

INTERNATIONAL

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2. No. 25

31st March 1922

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

Contents

POLITICS

- Bourgeois Public Opinion, Social Democracy and Communism. By *L. Trotsky* 185
 Danzig. By *Meyer* 186

ECONOMICS

- The Reparations Question as a Special Problem. By *Varga* 187

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

- The Miners' Strike in America. By *Tanin* 188
 Revolutionary or Anarchist Syndicalism. By *Eada* 189
 On the Eve of a General Strike in Denmark. By *Smohlan* 190
 Native Trade Unionism in South Africa. By *Lopes* 190

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

- The Trade Union Movement and the Communists in Italy. By *Repossi* 191

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

- The Henchmen of the Counter Revolution. By *Burian* 192

POLITICS

Bourgeois Public Opinion, Social Democracy and Communism

by *L. Trotsky*.

Taken from a book entitled "Imperialism and Revolution," soon to be published in Russian. The Editor.

** Upon what grounds do the gentlemen of the Second International base their demand that we, the Soviet Federation, the Communist Party, get out of Georgia? Upon what principle? Granted for the sake of argument, that Georgia was actually occupied by force, and that this occupation is the expression of Soviet imperialism! Granted! But by what right does Henderson, member of the Second International, and former minister of Great Britain, demand from us, from the organized proletarian state, from the Third International, from revolutionary Communism, that we evacuate Georgia? Is it because Mr. Henderson has beautiful eyes? Churchill at least supports his claim with naval guns and the blockade. But how about Mr. Henderson? On what does he base his claims? Upon the Holy Scriptures perhaps, upon his party program, or upon his works? But no, the Holy Scriptures are a naive myth, Henderson's program is a sophisticated myth, and as to his works, they speak loudly against him.

Not so very, very long ago Mr. Henderson was minister of a democracy, in fact, of his own democracy of Great Britain. How is it then that he did not succeed, nay, not even simulate an attempt to succeed, in bringing his Democracy [for whose defense no sacrifice was too great for him, not even that of relieving the Liberal-Conservative, Lloyd George, of his portfolio] to a realization of her own and Henderson's (not ours) principles? Why did he not demand the evacuation of India and Egypt? Why did he not support the Irish demand for complete liberation from the yoke of Great Britain? We know that like Macdonald, Henderson made use of those days in protesting with melancholy

resolution against the excesses of British imperialism. But these flimsy and powerless protests, devoid of all will, have never really threatened the actual interests of English capitalistic colonial rule, nor do these protests threaten them now. At no time did they lead to manly and decisive deeds. No, these protests only serve as a sort of confessional that eases the consciences of "Socialist" gentlemen among ruling nations, and also as a safety-valve for English proletarian discontent. They are not intended however to break the chains of the colonial slaves. For the Hendersons, English colonial rule is not a political question, but an accomplished historical fact. They have never proclaimed that Indians, Egyptians and other enslaved peoples have the right, nay, the duty imposed upon them by considerations of their own future to take up arms and overthrow English tyranny. They have never proclaimed their Socialist duty to make use of the first opportunity to offer aid in arms to the colonies in their struggle for freedom. This is a question of the most elementary arch-democratic duty, in fact in two senses: firstly, that the colonial slaves form an undisputed overwhelming majority as compared with the small ruling British minority; secondly this minority (and chiefly its official "Socialists") itself boasts of democratic principles being its guiding spirit. Look at India! Why does not Henderson encourage and promote a revolutionary movement to effect the evacuation of India by British troops? We can think of no more shameless, more appalling and flagrant breach of democratic principles than the rule of the British capitalistic hydra over the gigantic body of this unfortunate enslaved people. Henderson, Macdonald and Company, should unceasingly be sounding the alarm, they should indefatigably, day and night, be issuing demands and appeals, be making disclosures, and preaching revolt to the Indians and to all the English workers against this inhuman throttling of democratic principles. But they are dumb; what is still worse, they sign, from time to time, empty and barren resolutions that are as monotonous as English sermons. These resolutions only serve to show that Messrs. Henderson, Macdonald and Company, who completely accept British colonial rule as such, would indeed prefer to have roses without thorns, but that they are far from willing to prick their hands (the hands of loyal British "Socialists") with these thorns. Henderson makes himself comfortable in the easy-chair of a royal minister, as soon as it is necessary to do so for so-called "democratic", patriotic reasons. In his abandonment he does not at all seem to be aware of the fact that this easychair rests on the most anti-democratic pedestal in the world, upon the rule of a few capitalist cliques over many millions of the British Nation and over hundreds of millions of colored Asiatic and African slaves. But that is not all! For the purpose of defending this appalling rule that is masqueraded in so many democratic costumes, Henderson allied himself with the open military and police dictatorship of Russian Czarism. By being a minister during the war, Henderson was to all intents and purposes a Czarist minister. Henderson did not then think of asking the Czar, his protector and ally, to withdraw the Russian troops from Georgia and from the other oppressed regions. At that time he would have declared that to put such demands was to aid German militarism. Every revolutionary movement in Georgia directed against the Czar, would have been seen by him in the light of an Irish uprising, that is, as the handiwork of German bribery and German intrigue. One is actually intoxicated by these crass and appalling contradictions and conflicts that mark the policy of Henderson. But they are only natural. For, do not Messrs. Henderson & Co. accept the

rule of Great Britain, i. e., of its governing cliques, over one-fourth of humanity as an accomplished historical fact and not as a political question? These democrats with their Fabian and sterile Socialism were always the willing slaves of bourgeois public opinion. They are hypersaturated with the anti-democratic exploiting and parasitic spirit of the plantation owners as against the colored races, who do not read Shakespeare and wear no stiff collars.

And in spite of the fact they have Czarist Georgia, Ireland, Egypt and India on the debit side of their account, they have the cheek to demand of us, their enemies, not their allies, the evacuation of Soviet Georgia. Peculiar as it may seem, this idiotic and absolutely unfounded demand is at the same time the involuntary tribute which the petty-bourgeois democracy pays to the proletarian dictatorship. Either unconsciously or half-consciously Henderson and Company say:—

“Of course the bourgeois democracy whose ministers we become as soon as she calls us, cannot be expected to respect the democratic principle of self-determination. Of course we, the Socialists of this democracy, and respectable citizens of this ruling nation who disguise her slave-owning rôle with democratic fictions, cannot be expected to aid the colonial slaves by word and deed in rising against their oppressors. But you, the revolution embodied in a state, you are bound to do that which we cannot do because of our cowardice, our mendacity and hypocrisy.”

In other words, although they formally recognize democracy as the highest ideal, they at the same time voluntarily declare that those high demands which, were they put to the bourgeois democracy whose ministers or loyal parliamentarians they are, would seem ridiculous and idiotic, could and should be put to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

As a result of such involuntary tribute, they demand of the proletarian dictatorship an act which would fully correspond to their own political blunders. They demand that the dictatorship maintain and defend itself not by the application of its own methods, but with the aid of those methods which they claim to be obligatory for a democracy, but which they themselves, however, never apply. We have already said in the first manifesto of the Communist International:—

“Our enemies demand that we defend our lives according to the conventional rules and regulations of the French wrestling game, i. e., according to those rules that are made by our enemies, but which are never respected by them in the fight.”

To get a better and more concrete idea of the policy pursued by the “Western democracies” towards the backward nations, and of the part played by the gentlemen of the Second International in this diplomatic game, one only has to read the memoirs of the former French ambassador at the Czar’s court, M. Paléologue. Were this book not in existence we should invent it. Monsieur Paléologue himself should have been invested, had his memoirs not appeared in time. Paléologue is the most accomplished representative of the Third Republic not only because of his Byzantine name, (the word Paléologue is derived from the Greek) but also because of his thoroughbred Byzantine soul. In November 1914, in the first war period, a pious manuscript sermon by Rasputin was handed over to Monsieur Paléologue by one of the ladies of the court at a wink from above (most probably the Czarina). Monsieur Paléologue, representative of the republic, answered to the strict sermon of Rasputin with the following letter:—

“The fine-feeling French nation very well perceives that the Russian people embodies its love of the fatherland in the person of the Czar.”

Of course Paléologue intended this letter to be read by the Czar. This letter by a republican diplomat was written ten years after the 9th of January 1905 and 122 years after the execution of Louis Capet by the French Republic. For was it not a question of a secret diplomatic scandal? What does seem strange, however, is that upon his own initiative he tells us in this disgraceful work of the democracy which he so basely represented at Rasputin’s court. And all this does not prevent him of being a political leader of this “democratic republic” and filling an important post even to this day. We would indeed wonder at this, were we not well acquainted with the laws of progression of this bourgeois democracy which rose up to Robespierre, only to end with a Paléologue.

Behind the frankness of the former ambassador, there most probably lies the most cunning Byzantine cleverness. He tells us so much only not to have to tell us everything. Perhaps he only attempts to deaden our suspecting curiosity. Who knows but what demands the perverse almighty Rasputin put to him. We can tell through what complicated means Monsieur Paléologue had to guard the interests of France and of civili-

zation. At any rate we know definitely that Monsieur Paléologue at present belongs to that French political group, which is ready to swear itself black and blue that the Soviet government is not the true expression of the will of the Russian people. It is that group which never tires of repeating that the resumption of relations with Russia will be possible only after Russia will have been handed over through “well-functioning democratic institutions” to the Russian Paléologues.

The ambassador of the French democracy was not alone at the court. With him was Sir Buchanan. Paléologue tells us that on the 14th of November 1914, Buchanan declared to Sazonoff:—

“From now on the government of this British Majesty agrees that the question of the Straits and that of Constantinople should be solved in full accord with Russia’s wishes. I am happy to be able to tell you so.”

Four days later Buchanan said to Sazonoff:

“The British government is compelled to annex Egypt. It hopes that the Russian government has no objection to offer.”

Sazonoff was not tardy in voicing his approval. Three days later Paléologue “reminded” Nicholas II that “France was interested in Syria and Palestina where she had a vast treasure of historical reminiscences and of moral and material interests.” He, Monsieur Paléologue, therefore hoped that His Majesty would sanction the measures taken by the government of the democratic French Republic for the maintenance of its prestige.

“Oui certes.” (of course), answered His Majesty.

On the 12th of March, 1915, Buchanan finally demanded that Russia cede the neutral, i. e., the yet undivided part of Persia to England, in return for Constantinople and the Straits,

Sazonoff answered, “C’est entendu” (Agreed).

In this wise, two democracies together with Czarism which at that time reflected light from the overflowing splendor of the Allied democratic torch, sealed the destinies of Constantinople, Syria, Palestine, Egypt and Persia. Mr. Buchanan was no better nor worse a representative of the democracy of Great Britain, than was Monsieur Paléologue of the French democracy; Buchanan retained his post after the overthrow of Nicolas II. Henderson, Minister to His Majesty and British Socialist came to Petrograd during the Kerensky Regime, in order if necessary, to displace Buchanan, whom someone in the English government thought unfit to deal with Kerensky after his affairs with Rasputin. But Henderson examined the Petrograd atmosphere and was convinced that Buchanan was after all the right person to act as the representative of the democracy of Great Britain. Buchanan’s opinion of Henderson was undoubtedly equally favorable.

At least Paléologue held “his Socialists” as an example before the conspiring Czarist standard-bearers. Referring to the court campaign launched by Count Witte for an early peace, M. Paléologue told Sazonoff, “Just look at our Socialists. They are perfect” (page 189).

Paléologue’s estimate of Messrs. Renaudel, Longuet, Vandervelde and all their accomplices makes a certain impression even now, after everything that we went through. Paléologue received his orders from Rasputin and carried them out with awe. He, on the other hand, patronizingly passed judgment upon French Socialists to a Czarist minister, and found them to be without blemish. These words, “voyez nos socialistes—ils sont impeccables”, should be written as a motto upon the banner of the Second International. The words sounding the liberation of the proletarians of all countries, which still decorate their banners, are as ill-fitting to Henderson as the Phrygian cap to Monsieur Paléologue.

(To be concluded.)

Danzig

by Ernst Meyer.

** The comedy of self-determination enacted by the Entente in the Treaty of Versailles is brilliantly illustrated by conditions in the Free State of Danzig. Since the Allies did not want to give Danzig outright to Poland, they created the artificial entity of the supposedly Free State of Danzig. At the same time they drew up a number of provisions designed to give Poland various privileges in Danzig.

The territory of the Free State contains approximately 300,000 inhabitants, of whom 200,000 live in the city of Danzig. The agricultural territory belonging to the Free State is so small that its production of foodstuffs is insufficient for the feeding of the population. Danzig is therefore obliged to rely upon the

importation of food. Of course the territory of the Free State also furnishes an insufficient market for its industrial production. Therefore unemployment is greater than in most of the other industrial regions of Germany. As a result of the importation of the most important necessities of life, prices are in part higher than in Germany, so that the economic situation of the working class is very unsatisfactory. The economic dependence of this miniature state is connected with its political weakness. According to the Treaty of Versailles the Free State is under the protection of the League of Nations. This "protection" is expressed in the fact that the constitution requires the sanction of the High Commissioner of the League of Nations before going into effect. Furthermore, in the future all amendments to the constitution take effect only after approval by the League of Nations.

Poland has, after the High Commissioner, the greatest influence upon Danzig's political and economic affairs. According to the Treaty of Versailles, the direction of Danzig's foreign affairs, as well as the protection of its citizens, are taken over by the Polish government. Furthermore, the territory of Danzig is included in the Polish customs. In addition, Poland has the free use of the waterways, the inland ports and other facilities for foreign trade in Danzig without restriction. Still further, Poland obtains the policing and control of the Vistula, of the entire railway network and the entire system of postal, telegraph and telephone communication between Danzig and Poland. Finally, Poland is assigned the duty of the defense of Danzig, according to a report to the Council of the League of Nations. In short, Poland possesses an extensive right of supervision, which is to some degree equivalent to the annexation of Danzig to Poland, and will make this annexation complete in the near future.

Poland's preferential position and the supervision of Danzig by the League of Nations has resulted in Danzig having a constitution which is more backward than those of Danzig's guardians, who are governed by a parliamentary form of government. The Danzig Parliament, the *Volkstag*, is, to be sure, elected by the universal suffrage of all male and female citizens over 20 years of age according to the system of proportional voting. But in the constitution elaborated by the High Commissioner of the League of Nations together with the Constitutional Assembly it is provided that eight of the members of the Senate are to be elected for a term of 12 years. (The other 14 Senators may be recalled, require the confidence of the *Volkstag* and may at any time be recalled by the express decision of the latter). This has led to one party, the German National People's Party (the monarchist and most reactionary party of Germany), possessing a majority in the Senate with 14 seats, although formally the government is a coalition of the three bourgeois parties. Alongside the Senate and the *Volkstag*, financial matters are in the hands of the Financial Council. Thus the population has a much smaller share in the government than in states with parliamentary government.

The egoism of the National People's Party, which has filled almost all the more important official posts with its adherents, has caused dissatisfaction even in the ranks of the bourgeois parties. The German Party, formed by the fusion of the German People's Party and the Democrats, as well as the clerical Center Party, all of which depend for a large share of their support on the middle class voters, are striving for an enlargement of their political influence. Although they are in the coalition, they would much prefer forming a coalition government with the Right Socialists, thus ousting the National People's Party from participation in the government. The Right Socialists, however, have been constrained to remain in the opposition by the force of political circumstances. Thus, in order to increase their influence, they are putting on a radical mask. The Independent Socialists are practically without influence and have been so since the split of 1920. They have only 9 seats in the *Volkstag*, while the Communists control 12. The Communist Party of Danzig, which is affiliated to the Communist Party of Germany as a district organization, has the greatest influence in the working class. The Independents and the Majority Socialists have been repeatedly forced to join with the Communists in demonstrations against the bourgeoisie. The democratic and parliamentary illusions of the Majority Socialists have however prevented them from declaring their readiness to join in the united front against the bourgeoisie. Demands of the Communist Party for action in common in the unemployment question and on May 1st were rejected by them under flimsy pretexts.

The Communist Party has great influence in the masses, but is in spite of that in a difficult position. It has very skillfully taken up the defense of all the economic interests of the proletarian and semi-proletarian masses. The rising cost of food, the

proposed rent increase amounting to several hundred per cent. and low wages offer it an extensive field of activity. It is hindered however in the purely political field by the Majority Socialists' mask of radicalism, by the reactionary stand of the Nationalist Senate and by the political dependence and geographical situation of the Free State. The Communist Party is therefore devoting much attention to pointing out to the workers the necessity of Danzig's close cooperation with Poland and Germany. The propagation of international relations and of the international connections of the working class is one of the most important of tasks the Danzig Communist Party.

Naturally enough, every great economic or political struggle in Germany or Poland finds its echo in Danzig. As against the other workers' parties, who continually preach of Danzig's "peculiar" conditions, the Communists must bring the fact home to the workers that the Danzig proletariat can only successfully carry on the struggle for the improvement of its social condition in close collaboration with the workers of the neighboring countries.

The Polish government has only recently refused to sanction the establishment of a Soviet Consulate in Danzig. The Danzig workers have been made to feel on more than one occasion how Poland is using them for anti-Communist ends. Thus, for instance, Danzig serves constantly as a transit port for arms and munitions against Soviet Russia.

The particular difficulties of the situation and of its own tasks have caused plans to appear within the ranks of the Communist Party which originate in impatience and a desire for a speedier change of the situation in favor of the working class and the Party. The Communist Party must none the less prove to the rest of the proletariat that only a clear realization of the similar position of the proletariat as a class in all countries and the unified international tactics arising from that fact offer the prerequisite for success.

ECONOMICS

The Reparations Question as a Special Problem

by Eugen Varga.

This is taken from a pamphlet, entitled: "The World Economic Situation and the Course of Economic Policy in the Last Three Years", which is soon to be published in German by the Communist International. The Editor.

** The inherent tendency towards the restoration of the world's economic equilibrium is as yet very much hampered by the reparations burden which Germany has to carry for Continental Europe. But no matter how important this problem may be for Germany, we must nevertheless emphatically point out that this is only a *secondary problem* of the great disturbance in the world economic equilibrium, and that its "solution" (if we can admit the possibility of a solution at all) would in no way be synonymous with the solution of the world economic crisis, as is believed in Germany.

What namely is the essence of the reparation problem when examined from our point of view of the world economic situation?

Germany is to make yearly payments of 3,500,000,000 gold marks out of its limited production which even without such payments is scarcely sufficient for the renewal of its means of production and for the miserable maintenance of its proletariat. This amounts to about one-tenth of the national income of rich prewar Germany whose territory was still intact. The literal execution of this decision would mean:—

1—That in a few years Germany would be completely ruined. Its means of production would all be used up. Its currency would be absolutely valueless on the world market. Social struggles of the most frightful sort and the appropriation of the insufficient remainder of production would throw the country into Social Revolution or back to barbarism.

2—That the congested world market which is incapable of taking up the surplus goods from the field of over-production, would become still more hopelessly congested through the gigantic export of German goods. The literal carrying out of the reparations would then mean the immense growth of discord in the world economic situation.

The simplest solution would be to cancel reparations altogether!

Such a solution could be carried out, however, if Germany only had to make payments exclusively to those countries which

had a surplus production. We see that England has gotten used to the idea of not getting another penny from Germany. The English statesmen and political economists clearly see that the saving of the capitalistic system requires an order of world economy which renders possible the reduction of the gigantic and danger-brewing army of unemployed. But a Germany driven to a cut-throat export only means the perpetuation of English unemployment.¹

But only a very small portion of the reparation payments falls to the share of "rich" England, which could and would solve its problem through simple confiscation. By far the greater portion falls to France, Belgium, Italy and Serbia, countries which laid great hopes upon these payments. Let us take France for example. During the war it proceeded in its financial mismanagement just as blindly as Germany with the cry: "*Les Boches paiera!*" In France too, less taxes were paid during the war than in peacetime. And when "victory" had been won, and it was necessary to elect a "national majority", billions were again wasted among the electors. The actual material loss which France suffered, and which Keynes estimates at about 20 billions (which is probably correct) was puffed up to three and four times its actual value, all in the hope of German payments, and those capitalists of the occupied territory who had "good connections" were likewise granted exaggerated compensation. Thus we see France with a yearly deficit of 20 billion francs! Even the full payment of France's deserved reparations share would not bring about any noticeable equilibrium in the French budget. France can therefore not afford to agree to the simple cancellation of the reparation demands. From the point of view of government finances, we may say that France's interests demand that Germany pay in full. But Germany is not able to do this. And as far as it is able to pay, it can do so only with a huge export which on the other hand brings Germany into cut-throat competition with those countries which have a surplus production and incidentally also with France itself which through its annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, has become an exporting country of heavy industrial products. The artifices employed by France in its hope of evading this problem, in that it demands the full payment of reparations at the same time seeking protection against the competition of German goods behind a high protection tariff, will not work its salvation. The pressure of German prices makes itself felt in other countries, to which Germany dictates the prices of the world market. Besides, Germany's obligation to pay reparations in gold drives the stable exchanges higher, thus widening the gulf between the countries with an under-production and those with a surplus production. We thus see that with every attempt to collect reparations, the world economic crisis is only intensified. But to drop reparation payments altogether would simply mean bankruptcy for France.²

The Wiesbaden Agreement is an attempt to overcome these difficulties. The economic nature of this agreement consists of the systematic regulation of goods to be delivered to France by Germany instead of an anarchic dumping of goods on the world market. The goods delivered are assigned to the reconstruction of France's devastated regions, which means that they are to be consumed *outside of the regular course of French economy*. This would mean getting goods from Germany without creating an unbearable competition for France in the world market; deliveries and payments for the reconstruction of dwellings, roads, etc., that is for private purposes, without directly increasing the process of production and the supply of goods.

The Wiesbaden Agreement would be favorable to France. But it still remains unratified; the private profit-interests of influential French capitalist groups are in the way. Germany would not gain much by it. The delivery of goods on a large scale and of the same sort would cheapen production. The payment of its debts directly in goods would relieve Germany from the task of raising funds for the payment of reparation instalments. But the primary problem of how impoverished Germany can afford to strip its decreased production of a quan-

¹ We know very well that the absolute quantity of goods exported by Germany in the years 1920-21, is a comparatively small one, much smaller than before the war. But with the relative equilibrium in the world economic situation before the war, this export disturbed the economic situation in the other capitalistic countries very little, with the possible exception of England. But today, when the capacity of the world market to absorb goods is greatly reduced, every country seeks protection against German export behind tariff walls.

² Even with the complete reparations payments, the French budget would show a deficit of billions of francs for an indeterminate number of years.

ty of goods amounting to 3,500,000,000 gold marks annually remains untouched. Indeed, the difficulty would become still more increased by the fact that in the next few years Germany would have to deliver more goods to France than the latter's share of reparation payments would warrant. Germany would thus make advance payments with which France would credit it. But with the present impoverished condition of Germany such an experiment is out of the question. We must therefore admit that the German political economists who stamped the Wiesbaden Agreement as detrimental to Germany were in the right.

The reparations problem could be solved only within the sphere of a general solution of the disturbed world economic equilibrium. Every attempt at a special solution only serves to intensify the general crisis.

We shall have occasion to treat of this question again.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The Miners' Strike in America

by M. Tanin.

** The general referendum taken by the United Mine Workers of America decided in favor of a walkout by a 90% majority. A strike call has meanwhile been issued in accordance with this decision. The miners in the United States, and very possibly in Canada also, will go on strike on April 1st.

The ultimate cause of this giant struggle which will be participated in by 800,000 miners is—as has of late been the case everywhere and especially in Great Britain—the general offensive of the employers who are attempting wage reductions and the extension of working hours and are out to smash the unions. In no country is this capitalist offensive making itself more felt than in America, where in the course of the last eighteen months wage reductions have repeatedly been forced upon the workers in the principal branches of industry. The other method of attack employed by the bosses is revealed in the active propaganda for the "open shop", advocated in a patriotic disguise as the "American plan" which the kept capitalist press is loudly demanding under various pretexts (personal liberty, right to work, etc.).

The struggle now beginning cannot be better characterized than with the words of the Paris Edition of the capitalist "New York Herald":—"It cannot be said that the employers are adverse to the further development of events (into a strike—Ed.). They want a test of strength with labor." The paper goes on to say that the capitalists are determined to put through the wage reduction against all resistance.

So far the government has remained "neutral". The nature of this "neutrality" may be gathered from the recent bloodshed in West Virginia, from the textile workers' strike in New England which has already lasted two months and, finally, from the strike in the Chicago building trades. The administration, the military and the judicial authorities are everywhere supporting the employers' offensive.

The situation of the coal miners is aggravated by the reactionary conservatism of their leaders who are the usual type of labor fakirs characteristic of the officialdom of the American Federation of Labor. To make matters still worse, it appears from the latest reports that the mine owners have even at this early stage succeeded in dividing the workers by insisting in some states upon smaller reductions than in others. This policy has already had been effective in that the president of the Illinois U.M.W.A., F. Farrington, rebelled against the National Headquarters expressing his intention of entering into negotiations on his own accord. This is the same Farrington who at the recent U.M.W.A. Convention in Indianapolis supported the Left under Howat against Lewis. This fact need not cause any wonder, however, if one knows that Farrington's course was not dictated by any principles, but by personal and financial motives. Things of that nature occur very often in the American trade-union bureaucracy.

The miners' strike will very probably affect the anthracite industry where labor is organized in special unions. Reports from Pennsylvania indicate that 200,000 workers employed in the anthracite mines there are getting ready to strike. The appeal issued by the leaders of these workers is characteristic:—

"The archives of the State of Pennsylvania bear witness to the fact that 500 workers lose their lives every year by accident in the mines. Over 20,000 are injured annually. The worth of labor in the anthracite industry cannot be figured out in dollars

and cents. To the dollars paid out every year must be added 500 human lives who, like soldiers on the battle field, perish every year mining anthracite."

After this the district delegates of the workers point out that while the workers are only getting \$3.92 for every ton of coal mined, the owners are demanding and receiving 16 dollars per ton.

The workers demand a wage increase of 20 per cent and the retention of the eight-hour day.

The outcome of the struggle in the coal industry is of immense importance for the immediate future of the American labor movement. So far most of the recent conflicts on the industrial field have ended with a victory for the employers. The result of this strike will determine whether or no the present phase of the struggle, characterized by the employers' offensive, has arrived at the turnpoint.

One thing, however, is already certain. That is that the masses will be revolutionized through this strike. Samuel Gompers, of ill repute, the president of the American Federation of Labor, recently delivered in Boston a speech in connection with the strike (which is really a lockout) in which he addressed the following warning to the capitalists:—

"You should not be surprised if at no distant date the workers proceed to revolution. You yourselves are compelling them to do so."

This out of the mouth of Gompers, that most embittered antagonist of Socialism, for whom the name of government Socialist or social-traitor is too good! But it is an undisputed fact, as can be gathered from the latest dispatches to the "Chicago Tribune" that the conflict in the mining industry is having its effect upon the other trades. Even the conservative leaders of the Railway Brotherhoods are beginning to stir. And though their solemn declarations of sympathy with the striking miners should not be taken at their face value, there is nevertheless a possibility that the pressure of the masses might force them into action. We find the following paragraph on the sentiments of the masses in the Paris Edition of the "New York Herald":

"There can be no doubt that the temper the American workers in general is very bitter and that many workers are convinced that the representatives of industry and finance are using the industrial crisis as a weapon with which to reduce wages throughout the United States and weaken the trade-unions."

The American workers are defending themselves against these machinations, and no matter what the outcome of the struggle—the struggle itself will be a new lesson which will not be allowed to pass for naught.

Revolutionary or Anarchistic Syndicalism?

by W. Lada.

** The Anarchistic leaders of the new Trade Union Federation, the C.G.T. Unitaire based on the principles of the Red Trade Union International, appear to be resolved to lead their organisation into paths which can scarcely be of advantage for its future development. This was fairly obviously observable at the first meeting of the National Committee, and again appears in the attitude recently adopted by the Administrative Commission of the C.G.T.U. with reference to the Russian Social Revolutionaries.

This question has awakened a lively echo amongst social reactionaries in all countries. These feel the Russian Social Revolutionaries to be kindred spirits. Even during the imperialist war they pulled in the same boat as the imperialists of their country, against the revolutionaries—no wonder that in Russia they take sides with the party which combats the workers' government with every weapon of riot, terror, and assassination! But the Revolutionary Syndicalists? Are they going to take sides for the workers' revolution, or for those who combat it on the pretext that they have to defend "democracy"?

It might be thought that the answer was clear enough. It might surely suffice that French Syndicalism owes its existence, as is universally acknowledged to be the case, to the reaction of the proletariat against democracy, and it appears obvious that French Revolutionary Syndicalists, having to choose between a party representing the *idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat*, and a party which fights for democracy by means of

poisoned bullets from ambush (Fanny Kaplan's attack on Lenin!), would not hesitate a moment as to the decision. The present leaders of the C.G.T.U. are of a different opinion. "In face of the conflicts which are driving the parties against each other, in every country, in their endeavor to snatch might and power out of each other's hands" these leaders wish to adopt—no attitude. This is expressed in the resolution of March 16th, 1922. "French Revolutionary Syndicalism is in its nature and definition hostile to the state, is strictly opposed to any form of government—no matter of what sort... and holds fast to the principle of *standing outside* conflicts conducted by parties which are adherents of state power." This signifies: the battle rages among the parties, but the leaders of the C.G.T.U. are not in the least concerned in it, because the combatants are parties adhering to the principle of "state power"—of that state power based on "force and arbitrariness only". Lassalle once declared—in agreement with Solon the Wise of old—that it is only cowards and egoists, the short-sighted and selfish, who do not take sides when the battle rages between the forces of the future and of the past. The leaders of the C.G.T.U., in the year 1922, are however of the opinion that the highest conception of revolutionary virtue lies in standing aside whilst state power is being fought for, because this power is "based on force and arbitrariness".

This train of thought is quite familiar to us. Is it not Tolstoy's teaching: "Resist no evil?" Is this not the doctrine which disapproved of the revolutionary struggle against the Czar's regime, because this was an evil which should not be contended against by revolution, in itself another evil, being equally based on force? Is the leading motive of the anarchistic majority of the C.G.T.U. not thus simply *anti-revolutionary*, although they so proudly wrap themselves in the garment of "anti-statism" (antagonism to the state)?

Let us hear what the leaders of the C.G.T.U. have to say further.

When formulating their idea "precisely", they again raise a "mighty and permanent protest" against every government which does not shrink from "strangling the freedom of workmen struggling for their emancipation" in the endeavor to maintain its own mastery. Although they promise "precision", the leaders of the C.G.T.U. are here entirely lacking in precision, are even unclear and confused. It is not clear what attitude they adopt towards the question of the Russian Social Revolutionaries and the Soviet government—or if they refrain from adopting any attitude at all. They merely state their antagonism to *any* government "strangling the freedom of the workers". Is this intended to accuse the Soviet government of oppressing the Russian workers in the said manner? If this is the meaning intended, it should be stated straightforwardly, without diplomatic reserve. For then all revolutionists would see their duty plainly before them: protest—and silence a crime! Is this so? Or is it another example of human cowardice, of men who do not venture to say what they think?

Further. In the last paragraph of their resolution the leaders of the C.G.T.U. make two world-shaking confessions. Firstly, they are decided opponents of all useless expenditure of force, with the exception of that having for its object the defense of the revolutionary progress of the proletariat. Secondly, the fight for such progress is not to be identified with a fight for any party or government. The first idea contains—with double reservation—the same kernel as we have above characterized as an anti-revolutionary Tolstoian fad. The second contains either a platitude, and is as such superfluous, or it is petty malice combined with considerable obliquity. For up to now nobody has ever experienced or demonstrated that actual "revolutionary progress" can be attained without the cooperation of a revolutionary party, or maintained without the existence of a revolutionary government.

The leaders of the C.G.T.U. further enter protest against "any attack on the imprescriptible right of utterance of the idea of humanity, and on the right of defense of the individual sacrificed to police machinations in the name of 'reasons of state'". Another vague riddle. Against whom is the flaming protest of the leaders of the C.G.T.U. directed? What police machinations are meant? What victims of "reasons of state" are to be protected by the C.G.T.U.? If the Russian Social Revolutionaries are meant on the one hand, the Russian Soviet government on the other, it is the plain and obvious duty of the leaders of the C.G.T.U. to state this clearly and candidly. But they fear to do this. For this would show too plainly that they are becoming pace-makers for those counter-revolutionary reformists against whom they are contending in cooperation with us Communists. For the leaders of the C.G.T.U. are not capable of choosing properly between "reasons of state" in a proletarian state and the "imprescriptible right" of the individual to combat

this proletarian state. They refrain from taking sides, or—they take sides, abashed and half concealed, with the Social Revolutionaries.

Enough of this. Polemics against our friends of the C.G.T.U. are not our intention. Only necessity has obliged us to take up the pen against them. We Communists and adherents of the Red Trade Union International are brothers-in-arms of the Anarchists and Anarcho-Syndicalists, and are confident that they will sacrifice their doctrinaire and sectarian superstitions on the altar of revolutionary class war. We do not need to appeal to the charter of Amiens, as the "Humanité" does in its reply to the resolution of the C.G.T.U. Although it is true that this charter never expressed Syndicalism to be "anti-state" in nature or definition, what is more important to us than this historical document is the unity of revolutionary class war among the workers of France. This unity will however be destroyed if the Anarchist leaders of the C.G.T.U.—who represent only a part of the membership—endeavor to implant Anarchistic Syndicalism in France in place of Revolutionary Syndicalism. The C.G.T.U. will never succeed in gathering the great mass of the people around this banner. The masses are seeking for a way to complete emancipation, a way out of the hell of capitalist exploitation and oppression. Up to now their sole guiding star on the uphill path has been the Russian Revolution, Soviet Russia. Are they now to lose this guiding star in favor of "Eternal Anarchist Truth"?

Therefore we repeat the warning: Anarchistic Syndicalism must not take the place of Revolutionary Syndicalism, or the French trade-union movement will suffer greatly.

On the Eve of a General Strike in Denmark

by Smohlan.

The general lockout which originally affected one hundred thousand workers will from the 1st of April on affect more than double this number if before that time the workers have not submitted to the conditions of the employers. Thus practically the entire Danish working class is drawn into an actual class struggle. The governmental arbitration commission has submitted a compromise proposal which was rejected by the Employers' Federation although recommended to the workers by the trade-union leaders. This proposition calls for a wage reduction of 15 %, and in addition future wage cuts to correspond with the fall of prices. Furthermore the eight-hour day is to be suspended for porters and watchmen. The General Assembly of the Trade Union Federation voted for the acceptance of this proposition by 328 votes against 270. However, there is no doubt that in the event of a referendum the majority of the workers will reject it.

Lyngsie, the president of the great Factory and Day Laborers' Union, who although an old Social Democrat stands in the sharpest opposition to the other trade-union leaders, writes in a long statement:

"This is again a misunderstanding, for the 605 delegates in the General Assembly are not and cannot at the present time be the responsible expression of the will of the organizations affected by the lockout. An important section consists of the representatives of the local trade-union councils (105 delegates, one from each city), and the vote is in part misleading as a result of a statute, according to which, for example, 10 small unions with only 2000 members have 90 votes, while the Factory Workers' Union with 82,000 members has only 84 votes. Thus we see that the unions directly interested in the conflict reject the compromise proposal although the General Assembly recommended it for acceptance. The arbitration commission and the leaders of the Trade Union Federation can continue to state that the eight-hour day is entirely safe. It is, however, not true, because the proposal legally requires the workers to refrain from resisting overtime and at the same time weakens the guarantee against the misuse of overtime work which is contained in the payment of higher wages for overtime."

Lyngsie has no doubt spoken sincerely but he does not follow his words to their logical conclusion. Together with all the other leaders he voted against the motion for a general strike which only received 35 votes in the General Assembly. The lockout has now lasted six weeks, bringing with it ever increasing misery, without the Trade Union Federation having done anything to break the offensive of the employers by

resorting to appropriate measures. It appealed to the arbitration commission, to public opinion as well as to the reason of the exploiters. The leaders of the trade-unions and "Socialdemokraten", the central organ of the Social Democratic Party, repeatedly emphasized that they are not fighting against society and that the differences are not so great as to justify the continuation of the struggle. This attitude is all the more wretched because they have for 20 years boasted that the Danish labor organisations are the strongest and firmest in the entire world. As far as figures go, their statement is correct for in this primarily agricultural land there are 363,000 organised workers of whom 280,000 are organised in the Trade Union Federation. When in 1920 the King attempted a political coup this attempt was thwarted by a short general strike of the entire working class.

The government has now openly taken the side of the employers. Thus recently the Minister of the Interior ordered that the governmental subsidy to the unemployment funds be stopped. This means that of the 110,000 unemployed at least 75,000 will be exposed to starvation, for the unemployment benefit funds are exhausted and are not in a position to pay out benefits without state support. The brutality of the entire bourgeoisie has also not been without effect and the Danish working class—up to the present blinded by democratic illusions—is now pervaded by a feeling of intense anger. During the last few days conditions have come to a head and the opposition between the mass and its leaders is becoming greater day by day. In various provincial cities the locked-out workers have attacked the sons of the peasantry and the bourgeoisie doing strikebreaking work, which has resulted in very grave conflicts between the locked-out workers and the police. In the city of Randers the entire working class has proclaimed the general strike in order to compel the removal of the military called in by the police. In Horsens the military retreated upon the threat of a general strike. In Randers new disturbances are expected and in Kolding the workers have established a proletarian guard in order to prevent the excesses of the police.

In the week of March 19th—25th a second conference convoked by the Shoe Workers' Union of Copenhagen was held for the discussion of the situation. 162 delegates were present, representing 58 trade-unions and 6 trade councils with 75,000 members. The conference unanimously adopted an energetic resolution vigorously protesting against the attitude of the trade-union leaders. It called upon the workers of the entire country to hold general assemblies everywhere before the 1st of April, in places where the leaders oppose this move even without their consent. In these assemblies the following resolution should be voted upon:

"The undersigned organization, in general assembly assembled, resolves to join a general strike with or without the approval of the Trade Union Federation as soon as the majority of the organized workers in Denmark decide therefore. At the same time the General Assembly elects 3 representatives who are empowered to act in the name of the organization."

The conference decided to submit a final demand to the Trade Union Federation for the execution of the general strike if an absolute majority votes for it before the 1st of April. If this demand is not complied with, it will see to it that the strike takes place with or without the consent of the leaders.

The Communist Party, which has been carrying on an energetic propaganda, has supported the resolution of the special conference in a manifesto. The next few days will show whether the opposition will be able to obtain a majority for the general strike against the sabotage of the entire leadership of the trade-unions and the Social Democratic press.

Native Trade Unionism in South Africa

by M. Lopes.

In most of the countries of old Europe the war and its consequences the present economic and political crises have divided the nations into two clearly defined camps—proletariat and bourgeoisie—whose antagonism to each other has become intense to the verge of civil war. The issues of the struggle are plain—Proletarian Dictatorship or Slavery—and its method . . . civil war.

In South Africa it is different. Here we have still the struggle of Dutch Nationalism against British Imperialism, which at the beginning of the war broke out into armed rebellion; here the militant white trade-unionist of the Rand fights his masters with his foot on the neck of the native; here the vast masses of

colored and native people carry on a struggle against capitalism which to them means the domination of the white races over the black. The refusal of the white workers to cooperate with them in their struggles has thrown them upon their own resources. Thus their struggles for higher wages and better conditions of labor tend to develop into racial conflicts and are provocative of strange religious movements, of an ideology of "Africa for the Blacks" imported from the Southern United States of America, and of an acute development of race consciousness.

This state of affairs has been fostered by the methods used by the government in dealing with native strikers which is still the policy of "Schiet" (shoot).

Trade unionism however is spreading slowly but surely among the natives and colored people. During 1919 there were organizations formed here and there, in the Cape Colony and in the Orange Free State, and in July 1920 a conference was convoked at Bloemfontein of all these independent bodies with the view of uniting them into one great union of non-European workers. This gave birth to the Industrial and Commercial Workers Amalgamated Union of Africa (I.C.W.U.).

In 1920 this organization received its baptism of blood. The native and colored workers at Port Elizabeth struck for an increase in wages to which the authorities replied by the arrest of the strike leader, S. M. Masabalala. This was followed by a demonstration of the strikers outside the police station demanding bail and the release of their leader. They were fired upon by policemen and ex-service men, resulting in 149 casualties including 20 native and colored deaths.

Responsibility for the strike was attributed to the propaganda of the Communists (which practically did not exist among the natives). Our teachings are known to the leaders of the I.C.W.U. but they are far too prudent to associate themselves in any way with the Communists. This prudence causes them to support every political party except the Communist Party although they are well aware that its policy alone reflects the interests of the native races and the colored people.

The policy of the I.C.W.U. is to obtain relief from the Pass laws and other irritating disabilities through the solidarity of the black proletariat. Apart from this it is out to obtain better conditions of labor and higher wages. Its greatest task is still before it—the organizing of the native workers in the North, almost an insurmountable task in view of the implacable hostility not only of the Government but also of the white workers. But the president, Mr. M'simang, is now in Johannesburg doing this work.

Far greater success would have been achieved in this field had not a split occurred, when several groups in Cape Town broke away and formed a new organization, the Industrial and Commercial Union (I.C.U.). Thus at present we have two native unions, the I.C.W.U., with branches in the Transvaal, Orange Free State and the Cape Colony and the I.C.U., organized in the Cape, Port Elizabeth and South West Africa (before the war known as German South West Africa).

The I.C.U. held its first congress towards the end of 1921 which was attended by 50 delegates and a short account of its proceedings will give some idea of the policy of this union.

The presidential address contained the following passages:—

"Production is the greatest essence in human history and the black man of Africa not only shares in production but controls the key of success of every industry and commerce. The mining industry, agriculture, transportation, and many others, without native labor would fail... In the past we have been left aside by the white trade-unionists, but now we are organizing on our own lines, imitating the white man's practical methods; hence we shall court his acceptance and recognition as fellow workers."

The lack of clear ideas upon the nature of the class struggle was shown by a resolution which, while repudiating Mr. Archibald Crawford as the representative of the native workers at the International Labor Conference at Geneva on the grounds of his policy in supporting the political and economic subjection of the native and colored people, yet demanded representation at this Conference so that their grievances may be heard by the civilized world.

In true "trade-union" style the Congress demanded many things which are either useless or will not be even considered by the Union government, such as "that the existing pass laws as applying to the natives of the Transvaal and Orange Free State shall be repealed" and "that a special Commission be appointed by the Government to investigate the conditions under which the natives are employed in the mines of the Transvaal". The Congress protested against the increasing of the hours of

labor of the railway employees" such action being contrary to the principles embodied in the Peace Treaty of Versailles which was also ratified by the Union government".

Do these protests and demands not show how well the native trade-union leaders have assimilated the white labor leaders' faith in the good faith and generosity of capitalist governments? A faith touching in its simplicity and irritating in its stupidity.

But did not Mr. D. M. Brown, member of Parliament, in opening the Congress exhort them not to "forget the dignity of labor, a dignity which has been hallowed forever by the Founder of Christianity, in the Carpenter's shop at Bethlehem", to conduct the conference with dignity, and not allow any wild or rabid resolutions to give the people outside an unfavorable opinion of it.

Thus it would seem that the only difference between the leaders of the I.C.U. and the white labor fakirs lies in the color of their skins. But there is this difference between white and native unions or rather between white and native workers. The latter possess greater solidarity arising not of class but of race consciousness. Their consciousness as members of an "oppressed race" unites them as no other bond could do and gives their struggles, economic and political, the character of a spontaneous mass-movement. Whether this aspect of their struggle will be accentuated in the future or whether it will be lessened by the close cooperation of the white workers which will impress upon them that the issue of the struggle is not Black or White domination but that of wage slavery or Communism, only the future can show. The leaders of the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union of Africa whatever their faults, are certainly desirous of obtaining this cooperation and in seeking it they will have the fullest support of the Communist Party of South Africa,

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Trade Union Movement and the Communists in Italy

by Luigi Repossi.

Immediately after its breaking away from the Italian Socialist Party the Communist Party began a systematic work in the trade-unions. In February 1921 a Propaganda Committee was appointed by the Party for the purpose of carrying on this work.

At the Congress of the General Federation of Labor held (C.G.L.) at Livorno (February 26th—March 3rd 1921) the Communist workers received over one-third of the votes cast by the Trade Union Councils and about one-seventh of those cast by the Federations (i. e. 288,000 Communist votes given by the Trade Union Councils against 556,000 Socialist votes and 136,000 Communist votes from the Federations against 798,000 Socialist votes) These figures can only be taken as an expression of the relative strength of the two tendencies in the Italian trade-union movement so far as the trade-union councils are concerned, whilst as regards the Federations owing to the way these bodies are constituted the figures do not convey a correct impression, so that we may take it that something like 580,000 trade-union councils are concerned, whilst as regards the Federations, owing to the way these bodies are constituted the figures do not convey a correct impression, so that we may take it that something like 580,000 trade-union organized workers stand behind the party.

Immediately following the Trade Union Congress there was formed, in addition to the Central Committee of the Communist Party, a Trade Union Committee with its headquarters at Milan. In March, however, a ruthless police persecution of the Communist Party took place; in consequence of which and partly as a result of the Parliamentary elections which demanded every exertion, the activity of the Party in the trade-unions was for the time being almost suspended. But since June 1921 we have carried on a systematic activity within the trade-unions. The Trade Union Councils of Livorno, Salerno, Trieste, Tarante, etc., have already come over to our side.

Already at the time of the Parliamentary elections the Trade Union Committee had in agreement with the Party Executive, promulgated the slogan of the united proletarian battle front. On the 15th of August, however, the Trade Union Committee addressed a formal proposal to this effect to the C.G.L., the Italian Syndicalist Union and the Railwaymen's Union. Over a hundred thousand copies of the letter dealing with this together with the accompanying manifesto, were distributed among the workers. While the trade-union bureaucracy of the C.G.L. as unblushing demagogues rejected our proposal with regard to

the united front and the general strike as a defensive weapon against the capitalist offensive, and whilst the leaders of the Syndicalist Union and of the Railwaymen's Union gave lip service to the proposal but did nothing to prove their desire for its realization, the broad masses of the workers have very sympathetically responded to our slogan and have in several places compelled the leaders to endorse our proposal.

In all, the following labor organizations have endorsed our standpoint on the question of the general strike: The Federation of Wood Workers, 23 local unions of the Metal Workers' Federation, 4 Provincial Federations and 7 local groups of the Building Workers, 3 Provincial Federations of the Agricultural Workers, 46 Trade Union Councils including Turin, Trieste, Naples, Florence, Cremona, etc. and 42 local groups of various other industrial federations. In addition to this, Communist groups have been formed in almost all other trade-union organizations and embrace a very considerable minority of the membership.

On the 7th of September 1921, a conference was convened in Milan of all the organizations affiliated to the Communist Trade Union Committee. Although this conference was obliged to meet together and confer illegally for reaction was rampant in the city, over 100 delegates from all parts of Italy representing more than 500,000 Communist trade unionists took part in the proceedings. At the conference a report on the First World Congress of the Red Trade Unions was delivered and after an animated discussion affiliation to the Red Trade Union International was decided on. The decisions of the Moscow Congress were approved and a series of resolutions were adopted concerning the building up of our organization and the improvement of our propaganda. Among other things it was decided to publish a special organ for the propagation of Communism among the trade-unions. This organ "Il Sindacato Rosso" appears weekly in Milan.

In November 1921 the leadership of the C.G.L. found it necessary to call a national conference in order to consider its attitude with regard to the question of trade-union tactics and the International. As is known the Amsterdamers on this occasion had the upper hand and on the question of the general strike 246,402 votes were given by the Trade Union Councils for the Communists while 612,653 were given for the Socialist resolution, whilst from the Federations 169,310 votes were given for the Communists and 813,868 for the Socialist resolution. One must remark that these figures cause the comparative strength of the two movements to appear unfavorable to the Communists merely because they are derived from these trade-union organizations which are controlled by the Socialists, and the reports as to memberships are only as appear on the books though they may often have shrunk considerably. (For example the Federation of Agricultural Workers which at present has only 200,000 members was in the vote credited with 850,000).

Our organization work has gone forward ever since. Almost everywhere local organizations, district unions, etc., of Communist bodies have been formed. In certain industries special propaganda committees have been established. Of these we number in all 13, the 14th comprises the Union of War Invalids. In December 10,000 copies of our trade-union organ were printed.

The Communist Trade Union Committee has devoted itself recently to the Syndicalist Union. There are certainly between us and the old section within the Syndicalist Union certain points of contact; there are, however, certain differences of opinion. In particular the Syndicalists demand of us that we leave them free to split unions away from the C.G.L. For the rest, one has to admit that the Syndicalist Union, although Borghi and his friends prate of its hundreds of thousands of affiliated members, does not actually at the present time possess more than 100,000 and perhaps even only 80,000 members. The Syndicalist Union possesses no record of its sections, no statistical bureau, no proper secretariat; it will not and cannot yet discriminate between the Red Trade Union International and the Communist International.

Within the C.G.L. a systematic propaganda is being carried on as heretofore. At present there is proceeding an agitation for the calling of a Confederation Congress. In these efforts we are supported by the Lazzari section which opposes the reformist tendencies in the C.G.L. and advocates affiliation to the Red Trade Union International. On the other hand the Social Democrats in order to check our progress have recourse to the weapon of expulsions.

With regard to the newly formed notorious "Allianza del Lavoro" (Alliance of Labor) there can be no doubt that the alliance was brought about in order to allow D'Aragona and the

Serrati party to exercise pressure upon the government in a reformist direction. On the other hand the creation of this alliance is partly the result of our agitation for the united front. We have on this account joined the alliance and are carrying on propaganda therein in the direction and spirit of our program according to the decisions of the Trade Union Congress of Moscow.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

The Henchmen of the Counter Revolution

by Edmund Burian (Prague).

** The Russian Social Revolutionaries claim the "right" of recourse to weapons in their fight against the Russian proletarian revolution; they themselves have committed every infamy in their endeavor to bring about the fall of the Russian Communist government, but they protest against the judicial exposure of their true counter-revolutionary attitude. And the Mensheviks stand shoulder to shoulder with them, and are indignant at the Bolsheviks who are "determined to execute the leaders of the Social Revolutionaries at any price." The international proletariat is called upon to help the accused Social Revolutionaries, at the very moment when facts are forming the loudest accusation against the Social Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks.

Semyonoff's disclosures of the systematic preparation of plans for the assassination of Lenin and other comrades have shown the Social Revolutionaries to be the lackeys of the reactionary counter-revolution. It would certainly not be to the interest of the European proletariat to have "some of the leaders of the Social Revolutionaries executed at any price", but it is very much to their interest to have the reactionary character of the Social Revolutionaries exposed. The Social Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks feel a breath of fresh air once more. The Russian working people have driven them away, and want nothing to do with them, but now they turn to the reactionary capitalistic petty bourgeoisie, from whom they hope to receive help through the new economic politics. The Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks are setting their hopes on entirely reactionary elements, and are consequently themselves entirely reactionary in character. Although even Czecho-Slovak nationalist legionaries have recognized that these two groups are rendering service to reaction, the Russian 'Socialists' and 'Revolutionists' still refuse to acknowledge the fact, and still venture to come forward as complainants against the Russian communists!

The Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks are not only being brought to justice in a revolutionary court, they stand accused before the world's tribunals in the history of the world. 'Help the Russian Revolution!'—the utterance of this appeal is the duty of Socialists in all countries! And in this duty the Social Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks have failed. They have planned and executed attacks against the revolution but have never raised their voices in favor of the proletarian revolution. They speculate on the strangulation of the Russian proletarian government by the strengthening of reactionary elements. And the proletariat of Europe is asked to support these reactionary elements under the pretense of assisting 'tried and energetic revolutionists!'

All reactionary wishes are to be fully satisfied. Russian and international reaction are to be aided against the 'Red Terror' by the loudest possible uproar, and the united front of the proletariat against capitalism is to be destroyed! If the Russian proletarian government does not suspend the trial of the Social Revolutionaries, the united front of the proletariat is to be wrecked. Thus command the Mensheviks. The united front of the proletariat demands opposition to every suggestion of reaction, but the Mensheviks demand protection for reaction.

Thus the 'cry for help' for the Social Revolutionaries reveals itself in actuality as an accusation against the Social Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks. The international proletariat does not want executions, but it cannot give help to those helping reaction. Help the Russian revolution, prepare for the world revolution—this is the true battlecry of the European proletariat.