little, if any, skin, for all the美德 ships built 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 what has been called the capitalist system continues to exist, and 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 if it means the same time the Chinese government. The other five nations, the United States, Japan, and China 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 Chinese and Japanese statesmen and Chinese statesmen and Chinese are well aware of the fact that 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 a general 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 sphere of influence. Although the Americans have rich concessions which they cannot utilize on the basis of the Treaty of the Boxer War. China is now well divided among the different nations—Japan and the last 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-hai-wei, Cochin-China and Kweichow which places the latter two before a disagreeable alternative.

There is some hope of avoiding the coming conflict, naturally, the progress of the Russian Revolution. Soviet Russia is now successfully recuperating after long and weary civil and foreign wars. The Russian revolutionaries have great and many, and the new generation has been profoundly influenced by the Russian Revolution. Workers and peasants are deeply impressed. The fall of the Czar and the Russian worker and peasant have been impressed. The fall of the Czar and the Russian worker and peasant have been impressed. The Czar and the Russian workers and peasants see that their militarism is also uninvincible. The yellow labor unions have changed into red revolutionary unions and demand control of industry. The Japanese Communist Party has been formed, and it is working hard in the right direction. A general anti-imperialist strike. 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 want conciliation. Evasion and evasion 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 and to obtain high rank and salary, have now become the last war soldiers and deserters. The Russians, the Japanese, the Chinese and the Japanese workers and peasants see that their militarism is also uninvincible. The yellow labor unions have changed into red revolutionary unions and demand control of industry. The Japanese Communist Party has been formed, and it is working hard in the right direction. A general anti-imperialist strike. 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 want conciliation. Evasion and evasion 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 and to obtain high rank and salary, have now become the last war soldiers and deserters. The Russians, the Japanese, the Chinese and the Japanese workers and peasants see that their militarism is also uninvincible. The yellow labor unions have changed into red revolutionary unions and demand control of industry. The Japanese Communist Party has been formed, and it is working hard in the right direction. A general anti-imperialist strike. 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.

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 want it not as in the past. But the militarists and the politicians, not the police but the police. They are already looking toward a new light that shines from Russia. Japan underwent its own political revolution sixty years ago. It has been conducted entirely by the people and the people. The people today are awakened to the task of a second revolution—the social revolution.
Two very conspicuous events were recently reported from Japan—first the assassination of Zenjiro Yanaida, the greatest banker and multimillionaire of all other assassinations 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 Itagaki and the revolution of 1934 was also the work of a 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 just as their forefathers adopted capitalism sixty years ago. When we think of the desire for the Russian 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. Both of these revolutions were 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 result in a change of the course and degree of the social revolution in Japan, as elsewhere. In all probability this 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 vital question: 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 people of 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-Lorraine 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 treaty. It protests against the territorial as well as the economic clauses of the treaty.

The English and French bourgeoisie behind Mm. Clemenceau and Lloyd George saw in the war precisely the same opportunity as the large industrial associations of Germany: a monopsony. And it is these large industrial associations that hoped to rob France of its possessions in the East and its coal mines in the North, and England of a part of its coloies 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 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 coal danger to its 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: how would the 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 be responsible for 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 Ruhr still have precedents in Paris, and the Bloc National which corresponds to the Pan-German has not yet renounced its ambitious schemes. If French troops did not occupy the Ruhr 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 impertinence of its property privileges. It has grown rich at the expense of the working classes. Austria must continue to pay 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 pay and to keep its foreign obligations intact. 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 employment across the Channel is increasing alarmingly. On the other hand, Germany closes its own market; and because the mark is too low. And the more German issues paper money to cover its deficits the more the mark will sink. England gains 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 in the point of the sword; it will not allow anyone to touch it. It says: “France has only to decide whether 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 Bonapartist ideal remains too weak to pay all new taxes 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, the former is 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 using 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 today 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 relations. Study of its economic and political evolution, however, presents many interesting features and some useful lessons to students in the proletarian 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 bourgeoise legality. Strikes were exercised by legislative enactment and the enactment of the Federal and State Courts of Arbitration; the submission of industrial disputes to industrial tribunals; the pultry and trade-unionism received the blessing of the bourgeoisie. It was a model democracy, where the exploiters govern us. Engels pointed out—directly through the agency of universal suffrage, 24,802 persons out of a total population of 5,247,010 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 produces more new goods than does the majority of other large manufacturing countries. This has resulted in the development of 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 towns, including the 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 farming classes, and the interests, which represent the interests of agriculture in 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 and by the private property interests 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 possible control of the working class, the capitalists' class time, as well as 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 electorate, mainly because of the 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-bourgeois 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 one. This State had not experienced the baby boom. Labor government up to date, except for about five days, when the party was in the fight of the bourgeois parties for the political plums of office. The worker's economic position during that period was considered a good one. The competition on the other hand, in the eyes of many Australians 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. The I. W. W. was released with one exception, through the findings of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the cases.

When in office the Labour Government looked to as a means of emancipation and its supporters entertained high hopes of it leading them into the promised land of Parliametary socialism. It was the 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 was one of the most noted), and was carried on 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 in the industrial field 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 Channel-House, resulting in the party being split in twain. Most of its parliamentary members were expelled from the party on the introduction of conscription and from the Party 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 antagonisms. However, the agricultural community and 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 employers of labor and supported by the bourgeois 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 to be the most bitter of the bourgeois revolution 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, placing itself in the way of the Labour 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 occupying all the ports of the country, followed by 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 imprisoned, dismissed, their strikes being broken 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 I. W. W. strikers were taken as a work of the Taylor system was for the recent endowment by the Melbourne Trade Union Congress, representing 700,000 trade-unions, 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 labor 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 with the worker at the present time that the I. W. W. must become a W. C. T. U. to end the boycott of the Communists. However, it has 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 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, demonstrating being organized, and through the agency of the Labour Council much Communist propaganda being disseminated.

The Communist Party in Australia is still in its early stages of its organization and the C. P. is being Syndey. The problem of C. P. organization is difficult, and success is conditioned by the attitude taken towards the Labour Party, which is reformed, but still has strong militant influences with its rank and file possibility of the Australian bolters. 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, special reference being made to the question of the opposition 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 leading and directing 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 August to 1.85 to the mark, had been restored, has now petered out in a new decline. At the present time the dollar is fluctuating around 1.65, 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 down by the depreciation of the mark, are now rising because the foreign exchange speculators are becoming sufficiently confident, are now falling since their support, the mark, 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 deposits of the bankrupt banks are now at the mercy of the grain exchange speculators.

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 in increase of prices and rise of the mark, demonstrates the collapse of the present wave of industrial activity. The premonitory creases 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 face 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 deprecate 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 market was very low. The manufacturing industries are also complaining of the scarcity and increase of prices of the 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, 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 manufacturers had to 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 suffered because 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 foreign demand for iron future orders have not begun 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 the future demand for new 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 is falling;

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 railway companies of the Reich are struggling with the business. Many of the 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 on the financial difficulties of the Reich, theoretically should be more bearable. This 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 350,000 miners—27,000 more than on December 1, 1920 and 100,000 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 is also far behind the 1913 level. 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, 124.7 kg. That such a decrease 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 report 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 the productive capacity has decreased more, much more, than 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, because "the market problem is 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 period of the 1910s.

The profit policy of German "big business" which exports coal away 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 prices of growing misery. In spite of the nominal wage increases of many trades, they have not been able to keep 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 statistics gives only an incomplete and at 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. The increase in the foodstuffs and other items make the question of the higher cost of living a very serious one. 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 the credit they need 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 Party 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, the government pressure upon the unions 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 been 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, on the other hand, met the increase of wages with the setting-up of centralized councils which generally had no power. The capitalist class immediately set up 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 and 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 this allowance 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.

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 railway strikes were staged under some control exercised by the government. The miners fought splendidly, but the strike lasted for seven months, in which period wages were fixed at a level 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 in men in work are very loath to risk employment by striking. Thousands of thousands of workers during the war were not trade-unionists by conviction, and when the trade unionists deserted the colors. At the same time, the allowances still paid to unemployed are considerably higher than any paid in peace-time. In addition to allowances paid by 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 headings:

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 into associations demanding from the trade-unions the trade-union rates of wages while unemployed.

3. A growing paralysis 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 blaming the fact that, owing to the traditions of the British nation, 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 Party government will undoubtedly be strong 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 the 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 Sindacale 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 the organization of the unions so as to centralize them. It was a period in which the unionists who would not bear responsibility for such policy, separated themselves from the C. G. L. and organized their own revolutionary syndicalist union, the Unione Sindacale Italiana. Its membership quit at the same time the Socialist Party, becoming a political party of their own.

Contrary to the French syndicalists, the membership of the U. S. I. held a position of extreme intrinsicism during the war. A small group of war enthusiasts led by the Ameris was forced to leave the U. S. I. They organized their own Italiani 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 corrections the U. S. I. could adopt 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 Borghch changed not only his political views but also his attitude to the form of 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 policy of the government of the country.

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 question, the intransigence of 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, and who have been responsible for 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 allow 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 became convinced that 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 early in October, a resolution on international affiliation that did not clearly define their position was adopted. 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 unions 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 formation 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 taking no part in any joint action on account of the C. G. L. 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 the C. G. L. the former could not join the Moscow International. 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 doctrine 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 (a demand that was not met in the resolution adopted by the National Council) that it is incompatible with the strictly anti-parliamentary principles of the U. S. I. for any of its members to represent a political party, the Socialists, the Parliamentarians, the Syndicalists, etc. There is, therefore, no reason for the exclusion of the two members, since the union allows in its ranks adherents of various political parties and in particular revolutionary and social democratic 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 any tendency towards a clear-cut split, and all indications are that the vote was merely recorded for a change in the nominating procedure. 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 our age, 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 are working towards the saving of that part of the Russian people which on account of poor climate 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. Only those are acceptable to all of us. Posterior 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 funeral cortège 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 are 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 human. We, the Greek intellectuals, must now repay a part of our debt at the time of its cruel necessity. 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 effect 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 be content 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 régime are doing all in their power to relieve Russia. Our country is passing through difficult days. Poor, ruined by war, it can not be an original aid to the hard but 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.