

INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 2. No. 9

PRESS

31th Jan. 1922

CORRESPONDENCE

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

POLITICS

The Third Factor in the Revolution in Egypt.

by K. Trojanovsky (Moscow).

** The present political crisis in the revolution in Egypt is considerably different from the crises in Spring 1919 and Summer 1920. The international situation and the grouping of both the social and political forces in Egypt at that time varied in many respects from the situation which arose in Winter 1921-22 in the land of Pharaohs, pyramids and cotton where the exploitation and the misery of the fellahs apparently permit of no increase.

The reply of an indignant population to the rupture of the negotiations between the leaders of the National Party (Hussein-Roudshir Pasha and Zaglul Pasha respectively) and the British government in 1919 and 1920 was a widespread unrest which in March 1920 broadened out into open rebellion resulting in many difficulties for the British government and imposing gigantic sacrifices upon the unhappy vountry. And now, the British imperialists have refused even the modest reforms embodied in the ill-famed Milner memorandum and have decided to replace the protectorate by a colonial regime. The Nationalist Party, or at least its majority, is swiftly losing all influence by succumbing to the English and declining to lead the undoubtedly existing movement of the masses. The attempt of the Socialist Party of Egypt—the extreme left wing of the united national front led by Doctor Hussein—to save the situation is foredoomed to failure because neither the components nor the program of that party are proletarian; nor can its tactics be called revolutionary.

A part such as that cannot lead the working masses; because of its inherent weakness it will neither endanger British domination nor grow into a support of the national movement whose agent this "socialist" movement undoubtedly is. The formation of Doctor Hussein's group represents a feeble attempt on the part of the Egyptian nationalist bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia to win the working masses of the Nile valley and exploit them for their class purposes against the English. In its endeavours to imitate the policy of the Indian nationalists, boycott and non-cooperation, the Socialist Party meets with very little success, these tactics being detrimental to the interests of the landowners, traders and intelligentsia and hence disapproved by them while the workers and fellahs cannot boycott anything, their buying power being almost nil. Doctor Hussein has now appealed to the workers to strike, in spite of the slump in the cotton industry and the consequent depression in the economic life of Egypt. This appeal will but give the cotton plantation owners a welcome chance to lock their workers out; it provokes the masses to enter upon actions totally alien to their interests, and on behalf of ideals of which they know little or nothing.

Doctor Hussein's party, in short, intended nothing less than to smuggle through Nationalist goods under the declaration of Socialism and even Communism. So far it has failed, and the future will show if it can be done at all. The party is of interest only inasmuch as it foreshadows the development of Egyptian labor into a power that must be reckoned with by local and foreign capitalists.

Modern Egypt is the most advanced country in the near East. Of all Oriental countries the nearest approach to the capitalist countries of the West, she is being drawn into the whirlpool of capitalist development. Egypt is the first Mohammedan country in which a modern class organization is being established. Hence it is expected that of all Mohammedan countries Egypt will be the first where Labor will assert itself. ("Der Sozialist" No. 40, of October 1st, 1921.)

When the native bourgeoisie widened its national front, and deluded itself into believing that it was on the eve of victory over its national foe, labor came to the forefront. During the rebellions in March 1919, the Egyptian bourgeoisie became convinced that whenever the masses participate in a purely national movement, they will, under certain conditions, permeate that movement with a Socialist tendency. After the industrial workers, the fellahs of the Nile valley and the Arabs from the neighbouring oases had joined the national movement in 1919, it assumed the proportions of an elementary mass rising. The national leaders, terrified at the rapidly rising revolutionary tide, gave in to the British and concluded an agreement on the fictive independence of Egypt. In can safely be said that the failure of the March rebellion is due not merely to the British arms but to the native bourgeoisie's fear of the masses. At that time the Egyptian masses were organized neither on the industrial nor on the political field. The general political sentiment caused by the endeavors of the Nationalist Party made the workers organize themselves in trade-unions and in the Communist Party. The nucleus for the latter was provided by the scattered socialist clubs which had, under the influence of the Russian revolution, come into existence as early as 1917, with the object of spreading cultural enlightenment.

The new Party has set itself both political and propagandistic tasks. In this special attention is being paid to the industrial organizations of the workers, who had been under the influence of nationalism and Pan-Islamism. On the initiative of the Party, a General Federation of Labor was launched, which numbers at present 60,000 members. The Executive Commission of this Federation, established in June 1921, consists of nine members, three of whom are Communists. A periodical printed in Arabian is being issued; handbills are being published and widely distributed, and an active propaganda by word of mouth is being conducted. On May first, last year, a May Day Procession—the first of its kind in Egypt—was arranged in spite of the efforts of the government to hinder the demonstration and proved a great success, especially in Alexandria where 3000 workers participated in the procession. Thanks to its determined tactics and its well conducted propaganda the Party is gaining the sympathies of the working population. Its very existence tends to differentiate the National Party, whose right wing moves more and more towards the right, shedding in this process its nationalist skin and joining its class brothers, the capitalists from abroad, while the left wing is little by little losing what influence it had, many of its rank and file joining either the Communist Party or the "Socialist" Party which is endeavouring to get at the head of the movement.

The proletariat and its movement have become a power which already has been responsible for a number of political regroupings, though so far it has not been able to assume the leadership, and control of the movement. The situation in Egypt as it is today does no longer permit the Nationalists to lead the movement. The proletariat, on the other hand, and the fellahs

(peasants)—whose movement is not organized at all—are consolidating their forces and constructing their class and party organizations.

The crisis in Egypt coincided both with a weakening of the national concentration and the consolidation of the "third factor" in the Egyptian revolution. Hence the country could not rebuke Great Britain for being robbed of the last shreds of independence in a manner befitting the crime. This crisis took place when the national problem had somewhat receded and been replaced in the foreground by the social problems of a capitalist country with a newly created industrial proletariat. The coincidence was not a casual one by any means, however. The agents of British imperialism had grasped the political situation of the country only too well and shrewdly utilized Egypt's uncertain conditions to impose upon it a state of absolute bondage. The extremely moderate group headed by Adly Pasha, representing the rich landowners and traders, did not hesitate to sell their national rights for a mess of pottage represented by their class interests, and thus facilitated the work of their national oppressors. It is true they refused to accept Curzon's humiliating new conditions, but that is no proof of resolute defence. Like Pilate of old they washed their hands of guilt and left the arena. Nor had they to sacrifice much; merely their titles, and having done this, they were left to depart in peace. The feudal lords of Egypt and its bourgeoisie are much better off under the feudal and semi-feudal conditions of the British regime, than they would be in a free and democratic Egypt, not to speak of a proletarian dictatorship.

The history of Egypt has entered upon a new phase. The labor movement there will no longer be led by rich pashas, but by fellahs and industrial workers. And though British imperialism is still triumphant in the subjugated country, we do not doubt that before long it will be faced with difficulties which neither diplomatic machinations nor airplanes and tanks will be strong enough to master.

The moving force behind those difficulties will be the "third factor" in the Egyptian revolution, the workers and peasants of Egypt.

The Methods of Despair

by V. Stern (Vienna).

** Austrian capitalism is becoming conscious of the fact that it is about to breathe its last. *Politically* it still feels a bit secure because of the blind following of the Social Democratic mass-party and because of the weak organization and small membership of the Communist Party. At the same time however, the low value of the Austrian crown has *until now* harbored the illusion of "prosperity" on the economic field. But on both fields, the political and still more the economic, it constantly becomes clearer as to which way the wind blows. The discontent of the workers is growing from day to day. It is true that due to the distrust which the Social Democrats succeeded in planting deep in the hearts of the working-class against the "Communist *putschists* and dizzy heads", this discontent is not yet strong enough to transform greater masses of workers into Communists who are determined to fight. But the masses are becoming more and more receptive to Communist criticism and Communist methods of struggle. In increasing numbers they slip from the Social Democratic leadership. The cases where workers act over the heads of their leaders are becoming more and more numerous, and although few of these actions last long or are marked by any consciousness of purpose, every such struggle contributes considerably to the unmasking of the social-traitors. At the same time, the Communist Party is busy working on its inner organization in order to be up to the mark for the problems of the future. While doing this it does not neglect to carry on the struggle against the exploitation of the proletariat to the fullest extent that its small forces permit and in this manner it approaches the masses step for step, in its slow but sure and patient advance. Thus, politically, Austrian Capitalism is not yet conscious of *any immediate danger*, but it already feels *uneasy*. It notices the growth of the forces which may become dangerous and its answer to this, shielded by the Social Democracy, is the more rigid application of reactionary methods of suppression hitherto unnecessary. But on the economic field, Capitalism has already entered upon the stage of *complete helplessness and despair*.

Not that in Austria not enough money is earned. On the contrary, capitalists and profiteers of all sorts are making *enormous profits*. But they can do so only at the expense of the system which makes these profits possible; and only by accelerating the process of deterioration which is consuming the

very foundation of the capitalist system. The Austrian economic mismanagement which is based upon deficit, the destruction of the value of the crown, the enormously high cost of living and widespread misery are all well known examples of the rottenness of the system. But these signs of decomposition have gone so far that *even the bourgeoisie recognizes clearly that it cannot go on like that any longer* and that the end is near and inevitable if no way out is found. This recognition is at the bottom of the various "financial plans" which are being proposed here by the Social Democracy and the Government. Part of these plans were passed in the last few weeks, but most of them were passed in a *few hours* at the last session of the National Diet, before Christmas; this was done in order not to enrage public opinion and arouse severe criticism.

We must indeed distinguish between two financial plans of the Social Democrats, namely, between the one which they laid before the public and which besides shifting the heaviest burdens upon the masses, also demands a few tame property taxes, and the one which they worked out in negotiations with the other government parties and in which almost no semblance of a property tax remains, but which on the other hand contains a number of new burdens to be shifted to the masses in addition to those "demanded" by the Social Democrats. The "property tax" which the Social Democrats are proud to have "fought for", consists of an attempt with insufficient means, to persuade the property owners to pay their taxes first of all. Until now they did not even think of doing so. If the tax is not paid in time it should be increased to one and a half or twice the original amount. The owners can thus calculate whether it be more profitable to pay one and a half or even twice the tax amount later, when the money will perhaps have depreciated to less than a half of its value at the time the tax is due, or whether instead of paying the tax in time, they should not better "owe it" to the government. It was further decided to institute the *registration of foreign currency* and the "regulation" of the stock and bond market. It was expressly stated, however, that the Social Democratic claim upon foreign currency would not be carried out by paying high prices for them; but that those who would sell or loan their currencies to the government under guarantee of all speculative profits, would receive amnesty for *tax frauds*. As to a confiscation of currency the Social Democrats did not even dare to demand it. That is all. The Social Democrats also tell us of a "property tax" and even of a "tax on capital" which is to yield 20 billions. This "property tax" is the *bank-turnover tax*, which the consumer will of course have to pay. There is another law which the Social Democracy is proud of. Due to the depreciation of the crown, the workers got "millionaires' incomes" and had to pay the rate of taxes which used to apply to millionaires. This of course had to be "remedied". But then the *rich* and very rich people also had their *income tax reduced*.

As against these "property taxes", there are *mass-taxes* and *mass-burdens* whose effects exceed all bounds of human imagination. The worst of all is the abolition of the subsidies applied to reducing the price of food, chiefly that of bread. The Social Democrats demanded "in the name of the masses" that this measure be taken, but they wanted to have it done gradually. The government was determined to put it all through at once on the 1st of January, and even threatened to resign if this measure were not granted. The Social Democrats were there on the spot ready to concede. In the meanwhile, the 1st of December somewhat disconcerted all of them and a *compromise* was struck by which the greatest part of the intended reduction was to be carried out on the 8th January and the rest was to be divided into three parts so that at the end of April the job will have been done. The effects of this law are as follows: after *over 80 billions* of taxes which fall upon the consumers are thus granted, the most essential necessities like bread, flour, fats, milk, sugar, etc. will suffer a price increase of *about 250 billions*. The law does indeed provide that this rise in prices is to be counterbalanced by *higher wages* to be paid by the capitalists, but it is self-evident that this only means higher prices *on all goods*. It is also clear that the workers will not fully pay these 320 billions, because if they do, *they will all be lying in the cemetery in a few weeks*. Wages will rise more quickly than ever. But then prices will only rise more quickly. Wages will remain far behind prices, and the misery will increase. Whether the government deficit can thus be reduced is more than doubtful. What is certain, however, is that the flood of paper money will not thus be dammed. For, by as much as the requirements of the government may perhaps decrease, by just so much or more will the demand for credit on the part of private industry increase. The increase in the circulation of paper money during the last week of November, in which the demands of the government were almost naught was greater than ever before.

It becomes clear that such methods of recuperation arise out of absolute *helplessness and despair*. Every one admits that this "experiment" which is now being tried out is only a *leap in the dark*, and that it is *dared* because no *other way out* can be seen. The remedy recommended by the Communists, namely, the *confiscation of profits, chiefly through the seizure of capital goods*, is not even considered by the capitalists, because profit is the only thing they do consider. The Social Democrats, on the other hand do not approve of such a measure, because *they detest everything and anything that may lead to a struggle*. This common tie has now, at a moment when the bourgeoisie is perpetrating the greatest pillaging expedition against the proletariat, so bound the Social Democracy to the capitalist parties, that the capitalist press is more often and more openly putting the question as to whether the Social Democrats do not wish to transform the secret coalition into an open one by participating in the government. But the cleverer part of the Social Democracy has no desire to do so just now.

In this manner the capitalists and their Social Democratic aides have given the proletariat a Christmas present which will bring it untold misery during the coming year, but which will at the same time *intensify the class-struggle* in spite of the "exhortation system", thus contributing much towards the revolutionization of the exceedingly patient Austrian proletariat.

ECONOMICS

Soviet Russia's New Economic Policy

by Georges Safaroff (Moscow).

** "There being no flourishing large industry providing commodities for the peasants, but one way remains to form a link between workers and peasants, that is, trade."

This quotation from Comrade Lenin's address to the Ninth Congress of the Soviets is the essence of our new economic policy. To increase the forces of production and, most important, to improve agriculture constitutes our main foremost task. So long as we are not able to do so with the help of the large industries which have suffered heavily under both foreign and civil wars, there is no way out but trade, giving renewed impetus to the petty peasantry. At first glance this seems rather curious indeed. We must not forget, however, that in 1920 25 % of the total area of arable soil remained uncultivated. The relations between large and home industries underwent the following alterations: in Spring 1921 the total output of the large industries had fallen to one-fifth of the pre-war figures (when it had been four times as great as that of the home industries) and the output of the small industries and workshops constitutes at present from one-half to two-thirds of the total output of Russia's industries. Under the pressure of the burdens of civil war the small peasants did not raise more than was necessary to cover the needs of themselves and their families. If this state of affairs is not improved upon we cannot hope to increase the production of cereals. The only means to this end is to draw the peasants into trading connections. Industry cannot live without bread, nor without wood for fuel which is also furnished by the peasants. It must be brought home to the peasants that they themselves would materially benefit if agricultural activities were intensified. Trade cannot develop without commodities which must be provided partly by the small industries, partly by the large industries owned by the state, and thirdly by foreign trade. The proletarian state with the large industries, transport facilities, the government bank and foreign trade at its disposal must organize commerce. For this it is first of all necessary to stabilize currency, a thing impossible as long as large quantities of paper money are being issued continuously. The Ninth Soviet Congress decided accordingly and thus created the prerequisite for a market on a solid basis. In connection with these measures the budget of the Soviet state was cut down ruthlessly, it being recognized that this procedure was essential for the realization of the new economic policy. Development of foreign trade aided by the organization of export and import companies and with the assistance of foreign capital (with the monopoly for export and import remaining vested in the Soviets) is the second measure tending to develop local exchange of commodities under the control of the proletarian regime. If our industry has improved of late, it must be attributed to increased trading activities, which would have been impossible without import. Increase of industrial production by adopting the methods of economic calculation, and the sale of part of the output on the open markets constitutes the third measure to restore large industry and develop local trade.

The basis of all trading operations is at present the peasants' market. The cooperatives must enable the peasantry to secure the commodities essential for its well being and save it from the tender mercies of the capitalists, middlemen and speculators. Every increase of the influence of the proletariat and semi-proletarian masses in the cooperatives will be one more step towards that goal.

The Soviet State and the entire proletariat are at present in an extremely difficult situation. While the state must do everything to further the exchange of goods between town and country, between industry and agriculture; it cannot permit, however, private capital to assume a dominant role in the economic life of the country. This struggle, the class-struggle, must be conducted on an economic basis, with the proletariat organized in the State on one side and private capital desirous of winning and leading the peasantry, on the other.

"In the political and war epoch" said Comrade Lenin in the address mentioned above, "we went further than the economic alliance with the peasantry warranted". We were obliged to subordinate economic interests to our political aims, because in our armed struggle with counter-revolution the very existence of Soviet Russia was at stake. The result of civil war is the Soviet power, state ownership of industry and the soil. Private ownership of the soil has been abolished; it can no longer be an object of barter and hence no means for accumulating capital. Under the revised economic policy the peasant wants know to a square yard how much ground is at his disposal. Desirous of complying with this wish, the Ninth Congress has decided accordingly. As long as the Soviets are in power (and many the time they have been reported defunct!) no capitalist will find ways and means to speculate in real estate.

Large industry is a second factor for the proletariat under the new conditions. Though its (the large industry's) influence has been weakened in consequence of the country-wide disruption, it still has a decisive voice in the affairs of private capital which serves home industry and commerce. The monopoly of foreign trade and the cooperatives, which have public functions, are a third factor against private capital gaining supremacy.

How far is the peasantry interested in the new economic alliance with the working-class? A short survey of the international situation will convince everybody that the Soviet Government saved Russia from sharing the fate meted out to China, Korea and India by the "Great Powers". The Soviets protect the middle peasant class from the greedy appetite of Imperialism to which every bourgeois government would soon have succumbed as a logical result of its class position. Proof of this is the fate of highly developed capitalist countries with an inflated currency, as for instance Germany which has been ransacked and sold out.

Even if the peasantry has no sympathy with Communism, it is nevertheless interested in restoring industry and thus securing a supply of commodities for the villages. Only the Soviet government could do this for the peasantry on such favorable terms, for the foreign capitalists look upon Russia as a gigantic source of raw material and, in concluding agreements with the Soviet Government, cannot afford to overlook the power of International Labor. Only the Soviet Government, which is hostile to all brands of Imperialism, can thoroughly exploit Imperialism's inner conflicts of interest. The fact that the economic stability of the world cannot be regained without Russia, is the moving factor behind the condescension of the capitalist gentlemen towards the much hated proletarian dictatorship.

It was their land the peasants fought for in the Red battle lines, the land they can be sure of only as long as they and the industrial workers continue to hold the helm of the State.

In its struggle for existence, the Soviet Government must apply the methods of state capitalism while striving for the extension of the power of the state-owned large industries and for the organization of the small industries. But this struggle is also being carried on on behalf of the peasants, who, unless the struggle is successful, will surely be thrown under the capitalist yoke. Only the working-class, and the semi-proletarian elements sympathizing with it, can organize the state control of commerce and direct it solely with a view to increasing production. The semi-proletarian elements—the nucleus of Soviet organizers, the aides of the working-class—represent an animate capital which must be utilized in trading operations in order to organize the control of the market as the syndicates and trusts function under the Capitalist system.

We must adopt the system of calculation and economy which under the capitalist system enables syndicates and trusts to outlive their competitors thanks to organizational superiority

and a profound knowledge of the prevailing situation in their respective markets. That is the essence of Comrade Lenin's words when he said that the proletarian state must become a "captain of industry". The new course is meant seriously and for a long time, though not forever. Transition to higher forms of socialism will depend upon the speed with our large industry is restored, and upon our victories upon the international front of Labor.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The Syndicalists and Communists in France

by Jules Humbert-Dröz (Moscow).

The following article is an excerpt from the article which appeared in the Russian issue of the central organ of the Red Trade Union International "Krasnyi International Profsoyuzov" of the 15th of December, 1921. In view of Comrade Humbert-Dröz' position as a secretary of the Communist International, his description and opinion of French conditions are of special interest.

The Editors.

** The question of the relations between the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade-union movement is everywhere, and particularly in France, one of the most important problems of the revolutionary movement. In order to realize the unity and successful cooperation of all Communist and revolutionary elements in France, we must necessarily take into consideration and even partly accept the traditions of the past. The Communist Party of France is young, and since its Congress at Tours which was to mark the beginning of the new era of the reawakening of the labor movement, it has not quite realized the hopes of the revolutionaries. It was not able to free itself entirely of the influence of the reformist party of Jaurès, Renaudel and Longuet. It has indeed accomplished a great deal in the organization and propaganda fields; but it fell short in political achievements. The party executive was completely preoccupied in organization and administrative matters and did not perform its function as a leading political organ.

It is true that the leaders of the C.G.T., who are at the helm until this very day, were compelled at the Congress of Lille to give up their plans of expelling the revolutionary trade-unionists. They are doing their best, however, to effect a split and are gradually expelling all the revolutionary trade-unionists.

Under these circumstances the revolutionary minority faces the danger of dissolution and the scattering of its forces. This danger is so much the more real because since the unsuccessful strike of 1920, the great masses have left the C.G.T. and there remained in the organization only the really tried workers.

Those elements which are united in the Revolutionary Syndicalist Committees (C.S.R.) are carrying on the struggle against reformism in the spirit of the pre-war revolutionary syndicalist traditions of the C.G.T.

It is true that the Syndicalists are conscious of the fact that due to the far-reaching historical events of recent years, revolutionary thought and tactics require greater clearness and precision, but up till now they are only united by the fundamentally negative program of fighting against Jouhaux, Merrheim and reformism.

Thus the weak spot of the minority is the lack of creative revolutionary ideas and of a practical program, and should the federation minority become a majority tomorrow, it would find that the various conflicts within its own ranks would paralyze every attempt at constructive work.

In the C.S.R. we can name four divisions. Anarchists, "pure" Syndicalists, Spartacists, Communists and Party-Communists who are for the subordination of the trade-unions to the party. While the Anarchists have at present become outspoken counter-revolutionaries, the "pure" Syndicalists, i. e., the former Anarcho-Syndicalists, cannot as yet overcome the magic power of the old and stultified ideas of the Amiens Charter and are still denying all revolutionary significance to the Communist Party.

The Syndicalists-Communists who have gathered about their weekly organ "La Vie Ouvrière" and who are at the head of the intellectual revolutionary opposition, are sincere revolutionists, who have modified their position under the pressure

of social development, and who have even formulated their principles in the spirit of the Communist International, but who nevertheless have not yet had the courage to renounce all the logical conclusions to be drawn from their revision of the old Syndicalist doctrine. Finally, as far as the Party-Communists are concerned, I think that some of them, Lorient and Tommasi for instance, have wrongly interpreted the attitude of the Executive in this matter, and have sought to spread the false idea that it was their party's duty to subordinate the trade-unions to itself. The only effects of this attempt were to strengthen the Anarchists and the Anarcho-Syndicalists; they have also brought conflicts into the ranks of the Syndicalist-Communists.

While the party sought to act as an "impartial" judge in the midst of these struggles and various tendencies, the members of the party actually joined the various divisions, and some members even followed Jouhaux. The leaders of the pure Syndicalist camp belong to the party. And it was and still is the duty and obligation of the party to take a clear and unequivocal position in this fight. The party must fight for the Communist-Syndicalist Party, but it must on the other hand ruthlessly and energetically fight all other tendencies. There can be no room in the party for Majoritaires and "pure" Syndicalists; neither can it possibly insist upon the subordination of the trade-unions. In France the formulas of "Subordination" and "Independence" of the trade-union movement have assumed an absolute character. The Communist International has never demanded or approved the subordination of the trade-unions in any country. All that the Communist International demanded was that every Communist Party should promulgate the idea of Communism in the trade-unions and that the Communists should remain and be active within the trade-unions as disciplined Communists. We were always of the opinion that the party could gain the confidence of the working-class and a greater influence in the trade-unions, only through hard work and propaganda. This influence is a question of confidence and in no way a question of power. We believe that in France as well as in any other country this propaganda work could be accomplished by means of small committees and Communist groups within the trade-union movement. This poorly-understood and wrongly interpreted idea, indeed the very word — "group-formation", has become the bugbear which all our opponents parade against us.

As we have pointed out above, the position of the Syndicalists in all the big problems of the Social Revolution coincides with our own positions. While in conversation and in discussions with French comrades like Monatte, Monmousseau and others, I have had the opportunity of convincing myself that in all these questions there is not the slightest difference of opinion between us.

We therefore ask these comrades in the name of our common cause that they not only give expression to their ideas among their followers, but that they present and discuss them clearly and openly as their new platform and that they give them the widest publicity.

It goes without saying that this mutual relationship between the Party and Revolutionary Syndicalism can in no way be based upon the subordination of one to the other. For the solution of the problem it does not suffice to lay down the organic independence of the trade-unions as a principle, for every revolutionist must realize the necessity of coordinating and uniting all the revolutionary forces against the united bourgeoisie. The Syndicalist comrades have repeatedly pointed out in their organ "La Vie Ouvrière" the necessity of cooperating with the Communist Party. On the question of the part to be played by the Communist Party in the Social Revolution, however, there is great confusion in the ranks of the Syndicalist-Communists.

Among them are some who actually think the party to be the private property of a few politicians and journalists. On the other hand there are those who take no account whatever of the Communist Party as a revolutionary factor; according to them this question remains to be answered by Revolutionary Syndicalism. Indeed, the very existence of the Communist Party fills them with fear lest in the future they find in it their "Competitors". In reality, however, Monatte's idea is the old idea of the Syndicalist doctrine, namely, that of an "active minority" (minorité agissante) which leads the organized trade-union workers with it into the revolutionary struggles. Monatte is convinced that if Syndicalism is to adopt itself to the problems of the Social Revolution, it must assume the form and character of a political party, without confining itself to the organization of the working masses who are only striving to improve their working and living conditions. In such a case Syndicalism would undoubtedly become a political party which would be based upon the support of the organized trade-union workers. And with eyes wide open, Monatte still thinks that such a competition between

the two parties, i. e., between the Communist and Revolutionary-Syndicalist parties, would only benefit revolutionary development.

Of course, this idea needs no criticism. The existence of two Communist parties would become the source of painful conflicts which the working-class would not understand. Monatte also makes a mistake when he thinks that the uniting of all revolutionary workers into the Syndicalist Party would be such an easy matter. The fundamental question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, alone would cause the Syndicalists and Anarcho-Syndicalists to secede from the Syndicalist Party. According to Monatte's friend, Monmousseau, a "division of labor" is necessary in the revolutionary preparatory work; namely, while the Syndicalists are preparing the proletariat for the revolution, the Communists are to carry on propaganda among the intellectuals and peasants.

Of course, the Communist Party cannot be satisfied with the part that Monmousseau assigns to it; according to its nature it must remain a proletarian party. On the other hand, this division of tasks proposes a joint leadership and the unity of two organizations. The only solution of the problem consists in the following: that all the Communist-Syndicalists should join the Communist Party, whereby they renounce the attitude that Syndicalism alone can lead the revolution to a successful finish. Among the Communist-Syndicalists, it is Rosmer who came to this very conclusion. Of course, his old friends are fighting against his attitude, which shows that their prejudice against anything political decides the issue for them. But the real revolutionists must be able to free themselves of all prejudices. This particular prejudice is based upon the fact that in the past year the party has not fulfilled their cherished hopes. But the Communist-Syndicalists should take just the opposite view and consider it their duty to cooperate in the transformation of this young party into an organ of the revolutionary struggle, which is to launch its activities in coordination with the autonomous trade-unions and to join them in the fight against reformism and the various forms of Anarchism.

The Suffering of the Masses in Sweden

by Smohlan (Stockholm).

** Since the end of 1920 Sweden has been in the throes of a great unemployment crisis which has rapidly assumed larger proportions in the last few months. The number of unemployed has increased, according to the government's own estimate, from 80,000 last summer to 160,000. For many months tens of thousands have been entirely without occupation. The hours of other workers have been considerably reduced. The most that is done for these men is to grant them compensation, which never amounts to more than one-fourth of the prevailing wages. Last summer the government undertook relief public works to help meet the critical situation, but the wages paid were so low, that many workers preferred to forego this "help". It turned out that woodsmen earned so little that they had a deficit at the end of the week. They remained in debt for part of the food which the authorities had provided for them. In many cities large numbers of skilled workers were sent into the mountains to break stones, the machines which had done this work previously remaining idle. The bourgeoisie based its course of action on the claim that the morale of the workers would suffer if they had to remain too long without occupation. If anyone refused the work offered him, he lost his right to compensation. The unions failed completely to do anything against this; on the contrary, their leaders, together with the whole Social Democratic press, assumed the view of the government and the capitalists, that the work must be carried on as cheaply as possible. The heads of the Trade Union Federation even ridiculed the needy, calling their demand for a united course of action for the proletariat "Communist machinations". They refused, however, to do anything themselves.

But the working class' lesson was still not thorough enough. In the parliament elections of last fall the overwhelming majority of the workers voted for the Social Democrats, who won 17 new seats, and, as the strongest party, were called upon to take over the government. The energetic campaign offered many favorable opportunities for a psychological study of the masses. The meetings of the Communists were in general very well attended; the speeches were enthusiastically received, even by audiences of Social Democratic orientation. Thousands of workers declared that they agreed with the conclusions of the "inciters", but would vote for the Social Democrats for the present, and wait to see if the Communists advanced. In the meantime, they saw their deliverance from want in a Social Democratic victory and the parliamentary action that would follow it. They seldom were carried away by speakers at the Socialist or the bourgeois

meetings. But because they knew that a Communist victory was impossible, they gave their votes for the Social Democracy—less from conviction than from egoism. Now that the Socialist government is a fact, the disappointment of the workers will increase as the reforms they expected fail to materialize. The number of unemployed has doubled; misery is increasing; the capitalists are taking the offensive, and, with the threat of closing down the factories, have already forced considerable wage reductions. During 1920 wages in many industries were reduced 20 %, and now the capitalists are demanding a further reduction of from 23 % to 70 %. If they should accomplish their end, then in the metal industry for example, the workers will be in a worse position than before the war. In the glass industry the employers are offering wages that are 28 % lower than those before the war, though the cost of necessities is 116 % higher than in 1914. Besides, rent is so high, that a street-car worker in Stockholm, for example, must give up half of his entire earnings to cover it.

The Social Democrats have again shown themselves to be the most dependable administrators that capitalism has at its command. Just the fact that they are at the head of the country at this critical time makes the workers, still blind to the real causes of their condition, patient in their sufferings, and dullens their discontent. The government proposes to commence relief works that will supply 20,000 unemployed with occupation; for 70,000 it plans a temporary unemployment compensation. Fifty to sixty thousand remain entirely unprovided for, so that, as a Communist paper writes, "It seems as if the Social Democratic ministers lack even the honorable desire to break a lance with the bourgeoisie for the sake of the needy. No one underestimates the difficulties to be overcome, but as long as there are people living in luxury, there is always the possibility of obtaining bread for the starving."

The Communists have only to use the situation skilfully, to show to ever-increasing numbers just where the true representatives of the working class are.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Fight for a Mass Party in Germany

by Ernst Meyer.

** The press hostile to Communism is in the habit of regarding all events in connection with the development of Communist parties from the perspective of "splits". Even the fusion of a great part of the Independent Socialist Party of Germany with the Spartakusbund (Communist Party of Germany) after the Halle Party Congress appeared to those superficial critics to be merely a split. In reality as a result of the Halle Congress a big Communist Party was created that was able to pursue active propaganda quite differently from the small Spartakusbund. It would be as much a mistake in judging the Party debates within the United Communist Party of Germany to be influenced by the fact that in the course of these debates a few members and groups left or were expelled from the Party. A closer observer would surely ask the question, whether these discussions do not increase the strength of the Party from within and do not bring into stronger relief the character of the Party as a Party of the masses.

Anyone who has paid particular attention to the resolutions of the Party Congresses and the policy of the Communist Party since the Unity Congress in December 1920 will have observed that the Communist Party of Germany has besides the general propaganda for the dictatorship of the proletariat gradually developed a substantial political program. A comparison of the manifesto of the Unity Congress 1920 with the resolutions of the Party Congress in 1920 or with the resolutions of the last Central Executive Committee meeting shows this difference most distinctly. Besides pursuing the propaganda of the general principles of Communism the German Party deliberately devotes itself more and more to political and economic questions that concern the workers as and more to political and economic questions that concern the workers as a whole. Also the timidity at first sometimes shown in answering concrete political questions has gone, so that the Communist Party is fought by the sectarian-like "Communist Workers' Party"—though unjustly—as being "opportunist". This process of developing to a party of the masses naturally does not proceed without friction. Some good comrades are afraid of losing something of their revolutionary views, if the Party answers concrete political questions otherwise than by a general belief in the dictatorship of the proletariat. On the other hand, some comrades are tempted in advocating a party of the masses to

throw overboard even indispensable Communist principles in order to rally around themselves as many workers as possible.

As the tempo of revolutionary development in Germany visibly slowed down, the nature of the Communist demands has experienced certain modifications. That way makes it appear as if the Party revises itself continually backward. The course the Party pursued even seemed at times not to run in a straight line, because the adaptation to the tasks of a mass party did not proceed without opposition in the Party by the so-called "left" and necessitated a repelling of non-Communist exaggerations of the right. But in general the German Party has accomplished the task of becoming a mass party without too great vacillations and serious dangers. The debates and resolutions of the last meeting of the Central Executive Committee on the 22nd and 23rd of January are agreeable evidence for that assertion.

The opponents of the Party endeavour to call public attention solely to the expulsion of the Party members belonging to Paul Levi's Communist Working Union. Much more important are, however, the resolutions concerning the present tasks of the Party. The Central Executive Committee confirms therein the resolutions already previously adopted on the subject of the taxation program of the Party, based on the demand for the seizure of the "real values". The Central Executive Committee declared the willingness of the Party to draw the political consequences necessary for the execution of this demand, to further the formation of a purely Socialist government and also under certain conditions to assent to Communists joining a Labor Cabinet. This willingness is in the resolution expressly extended to the formation of Labor governments in the various component States of the German Republic.

How unjustifiable is the reproach that our Party shuts itself off like a sect is proved further by a resolution declaring the readiness of our Party for joint action with other working-class organizations for concrete political demands the realization of which are apt to improve the position of the workers. The efforts for the formation of a proletarian united front will be deliberately continued by the German Party and extended internationally. The Central Executive Committee demanded the calling of an international congress of all proletarian organizations before the meeting of Genoa. It rejects, however, any attempt at falsifying this idea by calling a conference only limited to the parties of the Western countries.

The Party as a whole has proved by these resolutions, adopted without opposition, that it is by no means disposed to shut itself off narrow-mindedly and to turn back into a clique of insurrection-brewing conspirators, as Paul Levi and his adherents allege. But the Central Executive Committee had so much more strongly to resist the attempt to deprive our Party of its Communist character and to destroy its organization. The aims of the Communist Working Union (K.A.G.) directed towards forcing upon the Communist Party a policy obliterating every line of demarcation between the Communist Party and the Independent Socialist Party.

The passage in the Communist Manifesto, stating that the Communists have no aims apart from the entire proletariat is misunderstood by the aforementioned K.A.G. in such a way as to mean that the Communist Party has no right of existence whatsoever in addition to the other workers' organizations. And as the other Labor organizations do not amalgamate with the Communist Party the members of the K.A.G. endeavor to lead our Party at least on the way to a fusion with the Independent Socialist Party.

The Central Executive Committee has unanimously rejected this attempt. The decisive resolutions were adopted against only two votes. This proportion of votes corresponds completely with the opinion held by the bulk of the members. It may therefore be expected that apart from a number of Party functionaries the decision of the Central Executive Committee will cause no material splitting-off of members. The withdrawal of a few members of the Reichstag group of course again weakens it, but in that respect it must be borne in mind that the Reichstag group with its 24 members, apart from two, consisted of late members of the Independent Socialist Party, who after the Party Conference at Halle withdrew as single members from the group of the I.S.P. In the Prussian Diet, the Communist group, which was elected after the founding of the United Communist Party, only loses two members.

The course which economic events have recently taken in Soviet Russia and the slackening of the revolutionary tempo in Germany have disenchanted many workers who hitherto have enthusiastically supported the Revolution and Communism. They are more sceptically inclined towards our Party than before. The difficulties of the revolutionary fight, the inevitable failures and intervals in the fray are causing them to keep aloof.

A few leave altogether; others, however, believe they must recommend to the Party the surrender of Communist principles or even the Party's dissolution in favor of a larger "social-revolutionary" Party. The great majority of the Party members has, however, not forgotten its experiences with the old Social Democratic Party. It knows the significance of a clear Communist Party in revolutionary as well as quieter times. The decision of the Central Executive Committee shows this firmness which in the way of organization will also find expression in the retaining of the bulk of the membership. The burning question of taxation, the wages disputes that are at hand and the threatening intensification of poverty and starvation among the masses of the proletariat will not find our Party, which is soberly and determinedly prepared for this situation, any weaker in spite of all these trials.

RELIEF FOR RUSSIA

Nansen in the Famine Territory.

** Dr. Fridtjof Nansen returned several days ago from his trip through the famine territory of the Volga.

Dr. Nansen stayed only a few days in Moscow where he was occupied with a number of organization measures in connection with the International Committee for Children Relief This International Committee for Children Relief, of which Dr. Nansen is chairman, comprises children relief organizations of 22 countries.

"The famine in the Volga region", said Dr. Nansen, "surpasses our worst fears. It will be enough to say that my companion, Dr. Ferrer, who has seen famines in India, Africa and Asia, has never met with any starvation experiences as terrible as those we witnessed on the Volga. My aim is to acquaint Europe with the actual scale of the famine, to explain its consequences, and to indicate the aid that would bring about the desired results."

The investigation of Dr. Nansen began in the government of Saratov. In Saratov Dr. Nansen visited the sheltering centers for homeless children, children's homes, nurseries and food-kitchens, of the International Committee for Children Relief, children's clinics, asylums etc. Then Dr. Nansen made an auto-mobile trip through the villages where he became acquainted with the work of the Village Commissions and the village food-kitchens maintained by the International Committee for Children Relief. Dr. Nansen personally visited the village huts to see for himself the actual situation of the peasantry. It was noticed that most peasants leave their huts only to go to fetch water; they live on the straw left over from last summer's harvest and on other food substitutes. Bran, 5 to 10 pounds of which was usually kept for the winter, is seldom to be found in the huts. There is no live stock at all.

From Saratov Dr. Nansen went to Marxstadt (in the territory of the German Commune) where he visited the children institutes of the city and the surrounding villages. In many peasant houses corpses of people who had died from starvation were found which had been lying for several days. In several huts Dr. Nansen found entire families in the starvation coma preliminary to death. Dead were lying with the dying. Here it has been proven that since the nourishment of children was started in the feeding stations of the "International Children's Aid", child mortality has considerably diminished.

Dr. Nansen returned from there to Saratov and passed through Penza to Samara. In the villages of the Samara Government. Dr. Nansen found the same terrifying scenes of hunger. In some villages the bodies of children lay in the back yard, completely gnawed by dogs.

Dr. Nansen continued from Samara to Buzuluk. With the help of the English "Society of Quakers" which is operating in Buzuluk, the local committee elaborated an extensive children's aid. However, the number of famished children here is so great that this aid can scarcely save half of the children.

Having returned to Samara, whither the Swedish Red Cross arrived at the same time with a train of provisions, Dr. Nansen gave the necessary directions to the relief organizations under his direction and returned to Moscow.

Everywhere, the local population and the representatives of the local organs met him with greetings and special delegations. A people's welcome for Dr. Nansen took place in Samara. A moving-picture photographer accompanied Dr. Nansen every-

where and took films of the frightful hunger-scenes in order to show Europe and America the true extent of the hunger-situation and the hunger-scenes of the Volga Region.

In order to succor all the famine-stricken with at least one pound of provisions daily for every person 500 carloads of provisions are necessary daily, besides the local mutual assistance and not counting fodder and medicaments. Dr. Nansen considers the work of the individual philanthropic organizations in Russia as altogether insufficient for a famine of such large dimensions. Dr. Nansen has in mind a number of measures on an international scale for an active aid campaign. According to Dr. Nansen's opinions, the most important and most radical measure in the fight against the famine, is official governmental aid by all the governments and countries of Europe and America. This aid must express itself in a big loan for Russia, in money and in provisions.

Genoa and the Proletarian Relief Campaign

by Willy Münzenberg.

** After several governments—especially that of America—have voted increased grants for the famine-stricken in Russia and after Soviet Russia has been invited to the Genoa Conference, tendencies in our Parties are making themselves felt towards bringing the relief action to an end. It is argued that the workers will never be able, by collections and small transports of goods, to mitigate decisively the sufferings of the Russian people and favourably to influence the economic reconstruction of Russia. "There are only two ways of reconstruction", they say, "Either we cause the social revolution in our own countries and with our newly-conquered state power provide a continuous support for Soviet Russia, or (by means of the united front of the proletariat) we strengthen our pressure upon the capitalist governments, so as to make them unconditionally recognize Soviet Russia, and, with regard to her economic position, conclude favourable economic and financial agreements (long-term credits) at the Genoa Conference.

These conceptions are fundamentally wrong. All judicious leaders of the Communist International know very well that in the present period an immediate victory of the social revolution in one of the important countries (Germany, France, England, America) cannot be expected. The same arguments—no relief campaign but revolutionary action—were, by the way, already at the beginning of the action in Autumn 1921 expressed by the small Communist Labor Party which on account of its "purity of principles" did not take part in the relief action. The results of the action up till now, however, and its political and material effects are the best proof of the incorrectness of this conception.

In those countries where the action was well organized, it was used as a means to counteract the policy of the Second and the Second-and-a-Half Internationals of isolating the Communist Party from the broad masses of the proletariat, and to bring Communist influence to bear upon non-Communist workers. In Switzerland where the Party numbers but six or seven thousand members, more than 150,000 francs were collected. Large masses of non-Communist workers have evidently contributed to this sum and thus for the first time got into touch with the Communist Party. On a still larger scale this has been the case in England, Holland and the United States.

To a certain extent the relief action of the Communist International has contributed in making numerous trade-unions, in all countries, bourgeois-pacifist circles and even governments alter their attitude towards Soviet Russia. Thus the relief action has had its share in creating the atmosphere without which conferences dealing with communications and commerce with Soviet Russia would not have been possible.

Still more evident are the material results. Until the end of February not less than

10,000 tons of goods

will have been sent to Russia, collected by the relief action of the Communist International, including 8,000 tons of foodstuffs with which several hundred thousand people will be nourished for months. This is not much, but at least something. The more the international conditions in Russia improve, the stronger Soviet Russia will be at the Genoa Conference, the more energetic will be its attitude towards the bourgeois governments. It is evident that the relief action cannot be carried on eternally, but only as long as real need and suffering in Soviet Russia provide the psychological conditions for successful work. To-day this is still more the case than in Summer 1921. All news from Russia report increased famine, misery and people perishing

by the thousands in the famine-stricken districts. The bourgeois governments' promises of relief have in most cases remained merely beautiful promises. Some bourgeois relief organizations in Russia receive more money from the Soviet Government for the upkeep of their apparatus, (hundreds of officials etc.) than they goods which they are bringing to Russia are worth.

Genoa is coming and its results depend to a large extent upon the economic position of Russia at that time. In short, all objective reasons for the continuation of the relief action, and even for its intensification, are present.

But it is necessary to enlarge our objects. To-day our activities must not be limited to the mitigation of the famine. We must proceed to assist Soviet Russia in its economic reconstruction. We must send to Russia the necessary tools, machines and reserve machine parts. Various parties, trade-unions and cooperatives must undertake to administrate some Russian factories. In some cases this has been accomplished already by the Foreign Relief Committee. This way will more quickly and surly show its practical results than the workers' loan proposed some months ago. But like the latter it has the advantage of combining practical assistance with international Communist education and co-operation.

No, the end of the relief action for Soviet Russia has not yet come. There remains the necessity of its intensification by political and parliamentary campaigns in all Western countries and of its extension by measures for cooperation in the economic reconstruction of Soviet Russia.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

The Amsterdamers want to Fight!

by W. Łada.

** About two weeks ago we wrote here as follows:

"Amsterdam is about to be tested, and the eyes of the proletariat of the entire world are upon it. Will it bring about the splitting of the French trade-unions to the joy of the bourgeoisie, in order to 'set an example', and to try to drive off the 'pest' of revolution through a 'radical operation' of this nature? Or will it still possess enough devotion to the interests of the workers to avert the threatening split, and to assure the unity of the movement—even if that will cost it its posts of leadership?"

At present the question has already been answered. At its last session in Amsterdam on the 28-30th December, 1921, the headquarters of the International Trade Union Federation took up Lozovsky's request for a joint-meeting of the Amsterdam and Red Trade Union Internationals for the purpose of preventing the threatened split in the French trade-union movement. According to the report of Jouhaux's Parisian organ, "Le Peuple", the Amsterdam office has established the fact that Lozovsky's proposal has no foundation whatever, because, due to the congress held at Paris, this split which he sought to prevent was already an accomplished fact.

We shall recapitulate the facts. The Revolutionary Syndicalists of France, who were expelled as whole organizations from the national and local unions, made an attempt to reestablish the unity which was thus endangered. It was self-evident that the only way in which this could be accomplished was at a Congress of the entire Federation. But the leaders of the C.G.T., did not want such a Congress to be called—with the participation of the expelled revolutionary organizations into the bargain! The Revolutionary Syndicalists therefore called the Congress themselves. On the 16th of December, 1921, the general secretary of the Red Trade Union International, comrade Lozovsky, telegraphed the headquarters of the Amsterdam Trade Union International and proposed a joint conference with the majority as well as the minority of the C.G.T., in order to avoid the threatening split. Amsterdam communicated this to the leaders of the C.G.T. The latter referred this matter back to Amsterdam. Oudegeest then declared in the name of the Amsterdam Trade Union International that he would present Lozovsky's proposal for a joint conference to the Bureau only on condition that the Red Trade Union International should attempt to postpone the congress of the Revolutionary Syndicalists. The very fact that he pinned such a condition to the support of Lozovsky's motion speaks for itself. It is also very characteristic that in his answer, he stipulated that the proposed conference be limited to the representatives of the two Internationals,—thus excluding the party directly interested in the question. And now comes the

headquarters of the Amsterdam Union International and states that now that the Congress of the Revolutionary Syndicalists has already taken place, the split which Lozovsky's motion sought to prevent has become an accomplished fact. In Paris Jouhaux has every means at his disposal in order to drive the revolutionary opposition of the C.G.T. to a split. In Amsterdam, Jouhaux encouraged this split through his malicious tactics, and now he and all his colleagues declare that the split is an accomplished fact, and the Amsterdam gentlemen refuse to consider any means that might liquidate this split! The entire comedy would be a well-played one if the side-scenes would not give the whole show away so cruelly.

The truth of the matter is that the Amsterdamers want to fight. They are eager to fight against the Red Trade Union International, against the revolutionary tendency within the trade-union movement, and they hope to be able to carry on this struggle under conditions favorable to them. The Red Trade Union International and the Communist International have repeatedly declared that they do not wish to create any special organizations alongside the existing national unions, and that they will strive with all their energy to bring about unity in the trade-union movement. They have repeatedly shown by their actions, particularly in their struggle against the "left" trade-union destroyers, of what great importance such unity was to them. But as soon as any revolutionary group becomes powerful in the movement, unity within the trade-union movement becomes an evil in the eyes of the Amsterdamers, the reformist leaders of the trade-union movement.

The whole policy of Amsterdam is based upon cooperation with the bourgeoisie; its main object is to support the bourgeoisie in its attempt to save the capitalist system by means of political, economic or social-political "reforms". "Economic Reconstruction" and "Economic Democracy" are the two main aims of the reformist trade-union movement. Socialism to them is only a phrase—a cloak which is necessary in order to keep back the masses who believe that Socialism will free them from the capitalist yoke. But the revolutionary trade-union movement wants to fight hand in hand with the Communist movement for the overthrow of the capitalist system. It does not want to cooperate with the bourgeoisie; it wants to fight against it. And as soon as the revolutionary tendency within the trade-unions becomes a power which threatens the regime of the reformist leaders, the latter attempt to kill off this revolutionary current,—even if such a step involves a split of the mass-movement. The struggle against the supposedly destructive group-formation within the trade-unions is only a pretext. The leaders who submit to anything perpetrated by the capitalist bourgeoisie and continue to cooperate with it are very impatient with and intolerant of organizational "offenses" and "crimes" committed by their own class-comrades. One must cooperate willingly, eagerly with the bourgeoisie; but with the workers who seek advice not only from Leipart, Jouhaux, Mertens or Thomas, but who also seek the opinions of the Communists as to the best means of fighting against their misery—with such "trade-union destroyers" cooperation is absolutely impossible! Such criminals must be eliminated, even though the organization thereby loses a part of the working masses organized in the trade-unions, and even if the trade-union movement should on account of the division of its forces lose its fighting energy against the bourgeoisie. *For the most important thing is that revolutionary thought does not get the upper hand in the trade-unions!*

This is the dominating motive of the Amsterdamers' whole policy. They are bringing about splits not only in France, but also in Germany, Switzerland, Czecho-Slovakia and Poland; wherever the revolutionary trade-union movement gains in influence, there they are at work to cause a split.

And then the Amsterdamers ask us for our progress, for our deeds; we shall only put the counter-question: Where are the deeds and where is the progress of the Amsterdam Trade Union International? We pick up the December issue of the official organ of the International Trade Union Federation, the "International Trade Union Movement", and we read the following conclusions in the article entitled "An Inquiry into the Decrease of Production":

"At the session of the managing board of the International Labor Bureau, which was held in October 1920, Pirelli declared, 'If we demand of the workers that they exert themselves (which we consider absolutely necessary) in order to increase production, it is equally necessary to satisfy them that the government and the ruling classes likewise exert themselves in the particular fields of production'. *We emphasize these words and we ask the ruling classes and the governments: What have you done for an increase of production; what have you done for lowering the*

prices; what have you done and what do you intend to do? We ask this question in the name of the millions of workers and their families who are threatened by hunger.'"

This is the question that the Amsterdamers put to their allies, the capitalist governments, the ruling capitalist class of the League of Nations. And we, on the other hand, ask the Amsterdamers, "What have you done for the improvement of the working-class' lot; what have you done to prevent your allies, the ruling classes, from bringing only misery and pain upon the working masses? And granting that your 'positive accomplishments' are nil—can you perhaps point out that the organizations of which you are the heads, represent an ever growing power? Not even that! It is a well known fact that the membership of the trade-union organizations in Germany, France, in England and several other countries, is shrinking. It was only recently that the largest English trade-unions, the Amalgamated Engineers' Union and the National Union of Railwaymen, for example, established the fact that their membership has decreased. And into the bargain, you create splits in the ranks of the organized working masses!"

And where, on the other hand, are *our* deeds and successes? As early as the end of October the general secretary of the Red Trade Union International, comrade Lozovsky, was able to report these in a speech held before the All-Russian Trade Union Council (see No. 9 of the "Red Trade Union Bulletin"). Since then, we see the signs that show us that the revolutionary tendency within the trade-union movement is gaining ground in spite of the crisis increasing, partly because of the crisis which the labor-movement is now going through. This is an indisputable fact in England, where 280 delegates recently met at a conference called by the London Committee of the Red Trade Union International, and where the first number of a revolutionary trade-union periodical will soon appear. It is also an indisputable fact in France, where when it came to the split, the majority of the organized workers in the trade-unions already belong to the revolutionary wing. Equally true is this fact in Czecho-Slovakia, in Switzerland, in Poland, and even in Belgium. In all of these countries the trade-union leaders are compelled to fight this "red flood" which threatens them by means of expulsions. In Italy our movement is also making greater and greater progress every day. In Spain and in the Balkans, the workers have been under its influence for a long time. Even in the United States of North America, in the A.F. of L., the organization of the old traitor Gompers, the revolutionary opposition is becoming stronger from day to day. Yes, even in Japan, the country of the new capitalism, Mr. Suzuki, the "Japanese Gompers", the former leader of the Japanese Trade Union Federation, voiced the fear that the "extremist" elements may soon get the upper hand in the Japanese labor-movement.

And our "positive accomplishments?" It will suffice to point out that at a time when the Amsterdam trade union press is continually raving about the bankruptcy of Bolshevism, at a time when "the economic ruin of Bolshevik Russia is an open secret to everybody", we live to see the hitherto unheard-of event of the capitalist world humbling itself before the greatest revolution in history, and inviting its leaders to a "peaceful" discussion and negotiations, on a footing of equality. The leaders of the Russian revolution are to meet the leaders of the capitalist world not as the trade-union leaders of Amsterdam used to do, not as lackeys and lickspittles who are begging for some reforms. No! They are to meet them as the mighty meet the mighty, in order to conclude a temporary armistice.

We conclude: Amsterdam wants to fight. We do not shrink before a struggle. Under the conditions pointed out above, we take up the fight which is forced upon us and we shall attempt, in spite of the split, to lead the working-class to a new unity, a new revolutionary solidarity.

Notice.

We call the attention of all editorial staffs to the fact that henceforth the articles and notices of our "Correspondence" are marked by an initial double star (**). We request that in reprinting the double star be printed as acknowledgement of source. The Editors.