

INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 2. No. 22

PRESS

21th March 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.

The Soviet Congress of Georgia to the Workers of the World!

** We representatives of the working masses assembled at the first Soviet Congress of Georgia send our fraternal greeting to all workers, to the oppressed and those struggling against exploitation throughout the world. At the same time we raise our protest against the oppressors and their servants, who at the present moment under the pretence of sympathy for "independent" Georgia are preparing fresh murderous assaults against the Workers' and Peasants' Government won by us. Georgia was formerly a component part of the Czarist Empire which was welded together with the chains of force. The working masses of Georgia, in full concord with the working-class of the whole of Russia, carried on for years the unrelenting struggle against Czarist autocracy, against the great land and estate owners and against the bourgeoisie. The lack of political experience on the part of the toiling masses of Georgia led to the leadership of the political struggle resting for a number of years in the hands of the petty-bourgeois intellectuals, who under the banner of Menshevism weakened the struggle of the working masses, and at the time of the imperialist war sought compromises with absolutism and the landowners and in particular with the bourgeoisie. The Menshevik Party controlling the helm of state poisoned the consciousness of the working masses with the dope of bourgeois patriotism. In this respect they worked in the same direction as the treacherous leaders of the Second International.

The March Revolution of 1917 which accomplished the downfall of Czarism brought the two petty-bourgeois parties, the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries, temporarily into power throughout Russia. In their midst the leaders of Georgian Menshevism, Tchkhaidze, Tseretelli and others, played a prominent part. In the area of international politics the slogan of the Mensheviks was, *as was the case with all other petty-bourgeois parties, the prosecution of the war hand in hand with the imperialist states of the Entente*. With regard to social problems the Mensheviks were for the maintenance of the bourgeois state. In the political sphere they held it necessary to back the government of the bourgeoisie by means of the "democratic republic", which as is apparent to all the world, is merely an instrument in the hands of the governing capitalist clique. So far as the question of nationalism was concerned the Mensheviks did as all other bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties. They offered determined resistance to the national demands of the Finns, Ukrainians and other peoples penned in the prison of Czarist Russia. In Georgia itself the Mensheviks sought by every means to retard the struggle of the working masses against their oppressors and to hinder the solution of the agrarian question. They allowed the despots of the former Czarist regime to remain at their posts. The Menshevik press in perfect accord with the openly bourgeois press exerted itself first and foremost in the launching of mendacious campaigns against the Bolsheviks, describing the workers and peasants as enemies of the Revolution and as agents of Czarism. In the whole history of the political struggle, one will hardly find a more dishonest and malicious slander, when one takes into consideration that the October Revolution which abolished the rotten regime of Kerenski and Tseretelli won Petrograd without hardly any bloodshed. The Caucasian Mensheviks took over the conduct of the civil war, which united the

Mensheviks, Social-Revolutionaries, Cadets and Black Hundreds in one camp against the Workers' and Peasants' Soviets. When the workers overcame all obstacles, and were victorious almost throughout the whole country, the Georgian Mensheviks brought about the separation of Transcaucasia from the Soviet Republic and attempted to transform it into an independent bourgeois state. They broke with the working-class of Russia and were from then on the sworn brothers of the bourgeois and landlord crew, represented by the Georgian Nationalists, Armenian Dashnyaks and the Mussavatists of Aserbaijan. Under the sway of the Mensheviks the whole of Transcaucasia was transformed into a counter-revolutionary camp in order to strangle the revolution of the workers and peasants developing there. In this way in Transcaucasia which had been torn away from Russia, the dictatorship of the exploiters was set up under the government of the Mensheviks—not from national motives but for class interest. The Mensheviks took possession of the administrative and police apparatus, influenced the whole of Transcaucasia and they ruled in Georgia without any restrictions. The entry of the Turks and the Germans into Transcaucasia embittered the struggle between the various national sections of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois front. The Georgian Mensheviks believed the time had come to partition Transcaucasia and to proclaim the apparent independence of Georgia. They saw in the troops of the German Kaiser and the Turkish Sultan a sure protection against the danger from the North, and they waged a relentless war upon strikes and the uprisings of the peasantry which repeatedly broke out in various parts of the country. Just as formerly the Georgian Mensheviks Tchkhaidze and Tseretelli had tried to suppress the self-determination of the Finnish and Ukrainian nations they now in Georgia exterminated the national aspirations of the Abkhassians, Adsherzians and Ossetines with fire and sword.

The collapse of German militarism only gave to Menshevik Georgia another master, leaving the international and the internal policy of Georgia unchanged. The Mensheviks now became a tool in the hands of the Entente imperialists. They kept up an unbroken connection with all the counter-revolutionary forces of Southern Russia. They neglected no measure that might harm Soviet Russia and of course the Communist Party was condemned to lead an illegal existence. A "special department" worked for the glory of the bourgeois republic.

The presence of the English occupation troops in Batum rendered the policy of the Georgian Mensheviks against Soviet Russia particularly insolent and provocative. Democratic Georgia was Denikin's safest redoubt.

The debacle of Denikin's army after the victories of the Red Army and the advance into Caucasia in the beginning of 1920, shattered with one blow the illusory reign of the Nationalist Party in Transcaucasia. The working masses were inspired with the greatest revolutionary enthusiasm. At that time already the Red Army could have come to Georgia to deliver it from the yoke of the Mensheviks and the Entente. The advanced workers and peasants impatiently expected this and constantly called for the help of Soviet Russia. The government of Soviet Russia desired to avoid bloodshed among the

workers and peasants and to secure as soon as possible a stable peace between the workers and peasants of Georgia and Soviet Russia. For this reason it abstained from sending the Red Army into Georgia, and instead concluded the treaty of May 1920

From the very first day, however, when the treaty was signed the Mensheviks began to violate it systematically, by openly and secretly affording help to all enemies of Soviet Russia, thus hoping to bring about the fall of the Soviet government and once for all to strangle the revolution of the workers and peasants in Soviet Russia. These gentlemen were, however, cruelly disappointed in their expectations. The winding up of the Polish War and the collapse of Wrangel in the fall of 1920 could not but bring about the defeat of the Georgian wing of the counter-revolutionary front. The experiences which the Soviet government had gained regarding the loyalty of the Georgian Mensheviks, and the unheard of breaches of trust and the treachery of the gentlemen rendered it impossible for the Russian Soviet Republic to remain neutral in the contest which the working masses of Georgia were carrying on against the Menshevik government. It is therefore quite natural that the armed workers and peasants of the Soviet Federation came to the help of the toiling masses of Georgia, fighting against the bourgeoisie and the landowners. As deliverers the Red regiments entered the country aglow with the revolutionary rising. The national army of Georgia created by the Mensheviks, refused to fight against the Reds, fraternizing with them instead. The Menshevik government that had branded itself with shame, by its treachery towards the revolution was overthrown; and its officials, taking with them the state treasury of the Georgian people, made good their escape to the ships of the Entente. These funds are now employed in a campaign of the basest slander against the federated Soviet republics and the Red Army.

The leaders of the Second International—Kautsky, Henderson, Macdonald, Huysmans—and many others vie with the leading imperialist politicians and with the newspapers of world finance in their assurances of their warmest sympathy for the "democracy" of Georgia and have the effrontery to declare that this has been overridden by Soviet imperialism. We representatives of the working masses of Georgia assembled at our Soviet Congress, we workers and peasants of Georgia denounce this disgraceful international comedy of business and lies. We declare that this sympathy of Henderson and Vandervelde is a nauseating piece of hypocrisy. We repudiate it with the same indignation and scorn as we do the sympathy of their patrons and protectors: the London and Paris usurers.

The capitalist and Social Democratic patrons of the Georgian Mensheviks propose to assault the population of Georgia, according to the methods of those plebiscites which the Entente got up or wished to get up in Silesia, East Galicia, Lithuania, Armenia and in other lands, in short, a plebiscite whose result is fixed *a priori* by those who deem it necessary to set up a comedy of democratic derision of the will of the people. The working people of Georgia has already made its voice weigh in the scales, first in the unbroken series of risings against the Mensheviks, then in the election of the urban and rural Soviets, and now in the Soviet Congress of the working masses of the whole of Georgia which gives the most proper and correct expression of the political experience, of the feelings and needs of the working masses of Georgia.

We stand in need of the Red Army as long as the existence of the Soviet republics is threatened, as long as the world proletariat has not yet wrested the government from the imperialist robbers, and as long as real securities for the calm, peaceful and fraternal collaboration of all peoples do not exist. We workers and peasants of Georgia, together with the workers and peasants of all the Soviet republics, and with the Red Army itself dream of those days when a real disarmament of imperialism will render possible the demobilization of the Red Army and the recall of our brothers to their peaceful work on the land and in the workshops.

Working men and women, workers of Europe and all the world over, do not believe in the lies, and slanders of our enemies and yours! Listen to the voice of your brothers, the workers and peasants of Georgia. The Red Army is no instrument of force, but our own instrument in the struggle of liberation of the working masses. Its rank and file consists of regiments recruited from all the nations of the great Soviet Federation; they are all inspired with the same ideas of brotherhood and solidarity. The Red Army does not recognize any national differences and no national fighting. It defends in the same measure the interests of the toiling masses of all countries. The bankrupt Mensheviks and agents of the Entente, Jordania, Tseretelli and Tchkhaidze, are carrying on an advertising campaign out of the funds they

robbed from the people that is to create a favorable basis for a new military intervention in Transcaucasia on the part of foreign imperialism. Jordania applied to the imperialist council at Cannes and to the yellow Social Democratic International. We, however, are calling upon the toiling masses of Europe and of the whole world to resist the new onslaughts of imperialism and of all its henchmen with all their might.

It is your duty, ye advanced workers, to tell the toiling masses of the whole world that for the first time in the history of the country the power is in the hands of the workers and the toiling peasants of Georgia. We shall firmly retain this power, and shall not suffer it to be wrested from us by anybody. We declare before the working men and women of the whole world that during three and a half years' rule of the Mensheviks, nothing was done for the workers of Georgia, nor were the peasants given the land the Mensheviks had promised them. The Mensheviks were not able, when they held power, to bring the country either internal or external peace. Their government, on the contrary, led to openly hostile relations not only with Soviet Russia but with the neighboring republics. The worst, however, was that they have embittered the relations among the divers races of Georgia. In consequence of their nationalist and chauvinist policy bloody collisions became frequent, especially in the domain of the strife of nationalities. The Soviet government acted quite differently. It succeeded in a very short period in solving the most important and basic problems. The land has already been distributed among the working people. Exploitation of any kind in agriculture has been abolished. The national peace among the mixed populations of the country, peaceable and brotherly relations with all the neighbouring states of Georgia—with Soviet republics as well as with those states that have no Soviet government—have been realized. During this one year, of the existence of the Soviet Government in Georgia, peace and calm within and without the country were not for one moment endangered or broken. It is our desire to live in peace and fraternity with all peoples. We exert ourselves to reconstruct our economic life destroyed by the many years of imperialist and civil war, and are convinced that in a short time we shall be victorious on the economic field of battle as well as on the military one.

Class conscious and honest soldiers and sailors of all countries, tell your brothers that the road to the restoration of bourgeois Georgia will only be over the corpses of the Georgian workers and peasants. In the face of the attempt to reconstitute the contemptible and hated regime of Menshevik sham-democracy we shall, as one man, rise under the slogan "Liberty or Death". Our alliance with Soviet Armenia, Soviet Aserbaijan and the whole of the Russian Federative Soviet Republic is fast and firm, and will remain forever unshaken.

Working men and women of Europe and the world over! To you we address this fraternal appeal, we call on the feeling of solidarity and brotherly unity of the working masses of all nations.

Long live the power of the Soviets, long live the international proletarian revolution!

The Presidium of the Congress.

Makharadse, Mdivani, Dumbadse, Orakhelashvili, Toreshelitze, Gegetchore, Todria, Gagloeff, Lakoba, Glonti, Ckuashvili, Papiashvili, Varvara Okud-yova, Mamulia Sturua, Himshiashvili, Baramishvili, Nasarethan.

POLITICS

Japan and the Coming Imperialist War

by Sen Katayama.

Moscow, March 1922.

The capitalist countries are rejoicing over the great success of the Washington Conference. The result of this conference about which they talk with ever-growing admiration is but a smoke screen to conceal the preparations for a new imperialistic war. Many, however, say that the Washington conference has accomplished nothing that is good; that is true if looked upon from a radical standpoint. The conference was called to solve questions that threatened imperialistic war in the Far East and for that the Washington Conference has done nothing. Perhaps the fact that they agreed on a naval holiday will give the capitalist countries a breathing spell better to prepare themselves for the coming struggle and it is also true that the situation in the Far East has somewhat changed on account of

the result of the Washington Conference. The agreement among the capitalistic countries will retard the coming imperialistic war somewhat but that does not mean that the imperialistic war will not come — maybe only after 10 or 15 years as they agreed, but it will come with greater force and greater vehemence than the one expected sooner because they will have better prepared for the new imperialistic war. They are now free to prepare for this new war since they have drawn a smoke screen before the eyes of the people by the statement that this peace will rule for some time to come.

The next war will not be fought with big ships that they have agreed to stop building, but by airplanes, bombs, and other scientific means, the convenience and effectiveness of which they found out during the last war. They have put no limitation at all on any effective fighting means.

I shall speak now only for Japan concerning the result of the Washington Conference. Japan will play a big rôle in the coming imperialistic war which must be fought in the Far East. Japan stands now in a far better position for the coming struggle than before the Washington Conference. Before the Washington Conference Japan had to compete in a moderate scale with America in dreadnought building which was a heavy burden, and Japan's financial resources were all sacrificed to this building of big ships. But now, fortunately, Japan does not need to bother with big ships. She will go on with other minor, and as I said, more important effective fighting means such as airplanes in the use of which Japan is backward compared to America or European countries. Thus she is free to develop her own fighting apparatus or fighting means more freely than she was before the conference.

Financially speaking, Japan is in far better condition than before, especially before the Chinese-Japanese war of 1894 and the Russo-Japanese war of 1904. Her national finances are also taxed and Japan as a nation became richer by many hundred times than Japan of 1890-1900, that is, before the two wars. For instance before the European war (1913) Japan's entire wealth was estimated at 32,043,130,000 yen. In 1920 it was estimated at 86,777,000,000 yen — an increase in 8 years of 54,340,000,000 yen. Japan before the war was a debtor nation, now she has become a creditor nation on a small scale. She is not in debt but has lent money to other countries. Moreover, her industry has grown to many times its former size.

Her gold bullion was about 2 to 3 hundred million yen; at the end of last year it was over 2 billion and, including silver, 2,250,000,000 yen.

Japan was struck by a financial and industrial crisis about the 15th of March 1920. Within a year the crisis had developed to such an extent that prices had gone down 40% to what are considered to be bedrock prices in Japan. Since then, they have gone up about 15% so that prices are still about 25% lower than before the big crisis.

During the last two years Japan has suffered because of a decrease in foreign trade, especially with Europe. Japan developed her industry on a war basis, and now she cannot compete with European nations because her industry is not far enough advanced.

However, she has retained her gold possessions almost to the same amount as they were before the crisis. Her home market has also revived and prices for manufactured goods for home consumption have gone up while prices of raw materials have gone down, so that in reality Japan is in a much better position than any of the European countries, especially the defeated countries.

Japan will have about 200,000,000 yen free to use for other purposes than armament as a result of the Washington Conference. This surplus can be used for the improvement of such industries as are auxiliary to her war industries. Another result of the Washington Conference is the free hand that Japan received in the exploitation of Korea and Manchuria and the extension of her influence in Siberia. This is why Japan so readily gave up her Shantung rights and yielded to the proposals to give up her absolute control over Yap. Japan hopes to exploit China in cooperation with other imperialistic nations. This, however, does not mean that the imperialistic conflict of the different nations concerned will be avoided; it will only accelerate the coming crash because so far their cooperation has not been successful. Their interests in the Far East are antagonistic and each one of them is trying to obtain a monopoly for the exploitation of those countries. This can be obtained only by means of war and since none of these countries is now prepared to enter into an armed conflict they have decided to sign an armed truce; for they could not do better in the Washington Conference than the compromise of the Four Power Pact.

Now I wish to point out another feature which may change the course of imperialistic policy of the world. I mean the liberal and social movement of Japan which has been growing for the last few years. Assisted by the Washington Conference this movement has developed rapidly. For the first time in the history of the country the Japanese people have become interested in the foreign policy of their government. The questions that have come up for public discussion among the Japanese people are the disarmament and other questions which were to be discussed at Washington. Many organisations were formed to discuss and study the position of Japan at Washington. For the first time since Japan has assumed an imperialistic policy Japan has had a disarmament movement. The reduction of the army and navy was influenced by a prominent statesman, ex-minister of Justice Ozoki, and he had nation-wide support for his movement. This is the first sign showing how much the Japanese people lost confidence in Japanese imperialism and militarism when they saw how the imperialism and militarism of Germany were crushed by the Allies. There was talk within the intellectual classes that for Japan imperialism is no longer good and it was proved that the same opinion is held among the masses when the Washington Conference was called and the Japanese people supported the idea of disarmament and started a movement for the reduction of the army and navy. It was, in one sense, a victory for the disarmament movement in Japan.

Recently, one of the political parties, Kokuminto, declared for the reduction of the army by half as the party policy. This army reduction is bound to become popular in Japan because the Japanese people have been long oppressed by the army clique much more than by the naval clique. It has long been the belief of the Japanese that their country must have a large navy since it is surrounded by water, but they have different opinions now since the Washington Conference has reduced the navy and stopped its expansion. The Japanese army and navy have been competitors as to who could increase their sphere of influence in the country, but now the international agreement is to stop the expansion of the navy, and it is the business of the Japanese people to make the army proportionate to the navy. One of the reasons why the delegations agreed so readily to the Washington proposals of navy reduction is that Japan is still in the hands of the army clique, that is, the military class has stronger power than the naval class. Now, since the navy is being reduced, the naval people will try to reduce the army as well, in order to be in a better financial position for the coming struggle.

So far I have spoken only about the results of the Washington Conference which affect Japanese national policy. There is yet another great factor which has been shown by recent developments in Japanese national life. One is the assassination of Premier Hara. Another is the assassination of one of the biggest bankers, Yasuda. Of course, these were deeds of conservative individuals representing old-fashioned ideas. Still, the assassination of the premier means a great deal to Japan. It is quite different from the anarchist killing of kings and czars.

Japanese history points out that the assassination of a premier has always been the signal for revolution. It is a sign of the overthrow of the existing government. People read it thus and are expecting a change. So it was in the revolution of 1868.

It is a sign of the coming revolution and at the same time a sign that the existing government is crumbling. People feel unrest; this was only accelerated by the death of the greatest Genro-Prince Yamagata, who had ruled Japan for 50 years in the most conservative, autocratic, and military way. The death of Prince Yamagata and also the death of Okuma will change the course of political development. Okuma apparently represented the liberal aspect of Japan, yet in his declining years became conservative and was a faithful puppet of the military clique. Everybody expects that the death of Yamagata will change things in Japan, especially that the military power which has been so strongly built up by past decades will crumble away. Then the emperor has become feeble minded and the young crown prince is Regent, all of which means that the politicians will go on ruling in their old way. Japan now stands in danger of being blown up by the discontent and unrest of the people.

Judging from the political development of Japan, a political revolution is nearing and many petty-bourgeois and even the big bourgeois are expecting political changes from the present militaristic to a liberal government. So the political parties which are in opposition to the present government are taking a more and more popular stand and are pursuing the popular course of political issues chief of which is universal suffrage. Not infrequently prominent statesmen declare that democracy should be established in Japan. Professor Soeda lecturing at

Hawaii declared that Japan must establish democracy, otherwise Japan will become Red; and as soon as he gets back to Japan it is his intention to work for the universal suffrage movement. He is considered to be one of the educated liberal spokesmen of Japan and is quite influential among the upper classes. Thus, everything is set for a political change in Japan.

There is another feature which we must consider as a result of the awakening of the Japanese workers.

I have had an opportunity to show how the Japanese workers have been awakening since 1918.* When the great rice riots occurred: there were spontaneous uprisings all over the country. Since then workers have been striking, sabotaging, and making radical demands. I shall give only one instance as to how the Japanese workers utilize the present-day facts in their own interests.

For instance, last December 500,000 government employees met at Osaka to demonstrate their position as a result of the Washington Conference. They knew that, as a result of naval reductions, tens of thousands of workers will be dismissed from the government and privately-owned shipyards, the employees of which alone are about 150,000 in number. In the meeting they approved of disarmament, but at the same time they sent a most radical note to the government asking it to remedy the situation of the workers. They also took advantage of the occasion to make a labor demonstration through the city. A similar meeting was held in Tokyo and a radical, outspoken manifesto similar that at Osaka was passed, which is remarkable because the workers of the government enterprises are very conservative and have always hitherto sided with the government. They are also better treated by the government than the workers in private enterprises. From these few instances we can see that the workers are rapidly awakening. The advanced vanguard of the Japanese proletariat is making progress in Socialist and Communist propaganda work.

The present rather bright financial position of Japan will not exist long. It is bound to change, and then from bad to worse. When we look into the future, we see and feel the uncertainty. This surplus of 200,000,000 yen, gained by the reduction of the navy, will only last about two years. Were it not for that, Japan would be obliged to resort to new taxation in order to keep up her armament programme, and that would mean bankruptcy. The future prospect of Japan looks dismal, and last year also had its hardships. The rice crop which has just been harvested was small, and the cost of living will inevitably rise. This year's crop is 3,000,000 koku under the average, and it is 8,500,000 koku less than last year's. There is the higher cost of living and increase of unemployment owing to the stagnation of general industry.

There is also extreme discontent, unrest, and dissatisfaction with the government's oppressive measures against not only the Communist and radical workers, but all the workers and peasants. All this creates more discontent than ever before on the one hand, and on the other, the militaristic, well-organized and greedy capitalist class will always strengthen and pursue its reactionary and oppressive policy. Thus the revolutionary movement is having its hard struggle, but in the end it will gain the victory and be in a much better position to meet the coming imperialistic war in the Far East.

What I want to impress upon the proletariat of other countries is that the Japanese workers will surely utilize the political revolution which is sure to occur within a short space of time and we Communists want to stimulate and cooperate with these radical revolutionary elements of Japan in order to prepare for the coming imperialistic war so that when the crash comes the Communists all over the world will be able to utilize the opportunity for the cause which is our common one both in the Far East and in the Far West.

Finland's Alliance Plans with Poland.

by Yrjö Sirola (Moscow).

After the breakdown of the Karelian adventure, the Finnish bourgeoisie was left with a bad taste in its mouth. The Bolsheviks are at the gates and "the enemy (the proletariat) is active within the country!" In all circles it is clearly understood that Finland is now at the parting of the ways. An alliance with Esthonia is already in force. Then again France is striving to cement an alliance between Finland and Poland, which means a war alliance against Soviet Russia. The assurances of the Polish Ambassador, M. Sokolnicki, that Poland entertains no offensive plans against Russia and that it is only a question of defending the status quo, cannot blind us to the facts.

* "Present Day Japan", International Press Correspondence Vol. I, No. 15.

The Swedish press openly cries that the "Polish Alliance makes Finland a vassal of France". But then again the Finnish, Swedish and reactionary pro-German press shouts that "Finland is now badly in need of a defensive alliance". It seems that Sweden is not in a position to give the necessary guarantees for eventual aid. The conflict with Sweden on account of the Aland Islands, which remained in the possession of Finland, is now making itself felt. Sweden wants no war with Russia; Sweden wants business.

Yet there are bourgeois circles in Finland who are outspoken opponents of an alliance with Poland. The former minister of war, General Theshoff, formulates the anti-alliance attitude as follows: "There is no danger of war with Russia. On the contrary the planned alliance would only be a nail in the coffin of Finnish independence. Strategically the plan is futile. If Russia should attack Poland, the Finns might perhaps take Petrograd, but that would be of no great help to Poland. On the other hand should Poland attack Russia, its armies would merely commit suicide in Russia. In either case Finland is only exposed to the revenge of Russia. It would therefore be best for Finland to remain isolated and avoid conflicts with Russia." That is what these circles think. But the imperialistic lords of Finland are strongheaded. The Progressives, the Agrarians and a part of the Swedish Party, have already declared themselves in favor of a five-year alliance and the National Coalition Party (the reactionary opposition) in favor of a three-year alliance. The Social Democrats have not as yet given their answer, but they can ill afford to support the alliance. Only recently they called the attention of their comrades in other countries to the existing war peril.

Already the alliance seems to have promoted the united proletarian front. In the Social Democratic party we notice a certain trend towards the left. The Social Democratic Party has vehemently protested against the measures against the Socialist Labor Party, and it sees itself compelled to put on a more radical tone, particularly because the new elections are coming up in July. On the 17th of January, the Socialist Labor Party issued a proclamation called "Rise in Defence of Soviet Russia". On the fourth anniversary of the Finnish revolution the party leaders, the editors and several other comrades were arrested. The mass meetings that were to take place under the direction of a new party executive on the 12th of February were forbidden by the police. The district official of Nyland (Helsingfors) are also under arrest. Our Finnish comrades are in the midst of a bitter struggle. But the proletariat is on guard. A vote is now being taken in the trade-union organizations, and in most of the trade-unions the majority is decisively for Moscow. The international proletariat must pay more attention to the Franco-Polish alliance plans in the Baltic, and it must thwart all preparations for an attack upon Russia.

ECONOMICS

The Economic Structure of Soviet Russia.

by Nicolai Bukharin.

The form of our economic life now coming into existence, is commonly designated by the term "State Capitalism". Our economic conditions are, however, so complicated that they cannot possibly be covered by one single term. Besides, the term "State Capitalism" has not in the literature of political economy the signification which our Russian literature has lately assigned to it. In the following essay I shall try to treat the problem of the different economic forms existing or developing in our country.

Enterprises of the Proletarian State.

These comprise the enterprises nationalized by the proletarian state. They are state monopolies, but they are not state capitalist monopolies, since in the case of the state capitalist monopoly the bourgeoisie "that constitutes itself as the state power" (Marx) is the owner of the enterprises. With us, however, the working-class is the owner of the nationalized enterprises. The forms of production being characterized according to the forms of property, it is evident that enterprises owned by the *Workers' State* must not be designated as state capitalistic. On the other hand, such enterprises are not yet *Socialist* productive units in the strict sense of the word, as the Socialist form of economy is, of course, based on a thorough and rigidly exercised systematization of the whole productive process. With us, however, and particularly under the conditions of the new economic policy, systematization, as compared with the adaptation to the conditions of the market, is of minor importance.

The fact that the enterprise is being carried on capitalist principles (principle of private property, payment of wages, production of a considerable part of the products for the market) does not make the enterprise a capitalist one, as far as the conditions of *property* are concerned.

Enterprises of Mixed Character.

These comprise those concerns in which the proletarian state and capitalist groups are partners. In these so-called "mixed" enterprises part of the shares is owned by the proletarian state; the rest may be owned by Russian or foreign capitalists. It is evident, that such "mixed" enterprises are neither state capitalistic ones nor purely capitalist enterprises. The capitalists and the state are their owners at the same time. The workers' state will receive part of the surplus value produced in these enterprises; the rest goes to the capitalist "partner". In the course of the general economic development an incessant contest for domination will be carried on in these concerns; with the increase of the economic power of the proletariat the participation of the capitalistic groups will become of less importance, provided we avoid making blunders; and the state will in a constantly growing degree determine and conduct the whole process of development of these enterprises, similar to that exercised by the great banking concerns and trusts in their control of numbers of joint stock companies in the capitalist state.

Concessionaire and Lased Enterprises

With regard to fundamental conditions of property in this group, the workers' State is the owner. Still not all the means of productions in these enterprises are held by it as the concessionaires and lessees can increase the production apparatus by means of independent transactions, by importation of machinery, construction of new factories, and can thus become owners of a part of the same. In most cases, however, the original investments will be owned by the workers' state. Here too, the surplus value produced will be divided into two parts, and the class-struggles will find expression in the changeable amount of these shares.

Private Capitalists' Enterprises under the Control of the Proletarian State.

These comprise the capitalist concerns in the true sense of the word, i. e., concerns exclusively owned by groups of capitalists or by a single capitalist. The development of these concerns will be regulated more or less from without, i. e., through the State Banks and the credit system, by way of the circulation of money.

Petty Bourgeois Units of Production and their Consolidation.

To this class belong the productive units of the home producers, so-called "Kustarys", the artisans and peasants, which are the strongest foundation for the development of purely bourgeois-capitalist conditions. To a great extent these productive units recruit themselves from the elements of pre-capitalist barter economy. These are particularly found in our eastern districts.

Of course, the freedom of production under the basic conditions of the existence of the innumerable petty-bourgeois productive units will inevitably bring about the enlargement of the sphere of capitalist conditions and the gradual strengthening of those important capitalist groups that are capable of competition with the enterprises of the purely governmental type and those of the mixed type.

These are the principle forms of production existing in our Soviet Republic.

It is necessary here to deal with another extremely important problem. Russian economy, considered as a whole, finds itself in the *world market* face to face with big capitalist systems. This gives rise to the following situation. The conditions of the world market may cause a part of the surplus value produced by the Russian economic system — pure state enterprises included — to find its way in one form or another into the pockets of the bourgeoisie abroad. (Payments to other countries, losses in the international exchange of goods in consequence of the weakness of our social-economic position, etc.). It may thus seem that even those enterprises that are exclusively held by the workers will produce part of the surplus value lost to the working-class. This circumstance which exists owing to the temporarily weak position of Russia in world trade is by no means a proof of the capitalist character of our state industry. This circumstance only serves to show once more that the development of our economic system is at the same time a singular form of the class-struggle. In Russia this struggle is going on in the form of a competition between state and private enterprises; of a contest for the best terms in contracts or concessions and leases, for the size of shares in the products, for power in the "mixed" enterprises, and for the best position in the goods-market and credit, etc.

In *world industry* this contest is carried on as a struggle for the most profitable contracts, duties, loan conditions, special contracts, etc.

The part of the surplus value going to the proletarian state will inevitably grow in the course of our economy. In the case of failure in the contest the claim of the internal and external capitalist groups will reduce the claims of the working-class to nil.

The West European literature of political economy understands by state capitalism the highest form of capitalism, the means of production being held by the bourgeois state, the most perfect and most powerful organization of the capitalist class. It is unnecessary to say that our "State Capitalism" is altogether different from the one characterized above.

Of course, our economic system can be changed into the "true" state capitalism, if the class-struggles in the sphere of direct processes of production and in the political sphere result in the loss of power by the working-class. This question will be solved by the result of the class-struggle, and we have sufficient reason to believe that in consequence of the crisis of capitalist world economy it will not end in favor of the capitalist groups.

In the event of this great historical strife being decided in favor of the proletariat, the capitalist groups inserted into our system of economy will objectively have played the part of the capitalist expert, and against their will they will have worked in favor of the working-class.

The multiplicity of the economical forms in our republic is one of the fundamental influences of our economic life, and has always to be taken into consideration. Therefore, in treating the question of the part to be played by the trade-unions under the conditions of the new economic policy, one has to consider before all the variety of our economic forms. It is evident that the tasks and the methods of the trade-unions are dependent on the kind of economic form. In the same way as the forms of enterprise vary in many ways from proletarian state enterprises, the task of the trade-union varies from its specially organizational part in the state factories, up to strike funds and strikes in private capitalist enterprises. The growing multiplicity of the economic forms determines the growing multiplicity of the tasks of the unions.

The Economic Causes of the Fiume Affair.

Trieste, March 5, 1922.

* * E.P. In order to get a clearer idea of what the economic causes of the Fiume affair are, it is necessary to examine more closely the reports of the bourgeois press which serves as the mouthpiece of the Italian wholesale trade and the large manufacturing industries, particularly those of Trieste. We must furthermore shed some light upon the inner polemic in regard to the free-port of Trieste and upon the sessions of the Chambers of Commerce of Trieste and Venice, which took place not long ago.

The question that is put to the Italian bourgeoisie, particularly to the bourgeoisie of Trieste, which is really in control of the main harbor on the Adriatic, is as follows:

"How is the maritime trade in the Adriatic and the trade with the neighboring countries lying on the coast, as well as the trade with Central Europe and the Near East to be consistently regulated?"

Of course, the questions of competition that arose between Venice and Trieste could easily have been settled when both of these large harbors were under the control of the same power, in spite of the fact that the latter left no stone unturned to cut the former out as a free-port. But the situation in Fiume is of a totally different character. Fiume is a state all by itself and it therefore feels justified in channeling the oriental trade into its own harbor, and in expanding its own hinterland, which until now was claimed by the Trieste trade.

Moreover, due to the crisis which is at present paralyzing their harbor, the wholesale traders of Trieste are particularly irritated by the *trading autonomy* of the port of Fiume, and they therefore feel that they are being thwarted in their expansion plans with respect to the markets of Central and Eastern Europe. The bourgeoisie of Trieste wants to become the pivot of Adriatic trade. Fiume, according to its opinion, should be only an appendage, a colony of the Trieste harbor. The bourgeoisie of Trieste, acting as an outpost of the Italian bourgeoisie, plans to drag the bourgeoisie of Fiume under the same politico-economic system in which it finds itself today. For the very same reasons the bourgeoisie of Fiume is fighting to maintain its political independence, which it considers as the foundation and prerequisite for its own economic development.

It should be of interest to cite certain passages from a work written by the bourgeois journalist Giulio de Benedetti, and published by the "Era Duova", the organ of the shipowners and wholesale manufacturers of Trieste. He formulates the question with sufficient clearness, as may be seen in the following:

"As compared with its pre-war importance, Fiume promises to become an important economic instrument. The neutralization which was established by the Paris Conference will have the effect of modifying its position as a natural market of the inland inhabitants, with the view of opening extensive trade relations in competition with Trieste.

"Fiume is not only an extraordinary treasure, but it also presents the indispensable means of national concentration in the Adriatic trade and traffic. That is why Fiume is in the first place an Italian problem."

He then proceeds as follows:

"The problem of Fiume is one of the penetration of the Adriatic. That is just why, if we are to avoid the danger of a forced and in many respects forcible collision between neighboring and further-lying nationalities, which are only too susceptible to friction with one another, particularly on the economic field, Italy must take the necessary precautions; for is not Italy, due to its extensive foreign trade, logically destined to become the chief purveyor for the Balkans, and is it not the duty of Italy to find a final solution to this problem by means of a clear and practical program, which is above all to safeguard her own interests?"

"Fiume will become the natural and preferred center for the trade that is being carried from Eastern Central Europe to the Near East. Nothing is therefore more natural than Italy's attraction towards Fiume, which offers her a footing for maintaining and preserving the purely Italian character of the Adriatic trade. Moreover, it has already very quietly expanded its sphere of influence into the Eastern part of the Mediterranean. Then again if Fiume succeeds in holding its own in its hinterland, which is easily separable from that of Venice and Trieste, it can become just as useful to Italy as Venice and Trieste. To repeat a fact so often pointed out, Trieste can, with its regained trading channels, become a bit of the Orient floating its products to Europe, and a port of Europe sending its products to the Orient. Nevertheless, as we have already pointed out should Fiume's radius of activity be controlled by a non-Italian power, the present and future importance of Trieste may suffer an unpleasant eclipse. It is therefore absolutely necessary for Fiume and Trieste to regain their pre-war trading channels, this steering the two neighboring harbors towards their old goal. But time is pressing. The competition from the North threatens to foil this practical plan for united control in the Adriatic."

The author then presents a little map showing the hinterlands of Genoa, Venice, Trieste, Hamburg and Fiume and the disputed territories of these harbors; and proceeds as follows:

"Of course, the sphere of activity of the various harbors is determined by their natural positions; but an important part is also played by the artificial circumstances which attract even such territories to the hinterland, that are geographically far situated. The most important of these artificial conditions is the tariff."

After the author mentions the "excellent system of collective tariffs", which Austria granted to the harbor of Trieste, he proceeds to point out that the destiny of Trieste is

"bound up with indissoluble ties not only to the economic and industrial prosperity of its hinterland, particularly of Austria, Czecho-Slovakia and Bavaria, but also to the condition of friendly relations, which we must strive to reestablish with these countries by way of trade. Should Hungary, as a result of a well-formulated tariff system, prefer to trade with another harbor in the Adriatic, and should Austria, Czecho-Slovakia and Bavaria be inclined towards Hamburg (and the new maritime projects make such a possibility quite palpable), Fiume and Trieste would receive such a set-back as would make recovery very difficult. Hence the necessity for a practical and vigorous trading policy of Italy, which is to steer the ship clear of these rocks."

The author then arrives at the following conclusions:

"Fiume as a free state under an Italian protectorate or as a territory which is sooner or later to join Italy politically, has for the present and for some time to come enough hinterland to insure its existence. But since Fiume by itself is not capable of adapting its harbor to the demands of the territories that it acquires, Italy, even more than Fiume, must with the aid and possession of Fiume create an economic organism to be based upon the actual and just estimate of their mutual interests, particularly those of Italy."

To be more explicit is really impossible. The opinions of the Trieste and Venetian wholesalers run parallel to those of the author.

Everything that is taking place in Fiume must therefore be considered from this viewpoint. The large manufacturers and the wholesale traders of Trieste are willing to assume the task of dictating the whole trading policy, in opposition to the Adriatic harbors, which are chiefly concerned in "dictating" to Fiume, which due to its different political regime, threatens to become a dangerous rival.

We thus see before us a struggle between two groups of the bourgeoisie, which are contesting for the markets of Central Europe and of the Little Entente. The authorities and the Fascisti are therefore nothing but the agents of the wholesale traders and manufacturers of Trieste in the struggle for the monopoly of the Adriatic trade.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

A Successful General Strike in south China.

by R. A.

** During the last few weeks a proletarian action worthy of special attention has been taking place in South China, the general strike in Hong Kong. This strike has shown the high degree of class consciousness and solidarity already possessed by the proletariat of South China. The Communist Party of South China also had the opportunity of taking successful part in the action. Hong Kong, with its quarter of a million inhabitants, is the most important port of the Far East, and is one of the largest ports of the world. Hong Kong is a British colony, and from this base the British capitalists still dominate a large part of the Chinese market. In January the seamen of Hong Kong demanded a rise in wages. The shipowners refused to accede to this demand. Upon this the Chinese seamen's union proclaimed the strike. Not a single blackleg put in an appearance. The port of Hong Kong lay still. The losses suffered by the English shipping capitalists amounted to millions. The governor of Hong Kong proceeded according to the most approved European police methods, and disbanded the seamen's union. But this did not bring a single seaman back to work. The strike lasted during the whole of February with undiminished vigor.

And now other trades began to participate. The Chinese hotelkeepers' assistants entered upon a sympathy strike. The Chinese servants in the houses of the rich Britons struck as well. The compositors and bank employees followed. The general strike in Hong Kong was soon complete. All the proletarian inhabitants of the city stood united behind the seamen. The strikers found material and moral support in Canton, the city of millions of Chinese, not far distant from Hong Kong. Canton is the seat of the radical government of Sun-Yat-Sen. Here too the workers are well organized. Canton also possesses a Communist organization, which lent every assistance to the general strike in Hong Kong. The English authorities and the capitalists in Hong Kong found themselves in the greatest difficulties. They were sitting on a powder barrel, so to speak. The united front presented by the Chinese proletariat defied the power of the government. There was nothing for it but to give in. At the beginning of March the government withdrew its decree disbanding the seamen's union, and the employers declared themselves in agreement with a rise in wages. The general strike was then broken off.

The general situation in China is again becoming very unsettled. A fresh war is impending between the militarists of the North, under the leadership of General Chang-Lu-Lin, and the ruler of Central China, General Wu-Pai-Fu. Chang-Lu-Lin dominates the completely bankrupt Peking government and is in league with Japan. Wu-Pai-Fu, on the other hand, is the confidential agent of America. It is thus intended to continue the Washington Conference, by the aid of other means, on Chinese soil. The sole government in China which is really prepared to represent the interests of the broad masses of the people against those of foreign capital is the Sun-Yat-Sen government in Canton. The organizations of the workers in Canton are being forced more and more into the foreground of political activity by the pressure of circumstances. This fact imparts a special degree of importance to the Communist organization in Canton. And the general strike of Hong Kong has clearly demonstrated that the Chinese working class is fully capable of fighting.

The Trade Union Question at the Plenary Session of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

** At the session of the Executive of the Communist International held on the 1st of March, Comrade Lozovsky and Brandler as representatives of the Red Trade Union International delivered a report on the trade-union movement. Comrade Lozovsky gave by way of introduction a short summary of the origin and development of the Red Trade Union International up to the time of its Congress. All decisions and resolutions of the Congress bear according to his words the evidence of that alliance which was consummated at the Congress between the Syndicalists and the Communists. Thereupon the General Secretary of the Red Trade Union International described the recent progress of our movement throughout the world.

In France the Syndicalists refused in practise to recognize the revolutionary alliance which had been formed at the First Congress. The French Communists at times took up a neutral attitude towards these problems and offered no opposition to the Syndicalists who thereby had a free hand. Towards the end of 1921 a change took place. The situation became clearer and more favorable for us.

Developments in Italy resemble somewhat those in France, nevertheless the Syndicalist-Communist Alliance on the whole is working for the capturing of the trade-unions. In Italy the Red Trade Union International is supported by one-third of the organized proletariat; the same may be said of Spain.

In America the fight continues, showing various tendencies. The Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.) have retained their revolutionary phraseology, but practically they are carrying on reformist tactics. The formation of the Workers Party is of symptomatic significance.

In Germany, a diminutive Syndicalist organization recently made an attempt to form a Syndicalist International. This attempt is of no significance. The Red Trade Union International has under its influence from 2 to 2½ million organized workers.

In Russia and in Bulgaria, the whole of the organized proletariat belongs to the Red Trade Union International. In Poland, the majority of the organized workers in some individual industries are ranged on its side and in others a considerable minority.

In general the influence of the Red Trade Union International in all countries is remarkable. It is true that this influence does not always find expression in figures; moreover the statistics of the Amsterdam International are just as defective as ours. Comrade Lozovsky denied that Amsterdam had considerable power and influence.

With regard to the international trade federations, a successful struggle for their revolutionizing is being carried on. The Amsterdam Union have begun to expel the trade-unions whose central organizations had pronounced in favor of the Red Trade Union International. The R.T.U.I. on the other hand is carrying on a successful struggle against these expulsions.

At the conclusion of this report the General Secretary of the R.T.U.I. dealt with the uncertainty which some comrades feel on the question of the R.T.U.I. It is true we are against a split. But we could in no circumstances draw the conclusion from that that we must not make use in an organizational way of a majority gained in a trade-union federation. Comrade Lozovsky condemned the tactics of remaining affiliated to the Amsterdam Trade Union International even when the majority in the trade-union concerned had ranged themselves on our side. In particular Comrade Lozovsky pointed out that neither the Czecho-Slovakian nor the Norwegian Party (the last named has the support of 75% of the organized workers) had understood how to make use of their influence.

In his supplementary report Comrade Brandler pointed out that the special task of the trade-union movement at the present moment was defined by the unprecedented and flagrant attack which is being made by Capital against Labor. The groups of the bourgeoisie warring among each other become united when they desire to attack the proletariat! The proletariat must likewise in united front take up the resolute struggle against the bourgeoisie. The example of France demonstrates how tremendously important a close union of the trade-unions with the working masses is. The chief task of the R.T.U.I. consists in linking together in every country all those elements which are agreed in their opposition to Amsterdam. The practical task of the R.T.U.I. is sustaining the fight of the workers

against the reduction of wages and they must use every opportunity to explain to the workers that every economic struggle is also a political struggle.

In conclusion Comrade Brandler drew attention to the growth of Communist influence in the trade-union movement and insisted on the necessity of making use of all the influence gained in order to form a firmly united organization of the R.T.U.I. for the fight for the emancipation of the proletariat.

The Task of the Communists in the Trade Unions.

** The Conference of the enlarged Executive just held in Moscow adopted the following resolution on the trade-unions.

1—The enlarged Executive affirms that the resolutions of the Third Congress of the Communist International with regard to the trade-union question need not be materially altered. The six months' experience of the period reported on has again proved the principles agreed on for the work in the trade-unions to be appropriate and correct. The present Conference resumes the topic for the sole purpose of reminding the Communists, that, according to their growing influence in the trade-unions, it has become necessary to render their work more and more concrete, adapting it to the respective conditions prevalent in divers countries and different industries.

2—Owing to the growing offensive of capital the trade-union movement of all countries is now passing through a serious crisis. This crisis expresses itself in the decline of the membership, and in the exhaustion of financial resources. On the other hand the increasing misery among the masses of the people produces an urgent and violent longing to fight against the offensive of Capital in one united front, thus breaking through the tactics of delay and hesitation followed by the reformist leaders, which deprive the trade-unions of their fighting spirit, and heedless of these leaders, defending their elementary rights of life by means of joint action.

3—This situation in the international trade-union movement is extremely favorable for the further development and strengthening of our activities in the conquest of the trade-unions; and for the deepening of Communist influence among the masses. This actual situation has to be the stepping-stone for the Communists working in the trade-unions, when fighting for the Red Trade Union International (R.T.U.I.).

4—In various countries the R.T.U.I. has up to now only been a current within the old organizations; in others, however, it really comprises the majority of the members, and, in others, even the trade-union organizations. This situation being given, it is the duty of the Communists in places where the R.T.U.I. is only a tendency, within every trade-union whether national or international, to rally around them as a firm nucleus all those workers who are willing to enter earnestly into the contest against the bourgeoisie and to carry on the fight with a will. Wherever we have a majority of revolutionary workers in the trade-unions the duty of the Communists will be to propagate the affiliation of the whole country to the R.T.U.I.

5—In the next instance the duty of the Communists consists in the expansion of their influence in the old reformist trade-unions, fighting against the split policy of the Amsterdam leaders, and in an exact and truly logical employment of the tactics of a united front in the trade-union movement. However large a minority within the different trade-unions or the trades council be—the Communists have to see to it that this minority remains in the various organizations, fighting therein for the carrying through of the program and for the tactics of the minority. The affiliation of the trade-union minorities that have to remain in the old organizations to the R.T.U.I. can only be an idealist one, and these minorities will have to prove their close connection with the R.T.U.I. by a strict adherence to the resolutions of the First Congress of the revolutionary trade-unions and through obedience to the tactics of the Profintern.

6—The Communists are in duty bound to see to it that the various trade-unions affiliated to the R.T.U.I. remain in the international craft and industrial secretariats. In case they should not yet have entered these they must do so. Before the international proletariat we clearly and openly state our position: We remain in the national trade-union federations and will only become affiliated with the Profintern, in the event of our winning the majority over to the principles of the R.T.U.I. The workers of every country will, at their general trade-union congress, decide which program and which tactics are in the interest of

the working-class: those of the Amsterdam International or those of the R.T.U.I. This is the only way to make the broad masses see who the "splitters" are, who prevent the formation of a center of power against the mighty exploiting class. This is the only way to make the masses see the Amsterdammers as the helpers of the bourgeoisie, who defend bourgeois democracy against the dictatorship of the proletariat, all the while treading down proletarian democracy when the Communists, using the means of proletarian democracy, try to win the majority in the trade-unions with a view of transforming the unions, from an organ of the bourgeoisie into their own fighting organ against it.

7—The ready-to-compromise tendencies extant in some parties with regard to the R.T.U.I. are caused by a series of miscomprehensions, and are based on the false hope of a wheeling to the left on the part of the Amsterdam leaders. This must be strictly and categorically condemned. The Amsterdammers will always waver, wheeling to the left at the same pace as the influence of the Communist parties increases in the various countries, and at the same pace at which the R.T.U.I. extends its organizing and ideological influence upon the trade-union movement of all countries. The Communists must by no means reckon with a wheeling to the left on the part of the trade-union leaders. The Communists base their tactics on the inevitable revolutionizing of the masses. With the development of social contrasts, with the growing influence of the Communist parties and the Communist International and the development of revolutionary ideas among the working-class, the attempts of the Amsterdam Internationalists to hide their reformist activity and repugnance of any fighting, even of fighting against the most imminent daily needs, with revolutionary phrases will increase.

8—The Communist parties and the Communist International, that have taken the initiatory measures for the formation of the R.T.U.I., have to continue their work by strengthening and developing their organization, which not only embraces Communist elements but also Syndicalist and unorganized revolutionary elements.

RELIEF FOR RUSSIA

The "Humanitarian" Capitalists.

by Ernst Meyer (Berlin).

** The working people of every country have felt themselves in honor bound to come to the aid of the starving workers and peasants of Soviet Russia. The collections made among the working people of capitalist countries, themselves plunged into the depths of poverty, and only able to contribute to Soviet Russia at all by depriving themselves of the necessities of life, have naturally not sufficed to neutralize the effects of the frightful famine catastrophe. Last autumn Nansen considered the sum of 5 million pounds sterling—half the cost of a dreadnought—as adequate for the relief of the famine in Russia. The League of Nations, whose own yearly budget exceeds 20 million gold francs, as also the separate capitalistic states, refused to grant this sum, although Nansen made it clear that this refusal implied hundreds of thousands of deaths in Russia. Meanwhile various classes of the bourgeoisie had also become aware of the frightful misery obtaining in Russia. This induced the Communist deputies in the Prussian Diet to make an attempt towards the utilization of state means for the relief of the famine. On the 11th and 13th of March a Communist motion came up for debate in the Prussian Diet, in which the demand was formulated that the Prussian Diet grant 20 million marks famine relief to the Soviet republic, without imposing any conditions whatever. At the same time the Communist deputies proposed that the money should be raised by cancelling expenses for the state police, especially for the police spy organisation.

The other parties, almost without exception, utilized this last proposal as pretext for condemning the Communist motion. They maintained that the Communists were endeavoring to utilize a purely humanitarian demand for the purpose of playing party politics. In reality, however, it was the representatives of the bourgeois parties who opposed the *whole motion* for the simple reason that they "would not give any support to Bolshevism", not even in the form of food to the starving. The actual upshot of the attitude taken by the two bourgeois parties of the right was identical with the phrase coined by the Berlin Nationalist "Deutsche Tageszeitung" some months ago: "Soviet Russia cannot be helped by food and medicine, but only by cannon". The Rightist deputies exerted themselves to the utmost to prove that Bolshevism alone was to blame for the famine, but their arguments were superficial to such a degree

that even the spokesman of the Democratic Party indignantly rejected their objection as "political subterfuges". The Communist deputies laid the more emphasis on the fact that the politics of intervention and blockade employed by the capitalist states against Soviet Russia, and supported by Germany, have been the means of hindering Russia in the work of reconstruction. Since the capitalist states have realized that there is nothing to be gained by fresh military attacks, and that resumption of economical relations with Soviet Russia lies in their own interest, it is naturally the duty of these states to offer reparation for wrong done by giving the means whereby the starving may be relieved. Germany is the more under obligation of reparation since she has on several occasions supplied weapons, soldiers, and money to the Baltic adventurers against Soviet Russia and by lending aid to Awaloff Bermond.

As the bourgeois parties were forced to admit the justice of these political and general humanitarian reasons, they sought other pretexts as a basis for their attitude of refusal. The representative of the Stinnes party asserted that it would be perfectly "unique" for one state to help another. The Communists were able to reply that Soviet Russia itself had set an example of solidarity last year, expressing proletarian sympathy by sending a large sum for the victims of the factory catastrophe in Oppau.

The representatives of the parties of the Right did not shrink, finally, from repeating the lie that the money collected for Soviet Russia was not employed for the benefit of the starving, but was used for purposes of propaganda. The spokesman of the Communist Party had already completely refuted this objection by quoting utterances of Nansen's, and by reference to reports from bourgeois correspondents and from the Red Cross, in which this assertion was repeatedly designated as entirely untrue. The Communist speaker was thus able to brand the repetition of this lie as a "conscious slander", and the call to order with which the President of the Diet expressed his disapproval of the term only served to emphasise the correctness of the characterisation.

The representative of the Center Party attempted to set the Communist motion aside by pointing out that feeding the hungry was more the task of *private* charity. At the same time he referred to the measures taken by the members of his, the Catholic, faith, who at the instigation of the Pope and of the German archbishops had arranged for church collections to be made, and had established a fund with the aid of a Catholic periodical. The Communist speaker, when presenting the motion to the house, had already drawn attention to the fact that the appeals of the Pope and archbishops had not in any way put an end to the campaign of slander being conducted by the Catholic press against Soviet Russia. He also emphasized the fact that the enormous extend of the famine catastrophe renders all private charity entirely inadequate, and that state help should be regarded as a perfect matter of course in face of what the capitalist world owes to Russia.

During the debate on the motion the Social Democrats felt exceedingly uncomfortable. They felt that their support of the official government policy with reference to Russia had made them participators in the responsibility. They were also fully aware of their own sins of omission with regard to the relief action, for neither the trade-unions nor the Social Democrats, nor even the Independents, with some few exceptions, had as much as ventured to reprint the appeal of the Amsterdam Trade Union International in favor of Russia.

The Communist motion received the greatest amount of support from the Independent Social Democrats. But even their speaker could not refrain from adding a hope of different treatment of the Menshiks and Social Revolutionaries to the demand for famine relief.

For the time being the debate was concluded by the Communist motion being referred to the budget committee. Here the parties will have the opportunity of proving whether their objections to the motion are only to its form, as they maintain, and if they are at bottom in agreement with lending aid to Soviet Russia. In any case, the debate demonstrated anew that it is possible for alleged representatives of humanity to pass over with perfect indifference and even brutality the actual fact that millions of human beings are dying of starvation. The attitude of refusal adopted by the large bourgeois parties should be a fresh means of inducement to all working people to exercise proletarian solidarity more than ever. The motion, which was necessary in order to show the real attitude of the bourgeois parliaments to Soviet Russia, will then bear immediate fruit in the form of actual concrete help for the starving workers and peasants of Russia.