

V. b. b.

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 59

23rd July 1925

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliessfach 213. Vienna IX.
Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

Stalin: On the Revolutionary Movement in the East.

The Bulgarian Murder Regime and its Accomplishes.

Kolarov: Who will be the Victor?

Dimitrov: Fresh Treachery from the Second International.
(On the Occasion of the Socialist Conference at Prague.)

Nin: Bulgaria and the International Trade Union Movement.

Kolarov and Dimitrov: To the Editor of the "Humanité".

Against the Attacks on the Soviet Union

Frunse: Always on the Alert!

Sokolnikov: Against the Financial Blockade — Financial Self-Help of Soviet Russia.

Hands off China

A. St.: The Work of English Imperialism in China.

Politics

Gallacher: Britain's Dirty Diplomacy.

Jaques: The Result of the Election for the Dutch Chamber.

J. B.: British Intrigues in Arabia.

The Labour Movement

Five Years Red International of Labour Unions. Manifesto of the R.I.L.U.

Domski: Congress of the Free Trade Unions of Poland.
St.: After the Great Labour Fight in Denmark.

Workers' Delegations in the Soviet Union.

Bukharin: The Visit of the German Workers' Delegation to the Soviet Union.

Organisation

A Contribution to the History of Industry. The Krupp Works.

Our Problems

Duncker: Graziadei's Revision of Marxism. 3.

On the Revolutionary Movement in the East.

By I. Stalin.

In the following article we publish Comrade Stalin's answers to the questions of the Moscow correspondent of the Japanese paper "Nishi-Nishi". We also give verbatim the questions of the correspondent. Ed.

First question. The Japanese people, the most advanced among the peoples of the East, is the one which is most interested in the movement for freedom of the Eastern peoples. The Japanese people would gladly become the ally of the Soviet Union in this great cause, the cause of the liberation of the oppressed peoples of the East from the yoke of the Western powers. Nevertheless Japan, which is after all a capitalist State, must sometimes act in opposition to this movement and make one front with the Western powers. (For instance the Anglo-Japanese alliance in consequence of which Japan must support England in its struggle against the insurgents in India, and the common action of Japan with England, America and France against the Chinese workers in connection with the recent events in Shanghai.)

What, in your opinion, is the way of escape from this complicated situation of the contradiction between the national ambitions of the Japanese people and the public and social order of the Japanese State?

Answer to the first question. It is true that the Japanese people is the most advanced of the Eastern peoples, and that it is

interested in the success of the movement for the liberation of the oppressed peoples. The alliance of the Japanese people with the peoples of the Soviet Union would mean a decisive step in the cause of the liberation of the Eastern peoples. Such an alliance would mean the beginning of the end of world imperialism. Such an alliance would be invincible.

It is however at the same time true that the political and social order of Japan drives the Japanese people into the path of imperialism, and makes it an instrument not of liberation but of the enslavement of the Eastern peoples.

You ask where a way of escape can be found from this contradiction between the interests of the Japanese people and the political social order of Japan.

There is only one way of escape: the political and social order of Japan must be adapted to the fundamental interests of the Japanese people.

Russia was at one time the terror of Eastern peoples, the gendarme of any movement for freedom. How can the fact be explained that it has changed from a gendarme of movements for liberation into a friend and standard-bearer of this movement? Only through the fact that the political and social order of Russia has been changed.

Second question. The Eastern peoples who inhabit the territory of Soviet Russia, are many centuries behind in their

development, in consequence of the despotic regime of Czarism, and only since the revolution have they received the right of independent development of their industry, their agriculture, their culture etc.

How many years will these peoples of the Soviet Union, in your opinion, require to reach the cultural level of the other peoples of the Soviet Union?

Answer to the second question. You ask about how many years the Eastern peoples of the Soviet Union will require to reach the cultural level of the other peoples of the Soviet Union.

It is difficult to say. The rapidity of the cultural development of these peoples depends on many internal and external conditions. I must once for all remark that the prognosis with regard to the rapidity of development has never been distinguished by accuracy, especially when it is a question of "how many years". The most essential facilitation for the cultural development of these peoples lies in the fact that the chief obstacles to development have already been removed, such for instance as Czarism, Russian Imperialism and the regime of the exploitation of the border territories by the centre. This fact gives the cultural development of the Eastern peoples of the Soviet Union a tremendous impulse. But to what extent this essential furtherance is utilised, depends on the Eastern peoples themselves, and above all on the stage of cultural development at which they were when the Soviet revolution broke out.

One thing however can be said without hesitation; under the present day conditions of development, the Eastern peoples of the Soviet Union have much more prospect of a rapid and all-round development of their national culture, than would have been possible under the rule of even the most liberal and cultured capitalism.

Third question. You say that the union of the national movement for freedom of the subjugated peoples of the East with the proletarian movement with the advanced countries of the West, ensures the world revolution. In our country, among the Japanese people, the slogan is popular: "Asia for the Asiatics!" Do you not find that there is something in common between our endeavours and your revolutionary tactics with regard to the colonial countries of the East?

Answer to the third question. You ask whether there is not something in common between the slogan "Asia for the Asiatics!" and the revolutionary tactics of the Bolsheviks with regard to the colonial countries of the East.

In so far as the slogan: "Asia for the Asiatics!" means a call to revolutionary war against the imperialism of the West, in so far — but only in so far — there is without doubt something in common.

The slogan "Asia for the Asiatics!" does not however merely refer to this side of the question. It contains two other component parts which are absolutely irreconcilable with the tactics of the Bolsheviks. In the first place this slogan begs the question of Eastern imperialism as though it were the opinion that Eastern imperialism is better than Western and that war against Eastern imperialism could be left out the question. Secondly this slogan inspires workers of Asia with a feeling of mistrust for the workers of Europe, estranges the Asiatic and the European workers from one another, undermines the international connections between them and thus undermines the foundations of the movement for freedom themselves.

The revolutionary tactics of the Bolsheviks are directed not only against Western imperialism, but against imperialism as a whole, including Eastern imperialism. Its aim is not that of weakening international connections between the workers of Asia and the workers of other countries, but in strengthening and extending these connections.

Thus, as you see, besides there being certain things in common, there are also fundamental differences between the slogan "Asia for the Asiatics!" and the Bolshevik tactics in the East.

Fourth question. In 1920, Lenin in a discussion with me, answered my question as to where communism had more prospect of success, in the East or in the West, as follows: "Real communism can only be victorious in the West. The whole West however lives at the expense of the East; the European capitalist powers enrich themselves chiefly in the Eastern colonies, but at the same time they arm their colonies, teach them the art of war and thus the West is digging its own grave in the East."

Do you not believe that the events which are following more and more closely on one another in China, India, Persia, Egypt and

other Eastern countries, are a sign that the time is near when the Western powers will be compelled to lie down in the grave which they have dug for themselves in the East.

Answer to the fourth question. You ask whether I am not of the opinion that the intensification of the revolutionary movement in China, India, Persia, Egypt and other Eastern countries is a sign that the time is near when the Western powers will lie down in the grave which they have dug for themselves in the East.

Yes, I believe it. The colonial countries are the most important support of imperialism. The revolutionising of this support must undermine imperialism, not only in the sense that imperialism will lose its support, but also in the sense that the revolutionising of the East will give a decisive impulse to the intensification of the revolutionary crisis in the West. **Imperialism, harassed on two sides, by a frontal attack and an assault from the rear, will have to recognise that its death sentence has been passed.**

THE BULGARIAN MURDER REGIME AND ITS ACCOMPLICES

Who will be the Victor?

By V. Kolarov (Moscow).

Zankov's campaign of vengeance against the Bulgarian people is still in full force. It is true that the thirteen thousand complementary volunteers called up, with the permission of the Ambassadors' Council to fight against the "Bolshevist danger", have since been demobilised. But the army of professional murders is still continuing its work of "saving the fatherland". The work of murder is still being carried on in the prisons, the prisoners are shot "when attempting to escape", and the revolutionists, put to frightful tortures in the dungeons of the inquisition, take their own lives.

The bloodthirstiness of the Sofian executioners has even aroused the indignation of the editors of the "Vorwärts" who after the conference at Prague, at which the international patrons of Zankov's accomplices declared these to be perfect angels and refused to condemn the bloody White Guard bacchanalia, designated the present regime in Bulgaria as a disgrace to Europa.

General Volkov, Minister of War, stated in Parliament that he had received 25 applications for investigations into the disappearance of prisoners, and had ordered the matter to be looked into. This is the first official acknowledgment of the murders committed in the prisons. The number of those thus murdered is naturally very much greater, and the many women, children and other relatives who gather round the gates of the police stations and prisons of Sofia, and wait in vain for news of their loved ones bear a sorrowful witness to the fact.

The "Vorwärts", quoting an extremely cautious estimate made by an Italian correspondent in Sofia, states the number of those murdered without trial to be at least 200. The Minister of War also stated that 3194 "conspirators" are still retained in prison, and that 1182 have already been brought before a court martial. The remainder are still imprisoned on remand in the hands of the "Okhrana" agents. The military authorities demand capital punishment or imprisonment for life for all these "criminals", though many of them are mere youths. And experience has shown that the courts martial do not hesitate to pronounce sentences of death.

The Mensheviks raise however no objection to the mass extermination of the representatives of the working people of Bulgaria, so long as the prisoners have been put on trial. The ruling bandits take cognisance of this and extend the activities of the courts martial.

The Bulgarian government and its Menshevik accomplices are spreading a report all over the world to the effect that it is only the participants in the Sofia bomb affair who are being put on trial and punished. This is a direct lie. As the correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" reports on 28. May 1925:

"not one of the innumerable persons condemned to death, or imprisoned in Sofia or in the provinces, can be said with certainty to have had anything to do with this crime."

The government has declared all members of the Communist Party, of the Communist Youth, and all Agrarians with trend to the Left, to be "criminals". It makes them responsible for the

assassinations in the cathedral at Sofia, and the courts of justice condemn them. This same correspondent writes that the

"participation of the Communist Party as such in the bomb affair remains unproved, and when we remember that all the leading communists were arrested, and heard exhaustively before being shot or hanged, this lack of proofs actually goes to prove the contrary."

The sole verdict actually bearing on the Sofia affair was that pronounced in the case of Friedmann, Koev, and Zagorsky. But even this verdict was anything but irreproachable, for the facts brought to light after the arrest of the Russian monarchist Druzelovsky have proved incontestably that the verdict was based on documents fabricated by this international criminal at the behest of the Bulgarian government.

The object of this bloody campaign on the part of the bourgeoisie has not by any means been the discovery and punishment of criminals. The government hoped that the exaggeration of the "Bolshevist danger", aided by the fabrication of forged documents, would secure for it the sympathy of the victor states, and eventually some alleviation of the terms of the Peace Treaty. In the first moments after the frightful explosion in Sofia, it almost appeared as if the government had attained this aim. But it was not long before it was obliged to admit the contrary to be the case. The whole bourgeoisie finds to its sorrow that Bulgaria is completed isolated so far as international relations are concerned.

The representatives of the bankers and speculators, in destroying the actively conscious section of the proletariat, have pursued the aim of robbing the revolutionary movement of its leaders, and giving a severe lesson to the obstinate workers and peasants refusing to be convinced of the advantages of the White Guard power. It may be that they have attained the first part of this aim to a certain extent. But this "victory" will bring down a frightful vengeance upon them later on. The extermination of the flower of the rising social class is not a crime that will go unpunished. Those whose minds are not completely poisoned with the thirst for blood are already realising that the masses of the people are now more irreconcilable and antagonistic towards their suppressors and murderers than ever before. It is not possible to reign for ever by the gallows and the sword.

The policy of the 9. June has suffered final shipwreck. Zankov's adherents, now notorious all the world over as insatiable bloodsuckers, will soon vanish from the scene. The Bulgarian bourgeoisie, weak, base and cowardly, will squeeze the utmost out of Zankov and his followers, and then throw them aside on the manure heap. Then the bourgeoisie will seek fresh tools for the suppression of the masses of the people. It will find itself obliged to make concessions to the people, and to provide a safety valve as vent for the dangerous atmosphere created by the cruelties of the White Terror. It will return to the starting point of its pre-war power and will try to deceive history. The immediate future will show the extent of its success.

The gallows are still standing all over the country, and the blood of the best fighters for the welfare of the people is still being shed in the prisons, but none the less the sun of the White Guard regime is setting. The regime is dying. The Bulgarian people emaciated and covered with blood, will emerge victorious from the battle.

Fresh Treachery from the Second International.

(On the Occasion of the Socialist Conference at Prague.)

By G. Dimitrov (Moscow).

The growing indignation aroused in the ranks of the international proletariat against Zankov's bloody regime and against the treacherous behaviour of the Bulgarian socialists, who support this regime at home and defend it in the eyes of public opinion abroad, spread during the last few months to a part of the Second International and to the Amsterdam Trade Union International.

This forced the leaders of the Second International to convoke a Conference in Prague, in order to unify the attitude taken by the Socialist Parties in the Bulgarian question, and to paralyse the dissatisfaction and indignation against the policy of the Bulgarian section which had penetrated the socialist ranks.

The decision of the Executive Committee of the Second International, to call a conference at Prague, gave rise to much uneasiness at first to governmental circles in Sofia. These feared that the Conference might adopt the condemnatory standpoint of the English Labour Party, and the governmental press therefore began to accuse Zankov's socialist accomplices of incapacity to defend "Bulgarian affairs" before the International.

The Socialists themselves were no less uneasy. They felt that, if they were disavowed by the Second International, they would forfeit the last remnant of the prestige left to them among the Bulgarian bourgeoisie, which simply uses them as an instrument for its policy abroad. On the eve of the conference in Prague, the Socialist leader Kristo Pastukhov published the following warning to Vandervelde, Fritz Adler and Tom Shaw in his newspaper "Epokha":

"It is entirely unpermissible that the Bulgarian should be placed in the position of defendants in Prague, as has been insinuated. On the other hand, we must not allow too much attention to be devoted to the question of relations with the Bulgarian government, for this question has an internal local character... If the attitude of any country or party is submitted to severe criticism, this will not only fail to promote the peaceful solution of the Bulgarian question, but will on the contrary cause both the Bolshevist wing and that of reaction to grow... We hope that the International, which has of late approved of the attitude of the Bulgarian socialists and has begun to speak of national minorities and reparations, will not go back on its words and will not deal only with the past. We have the right to expect that the Conference will go forward with firm footsteps."

The Sofian hangmen and their socialist servants had however no need to be afraid of the conference of the Second International in Prague. As the resolution passed at Prague shows, the leaders of the Second International preferred to disavow the English delegation and the dissatisfied socialist elements, and to remain faithful to the end to the Bulgarian Mensheviks, who have after all done nothing more than carry out the counter revolutionary policy of the Second International, only rather too zealously.

It need not be said that the instigators of these murders and deeds of violence among the Bulgarian people, and their Menshevik accomplices, have been delighted at the declaration made by the Prague Conference, to the effect that the Conference abstains from inquiring into the situation in Bulgaria, and from ascertaining the truth about the mass murder and violence, and fully shares the opinion of the Bulgarian Mensheviks, that "the question of the Bulgarian governments is of an internal local character." For this signifies the open furtherance of the horrifying Terror in Bulgaria, and this at a moment when even the Minister of War, Volkov, admitted in Parliament that murders were being committed without trial and without investigation, and that there are still thousands of arrestants in prison. The governmental newspapers of Bulgaria are full of praise in their comments on the decision of the Socialist Conference in Prague. They regard this decision as a "great success for the Bulgarian government", and as a brilliant defence of the "honour of Bulgaria". The Mensheviks themselves declare in their newspapers "Narod" and "Epokha" with all solemnity, that thanks to them the idea spreading abroad that "Bulgaria is a land of Terror, of murder and of barbarism", has been exploded.

The cynicism of the leaders of the Second International has however exceeded all bounds, for the Prague Conference not only declared itself solid with the disgraceful and treacherous attitude of the Bulgarian Mensheviks, but declared at the same time that the Bulgarian Social Democrats had fought against the Terror regime, had demanded an amnesty for the political prisoners, and had protested "valiantly" (?) against the state of siege proclaimed after the explosion in the cathedral of Sofia.

The leaders of the Second International had the insolence to issue this lying declaration, despite series of incontestable facts proving the full participation of the Bulgarian Mensheviks in the unheard of misdeeds of the Zankov government.

Even at the moment when the Prague Socialist Conference had already met, the organ of the Bulgarian socialists, the "Epokha", continued to incite the Zankov government to fresh deeds of violence and cruelty against the bleeding masses of working people and peasantry, and against those of their leaders who were still alive.

Thus for instance the 'Epokha' published the following base and provocative article in its number of 11. June:

"Youths deceived into illegal activity.

The newspapers are full of reports on the legal proceedings being prepared against a few dozen young people — scholars and students — who have become involved in illegal activity. It is easy to comprehend how these misled young people — girls and young men — have come into this position. They are victims of the poison created and spread abroad by the leaders and representatives of the United Front. Now that these young people are faced by the terrors of to-morrow's verdict, they experience the frightful consequences of the madness into which others have drawn them, and it is a question whether the authorities have been successful in laying hands on all the braggadocios who have been inoculating this poison for years, secretly or openly, have spread the teaching of the armed insurrection, induced these young people to take oaths, have supplied weapons, received and distributed money, literature, etc. We are convinced that this is not the case. It is however necessary and will continue to be necessary. The bonds and considerations of relationship and friendship must be set aside. The law must be applied against all who have trespassed against it, or the prerequisites for an unfavorable criticism will be created."

The newspaper "Epokha" wrote in a leading article, published 12. June:

"The military courts execute the enactments of the law for the protection of the state. In this time of severest trial for the country these emergency courts lay their heavy hand on the conspirators and their accomplices. The United Front of the Communists and Agrarians, which has attacked the lives of its antagonists, and prepared a bloody coup d'etat, has brought its own adherents to the gallows... The courts martial fulfil their duty. They cannot be reproached in any way... The chief culprits of the United Front conspiracy have suffered the severest punishment of the law. The United Front or heart of the conspiracy has been destroyed. Under these conditions the government can in our opinion proceed to the restoration of normal conditions in the country and must not for a moment slacken the watchfulness (?) of the administrative and legal authorities."

After preserving silence for two months on the unheard of cruelties and brutalities committed in connection with the explosion in the cathedral of Sofia, the Socialist Parliament fraction has at last been struck with the idea obviously in connection with the Prague Conference — that it was time to put a question to Parliament on the mass arrests which have been made since the explosion (12. June). The Socialist deputy submitting the question, K. Bosvelyev, made however the following statement:

"The mass arrests of citizens come as no surprise to us, for the misdeed committed in the cathedral gives the state the legal right of self-defence. And we are fully convinced that these mass arrests have been made with the intention, in the first place, of seizing the guilty, and in the second place of preventing the repetition of such crimes in the future. But as always happens in such cases (?), innocent persons, the victims of denunciations, have been arrested with the guilty..."

We believe that it is to the interest of the state, and to the interest of public peace, if the position of the arrestants is cleared up as speedily as possible, and the innocent set free. When the stress of such events induces a government to resort to martial law, it is for the reason that courts martial act rapidly, settle rapidly, and rapidly impose the deserved punishment. If there is a lack of military judges for the courts of inquiry, more should be appointed. There are sufficient reserve military jurists well able to lighten the work of the military courts...

We have received complaints from relations of arrested persons who have disappeared. We are far from accusing the central authorities with reference to such cases of mysterious disappearance. As I have already stated, and now repeat with all the earnestness which this question demands: We are far from accusing the governmental authorities with reference to those cases of mysterious disappearance. We well remember the noble and humane words (?) uttered by the Minister of War on the occasion of the proclamation of a state of war,

words calculated to warm the hearts of all who heard them (?). We demand that the government throw light upon the actions committed by irresponsible persons (?) in the streets, not only because we are anxious for the government to remain unspotted, but because we are at the same time aware that accusations made against the government are also made against our unhappy country, against Bulgaria. To us it appears perfectly clear that, since the government cannot be accused of these crimes, it is the more under an obligation to clear up the matter, to prove to foreign countries that in our country justice is actually being exercised." ("Narod" and "Epokha" 13. June.)

Even the bourgeois radical newspaper, the "Radical" is indignant at this indescribably servile attitude of the Socialist Parliament fraction. Its number of 15. June contains the following:

"It must be observed that the representatives of the Socialist Parliamentary fraction laid their question before Parliament without conviction and with a certain irresolution, as if it were not exactly necessary to seek for the truth or to find the guilty, but were merely a question of registering some question put by the Socialist Parliamentary fraction, just as an article by the Secretary of the Social Democratic Party was dealt with by the foreign press a few days ago. Thus an important question was submitted to Parliament and then removed from the agenda again unnoticed even by Parliament itself, and retired into the background in favour of questions not claiming the attention of the Bulgarian citizens at the present time. The representative of the Social Democratic Parliament fraction did not even deem it necessary to convert his inquiry into an interpellation, by which a general debate on the question would have been caused."

During the Prague conference itself the Socialist leader Yanko Sakysov expressed himself literally as follows in an interview with the correspondent Leon Weiss:

"There is no thought whatever of any description of terror or Fascist dictatorship in Bulgaria. The whole matter is that some excesses have actually been committed by the volunteers placing themselves at the disposal of the government, excesses explicable on the one hand by the indignation of the masses (?) against the communists, and on the other hand by the circumstance that the government has not had sufficient soldiery and police at its disposal. If there had been a regular army and a powerful police force instead of the volunteers, these excesses would not have taken place."

This is the "valiant" manner in which the Bulgarian Menshevik fight against the violence of the Zankov regime, against the state of siege, and for the restoration of the rights and liberties of the masses of the people, now trampled underfoot.

And the Prague Conference of the Second International has declared itself solid with this shameful and treacherous attitude. The masses of the working people still under the influence of this International have now a renewed excellent opportunity of recognising its true countenance, its utter social treachery, and their proletarian conscience will be roused to the greatest indignation by the cynical decisions of the Prague Conference.

Bulgaria and the International Trade Union Movement.

By Andrés Nin.

In Bulgaria blood continues to flow ceaselessly. The most self-sacrificing champions of the masses of Bulgarian workers and peasants, after having fought heroically since September 1923 against the most horrible of all tyrannies, have been swept from the field of battle by every means that the Sadistic imagination of a "Professor" can conjure up and place at the service of the bourgeois dictatorship. The courts martial continue to work un-interruptedly. Gallows have been erected in every square. Thousands of workers and peasants fill the prisons, or are brutally murdered.

Bulgaria has become a mighty field of pain, a place of torment, a Dantesque hell: Since the bloody suppression of the Paris Commune in 1871 the working masses have not suffered such a frightful suppression, have not undergone such a brutal extermination, as they have suffered in this little Balkan country since the day that Zankov established his bloody dictatorship by a bold coup d'etat.

In face of these events, it must be declared that the international proletariat has not quite done its duty; it has not reacted with sufficient energy against this systematic and carefully organised massacre of its Bulgarian brothers. There was a time — before the war and before the October revolution — when the executioner Czars of Russia could not visit the great European capitals without hearing the indignant curses and shouts of the working class. But now it has been possible for one of the executioner ministers of Zankov's government, Kalfov, to pass unpunished through almost the whole of Europe. Here and there, on the initiative of the Communist Parties and of the revolutionary Trade Unions, protest meetings have been organised against the Bulgarian atrocities: But the voice of the proletariat has not been raised loudly enough to stay the hand of the executioner.

Mass action has been lacking, united action among all the workers organisations. The Second International and the Amsterdam International have again been on the other side of the barricades. And how could this be otherwise when in Bulgaria itself the Socialist leaders and the leaders of the reformist Trade Unions are hand in hand with the Zankov dictatorship. Did they not help to establish this dictatorship? This is an incontestable fact, and the reformist leaders will not succeed in concealing it. History will record their heavy responsibility. They will never be able to rid themselves of it.

But the leaders of the Amsterdam International must declare clearly and distinctly whether they are on the side of the executioners or of the victims. Whether they who are always ready to join in bourgeois protests against the so-called "Bolshevist terror", declare themselves in agreement with the methods pursued by the Zankov government. We should even be content if they would give us a modest explanation of whether they are in agreement with the systematic destruction of the revolutionary trade unions, in which almost the whole of the organised workers are united? They are probably aware that all our Trade Unions have been closed, the Trade Union newspapers prohibited, many of the secretaries of the organisations killed, the Trade Union premises and funds simply stolen by Zankov and his helpers, and the simple fact of membership in a Trade Union regarded as a crime.

If the Amsterdam leaders want to inform themselves more exactly on the nameless crimes committed in Bulgaria under the cloak of the "Defence of civilisation", they only need to apply to the leaders of their Bulgarian section, the sole one still able to carry on its functions legally in the whole country, all the fighting organisations of the workers and peasants being unmercifully destroyed. If but a single spark of proletarian dignity is left to them, they would then have to do their utmost to put an end to Zankov's bloody regime, to the indescribable atrocities being committed in Bulgaria, and to join the revolutionary trade union organisations for energetic common action.

Never before was the United Front of all Trade Union Organisations so urgent. The aim is clear; no sincere revolutionary fighter can feel a moment's doubt. This aim is the defence of the most elementary right of coalition and organisation among the workers, employees, and peasants; the arousing of the working class of all countries to action against a regime worthy of the middle ages, and a dark blot on the civilisation of today.

Once more, you gentlemen of the Amsterdam International: Are you with the executioners or with the victims? Are you with Zankov, or with the workers who are defending their class organisation with their lives?

The Bulgarian workers, and with them the proletariats of all countries, including the proletariat which you assert you represent, await your answer.

To the Editor of the „Humanité“.

By V. Kolarov and G. Dimitrov.

Referring to the reproduction of a photograph showing the devastation of the town of Vratza, published by the "Humanité" on 30. May, the Association of Bulgarian Journalists in France issues the following declaration, appearing in the newspaper "Posljednye Novosti" on 18. June:

"On 30. September 1923, during the final days of the communist insurrection in Bulgaria, the Bulgarian communists set the town of Vratza on fire on three sides. 600 houses, a third part of the town, were destroyed by the flames. Many of the inhabitants lost their lives in the attempt to save their pro-

perty; many of them were injured, and thousands were left homeless in the streets. The photograph of the devastation brought about by the communists was published by the communist paper of France on the 30. of May, with the instructive title of 'How Zankov's bandits dispense justice to the people!'"

This declaration on the part of the Association of Bulgarian Journalists in France, these generously paid agents of the Zankov government, is a vile lie from beginning to end.

The actual truth is that on the 28. September 1923 the military authorities themselves caused the fire by incautious handling of the war material stored in the town, so that the part of the town in which the stores were, was reduced to ashes.

The insolent mendacity of these journalists is sufficiently proved by the fact that not even Zankov's government had the courage to throw the blame of the fire on the insurgents, for it was too generally known that they had nothing to do with it. The government paper: "Mir" stated that Vratza fell a victim to the fire in the "higher interests of the state" only.

The investigation into the causes of this frightful fire were stopped by the military authorities with the substantiation that it had failed to find those guilty of causing the fire.

Many persons were arrested in the Vratza district in connection with the September risings. And the ensuing legal proceedings have all been settled long ago. But up to the present no case has been brought before the courts, or any charge brought against anyone, on account of the fire in Vratza.

We, as leaders of the rising, were sentenced, both of us, to 15 years hard labour. Every possible charge was brought against us, but on no occasion was even the slightest accusation raised against us in connection with the fire in Vratza.

The inhabitants of the town of Vratza were themselves very well aware of who were the real culprits. This is the reason why the Parliamentary election in November 1923 (one and a half months after the fire) despite the intensified Terror, resulted in two thirds of the votes cast in Vratza being given to the Communist and Agrarian list, that is, the list of the insurgents who, according to the representations of the Bulgarian Journalists in France, had reduced the town to ashes.

Would the "Bulgarian Journalists in France", who reacted with such sensibility when the Zankov government was charged with setting the town of Vratza on fire, and who resorted to a clumsy and unskillful lie in the defence of the government, not care to take up the cudgels again in defence of Kalfov's (Minister for Foreign Affairs) confutation of the English Ambassador's assertion that no fewer than 5000 of the workers and peasants arrested have been murdered since the suppression of the September insurrection?

Perhaps they would care at the same time to enlighten French public opinion on the following questions:

1. How many workers and peasants have been arrested in connection with the risings in the town of Lom; how many of the prisoners were thrown from barges into the Danube and drowned?

2. Who removed many leading workers' and peasants' functionaries from the Philipoppel prison, and afterwards murdered them?

3. Who murdered Dr. Iliev and the sister of mercy from the Ferdinand Hospital? These helpers aided the wounded of both sides.

4. Who murdered, in the town of Samokov, 20 of the arrested communists, headed by the communist deputy Boris Ch. Sotoriv?

5. Who murdered the peasant leaders Stambulijsky, Daskalov, Duparinov, Kalechev, Krum Popov, and others?

6. Who murdered, at the end of last year and the beginning of this, the deputies Petko D. Petkov, Dimo Ch. Dimov, T. Strashimirov, Harlampij, Stojanov?

7. And would they no care, finally, to inform French public opinion of how many hundreds of the old communists and peasant organisers arrested after the explosion at Sofia have "mysteriously" disappeared? Among the disappeared are the journalist Josef Herbst, the writers Geo Milev, Yasenov, and Polyanov, the author Anton Strashimirov, the political economist Georgi Bakalov, the representative of the Red Aid, Theodor Demitrov-Mikhailov, many officers oppositional to the Zankov regime, and others.

We propose to the "Association of Bulgarian Journalists in France" that they join the whole French press in carrying out

a journalistic investigation of the causes of the fire at Vratza, and of all the facts so far published on the bloody crimes committed against the Bulgarian people by the Sofian patrons of these "Bulgarian Journalists in France".

Such an investigation would at the same time have the effect of showing that the "Humanité" has hitherto not been in a position to publish even a thousandth part of the frightful crimes to be laid at the door of the Zankov bandits in Bulgaria.

AGAINST THE ATTACKS ON THE SOVIET UNION

Always on the Alert!

From Comrade Frunse's speech at the review of the troops on July 8th 1925.

A number of facts gives evidence that the Soviet Union is faced by a series of trials in the sphere of international relations. These trials are above all to be expected from the present English Government. The position recently taken up by Chamberlain and a number of other members of the English Conservative Cabinet, leaves no doubt as to the fact that the English Government is engaged in preparing for hostile action against us. In what form and when this will occur, we do not know.

It is indeed extremely doubtful whether the present Conservative Cabinet which represents the aristocratic and bourgeois circles with the utmost imperialist tendency, would make up their minds to undertake such an adventure as that of open, armed opposition to us. It may be doubted firstly, because this policy which threatens to kindle a new world conflagration, would hardly meet with the approval of the wide circles of the English population, let alone of the English working class; from a number of facts it is evident that the workers of England who carry sufficient weight in the policy of their State, could not admit of such steps being taken, since it would be to the detriment of their very own class interests. Secondly the English Conservatives, in their policy of organising an anti-Soviet bloc, would hardly be able to unite on the spot the other bourgeois States and to arrange a repetition of the ill-famed campaign of the fourteen States.

Although however we may doubt the possibility of an armed attack against us on the part of England, we must not neglect the fact that public opinion in all the States of Western Europe is being intensively worked upon in this direction. Almost the whole bourgeois Press is carrying on the most furious, relentless campaign against us, with which it is obviously preparing the ground for taking more decisive measures in the future. I can hardly be wrong in saying that the recent event, unparalleled in its insolence, on the frontier between the Soviet Union and Poland, is directly connected with the above-mentioned policy of the English Government.

In recent times, a certain inclination to an improvement in our relations with Poland has been observed. Many deeply-rooted economic interests had led to a considerable part of the leading circles in the Polish State considering the necessity of a change in the former practical policy of Poland towards us, which had been of an extremely anti-Soviet character. Apparently some Polish circles now wish, by making use of the pressure on the part of England, to destroy these improved relations and return to the strained situation. **Were not our policy so firmly and inflexibly on the side of peace, the incidents on our frontiers would already have led to armed conflict.** It requires no small amount of coldbloodedness and self-restraint on our part calmly to put up with the incessant shooting at our frontier-guard, the wounding and murdering of our peasants of the border territories who are engaged in peaceful work etc. We do not abandon hope that the Polish Government will put an end to these provocative attacks and restore order on its frontiers. But in all this we must be prepared for radical complications.

The question of the defence of our State must at present be the point on which the attention of the working masses of our whole Union is focussed. We military functionaries are at present faced by tasks of great responsibility. **The Red Army**

and the Red Navy must be fully prepared for war at any moment. The Red Army and the Red Navy must answer with powerful blows any attempt to disturb the peace of the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union. I do not doubt that if it were put to a military test, the Red Army would uphold the honour of its Red war banner.

Having acquainted myself with the condition of our troops in the Leningrad district and here also, I realise that they are everywhere working with all their might. We are making rapid progress in all branches of military organisation. We have had no little success. Of course there is still much left to be desired. We do not close our eyes to this fact. The organisation is good, the desire to work exists, nothing is needed but practice and experience.

Our internal situation, especially that of our economic work, is rapidly improving. All data go to prove that we shall have a considerably bigger harvest this year than last. This guarantees that our economic reconstruction is developing more and more rapidly. Needless to say, even if our harvest is good, many difficulties still lie ahead of us. One of these difficulties is the danger of an organised boycott of our export of cereals. The English Government among others is exerting itself particularly in this direction. We will hope however that with the support of the English proletariat, this policy which obviously disregards the interests of the working masses of England, will meet with a defeat. In any case they cannot frighten us with it. We have passed through worse times!

Against the Financial Blockade — Financial Self-Help of Soviet Russia.

By G. Sokolnikow,

People's Commissary for Finance of the Soviet Union.

The rapidly developing foreign trade of the Soviet Union could without doubt develop still more rapidly if normal credit relations existed between the Soviet Union and other countries. If this were the case, the export from the Soviet Union of goods required by foreign countries would on the one hand be easier and on the other hand the purchases of our Union in foreign countries would increase. These normal credit relations however are very difficult to attain. In individual countries, it is true (Italy for instance), they are beginning to meet us, but in a number of other countries the policy of complicating and restricting of the granting of credits to us is maintained.

If this is the case with trade credits, this policy is being carried out still more rigorously in the sphere of long period credits, which the Russian White Guardists recommended with the foreign bourgeois politicians as early as 1922 when the leading White Guardist emigrant organisations in Paris approached the Hague Conference with the demand that it should apply the tactics of "the annihilation of Bolshevism by the refusal of credits".

The hope that it would be possible to overthrow the Soviet Government by these means was quite absurd, as can be indisputably demonstrated to-day. The Soviet Union managed to establish the equilibrium of its economic situation without foreign credits and is already well on the way to a rapid development of its productive forces. The profound policy of the financial blockade on the contrary led to the result, quite unexpected by its partisans, that a number of capitalistic countries which might have bettered their economic situation by producing goods for the gigantic market of the Soviet Union, cannot, with the greatest efforts, escape from the condition of a chronic crisis. It cannot be too decidedly emphasised that the intensification of the industrial crisis in England and the increase in the number of unemployed in recent times, is due exclusively to the fact that English capital has barricaded the access to the market of the Soviet Union for its own goods, thus condemning English industry to stagnation and the British workman to misery and unemployment.

In order to conceal this fact, the members of the Conservative Government have no alternative than to try and rouse hatred against the Soviet Union by means of the most absurd tales. No one however is able to disprove the fact that a million and a quarter workers in England have no possibility of using their

labour power for productive work, and that to a large extent because the English politicians and business men refuse to establish correct credit relations with the Soviet Union.

I do not doubt that the plan to arrest the economic rise of the Soviet Union by the financial blockade, will be defeated by the efforts of the working masses of the Soviet country. This will be brought about by the organisation and consolidation of the internal conditions of credit of the State.

When the fourteen States, organised by the English reactionary Government, attacked the Soviet Union, millions of people took up arms in this country and carried off the victory. At the present moment, the English Conservative Government is again endeavouring to cut off the Soviet Union and to strangle it in the noose of the financial blockade. This noose will be cut by the organisation of State credit.

The more rapidly and completely the task of organising State credit is carried out, the more rapidly and successfully will economic and cultural construction proceed, the more completely will foreign capital be disappointed in the policy of the financial blockade, the more rapidly will foreign capital recognise the hopelessness of this policy and the necessity of coming to a financial agreement with the Soviet Union which is compatible with the dignity and the interests of the Soviet Union.

HANDS OFF CHINA

The Work of English Imperialism in China.

By A. St. (Moscow).

The events in China have in recent times become the hub of the anti-Soviet campaign in Great-Britain. Day by day the Conservative papers repeat the fable of "the Soviet commissaries who are directing the anti-European movement in China". A short time ago they spread throughout the world a story of **Dosser**, "a Comintern agent" and his documents, a story which has already led to a contemptible scandal before the mixed Anglo-Chinese Court. Chamberlain does not tire of rising in Parliament and maintaining that the Soviet Government has brought about "the events in China".

It is time at last to find out who really is the guilty party responsible for the complications and conflicts which are happening and ripening in the Far East. There are some facts which speak in eloquent language and which characterise the methods of the English policy in China and the methods of the struggle of English imperialism against the influence which the Soviet Union has on the working masses of China.

In **Manchuria**, England is at present devoting increased attention to **General Tchang Tso Lin**, whom the "Times" calls "the strongest figure of modern China" and "China's future ruler". England's present efforts are directed towards turning **Manchuria into a bulwark for the fight against the Soviet Union**. This is why it has made it its task to aggravate relations between the Soviet Union and Tchang Tso Lin. There can be no doubt that during the recent conflict of the Soviet Union with Tchang Tso Lin with regard to the East-China railway, the British Government backed up this "uncrowned king" of Manchuria and made efforts to turn the East-China railway into a weapon against the Soviet Union.

At the present moment we have definite news that England is taking steps to strengthen the army of Tchang Tso Lin; **British banks** are putting a credit at Tchang Tso Lin's disposal so that he may order **40,000 rifles from Birmingham**; at the same time the English are attempting to make use of the **White Guardists** for the organisations of a strong nucleus in the army of Tchang Tso Lin and for the creation of reliable divisions in the fight against the national freedom movement. The organisation of these divisions has been entrusted to **General Netchayev**, the representative of the Ataman **Semenov Malikovskiy**, **Colonel Orlov** and **Nikolai Merkulov**, formerly a member of the White Guardist "Amoor Government". These divisions are supposed to consist of about 5000 men to begin with and to be excellently fitted out with weapons and equipment at the cost of the English.

In **Peking**, the English agents are taking measures for the reorganisation of the Chinese State police. The foreign instructor **Munte** has been entrusted with the task of undertaking this re-organisation in order to render the State police

capable of maintaining the "order" which seems necessary to the English, and of fighting against the Chinese movement for freedom.

In **South China**, the English agents are again organising the ill-famed Fascist bands with whose help the English Government endeavoured last year at **Canton** to overthrow the Government of **Sun Yat Sen**. The bands are organised from the remains of Tchang Tso Lin's troops in order to **fight against the Kuomintang party** and are armed with carbines and machine guns by the English.

In **Shanghai** the English Consul has entered into a compact with the **Chinese Fascist groups** and supported them in the organisation of the reactionary society "**Revenge on the National Traitors!**" This society is of a terrorist character. It has made it its policy to "**clear out of the way**" all prominent politicians who are at the head of the Chinese freedom movement. The president of this society is an agent of the English counter-espionage.

One of the chief tasks of English policy in China at the present moment is to **get the United States to join in an active fight against the national movement**. The English agents stop at nothing in order to fulfil this task. One of the methods of drawing the United States in, is that of provoking collisions between the Chinese and Europeans or Americans. An example of this political method is the provocative shooting down of demonstrators in Canton which was to serve as a prelude to open hostility of the allies towards the Kuomintang Government.

The organisation and arming of **White Guardist troops** against the Soviet Union; endeavours to involve Tchang Tso Lin in conflicts with the Soviet Union and fanning the flames of these conflicts; the organisation of Fascist terror groups to fight against the Chinese national movement, and finally despicable provocation through shooting and murders: these are the methods of England's policy of "peaceful civilisation" towards China and the Soviet Union.

The aims of this policy are very far reaching. The English papers have recently spoken openly of **England making it its object to create a bloc in the East against China and at the same time against the Soviet Union**. Obstinate rumours are abroad that **Chamberlain** is carrying on negotiations with the Japanese Ambassador **Ishi** with regard to this, and is discussing with him the question of common action on the part of the Allies against China (the issuing of an ultimatum to the Chinese Central Government) and the division of China into spheres of influence among England, the United States, Japan and France. It is however more than doubtful whether, in view of the present situation in China, English imperialism will succeed in realising its plans. The attempt to carry out these plans will only drive China still closer to the Soviet Union, and then the words of a Japanese newspaper will come true:

"If the Chinese dragon and the Russian bear unite, there is no power in the world which would be able to get the better of them."

POLITICS

Britain's Dirty Diplomacy.

By Wm. Gallacher (London).

British Imperialism is in a very bad way. The mighty British Empire which came into existence by a special decree of the Almighty God (so at any rate we are told in patriotic song) and which was to last through the ages, is rapidly breaking up before our eyes. The **dominions** which once provided a useful market for the manufactured goods of the "mother"-land, are now producing for themselves and are even competing with the dear old "mother" in the world market. In fact so far from acting as obedient daughters should to an old and decrepit "mother", they are behaving more like dissatisfied lodgers, ready to quit on the slightest provocation. Then again, the plan of the American **Dawes** which they so hurriedly carried through, has reacted very seriously against them. The **Coal Industry** of Britain has been hit extremely hard and the **Steel-smelting Industry** is almost bankrupt. On every side there are masses of **unemployed**. In fact there is a permanent unemployed army of two millions. A bad state of affairs truly.

The only way to keep things going is to intensify the exploitation of the subject peoples of the East and to reduce the wages of the exploited workers at home. But the workers are not going to submit to further reductions without a bitter struggle, and so we find the powerful unions discussing the question of a fighting alliance for the purpose of breaking the employers' offensive and carrying forward an offensive of their own. As for the Eastern peoples, the example of Soviet Russia has stirred them to a new and greater effort to achieve their emancipation. They have seen the workers and peasants of that great country rise in their organised might and throw off a brutal tyranny that had lasted a thousand years. What the Russian Workers and peasants have done, they can do, and so throughout the East the idea of organisation is spreading amongst the workers and peasants.

In China especially its effects are seen. There the masses under the direction of the Communist Party and the Kuomintang are challenging the Imperialists and preparing to finish them off for good and all. Once China is free, India is sure to follow, and when the Indian workers and peasants rise, the British Empire is finished for ever. Britain would ruthlessly crush the Chinese back into subjection, but America bars the way. Not because America loves the Chinese. Far from it. Britain wants to keep the Chinese enslaved and to squeeze her profits out of the sweat of their bodies. America wants the "open door" so that she can pile up profits by making China a huge American market.

In this her desperate plight Britain sees Soviet Russia as a cause of all the trouble. "Free Russia" is an inspiration to all who are oppressed. But not only is Russia free. While Britain and the other European countries are going back, Russia is going forward. While the standard of living of the workers in the capitalist countries is falling, in Soviet Russia it is steadily rising. By some means or another, progress in Russia must be held back. The British Bankers refuse credits, but still Russia moves forward. The only other way they can think of is war.

War against Workers' Russia? No, the British workers will not tolerate that. Already the General Council of the Trade Union Congress has written to Baldwin, the Conservative Prime Minister, protesting against the provocative language of his colleagues and declaring that the whole Trade Union movement will most rigorously oppose any attack on the Soviet Government.

But the British Bourgeoisie are cunning and unscrupulous. They are not likely themselves to declare war on Russia, but they will do their best to get the "tied" states on the borders of Russia to open the attack. Finland, Estonia, Poland, Roumania, any or all of these may be used for their purposes. The manhood of these countries will be sacrificed without scruple if only the British Imperialists can see their way clear to rush them into war.

The fact that Britain is trying to use Germany for this bloody work shows the dirty depths to which her diplomacy can go. A few years ago the Parsons, Press and Politicians of Britain were united in the filthiest and rottenest campaign of lying ever instituted, against the Germans. The most horrible stories were told about the "brutal and bestial Hun". Stories of how they boiled the bodies of the dead to get fat out of them (they could even tell where the factories were). Stories of raping women and then cutting their breasts off. Stories how they tore infant children from their mothers' arms and nailed them up to barn doors laughing hideously all the while. This and other stories of a similar character were spread broadcast throughout the country, coupled with the declaration that moral, God-fearing, religious England would never again, under any circumstances or in any way, associate with the unspeakable Germans. Germany was to be an outlaw country. And now, behold, moral, God-fearing, religious England is going to use the "outlaw" nation to pull her chestnuts out of the fire.

If the German Bourgeoisie or the Bourgeoisie of any of the borders states are stupid enough to try and do the dirty work of Britain, they in turn, like the Bourgeoisie in Britain, will be faced by the determined opposition of the organised workers. In Germany and in the Borders States the Communist Parties will see to this. It is a task which they will not neglect. They will rally the workers for a "War against War" and smash any attempt to stop the onward march of the First Workers Republic.

Long live Soviet Russia!

Long live the United Front of the World's Workers!

To Hell with British and all other Imperialism!

The Result of the Election for the Dutch Chamber.

By Jacques (Rotterdam).

On July 1st, the elections for the Second Chamber took place in Holland; not less than 32 parties took part. The absurdity of this fact is increased when we realise that Holland only has 7 million inhabitants and consequently about 4 million electors. (The franchise is granted to both men and women from the age of 25.) The 32 parties had 100 mandates to divide between them.

The disunion which is characteristic of the whole country, also applies unfortunately to the ranks of the workers, who originally submitted five different election programmes, one of which was withdrawn in the course of the election campaign, that of the "Revolutionary Action Committee" (Communists who are in opposition to the resolutions of the Comintern!). The opposition nevertheless voted for this programme in order to emphasise the fact that it continued to be in opposition. The Communist list obtained one mandate.

The "Social Democratic Labour Party" succeeded in winning over the greater part of the electors from the ranks of the workers, and received 24 mandates; in the previous Parliament it had 20. The S. D. L. P. of Holland is ruled by those who are kindred spirits of Wels, Noske etc.; their increase in power in Parliament therefore means a consolidation of capitalism. The other programmes submitted came from small circles. In the whole country they only represented about 16,000 votes altogether. The only one worth mentioning is the "Rapaille Party" (anarchists) whose candidate was a picked idiot with the idea that, if he were elected, his conduct in Parliament would make Parliament ridiculous in the eyes of the masses.

In the capitalist camp it is still more difficult to find one's way about. The "Union of Actualists" is an imitation of the Fascists of the German type, to which the younger generation of the Dutch aristocracy belongs. Their list only received 2000 votes. The Conservatives are represented in several varieties. In addition to the "Reformed State Party" there is a doubly "Reformed State Party" which has so far "reformed" itself that it has returned to the middle ages. It is for instance opposed to all progress in technical matters, such as electrification, use of artificial manures etc.

Akin to them is the "Roman Catholic State Party", which only formed a separate organisation in order to keep the Catholic sheep within the fold of "the preservation of the State". A group which resembles the Wirth wing in the German Centre Party, split off because of its democratic whims. The party which bears most resemblance to the German Stinnes Party, has the characteristic name of "Anti-Revolutionary Party", besides which the "Christian Historical Union" is the only one of any importance. The latter carries on its business, as its name indicates, with Christian trimming, rather shamefacedly, while the former is brazen. Their nearest neighbour is the "Freedom League", the reservoir of the narrow-minded Liberals who are backed by the capitalist shipowners who are so powerful in Holland. Thus large capital has made sure of the conservative, liberal and religious driving forces for its policy. In order that not a single vote should be lost, special lists were made by the parties for individual occupations, such for instance as music-hall artists!

Another party wants free State pensions for all citizens, a further party better pensions for the pensioners who already exist; apart from these there is an "Annuitants' Party"! All these are groups which, in addition to their narrow-minded particularism, act as squires to the reactionary movement.

An "Agricultural Party" in addition to two "Open Country Parties" represent the interests of the small peasants. A "Land Party" aims at obtaining land law reform (Similar to Dammschke). There is also a "Sport Party" which represents the interests of almost 4 million Dutchmen in so far as they are cyclists. It only obtained 4000 votes however. As all these parties together fail to provide what some Dutchmen want, there is a party of "Independents", who obtained 294 votes.

If we want to get to the bottom of this "multi-partyism", we must take into consideration that which has been hinted at above, i. e. that the capitalists have understood how to make use of the elements which are most significant in politics among a people which has absolutely no class-consciousness. In the

same way as for instance Mosse in Berlin publishes the "Berliner Tageblatt" for the large capitalists and the "Berliner Volkszeitung" for the "plebs", with the intention of harnessing the plebs to his chariot, does Dutch capitalism proceed, though with different means, those of promoting political parties, clubs, circles etc.

The economic conditions of living of the Dutch proletariat have hitherto not been so hard as those for instance of the German proletariat. During the time of enormous profits which the world war brought to all those countries which did not take part in it, many a crumb fell to the workers and, furthermore, he participates, though only to a very slight degree, in the profits which are squeezed out of the colonies. Thus the Dutch capitalist can, without narrowing his own rate of profit, give a few pence more a week to his workers than can the German capitalist.

The world economic and world political development will gradually exhaust the source from which the Dutch capitalists quench their thirst, and then they will build up their existence, which has hitherto been built on the hunger and oppression of the colonial slaves, on the more intensive exploitation of their own fellow-countrymen. The influence of the Communist movement will grow hand in hand with this economic development.

British Intrigues in Arabia.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

After the conquest of Mecca by the Wahabiti in October of last year, there was for a time peace in Arabia. Whilst Ali who, as successor to his father Hussein, had been made king of the Hedjas, was desperately appealing with cries of help to the whole Mohammedan world in order to save Jeddah, the port of the Hedjas, which was the last remnant in his possession and even then was threatened by the Wahabiti — the latter comfortably installed themselves in the conquered kingdom and especially in the holy places of Islam — the English confined themselves to observing strict "neutrality" i. e. inciting both opponents through money and promises to continue the war until the moment which seemed favourable to England for her to get the greatest advantage out of the situation.

First of all the new king of the Hedjas was to be compelled to accept the agreement with England which meant shameful abandonment of the most elementary demands of Arabian independence, and which Hussein had persistently refused to sign until the catastrophe with which his rule ended. Ali however refused to consent. A few weeks ago it was announced that the negotiations with regard to an Anglo-Arabian agreement had been broken off. In this way England gained a free hand for her further policy in Arabia.

After his defeat by the Wahabiti and his abdication, King Hussein had fled to Akaba, a port which had, from time immemorial, belonged to the territory of the Hedjas. As this town is situated about in the middle between Mesopotamia, Transjordan and the Hedjas, it was possible for Hussein from there to remain in close contact with these three countries, ruled by his three sons, and to stir them up to fight against England, which had behaved towards him in such a treacherous and underhand manner. The representative of the British Government therefore came to an understanding with the Colonial Ministry to drive Hussein out of Akaba. The old king opposed all the English demands. The Mohammedan organisations of various Arabian countries protested against the British demand. The English however were not deterred from using force. A British cruiser landed sailors, took Hussein prisoner and conveyed him to the island of Cyprus which is to be his residence in future.

This however was not the end of the affair. In order to consolidate their strategic position east of the Suez Canal, the English had always planned to extend their mandatory territory. In view of the promises made to the Arabs, as well as to avoid acute conflicts, they had however repeatedly postponed occupying Akaba. Now Hussein's "obstinacy" gave them a pretext for the military conquest of the town. Regardless of the threatening attitude of the population, who gave expression to their fanatical hatred of the English in the form of processions and protests, Akaba and its surroundings were on July 1st annexed to the British mandatory territory. The arbitrariness of this annexation, even from the point of view of bourgeois international law, is evident from the fact that esteemed English

politicians, even members of the Conservative Party, protested against this deed of violence on the part of the British Government.

Nevertheless English policy in Arabia is far from seeing the end of its difficulties. On the contrary, the anti-English propaganda among the Arabs is becoming more and more popular, and the enthusiastic reception of the Turkish diplomatic representative both in the British and French mandatory territories, is symptomatic of the attitude of mind of broad masses of the people, who thus express their sympathy for Turkey which has been freed from the imperialist yoke.

The intrigues through which England has achieved temporary success, will in the end be the doom of British policy in Arabia.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Five Years of the Red International of Labour Unions.

(18th July, 1920—18th July 1925.)

To the Workers of All Countries.

Beginning and Growth of the RILU.

Five years have passed since the setting up of the Provisional International Council of Revolutionary Trade Unions out of which there grew and developed the RILU. The Council was set up in the middle of July 1920, during the Second Congress of the Communist International. At that time there were present in Moscow representatives of the revolutionary unions and minorities of Italy, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Spain and France, who, together with the Soviet unions, and after long and careful discussion, arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary to unify the whole of the revolutionary elements in the World Trade Union Movement.

At that time the international labour movement was still undergoing a revival. The Amsterdam International formed once again, after the war had drawn the working class masses into the International Labour Office of the League of Nations and done everything that lay in its power to get the restless working masses to put up with the capitalist regime. The Soviet Government and the Soviet Trade Unions were blockaded, with the assistance of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, the international bourgeoisie was making separate efforts to stamp out the first proletarian revolution and kill any desire on the part of the workers in revolt against the ruling class.

All revolutionary Communist elements in the international labour movement found, in March 1919, their international centre in the Communist International, while the revolutionary elements in the trade union movement were left ununified, although the years of the war and the political bankruptcy of the Trade Union International had brought into being the necessary conditions for the setting up of an international revolutionary centre for the trade union movement. While formally the RILU was set up in the middle of 1920, it actually took root in the first years of the war. The Zimmerwald and Kienthal Conferences, which brought together all the honest and genuinely socialist elements in the international labour movement, marked a stage not only on the path towards the rebirth of the political movement of the proletariat, but of the trade union movement as well.

The War and the Versailles Peace had influenced to a tremendous extent the fall of the official leaders of the Socialist and trade union movement, and the most important task then was to bring the scattered revolutionary elements of the world trade union movement together into one common centre and begin a systematic struggle against reformism and its corrupting influence on the labour movement. The provisional centre created in 1920 set itself the task of carrying on an energetic struggle against the theory and practice of the Amsterdam International and of setting up a strong theoretical and tactical basis for the revolutionary trade union movement.

The formation of the RILU was hailed with a perfect storm of indignation. International reformism did not want to "recognise" the new International, taking a leaf from the book of the international bourgeoisie who refused to recognise the Soviet government. There was a time when nobody would "recognise" that the earth revolved on its own axis. But this did not prevent

the earth from revolving, nor did the RILU. cease to grow and develop simply because the leaders of the Amsterdamers had decided not to recognise it as an International.

Five years have passed and we can and must summarise the result of our activities. It must be borne in mind, first of all that the international situation has changed. With the end of 1920 the bourgeoisie began their offensive, being driven thereto by the world economic crisis. The work of the RILU. went on developing under the conditions created by the capitalist attack, the most important task of the RILU. during this period has been the organising of opposition to the capitalists' attack.

During these five years the international proletariat has suffered fairly many defeats on different sectors of the social front, but the principal task the bourgeoisie had set themselves — the break up of the labour movement and the rehabilitation of capitalism in its pre-war state — was not carried out, and this, be it said, by no means through the fault of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals. Notwithstanding the exceptionally unfavourable situation, the revolutionary elements in the international labour movement united in the Communist International and the RILU. were able not only to organise opposition, but in some places even took up the offensive themselves. During these five years they were hammered out and elaborated not only in resolutions, but also in the practical day-to-day struggle which during these years brought Communism into collision with reformism and the theory and tactics of the revolutionary trade union movement.

Each of the three RILU. Congresses summarised the results of the work done and marked out the further course to be followed in the fight in close collaboration with the Communist International.

The first Constituent Congress of July 1921 set up the Red International of Labour Unions, gave it a constitution, a programme of action, defined its attitude to the Amsterdam International, established the mutual relationship to be observed with the Communist International, warded off the attack of the Anarcho-Syndicalists by giving a true appraisal of the theory of neutrality and independence, and gave a clear answer to all the organisational and political questions agitating the international trade union movement.

The Second Congress (November, 1922) went further in this direction. Being desirous of bringing within its own ranks the best elements in the international syndicalist movement, the congress gave up its organisational connection with the Communist International, while particularly stressing the need for close political collaboration with it. The Second Congress went into the organisational tasks of the revolutionary trade union movement with particular care, calling upon the workers to fight energetically against craft unionism and for the reconstruction of the unions on the industrial principle. The Congress spoke in defence of the slogan of the United Front in order to ward off the attacks of the capitalists. This slogan met with the bitter opposition of the Amsterdam International in spite of the great sympathy shown by the broad masses of the workers.

The Third Congress (July, 1924), in addition to formulating the immediate tasks, forms and method of struggle against the employers' offensive, by thoroughly going into the question of the workshop committees and factory groups, the International Propaganda Committees and the methods of struggle against the Fascist Unions, specially considered the problem of strike strategy, labour emigration, and particularly the task of creating world trade union unity.

Each passing year of the dual existence of the Red International of Labour Unions and the International Federation of Trade Unions has demonstrated the fundamental differences between the revolutionary and reformist trade union movement. The IFTU. became a centre for the whole of the reactionary and conservative elements in the labour movement, became a support for the international bourgeoisie and its imperialist policy, while the RILU. became a rallying point for all revolutionary and progressive elements in the world trade union movement, became a support and instrument for the social revolution.

What Amsterdam has come to.

The Amsterdam leaders are very fond of frequently talking of the RILU. as an organisation confined within the frontiers of the Soviet Union. We would be greatly interested to learn from

them whither and how the Amsterdam International has developed during the six years that it has been in existence, what it was, what it has become, and what it possesses.

Had they any desire to tell us honestly what they possess in the way of a membership, they would have to inform us that when the Amsterdam International was founded six years ago, it had within its ranks nearly 25 million organised workers, while today it has only 16 millions. Six years ago there were inside the organisation affiliated to Amsterdam some small groups of workers dissatisfied with the reformist policy, while today we find that inside the Amsterdam International nearly one third of its members stand on a platform opposed to reformism, i.e. on the platform of the RILU. Six years ago the Amsterdam International was a European Federation, and so it has remained to this day. During all these six years the only non-European unions to affiliate to the Amsterdam International were those of Palestine, but it has made up for that by having lost not only ideologically, but even organisationally as well, millions of workers.

Six years ago there was nothing to be heard of a Left wing in the Amsterdam International, while today the Left Wing is causing the greatest uneasiness to the Second and Amsterdam Internationals, since it has nearly one third of its adherents among the members of the Amsterdam International. Thus only one third of the members stand for the Right Wing point of view to which the majority of the present Amsterdam leaders belong. In brief, six years ago the Amsterdam International had at its head, while acting as representative likewise of the British Trade Unions, Mr. Appleton, Gompers' friend; today the president of the IFTU. and representative of the British Trade Unions, Purcell, is a friend of the Soviet Union. Such are the "victories" obtained by international reformism for the six years that the Amsterdam International has been in being.

The RILU., a Genuine Fighting International.

But what about the RILU.? How many members has it? The RILU. began as a provisional centre by having unified the revolutionary elements of a few countries, and at the present time there are affiliated to the RILU. wholly and completely the trade union movement of the Soviet Union, China, Java, Greece, Chili, Persia, Egypt, the broken up but still revolutionary trade union movement of Bulgaria and Esthonia, and finally, ideologically identifying itself with the RILU. (although not formally affiliated on account of the bourgeois terror), we have the trade unions of Finland. In addition, not less than half the organised workers of France, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Yugoslavia, Japan, the Argentine, Australia, besides important Minority Movements in Germany, Britain, Italy, the United States, Poland, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Spain, etc., are linked up with the RILU.

The RILU.'s influence is very great in all the colonial and semi-colonial countries as is to be seen from the recent events in China. While the Amsterdam International has never gone beyond the limits of Europe, the influence of the RILU. is being spread into the farthest corners of the earth. The RILU. possesses important points of supports in India, the Philippines, South Africa, Mexico, Canada, Cuba, the Hawaiian Islands, Brazil, etc.

How is this difference to be explained? By the fact that the Amsterdam International is a mere cog in the imperialist machine, and in the name of the workers gives its blessing to the exploitation being carried on in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, while the RILU. is a weapon of the social revolution and fights for the independence of the oppressed peoples. The Amsterdam leaders are very fond sometimes of referring to their millions of members, but they forget that inside their own organisation the number of RILU. partisans is constantly growing and that the Amsterdam International has only strength to lend support to the ruling classes, while powerless to do anything in the workers' interests. In other words, the strength of the Amsterdam International is in direct proportion to the strength of capitalism.

During these five years the international labour movement has had sufficient experience and been in a position to convince itself of this irrefutable fact: that when the labour movement is on the downward trend, when it is broken up, the Amsterdamers are masters of the situation (as in Hungary, Italy, Yugoslavia, Roumania, Poland); and that when the labour movement is marching forward, and serious revolutionary struggles begin to take place it goes forward under the banners of the Communist International and the RILU.

What has recently happened in China amply proves the truth of this statement, and in Europe too it is possible to find instances enough to prove the same thing. The rôle played by the Amsterdamers in their support of the imperialist State is particularly obvious at present in France. Who in France is fighting against the Moroccan adventure? The Communist Party and the Unitary Confederation of Labour. Thus the reformists from beginning with the defence of the Fatherland have finished up with defending the most unjustifiable predatory colonial war that has ever taken place. What we now see in France can be seen in all countries. Who opposes England's policy in China? The Communist Party of Great Britain, the Minority Movement, linked up with the RILU, and to a certain extent the Left Wing. But the Right Wing of the British Trade Unions, the sole hope of the Right Wing Amsterdamers, is lending its full support to the shamefully predacious and openly audacious policy of wholesale robbery being followed by Baldwin, Chamberlain and Co.

No, matter for surprise then that the toilers and exploited in the colonies and semi-colonies are rather lukewarm in their attitude towards the Amsterdam International and feel themselves drawn towards Moscow, to the Red International of Labour Unions.

For World Trade Union Unity.

Despite the deep gulf dividing the leaders of the RILU and the leaders of the Amsterdam International on matters of principle, the Red International of Labour Unions, for the sake of systematically organising opposition to the capitalist attacks, for the sake of closing the ranks of the working class, has brought forward the idea of the United Front and Unity of the Trade Union Movement. "The trade union movement is split and this is a trump card in the hands of the capitalists; let us bring together the disrupted trade unions." This is the call of the RILU.

In order to get the maximum guarantees for real unity, the RILU has proposed and continues to do so that National Unity Congresses be convened on a proportional representation basis, and that subsequently there should be convened, on the same basis, the International Unity Congress. We state in advance that we will submit to the decisions of the Unity Congresses, no matter to whom they give the majority, and we propose that the Amsterdam International and its affiliated organisations do the same thing.

What answer was given by the reformist champions of democracy to all the proposals to put a stop to disruption by the use of perfectly democratic methods? Their sole reply was an outburst of foul abuse, shameless attacks and attempts to show that our proposals, concealed some sort of trap and wily intrigues.

We make the same proposal before millions of workers, we propose the creation of joint organs for the purpose of controlling the Congresses to be convened, declare in advance that we will submit to the majority's decision, and the reformist shout from the housetops that exactly herein lie Moscow's intrigues.

All this shouting, all these fulminations against the National and International Unity Congresses merely bear witness to an unclean conscience. If the leaders of the Amsterdam Right Wing, instead of phrasemongery on unity, really did think of the interests of the working class, they would have accepted our proposal, since it alone provides the least possibility of creating a single united militant Trade Union International. But though the Right Wing Amsterdamers do not even want to hear about unity, the working class masses have the attainment of unity in the disrupted trade union movement very much at heart. It is by no mere accident that this question is the most important matter for dispute inside the Amsterdam International, nor was the development and formation of the Left Wing inside the Amsterdam International precisely on this question by any means accidental either.

We are nothing daunted by the Right Wing Amsterdamers' refusal to fuse both Internationals nor their attempt to dispute the influence of the RILU. They fear unity not because they are strong, but because they are bound to the bourgeoisie, and are too weak to throttle the opposition in their own ranks.

To those of little faith — and there are such in our ranks — we would give a reminder of the indisputable fact that the Amsterdam International has organisationally weakened during these years, that there is complete ideological and political confusion in its ranks, while the RILU is slowly but steadily growing and welding its ranks organisationally, ideologically

and politically. Such being the case, can there be the least doubt that the day is rapidly drawing nearer that will see the establishment of Class Unity in the International Trade Union Movement?

Much has been done by the international revolutionary trade union movement during these five years, but still more remains to be done. We are confronted by gigantic tasks, that of uniting tens of millions of workers, of creating the army of the social revolution.

To work, comrades! Put your shoulders to the wheel and strengthen the Revolutionary Trade Union Movement! Prepare for the Social Revolution!

Down with World Imperialism and World Reformism!

Long live the fraternal alliance of the revolutionary workers of the West and the oppressed peoples of the East!

Long live the Red International of Labour Unions!

Long live world trade union unity!

The Executive Bureau
of the Red International of Labour Unions.

Congress of the Free Trade Unions of Poland.

By L. Domski (Warsaw).

Between 11. and 14. June the Polish trade union "Class Unions" (so-called to differentiate them from the yellow and Christian unions) held their conference in Warsaw.

It need not be emphasised that this congress mirrored but imperfectly the real state of affairs in the Polish Trade Unions, for it was attended almost exclusively by appointed trade union bosses. Even the representative of the Amsterdam International, the German trade unionist Sassenbach, had the opportunity of observing the wrong idea given by the congress of the actual trends of feeling among the Polish workers, when he visited the Plenary Session of the Warsaw Trade Union Cartel after the close of the Congress, and saw to his astonishment that the majority of the delegates were from "Red Trade Unionists". Unfortunately he omitted to visit the Warsaw works and factories; here he would have been even more astonished.

The participants in the Congress were selected with the greatest care. The overwhelming majority of the "delegates" were simply appointed by the committees of the great unions, which themselves are notoriously only able to retain their position at the head of the Trade Unions with the aid of the police. Thus for instance the Red miners of the Dombrova and Upper Silesian coal basins were represented by social democrats only. 120 members of the Polish Socialist Party (P. P. S.) and 19 members of the "Bund" (Jewish Mensheviks) were opposed by 12 Red trade unionists only, four of whom were accorded advisory votes only. Besides these, two so-called Independent Socialists were present, but these played no part in the congress.

The Red Trade Unions naturally did their best to appeal to the broad masses. A workers' meeting was convoked on the opening day of the Congress. Although it was impossible to announce this in any newspaper, approximately 1500 workers assembled. The speakers were workers from different parts of Poland, sent by the various factories and local unions to control the above mentioned delegates. The feeling of the meeting was excellent. Special enthusiasm was called forth by the address of a Ukrainian delegate, who held a speech in his native language. Great enthusiasm was also aroused by the appearance of workers' delegates from White Russia, Dombrova, Upper Silesia, Lodz, Czenstochau, etc.

An elected delegation appeared later at the Congress. The PPS. members were beside themselves with annoyance, and refused to admit the delegation. The police took sides with the PPS., and the delegates were not admitted. However, the festive atmosphere of the PPS. celebrations was destroyed.

And even greater disagreement arose through the refusal to admit the Communist deputy Prystupa, or to permit a welcome to be read from the Central Committee of the Polish Communist Party and the Communist Sejm fraction.

The Congress began with sounding addresses of welcome from Sassenbach and other foreign representatives of Amsterdam, all of whom stated in succession that the number of members had decreased, but assured the Congress at the same time that the Trade Union movement was making progress, and that the tactics hitherto pursued were the sole right ones.

On 12. June the discussion began. The Chairman of the Trade Union Federation, **Zulavski** — facetious as usual — gave a short report, word for word the same as the reports given at the First and Second Congresses. Four delegates belonging to the radical Left then took up the discussion — comrades **Amsterdam**, **Burzynski**, **Leskiewicz** and **Gutman**. These submitted the whole activities of the Trade Union Federation to annihilating criticism. They stigmatised its activity as deliberate sabotage, and pointed out the close connections between the PPS. leaders and the police authorities. When **Zulavski** retorted that this same building (the Congress was held in the Town Council Hall) was at one time the headquarters of the Russian Okhrana (Secret Police), our comrades replied that it is today the headquarters of something even worse than the Okhrana, the Polish "Defensive", and a member of the Executive Committee of the Trade Union Federation, Comrade **Pruszynski**, has been held behind prison walls for a year, and could only welcome the Congress in a letter sent from prison.

Next day the agenda consisted of the question of Tactics and of the Economic Situation. The Red delegates demanded that the economic situation should first be discussed. This did not however suit the PPS. members, and an entirely abstract debate on trade union tactics was commenced, without the basis which the economic discussion would have given.

The reports given by **Szczerkovski** and **Zulavski** were entirely purportless. The sole point of interest was **Zulavski's** theory that the PPS. has not the slightest desire to support **Grabsky's** government; all it wants is to prevent the overthrow of this government, since it might be replaced by a worse. (This does not seem to us to be a theory at all, much less an interesting theory; it is merely one of the everyday hypocrisies of the PPS., for every child knows that there is no government so bad that the PPS. would not support it. Ed.)

The opposition speakers among the Red delegates, **Ostrovsky**, **Amsterdam**, **Leskiewicz**, and **Altmann**, were continually interrupted by the PPS. members, who even wanted to pull the Red delegates off the platform by force. The "Reds" however held steadfast, and courageously proclaimed the programme of the revolutionary workers of Poland, who march at the head of every trade union struggle. When the Socialist **Stonzevski**, from Vilna, attacked the Jewish workers, calling them dollar profiteers, the delegates of the Bund had not the courage to protest. It was only thanks to the courageous attitude and openly expressed indignation of the few "Red" trade unionists that the PPS. speaker was called to order.

A second storm of indignation was aroused by **Zulavski**, when he replied to the accusation of co-operation between the PPS. leaders and the police against the Red Trade Unions by calling the communists "vile scoundrels".

The most violent strife of all was aroused by the division on the question of the relations between the Trade Unions and the Communists. The flaming fighting speeches of **Burzynski** and **Leskiewicz** led to actual blows with the PPS. members. The PPS. speaker **Klimaszewski** declared in his concluding speech, that 95% of the communists were provocateurs. A resolution was passed breaking off all relations with the Communist Party, upon which the Red delegates rose to their feet and sang the International.

In conclusion, all the PPS. motions were of course passed, and all those of the revolutionary delegates rejected. The only one of our resolutions partially accepted was that on the Jewish question, but the slogan of the Workers, and Peasants' Government was struck out of this. This was done in face of the fact that even that central organ of social treachery, the "Robotnik" published on its title page the slogan of "Long live the Workers' and Peasants' Government".

The decisions arrived at by the congress are of interest in so far that we may observe that even this Congress is prepared for impending social struggles. But what were the conclusions drawn by the congress? The Congress decided that no single union has the right to strike without the agreement of the General Trade Union Federation. One decision states that the strike has its good sides; it is however purposeless until the unions have accumulated adequate strike funds. This means in other words that today, when we are surrounded by a general capitalist offensive, all strike struggles are to be postponed until the day of judgment.

It need not be said that all motions brought up by the radical Left, demanding the commencement of a mass campaign for the national and international unification of the trade union movement, were rejected.

The courageous speeches and the whole attitude, of the representatives of the Red fraction, were however the means of making considerable impression, even on many of the PPS. members. Many of these approached the revolutionary delegates and assured them that they, the present majority, would certainly be among the opposition "at the next Congress". This was another reflex of the pressure exercised by the working masses, and will certainly find even greater expression after the Congress. The tactics pursued by the Red fraction showed considerable progress as compared with those followed during the Second Congress in 1923, at which the revolutionary Trade Unions were better represented, but lacked firmness of principle and determination. The present tactics lend impetus to more active trade union work, and it is to be hoped that the question of inducing revolutionary workers still outside of the trade unions to join will now be more rapidly solved.

The clear and unequivocal decisions accepted by the III. Party Congress are causing many Communist workers to return to the trade unions. In the coal areas all communists have already joined the Trade Unions, and their example has been followed by many non-party but revolutionary workers. The fresh wave of social struggles and strikes now sweeping forward will lend fresh impulse to the final rule of the revolutionary workers in the Trade Unions.

After the Great Labour Fight in Denmark.

A Letter from Copenhagen.

By St.

The lock-out of workers in Denmark and the sympathetic strike movement lasted for **twelve whole weeks**. About 150,000 industrial workers were included in the struggle.

It is true that in the end not all the demands of the workers (payment according to the index of the increase in cost of living plus some varying additions to wages etc.) were fulfilled, nevertheless some results were obtained which imply a certain improvement in conditions of wages and work. A complete victory of the combatant workers would have been achieved, had the general strike of the transport workers (including the export of agricultural articles) been carried through immediately after the lock-out. It would have been followed directly by a **seamen's strike**. The transport workers' strike actually brought about the final decision.

The Managing Committee of the General Trade Union Association, as well as the Social Democratic Government, attacked the fighters in the rear, their only object being to obtain peace and an understanding between the employers and the workers on a peaceful basis. It is characteristic that they presented the State Arbitrator **Dalhoff**, a notorious lackey of the employers, with the "Gold Medal for Merit".

The fight itself was really only carried on by the "Union of Labourers" (unskilled workmen who work in all industries). It is the strongest Danish trade union and numbers 45,000 members. At the head of the union is the old trade union leader **Lyngsie** who is also a prominent member of Danish Social Democracy.

This union had to carry on the fight against three fronts simultaneously: against the Trade Union Association which demanded that the Labourers' Union should submit to the arbitration award and, when this was refused, withdrew its support from the strikers and the locked-out workers; against the Social Democratic Government which held the apparatus of State ready for use against the union, and against the bourgeois Press "journalle".

Now that the great Labour fight is over, the conflict between the Union of Labourers, personified in **Lyngsie** on the one hand, and the leaders of Social Democracy as well as the trade union bureaucracy on the other hand, has become greatly intensified. In Press communiqués and speeches as well as in a book which is about to appear and to which the Press has already had access in proof-form, **Lyngsie** takes the Trade Union Association and Social Democracy to task. His attacks were specially directed against the President of the Trade Union Association, **C. F. Madsen**, the Social Democratic head of the Government **Stauning**, the Social Democratic Minister for Public Welfare **Borgbjerg** and the chief editor of the "Socialdemokraten" (the Social Democratic central organ in Copenhagen), **Marinus Kristensen**.

The most violent retorts then began to appear on the part of **Stauning, Borgbjerg, Madsen** etc. In the course of these replies, the ministers in their overhaste blundered so far as to betray the fact that the Social Democratic Ministry was at the point of **compelling the workers** to give up the fight. The Cabinet had already on **June 4th** adopted a provisional law "for the protection of the social economy", according to which all work was to be resumed and all dissensions which could not be settled by negotiations, were to be adjusted by an arbitrator appointed by the Government. Had the arbitration award on June 5th been once more refused by the respective parties, the law would have come into force.

The conflict between **Lyngsje** and the other leaders within Social Democracy is not yet settled, although **Lyngsje** seems to have given in. He at least reflects the sulky discontent with the Reformist leaders and their methods among certain groups of the Danish-workers.

The Communist Party of Denmark which has taken up its stand indefatigably for the general strike as the only means which could have guaranteed them the victory, must use the present moment after the great Labour fight to multiply its efforts for the formation of a Trade Union Left bloc in Denmark.

WORKERS' DELEGATIONS IN THE SOVIET UNION

The Visit of the German Workers' Delegation to the Soviet Union.

By N. Bukharin.

The German Workers' Delegation left Berlin on the 11th July and will arrive in Moscow in a few days.

This delegation is a very special delegation. Many foreign comrades from various countries have already visited us. Many communists, many sympathisers from all over the world have already been in our country.

A delegation such as the German one comes to us however for the first time, and the toilers of the Soviet Union must show these delegates in particular all the attention of which their comradeship is capable.

A terrible agitation is being carried on against the Soviet Union — both on the part of the international bourgeoisie and on that of Social Democracy. The extent of **Karl Kautsky's** activities against us for instance is well known.

But in spite of all, the class-consciousness of the proletariat is making a way for itself, the proletariat is holding out a hand to us. The worker of Europa — not only the communist, but even the Social Democrat, the Menshevik — is keen to learn the truth about our country. The working class is conscious of the mendacity of the bourgeois and Social Democratic Press and wants to know what is going on in our country.

Consequently a movement has actually arisen in Germany. The **Leningrad** workers gave the impetus to this movement by inviting delegates from the German workers to visit them. The selection of delegates began in the factories and works. The delegates were chosen at a meeting of all the workers in each factory. Among the chosen were members of the Communist Party, of the Social Democratic Party and also non-party workers.

The workers in the work are paying the cost of the journey of the delegates out of their own pockets. Throughout Germany — in Berlin, in Munich, in the Ruhr, in Saxony — the question of the delegation was eagerly discussed.

This resulted in an agitated political campaign in the ranks of the working class. The Social Democratic panjandrum immediately declared war to the knife on all those in favour of sending a delegation to the Soviet Union. The Berlin "Vorwärts" stated:

"Anyone who allows himself to be taken in for this transparent purpose, however good his intentions may be, is in danger of meeting the same fate as overtook those students who also were inspired with enthusiasm for Soviet Russia. Let the curious be warned!"

The "Vorwärts" thus hints that the bolshevist barbarians will immediately shoot the kind-hearted German workmen or at

least sentence them to death, as they did the poor students who were so deeply attached to Soviet Russia.

The "Vorwärts" however did not explain why the Bolsheviks have such a strange passion for shooting persons because of their enthusiasm for Soviet Russia. That however is a trifle. The important fact is that the leading organ of German Social Democracy has sunk to the use of such filthy and at the same time such stupidly naive methods.

In spite of this agitation the movement is steadily growing and now embraces large circles of the Social Democratic workers. The Social Democratic leaders however are getting more and more infuriated. The workers on the other hand eagerly competed for the privilege of being sent to the Soviet Union.

Thereupon the Social Democrat Press resorted to still more disgusting methods. It began to write that the workers were not going at their own expense, but that they had been bought with money from Moscow! Thus for instance the Social Democratic "Volksfreund" wrote:

"... Apart from this they are going to make collections in the works for the journey in order to foster the delusion that the costs of the journey are being borne by the workers themselves, whereas in reality the whole is being paid out of Moscow's big money-chest."

In other words, the Social Democratic panjandrum began to stir up the workers by pretending that the intention was to buy them. At one time they try to frighten them with the fairy-story that they would be murdered, and at another time to rouse them by saying that they are being bought. The two assertions, it is true, do not tally, but what do the Social Democratic leaders care!

The most interesting thing about this agitation is that:

Firstly, the Social Democratic leaders were thoroughly well informed as to the terrorist undertakings of the Fascists, through the organisers of this undertaking belonging to the Berlin police-authorities (this with reference to the "enthusiasm" of the students).

Secondly, just at that moment the examination of **Richter** was taking place, the ex-Chief of Police, who made hysterical scenes in Court and admitted that he had been bought by **Barmat** and accused another of the Social Democrat leaders, **Heilmann**, the personified "conscience" of the Social Democratic party, of having also been bought by **Barmat**, which **Heilmann** had previously denied under oath. (This with reference to venality.)

Thus we see that the Social Democratic leaders made use of every possible means. Nevertheless these means have had no effect. The "workers committee" which had been entrusted with the organisation of the journey, indignantly repudiated the calumnious accusations of the Social Democratic Press, although two of its members were Social Democrats.

From the latest news we gather that the departing comrades, among whom were 40 members of the Social Democratic Party who have undertaken the journey in defiance of the veto of their party, were enthusiastically accompanied to the station by the working population of Berlin.

The initiative of issuing the invitation was taken by the Leningrad workers, but all the other workers of our country and of all countries should pay special attention to this delegation. Nothing can so thoroughly destroy prejudices as the fraternisation of our factory workers with the factory workers of the German Hindenburg Republic.

ORGANISATION

A Contribution to the History of Industry.

The Krupp Works.

As class struggles become more acute and workers lose their parliamentary illusions, the Parties concentrate their agitation and propaganda more and more among the workers employed in big industries. The factory newspapers of the Factory Management, the latter's social clubs for the workers in their employment, the factory sports Leagues and other means serve to win over the workers to collaboration with the employers — to a policy of class collaboration and thereby the policy of the bourgeois parties. The Managements publish in the bourgeois press, in special pamphlets and in special editions of

bourgeois newspapers full accounts on the history of the various big industries which represent working conditions in a rosy light and which above all endeavour to convince public opinion "that these welfare institutions are models of perfection".

In view of these facts, the Communist press should pay more attention than ever before to factory questions. Workers correspondents should write as fully as possible on questions of production, working hours, wages, employers' profits, safety precautions against accidents, effects of rise in cost of living on real wages, on the fighting experiences of the workers of the factory and their immediate tasks. They should also be able to deal with factory questions in connection with corresponding political questions. If in connection with this, we can expose the attitude of the political parties to the various questions by giving actual facts, our agitation and propaganda work will be even more successful than formerly.

The present report on the Krupp-Works, which we have taken from the "Ruhr-Echo" is the first report of this kind which is to serve as a model for a systematic and co-ordinated discussion in the Communist daily press of the most important factory events. Factory nuclei and workers correspondent circles, should induce certain comrades to write the history of the various big works and factories. If in connection with this, the experiences of the workers of the said works or factory in the various movements and struggles are criticised and the immediate tasks of these workers are expounded in a precise and convincing manner on the basis of the general economic and political conditions, such a detailed discussion of the conditions in the various big factories and works will considerably help our factory nucleus work.

The firm W. Krupp in Essen is again in the lime light. The trade columns of bourgeois newspapers contained the announcement of important measures by which the pretended imperiled profits of the shareholders are to be protected. **Curtailments on a large scale are foreshadowed.** The Management is publishing announcements saying that a **reduction throughout the entire works is contemplated.** In connection with this, special stress is laid on the **disagio** which the **Krupp loan** — negotiated in America through the Dresden Bank — has to record. Next Saturday, there is to be a meeting of the Board of Control followed by an emergency general meeting.

In view of all this, it is necessary to make a much fuller examination of the Krupp Works. The Krupp firm employed at the end of the war about 10,000 workers in the production of munition and other war material. After the collapse, all the Krupp works were reorganised from war to a peace production basis. At present the Krupp works produce instead of guns and munition, locomotives, agricultural machinery, Diesel motors, motor cars, and lorries, typewriters, adding machines, cinema apparatuses, optical instruments, in fact every possible kind of ready made articles down to sets of false teeth made of steel guaranteed not to rust.

At present, there are 28,400 workers employed in the Krupp works, including 16,000 piece-rate technical workers, 6,000 time-rate technical workers and about 6,000 unskilled workers. Just now only about 100 women are employed there as cleaners. **Wages** have been fixed by the Court of Arbitration at 66 pfennigs per hour for time-rate technical workers and at 52 pfennigs per hour for unskilled workers. Piece workers earn on an average 10 to 20% more. **Working hours** vary a great deal. **In the blasting furnace departments work goes on from 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. uninterruptedly.** The workers there have 12 hour shifts, and the only way to get the interval for rest is by relieving each other. This means that every such interval means **double work** for those who remain at work. In the mechanical workshops the speeding up system is carried to the utmost limit.

The American system of division of labour carried to the utmost extreme in connection with Ford production methods, exact calculation of every manipulation are applied, whilst the pay of the workers is only one fourth of the pay of American workers.

The Krupp firm has gone the right way about getting the utmost out of its workers, and the **productivity of labour** has increased remarkably especially during the past few months. Within three months the **productivity of labour** increased 33% whilst the **number of working hours** decreased.

Thus production in the Martin works was as follows:

October 1924 5127 tons in 36524 working hours

January 1925 10839 tons in 51588 working hours.

Whilst productivity rose almost 100% the number of working hours increased less than 50%. The same is the case in other departments of the works.

Low wages compel workers to work considerable overtime beyond the 60 hour week (in the mechanical works.). It has been ascertained that in a department where 91 workers are employed overtime done by 69 of these workers amounted to 845 hours in one month. There are workers who have done 58 hours overtime in one month. The firm's excuse for this overtime abomination is that it has to pay large fines if the orders for abroad are not carried out at the fixed time. But the firm does not tell the workers why it makes such short term contracts for delivery. On the other hand the **closing down of more departments is contemplated.**

The Krupp firm always liked to pass for a firm concerned about the welfare of its workers. During the inflation it endeavoured to suggest to its workers, through the introduction of **workers shares**, that they could become "co-partners" of the firm. The experiment failed, and when all the calculations were again made in gold marks, workers shares were abolished with one stroke of the pen, after their owners had received a trifling sum of compensation.

Another social-political experiment by which the firm tried to keep its workers in **subjection** was a still greater fiasco. In connection with the Sickness Insurance Law, the Krupp firm had established in 1884 a **Workers' Pension Fund.** Every worker was compelled to contribute to this fund, the contribution being a deduction of 2 1/2% from the wage. Workers could draw on this fund only after a 20 years membership. When a worker left, the contributions he had hitherto contributed, were not returned to him, nor were they placed to his account in any other form. On December 31, 1914 there were 33 1/2 million marks in this fund. 2,477,000 gold marks were expended in 1914 for current pensions.

On December 1, 1923, the pension fund was closed at the proposal of the Krupp firm. And the obligations and rights of the members came to a standstill because, as it was alleged, owing to the depreciation of the valuta, the capital of the fund was lost. Today the Krupp firm pays out of the business fund a sum of 107,600 marks a month to 6889 members of the Pension fund. One half of the 4,095 men pensioners receive in round figures a **pension of 15 marks a month.** The amounts received by the other half fluctuate between 15 and 28 marks. For 30 to 50 years a considerable number of workers placed their labour power at the disposal of the Krupp firm and submitted to having part of their small earnings deducted in the hope to be provided for in their old days. Today they and their families can starve on 15 marks a month. A brilliant example of how capitalists "make provision for their workers".

The profits of the Krupp firm are not as modest as the sums they spend on their pensioners. Just one example: cash registers are made in Krupp works. What enormous sums are gained by this, is shown by the following table:

Cost of production, including 70 hours wages and material	175 marks
Overhead charges 220%	385 "
Agents profit per cash register	250 "
Total Amount	810 "
Selling price of the cash register	1850 "
Therefore net profit	1040 "

300 such registers must be made in a month. Therefore 300,000 marks profit in one month. The agent receives for his work more than the total cost of production including wages. A young agent in Hagen sold 4 cash registers in one week, making thereby a clear profit of 1,000 mark. The agent in Hanover pocketed 18,000 marks in one month. But when workers ask for a few pfennigs more in wages, the representatives of the firm have always the excuse ready that this would raise the cost of production too much.

The proposed reorganisation of the firm is to **increase production whilst reducing the number of workers** and is at the same time to counteract the workers' demands for a reduction of working hours and increase in wages. For this purpose the firm threatens curtailments on a large scale. By its present procedure the Krupp firm is setting the pace for the heavy industry

capitalists in the Rhineland and in the Ruhr Basin. Its action must be appreciated by the workers at its true value and should be resisted by them.

No closing down of works, but shortening of the working hours and abolition of the overtime abomination, — such is the demand of the workers. With a proper reorganisation — and the firm itself has shown that this is possible — the orders received by the firm can be divided between the various departments. A price policy which has not only the interests of the shareholders in view could bring plenty of new orders to the firm. Given the frame of mind of German big capital headed by the Krupp firm, such a solution cannot of course be expected. The Krupp workers must therefore prepare for most energetic resistance to the reorganisation which the firm is contemplating.

OUR PROBLEMS

Graziadei's Revision of Marxism.

By Hermann Duncker (Berlin).

3. Graziadei's Conception of Value.

Having condescended to examine the "value of a commodity", Graziadei declares that the value is a conception of value "The exchange-value, that is the conception of value which is formed during the exchange", (Page 28¹), and he regards the basic element conception of value as: 1. The use which a product serves, and 2. the cost which it causes. Value is only the relation between use and cost:

"Marx failed to observe what the simplest experience teaches, that is that all conceptions of value vary between two basic elements, between cost and use, of which the second is just as important as the first." (Page 31.)

Truly that is an annihilating valuation of — Marx: Let us look closer at it! Graziadei says: "The value which one attaches to a thing is a conception". (Page 24²).

It is seen therefore that value is forced by Graziadei into the field of the subjective. For Marx on the other hand, the value is a social factor, and not simply an individual conception. No matter how many personal estimations accompany the act of exchange or proceed it, they are fundamentally different from the real relations of magnitude at the bottom of the exchange, that is the value or exchange-value. Graziadei directs himself and rightly, against a tendency which occasionally makes itself apparent in vulgar Marxist economy, as though value were an objective attribute — almost a physical or chemical attribute — of the thing (Page 23). That is naturally nonsense. But Graziadei goes to the other extreme: value is only a personal conception of value!

In reality the value as a social entity is, as it were, "objectively" given to the individual, and to that extent it is actually "a thing created by forces" superior to human will

¹) The lack of precision in the investigations of Graziadei shows itself for example also in the fact that in other parts of his booklet he says that the conception of value "proceeds the exchange". (Pages 30 and 34.)

²) In another part of his booklet, it is true, Graziadei says that "the value of a product is the result of the judgment and the action of persons" (Page 23). Unfortunately, this is not carried through any further. Graziadei lets his Robinson (Page 26) set up a "conception of value" by comparing the use of a fruit and the efforts which are necessary to pluck it from the tree. In "consequence of his judgment" Robinson then climbs the tree. Very good, but the value of this fruit will then nevertheless not be determined by the preliminary judgment of its value, but through the effective efforts which have been made to obtain it, should Robinson arrive at all at any economic estimation of value. We see therefore that already here the **conception of value** and the **value** itself prove to be two different things. Later, Graziadei defines the conception of value, in passing, as "the relation between the use of the commodity and the amount of money which has to be paid for it" (Page 63). As the last named however is the price, the "conception of value" is therefore not an element of "price", as Graziadei would gladly have us believe.

(Page 22), if, and it is really not otherwise possible, by will we understand the conscious will of the parties to the exchange themselves. Apart from this however, the momentary price of a commodity in capitalist economy is also as a rule an objective factor for the individual buyer. This factor is not formed in the course of the exchange act on the basis of the subjective estimations of the parties to the exchange. The capitalist commodity market is in general not a job-line bazaar in which both parties to the exchange, after endless bargaining, finally "agree" upon a price. Where, however, it is a question of "collectors' value" (with antiques and such things not replaceable), professor Graziadei may have "bargained" for prices favourable to him, and we wish him in this connection all success without any envy. The only thing is that these prices have nothing to do with the exchange-value of the continually produced commodities on the open market.

Occasionally, Graziadei also seems to see how little the subjective estimation of the buyer and seller has to do with the formation of value or price. In his booklet, which is so rich in contradictions, there are lighter moments of inspiration in which Graziadei declares:

"that the comparison between the total use and the price... will be decisive for the estimation and action of the user." (Page 71.)

In another part of Graziadei's booklet, the buyer asks, "is it useful enough to pay the new price?" (Page 67.) Very true. But that only means that the buyer considers his personal possibilities of use in connection with the goods of the great social department store which already have their fixed prices. The consideration of whether and what to buy therefore, does not create the price of a commodity! If that is true of the consumer then Graziadei must also admit that the selling price of the finished product appears to the seller as an unalterable fact" (Page 101). How then, can the conception of value based upon considerations of utility etc., have become decisive for the magnitude of value (price), of the commodity? Marx continually pointed out with all possible clearness that a commodity naturally must have a utility (Marx called it "use-value" which Graziadei describes as confusing (Page 25), otherwise the buyer would not buy it.

"The use-value is in general the bearer of the exchange-value, but not its cause. If the same use-value could be created without labour, it would have no exchange-value, yet it would have the same useful effects as ever. On the other hands, nothing can have an exchange-value unless it has a use-value, unless it has this useful bearer of labour" (Marx, "Capital", Vol. III, Page 758).

Utility is thus an indispensable condition, but not the "cause" of exchange-value or its magnitude. The utility of an automobile is a condition for entering into exchange or transaction, but the price or value has absolutely nothing to do with the magnitude of the utility³). And to this must be added that Graziadei, after he has manipulated on Page 27 with a commodity with a utility of 10 and another commodity with a utility of 20, admits on Page 56 "that people do not know how to estimate utility".

"On the contrary, just because they are not able to estimate utility in itself, they take refuge as an auxiliary criterion in the application of 'labour power.'" (Page 56, Note 17.)

By which the Marxian theory of labour-value ("application of labour power"!) is justified in secret even by Graziadei! (See also Page 45, Note 14.)

Apart from this, the "conception of value", as we saw above, also contains the element of cost, and that must help now further. The manufacturers want to have their "costs of production sufficiently compensated for" in the price (Page 44). But with this we are forced into a horrible confusion in Graziadei's economics.

³) In the world of Graziadei, products are not more valuable because they have taken a greater amount of labour, but they demand a greater application of labour power, because they are more valuable! (see Page 27). Everything stands on its head. But at least here Graziadei brings "the higher utility" into proportion with the "higher expenditure of labour power". And this same Graziadei declares that Marx operates with "an imaginary and non-existent world, created only for expedience!" (Page 108.)

The costs of production cannot be traced back to labour. Labour of various kinds is not comparable, says Graziadei, and also not labour of the same kind, "because of the prevalence of incalculable nervous factors" (Page 59). It is peculiar that the wages for incomparable labour are nevertheless correspondent! On Page 57 Graziadei rightly rejected "risk" and "abstinence" — these wonderful vulgar-economic defence for profits — as elements of the cost production. But on Page 102, they suddenly appear again in the enumeration of these costs of production. The employer has undertaken "the risks and the worries of an employer" (similarly Page 106), for this the interest on capital must be reckoned in the costs of production! Apart from the costs of production, the manufacturers must receive "a certain compensation for their labour" (Page 96) says Graziadei. Is that another way of saying profit?⁴⁾

⁴⁾ The utility theory of Graziadei would truly create the greatest profit for the capitalist producers if — the world were as patient as the paper! According to Graziadei the producer should demand for his commodities on the market "a number of products, the utility of which to him would compensate for the loss which he suffers by giving up his own commodities, and also the efforts, the costs, which their production has involved". (Page 43.) That would mean however, a double payment: 1. Compensation for the loss involved in the surrender of the goods and 2. Compensation for the costs of the goods! A little too much at one time.

Graziadei stresses strongly "the necessity for a constructive criticism" (Page 47). But what happens to this constructive criticism, after Graziadei has fundamentally bombarded the Marxian theory of value with critical volleys ("errors", "sophism", "imperfections" "one-sidedness" etc.) because it is "in contradiction with a great part of economic reality" (Pages 48, 109 etc.)?

Marx, by the way, had already considered the possibility of a Graziadei when he wrote to Kugelmann:

"And then the vulgar economist believes that he has made a great discovery when he insists, with reference to the revelation of the internal connections, **that things are not what they seem**. In reality he insists upon the appearance and accepts it as the finality. Why then, science at all?"

(Marx, "Letters to Kugelmann", page 46.)

The constructive science of Graziadei on the other hand operates with the "conception of value" and its utilitarian and cost elements, and arrives at the remarkable results: 1. "The impossibility of estimating the utility ex-novo"⁵⁾ (Page 55). 2. "The impossibility of estimating the costs of production ex-novo (pages 57—59). How does a conception of value or a price come from 0+0? Graziadei's theory of price must give us this answer.

⁵⁾ "ex-novo" = original, that is without the respective traditions and examples from the past.