

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4. No. 72

9th October 1924

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

- J. Stalin: On the International Situation. I.
- Politics**  
Ex-Diplomat: Punch and Judy.  
M. N. Roy: Memorandum for the Annual Conference of the British Labour Party.  
I. Amter: The Elections in the United States.  
Irandust: The Fight for Mossul.
- Hands off China**  
Leon Trotzky: The Soviet Union Supports Suppressed China.  
Demonstration of the "Hands off China League" in Moscow. To the Adherents of the Red International of Labour Unions.
- Economics**  
Eugen Varga: Economics and Economic Policy in the First Half Year of 1924. VI.
- In the Camp of our Enemies**  
How the Mensheviki Prepared the Attempted Revolt in Georgia
- In the Soviet Union**  
The Budget of the Soviet Union
- In the International**  
M. N. Roy: Newbold "Explains".
- Appeals**  
To All English Labour Organisations and to All English Workers.
- The White Terror**  
Ehrenfried Wagner: Support the Amnesty Campaign of the German Proletariat.

## On the International Situation.

By J. Stalin.

For the characterisation of the present international situation, I think it is not at all necessary to take every more or less important fact and feature of present international affairs into consideration. For this purpose it is only necessary to observe the fundamental, vital facts of the present period. In my opinion there are, at present, three such facts: a) The dawn of the "Era" of bourgeois-democratic "Pacifism", b) the interference of America and the London agreement regarding Reparations; c) the strengthening of the left element in the Labour movement of Europe, and the growth of the international importance of Soviet Russia.

Let us consider these fundamental facts.

### I. The "Era" of Bourgeois-Democratic Pacifism.

The Entente has proved powerless to deal with the results of its military victory. It succeeded in completely defeating Germany and encircling the Soviet Union. It succeeded in drawing up a scheme for the exploitation of Europe. The countless Conferences and Treaties of the Entente states testify to this. But it proved powerless to carry out the scheme of exploitation. Why? Because the differences between the Entente countries are too great. Because they have not succeeded, and will not succeed, in coming to an agreement on the division of the booty. Because the resistance of the countries who are subject to the exploitation, becomes more and more serious. Because the scheme of exploitation carries the germs of military conflicts within it, but the masses do not wish to go to war.

Now it is clear "to all", that the imperialist frontal attack on the Ruhr which reckoned on the annihilation of Germany, proved dangerous for imperialism itself. It is also clear that the openly imperialist policy of the ultimatum, which reckoned on the isolation of the Soviet government, had only contrary effects. It has come to this, that Poincaré and Curzon, though they faithfully served imperialism, nevertheless by their "work" only increased the growing crisis in Europe, roused the resistance of the masses to imperialism and forced them on towards revolution. For these reasons the change of the bourgeoisie from the policy of a frontal attack to the policy of compromise was inevitable — from open imperialism to hidden imperialism, from Poincaré and Curzon to Herriot and MacDonald. To exploit the world without some sort of guise is not without danger. The Labour Party in England and the block of the Left in France are to cover the nakedness of imperialism. That is the origin of "Pacifism" and of "Democracy".

Many believe that the bourgeoisie have come to "Pacifism" and "Democracy" not out of necessity, but of their own accord on their own, so to speak. It is supposed that the bourgeoisie, after it has defeated the working class in decisive struggles (Italy, Germany) feels itself to be conqueror and can permit itself "democracy". In other words, so long as there are decisive struggles, the bourgeoisie needed a fighting organisation, Fascism, but now, when the proletariat is defeated, the bourgeoisie has no need of Fascism and can substitute "democracy" for it as the best means of establishing its victory. From this it is concluded that the power of the bourgeoisie is assured; the

"Era of Pacifism" is looked upon as one of long duration, and the Revolution in Europe must be postponed indefinitely.

This conclusion is absolutely incorrect. Firstly it is not true that Fascism is only a fighting organisation of the bourgeoisie. Fascism is not merely a military-technical matter. Fascism is a fighting organisation of the bourgeoisie dependent upon the active support of Social-Democracy. Objectively, Social-Democracy is the moderate wing of Fascism. There is no ground for supposing that a fighting organisation of the bourgeoisie can reach decisive results in its struggles, or in a government of a country without the active support of Social-Democracy. There is just as little ground for supposing that Social-Democracy can achieve decisive results in the struggles or in the government of a country without active support by the fighting organisation of the bourgeoisie. These organisations do not exclude, but complement one another. They are not poles apart, but immediate neighbours. Fascism is the unformed political block of these two basic organisations, which arose under the critical after-war conditions of imperialism, and is intended for the struggle against the proletarian revolution. The Bourgeoisie cannot retain its power without the existence of such a block. Therefore it would be a mistake to believe that "Pacifism" means the liquidation of Fascism. "Pacifism" under present conditions is a maintenance of Fascism with its moderate social-democratic wing as a camouflage.

Secondly it is not a fact that the decisive struggles have taken place already, and that the proletariat has been defeated in these struggles and that the bourgeois power has, in view of this, been confirmed. There have been no decisive struggles yet, because there were no Bolshevik mass parties who were fit to lead the proletariat to dictatorship. Without such parties, under conditions of imperialism, decisive struggles for the dictatorship are impossible. The decisive struggles in the west are still to come. There have only been the first serious attacks, which were beaten back by the bourgeoisie, a first serious trial of strength, which proved that the proletariat is not yet strong enough to defeat the bourgeoisie, and that the bourgeoisie no longer possesses the strength to defeat decisively the proletariat. And just because the bourgeoisie no longer has enough power to force the proletariat to its knees, it was compelled to give up the frontal attack, to enter upon byways and compromises, to take refuge in "Pacifism".

Finally, it is also incorrect to say that "Pacifism" is a sign of the strength and not of the weakness of the bourgeoisie, that from "Pacifism" must result a confirmation of the power of the bourgeoisie and a postponement of the revolution for an indefinite period. The present pacifism signifies the mediate or immediate admission of the parties of the II. International to the governing power. But what does this mean? This means their inevitable self-exposure as the lackeys of imperialism, as traitors to the proletariat, for the exercise of government of these parties can only lead to one result: to their political bankruptcy, to the growth of the differences within these parties, to their disintegration and decay. But the disintegration of these parties leads to the inevitable disintegration of the power of the bourgeoisie, for the parties of the II. International are the principal supports of imperialism.

Could the bourgeoisie enter upon the daring experiment of pacifism of its own free will without particular necessity? Of course, not! In the period following the imperialist war, the bourgeoisie is making for the second time an attempt at pacifism: the first time immediately after the war, when the revolution, it seemed, was knocking at the door; a second time, now, after the hazardous attempts of Poincaré and Curzon. Who will deny that this sudden turn of the bourgeoisie from pacifism to unbridled imperialism and back can proceed without injury to imperialism, that it has flung the millions of the workers out of the usual bourgeois lines, that it draws into politics the most backward sections of the proletariat, that it makes the revolution easier? That Pacifism means a powerful stirring up of the masses and their entry into politics, that it causes the bourgeois power to totter, and prepares the ground for revolutionary convulsions can hardly be doubted. For this reason pacifism must lead, not to the confirmation, but to the weakening of the bourgeois power, not to the postponement of the revolution for an indefinite period, but to its acceleration.

It does not follow from this that pacifism presents no real danger for the revolution. Pacifism leads to the undermining of the foundations of the bourgeois power, it prepares conditions which are favourable for the revolution. But pacifism can only

lead to such results against the will of the "pacifists" and "democrats" and only by the very keenest work of the Communist parties in exposing the imperialist and anti-revolutionary nature of the pacifist-democratic power of Herriot and MacDonald. As to the will of the pacifists and democrats themselves, as to the policy of the imperialists, they are only taking up pacifism with one object: to betray the masses with high sounding phrases regarding peace, to prepare a new war, to dazzle them with the brilliance of "Democracy", to maintain the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, to deafen the masses with the cry of the "sovereign" rights of peoples or of states, to prepare the more successfully the intervention in China, the massacres in Afghanistan and in the Sudan, the partition of Persia; to fool them with speeches full of promises of "friendly" relations with Soviet Russia, of this or that "treaty" with the Soviet government; to ally themselves more closely with the anti-revolutionary conspirators, driven out of Russia, for the purpose of bandit raids in White Russia, in the Ukraine and in Georgia.

The bourgeoisie needs pacifism as a mask. In this masquerade lies the chief danger of pacifism. Whether the bourgeoisie reaches its goal — the betrayal of the people — depends upon the energy of the work of exposure by the Communist parties of the West and of the East and on their capacity to tear away the mask from the imperialists posing as pacifists. Without a doubt events and practice work for the communist in this respect, in that they drive the wedge between the pacifist phrases and the imperialist deeds of the democratic servants of Capital. It is the duty of Communists not to lag behind events, but ruthlessly to expose every step, every act of the lackeys with regard to imperialism and of treachery against the proletariat on the part of the parties of the II. International.

## II. The Interference of America in the Affairs of Europe and the London Agreement of the Entente on Reparations.

The London Conference of the Entente is the most complete expression of crooked, false, bourgeois-democratic fascism. If the entry into power of MacDonald and Herriot and all the talk about the "restoration of normal relations" with the Soviet Union was intended to cover and mask the embittered class war in Europe and the deadly enmity of the bourgeois states against the Soviet Union, the agreement of the Entente in London was to cover and mask the desperate struggle of England and France for the hegemony of Europe, the growing antagonism between England and America in the struggle for the control of the world market, the superhuman struggle of the German people against the colonial yoke of the Entente. "There is no longer any war between the classes, the Revolution is at an end, now the work of the collaboration of the classes can be carried out to an end!" cry the MacDonalds and the Renaudels. There is no more conflict between France and England, the war is at an end, now the work of general peace with America at the head, can be carried out to completion! declare their friends at the London Agreement and their brothers in the betrayal of the cause of the working class, the social democratic heroes of pacifism.

What however took place at the London Conference? Before the London Conference the Reparations problem was solved by France alone, more or less independent of the Allies, for France had a sure majority on the Reparations Commission. The occupation of the Ruhr was a means for economically disorganising Germany, and a guarantee that France should receive reparations payments from her — coal and coke for the French metal industry, semi-manufactured chemical articles and dyes for the French chemical industries, and the introduction, free from duty, of Alsatian manufactured articles into Germany. The scheme reckoned on the creation of a material basis for the military and economic hegemony of France in Europe. But as is well known, the scheme did not succeed. The methods of the occupation led to opposite results. France received neither payments nor goods in any satisfactory measure. Finally, the originator of the occupation, Poincaré himself, on account of his open imperialist policy, which carried in itself the germ of a new war and of revolution, was thrown overboard. As for the hegemony of France in Europe, it did not come about, not only because the methods of the occupation, and of the open exploitation excluded the possibility of a close economic working together of French and German industry, but also because England was decidedly against such a close working together, for it could not but be known in England, that the combination of German coal with French ores must lead inevitably to the decay of the English metal industry.

What has the London Conference of the Entente done for all this? Firstly, the Conference rejected the way of independent solution of the reparations question by France, and thereby admitted that disputed questions must, in the last instance, be solved by a commission composed of representatives of the Entente, with a representative of America at its head. In other words, if Germany is to be plundered, she is to be plundered together.

Secondly, the Conference refused to accept the Ruhr-occupation, and recognised the necessity for the economic (to be immediately undertaken) evacuation, and the military (to be carried through within a year or less) evacuation of the Ruhr. The reasons are: the occupation of the Ruhr is at the present time, from the point of view of the political situation of Europe, dangerous, and from the point of view of the systematic and organised exploitation of Germany, futile. But that the Entente is proceeding to the systematic and thorough exploitation of Germany can scarcely be doubted.

Thirdly, while the Conference rejected the military intervention, it entirely approved of the financial and economic intervention, and declared: a) The necessity for the establishment of a bank for issuing shares in Germany under the control of a special foreign commissioner; b) the handing over of the state railway, which is to be controlled by a special foreign commissioner, into private hands; c) the setting up of a so-called "clearing committee" of representatives of the allies, which collects into its hands all reparations payments in German currency, finances the German delivery of goods and invests some of the sums of the reparations payments (in case of the uselessness of their assignment to France) in the German oil industry, and therefore possesses the possibility of holding the gold market of Germany in its hands. It is scarcely necessary to prove that this means converting Germany into a colony of the Entente.

Fourthly, the conference recognised the right of France to obtain from Germany by force, coal and chemical products within the course of a certain time, though it here made the reservation, that Germany retains the right to appeal to the Commission of the Court of Arbitration with a demand for the restriction of the quantity, or even for the cessation, of these forced deliveries. Thereby it has annulled, or almost entirely annulled, the rights of France.

If one adds to all that the loan to Germany of a sum of 800 million Marks, which is to be covered by English and above all by American bankers, if one considers further, that at the conference, the bankers and in particular the American bankers, were in command, one gets a complete picture: Of the French hegemony there is absolutely nothing left, the hegemony of America is set up in place of the hegemony of France.

These are the results of the London conference of the Entente.

In view of this many believe that from now on the clash of interests in Europe, having regard to the mastery of America, must decline; that America, interested in the export of capital to Europe will know how to place the European countries on rations, and to force them to remain quiet for the enrichment of its bankers; that in consideration thereof the peace in Europe, certainly an enforced one, can be considered as more or less ensured for a more or less indefinite time.

This supposition is completely incorrect.

Firstly, the conference has solved the problem of Germany without reckoning with their host, without the German people. It is of course possible to regulate the "systematic" changing of Germany into a decided colony. But to try to convert such a country as Germany into a colony, now, when the backward colonies are being held in subjection with difficulty, means to lay a mine under Europe. Secondly, the conference has given a set-back to France, which had pushed itself too much to the fore, and has therefore of course given greater weight to England in Europe. But the belief that France can reconcile itself with the superiority of England, means, not to reckon with the facts, not to reckon with the logic of facts, which usually proves stronger than every other logic.

Thirdly, the Conference recognised the hegemony of America. But American capital is interested in the financing of German-French industry, and in its most purposeful exploitation; for example in the sense of a combination of a French metal industry with the German coal industry. There is hardly any doubt that American capital will use its superiority in this favourable direction. But to believe that England will reconcile itself with such a situation means not to know England and

not to know how dear to England are the interests of its metal industry.

Finally, Europe is not an isolated land but is connected with colonies and lives on the life blood of these colonies. To believe that the conference can alter anything in the relations between Europe and the Colonies "for the better", that it can hold off or retard the development of the antagonisms between them, means to believe in miracles.

What is the final conclusion?

There is only one final conclusion: the conference in London has not solved a single one of the antagonisms in Europe, but instead has only added new antagonisms, antagonisms between England and America. There is no doubt that England, as before, will deepen the antagonism between France and Germany in order to ensure its political superiority on the continent. There is no doubt, that America on its side, will deepen the antagonism between England and France in order to ensure its hegemony in the world market. We have no desire to speak further of the deep antagonism between Germany and the Entente. World events will be decided by these antagonisms and not by the pacifist speeches of the rascally Hughes and of the pompous Herriot. The law of the unequal development of imperialist countries and of the inevitability of imperialist wars remains now more than ever in force. The London Conference only masks these antagonisms in order to create new conditions for their sharpening to an extent hitherto unknown.

(To be continued.)

## POLITICS

### Punch and Judy.

By Ex-Diplomat (Moscow).

The British public electors are now being afforded the spectacle of a parliamentary Punch and Judy show, which is being performed for their entertainment by the leaders of the Government and of the Liberal party and in which the leading roles are taken by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Mr. Asquith. What terrible blows these marionettes are dealing each other, how fierce are the polemics in which they are indulging! The Liberals greeted MacDonald's "Russian policy" with a storm of vituperation, which MacDonald was not backward in answering. "This is a crude experiment of nursery diplomacy", declared Asquith with regard to the Anglo-Russian Treaty signed by MacDonald, to which the latter replied by asserting that his Liberal and Conservative predecessors had dealt with the Russian fishing dispute after the manner of ignorant fish-wives, while the "nursery diplomacy" had succeeded in solving this question.

Asquith concentrated the thunder bolts of his rhetoric upon the Anglo-Russian Treaty: This undertaking was absolutely unprecedented in English political history. Asquith unconditionally identifies himself with the protests of his colleagues and so on. As a matter of fact his stage thunder is only intended to conceal his complaint that the signed agreement is not a final one, that it contains no figures or conditions concerning the loan, and that it leaves British interests entirely without any definite guarantees.

In a recent speech MacDonald made use of equally formidable stage thunder, which if characterised by fewer university classical phrases contained more democratic witticisms and more popular quips. MacDonald's attitude appears at the first glance to be of a most determined and bellicose character. Of course he is in a position to inveigh against the Conservatives, but before all he launches his attacks against his allies, the Liberals. It seems as if he would defend most determinedly the Anglo-Russian Treaty as a whole, as well as the whole policy of approach with the Soviet Union. At the end he bitterly complains of the heaviness of the burden of Office and thanks in anticipation those who will make use of the Anglo-Russian question in order to rid him of this burden. We have the impression, however, that he clings more tightly to office than to the Anglo-Russian Treaty "as a whole". The broad masses of the English people loudly and emphatically urge the claim, "the Anglo-Russian Treaty as a whole". And they are perfectly right, because their sound instinct has led them to perceive the real issue and to realise that a revised Anglo-Russian Treaty would no longer be the Anglo-Russian Treaty, and that its revision at the

hands of English politicians would mean a hidden form of its liquidation. MacDonald appears to defend the claims of the people with all the sincere intonations of a popular tribune, but if we examine his words more closely we find something quite different.

The rhetorical thunder bolts of Asquith and the varied chorus of his Liberal colleagues who have gone on the war-path against the Treaty, have only one *leit motiv*: Revision of the Treaty. For a considerable time past all Liberals comprising Asquith's retinue have been putting forward the slogan of eliminating from the Treaty the guarantee for the Soviet loan. They knew what they were about. It had been generally known for some time that as regards the question of the tsarist debts the Soviet Government could only consent to negotiate regarding this question in the event of it receiving a sufficiently large loan. The recognition of the old debts as an essential part of the understanding regarding the loan — this is how the Soviet Government, right from the outset, formulated the question; this is how it formulates it today, and this is how it will formulate it in the future. If you remove from this building the corner stone, the loan, the whole structure will collapse and there will be absolutely nothing left of the whole Agreement. This is known to every one, and even such old fossils as Asquith and Grey cannot help knowing this.

Treaty without loan: such was the slogan of the fossilised English Liberals and which Asquith and his friends at first bellowed forth with all their might. But this attitude was too crude; it was too apparent that the Asquith Liberals were openly destroying the agreement with the Soviet Union. It was necessary to hit upon a more refined method and this is why the Asquith Liberals, touched by a creative spirit, have recently been inventing new difficulties. They now speak of those guarantees which the Soviet Government could grant to the English Government, of guarantees that the loan shall not be used to further the aims of the Communist International, to strengthen the Red Army etc. The same leading English circles which are arming all our western neighbours at an increased rate, suddenly again become the most strict and scrupulous pacifists whenever the question arises of granting a loan to the Soviet Republic, and with Puritan rigidity they begin to demand that not a single copek shall be used for the Red Army.

Let us now glance at the very determined and bellicose speech of the popular tribune, MacDonald. He turns to his opponents with very definite and binding declarations. If we examine his declarations we are forced to rub our eyes with amazement. Not only is the loan to be limited to a definite sum, which is to be determined by the House of Commons, but this sum is only to be used for those purposes and for those aims to which the English House of Commons will consent, and the loan will be guaranteed on the part of the Soviet Government by real values and these also are to be determined by the House of Commons. From whence comes this? Is this perchance contained in the Treaty? No this is not contained in the Treaty. MacDonald improvises a new treaty. With us there was concluded one treaty; MacDonald suddenly brings forward a whole series of entirely new conditions. Of what use was it for us to conclude a treaty if on the following day the other party brings forward entirely new conditions to which we never agreed? The revision of the Treaty, which by some strange means peeps out in MacDonald's speech, approaches very nearly to the revision of the Treaty demanded by the Asquithians. Involuntarily there arises the thought: have these two opponents, MacDonald and Asquith, hinted before-hand to one another that they will pronounce themselves practically in favour of the same thing?

If at the head of the government of the English Labour Party there stood really serious statesmen, who had an eye for the whole historical period and who thought not only of tomorrow, but also of the day after tomorrow, what a magnificent turn could be given to English policy and what a huge role could be played in this by the question of the Anglo-Russian Treaty! But alas, in England we have men who only have an eye for immediate needs, who live from hand to mouth.

The speech of MacDonald, which is apparently so bellicose, is in fact a retreat covered by polemical phrases. MacDonald retreats, and behind his theatrical polemic against the Liberals one perceives already an agreement with them. As a matter of fact we are only confronted with Punch and Judy.

## Memorandum for the Annual Conference of the British Labour Party.

By M. N. Roy.

Comrade Roy has addressed the following Open Letter to the delegates of the Labour Party Conference:

Mr. Chairman and Delegates,

In the Conference of this year, you will be discussing the programme of your party in the light of experience gained in office. Those who took up the government and have been administering it for these seven months on your behalf, and on behalf of the British working-class, will be giving an account of themselves to their constituents assembled in this conference. They will be expected to show that in office, they have adhered to the Party Programme as staunchly as out of office. There is, however, one point in the programme of the Labour Party which I propose to stress in this Memorandum, lest it be overlooked, even by the rank and file of the Party.

The question I desire to call to your attention, is the so-called "Indian Question". The Labour Party is committed to the principle of Self-determination of peoples. Looked at from this point of view, the Indian question is not very intricate, unless the right of Self-determination of subject peoples is hedged around with the theory of "Responsibility" on the part of Imperialism to introduce "good government" into the colonial countries. This theory of responsibility was invented to gild the chain of political slavery and economic exploitation of the subject nations. Nevertheless, the Labour Government, headed by Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, who once upon a time was a severe critic of Imperialism and an advocate of self-government for India, has abandoned this principle of Self-Determination in favour of the preposterous theory of Responsibility. Instead of recognizing the right of the Indian people to a free national existence, in consonance with the principles advocated in your programme, the Labour Government has on the contrary, endorsed the claim of British capital to hold the Indian people in subjection, and as administrators of the Empire, have undertaken the shameful task of enforcing this subjection. In doing so, the Labour Government has talked of Britain's "responsibility" no less hypocritically than the governments of Curzon and Lloyd George.

Here I do not propose to demonstrate that the conspicuous failure of the Labour Government to stand by its programme is due to the faultiness of its principles, half-heartedly professed. The Wilsonian doctrine of Self-Determination, formulated to deceive the subject nationalities and to aggrandize the Entente Imperialism at the cost of the Central Powers, is mere hypocritical cant. By subscribing to this doctrine, the colonial programme of the Labour Party becomes a mockery. The imperialist attitude of the Labour Government is the inevitable result, for the doctrine of Self-determination goes hand in hand with the theory of responsibility.

The following facts will show how the Labour Government has neglected to apply to India a policy remotely approximating even to this equivocal doctrine of Self-determination.

1. The faith that Indian Nationalists had in the good will and love of freedom of the Labour Party was rudely shaken by the jingoist message that Mr. MacDonald sent out just on the eve of assuming office. He had not a word of sympathy for the Indian people fighting for the right of Self-determination; on the contrary, forgetting the countless acts of despotism, tyranny and brutality committed by the British rulers of India, he valiantly championed the cause of "law and order." May we not ask the Labour Government in conjunction with the British working-class: "Which is lawless? The right to freedom, or Imperialist domination?"

2. The National Demands, formulated by the members of the Indian Legislative Assembly, elected on the franchise granted under the Constitution sanctioned by the British Parliament, have not been heeded. So meagre are these demands that they do not even require anything more than a partial application of the principle of Self-determination. A Round Table Conference of the people's representatives and those of the government, is the crux of this demand. It was not granted. The Secretary of State for India declared in Parliament that the demand for a Round Table Conference could not be entertained. The Nationalists did not fail to indicate in advance that in the proposed Conference, they would be moderate. The cardinal points of the Nationalist programme in the Conference would be: a) Provin-

cial autonomy, that is, the provincial governments (still parts of the imperial political organism) to be made fully responsible to the Legislature; b) Partial responsibility in the Central Government, which would continue to be headed by a British Viceroy; c) a promise to grant Self-Government, not necessarily with the control over the army, foreign affairs or relations with the native states, at the expiry of a fixed period of time, and d) Indianisation of the public services, that is, to man the latter with more Indians and fewer English. If the principle of Self-determination means anything at all, and the Labour Party honestly adheres to it, these demands should be looked upon as the irreducible minimum, and therefore, granted immediately. A resolution calling for the Round Table Conference and tacitly embodying these demands, was carried through the Legislative Assembly by the elected majority in the face of government opposition. This voice of the people, expressed through the medium of a constitutional instrument forged by two high British officials and sanctioned by the British Parliament (Reforms of India Act of 1919), has not been heeded. Neither was the resolution acted upon, nor did the Government resign as it should, being directly hostile to the wishes of the electorate.

Precisely in such embarrassing positions, the theory of "Responsibility" conveniently comes in. It was maintained that the Nationalists who carried this resolution, were not speaking in behalf of the "dumb millions", having been elected by barely two per cent of the population, and that the British Government could not abandon its sacred responsibility to protect the interests of the illiterate masses. In order to maintain this preposterous position, the Labour Government should answer two questions: 1. Who entrusted British Imperialism with this "responsibility", and 2. Were the Indian Nationalists ever satisfied with such a limited franchise, which was imposed upon them grudgingly, after one hundred and fifty years of undiluted despotism? The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, accepted by the British Labour Party (even before it assumed office) as the Magna Charta of India, are either a democratic instrument or an undemocratic one. If it is democratic, the voice of the Legislature elected according to it should determine the governance of the country. If it is undemocratic, then it should be scrapped and replaced by a democratic constitution. The Labour Government has done neither the one nor the other. It has eagerly sought to maintain the *status quo* of Imperialism.

3. The so-called Indian Deputation which recently visited Britain, presented a Memorandum whose contents are known to you all. They are even more moderate than the demands made in India. The eventual grant of Dominion Status was not made a *sine qua non* of the programme of this deputation. Lord Morley's policy of "rallying the Moderates" impelled the Labour Party to extend semi-official encouragement to this Deputation, which represented one-twentieth per cent of the population, if the Nationalists in India represent less than two per cent. But even this Deputation, composed of confirmed loyalists wedded to the doctrine of Imperial Federation, with its ridiculously modest demands, was finally sent home without any official assurance that even this beggarly pittance would be granted. On the contrary, the redoubtable members of the Deputation have obviously been instructed to throw mud at the Nationalists at home for obstructing the way to an "honourable compromise".

4. Nationalist leaders in the Indian Legislature, who have sacrificed and suffered imprisonment for advocating the right of Self-determination, are not recognized by the Labour Government as representatives of the people; but the "dumb millions" of India may use as their mouthpiece such an eminently reactionary ex-official as Sir Sankaran Nair, whom the Independent Labour Party proposes to put up as their parliamentary candidate.

5. During the last half-year, a resolution demanding the release or trial of political prisoners held indefinitely without even being told what is the character of the evidence against them, has been several times carried through the Central and Provincial Legislatures by the elected majority. The Government disdainfully ignored this resolution, and continued to hold the prisoners in unlawful custody.

6. In two provinces, (Central Provinces and Bengal) the Governors have unceremoniously dismissed the Legislative Councils and have usurped all the power in their own persons. They did so, because the Opposition was in the majority, and refused to sanction supplies to the Government so long as their demands were not considered. In Bengal, a large part of the opposition was directed against the individuality of the Ministers, who are

supposed to be responsible to the Legislature, but are appointed and dismissed by the Governor. The latter would not even consent to change the Ministers, who were *persona non grata* to the majority of the Legislature.

This sort of parliamentary deadlock was threatened by the Nationalists when they entered the Legislatures, previously boycotted by them, and it was in this legal parliamentary obstruction that Mr. MacDonald detected "violence" which, he gratuitously warned the Indian public, would not "cow down any party in Britain". If Mr. Baldwin had sought to remain in office after the last elections, we would have found the same Mr. MacDonald abandoning his pacifism, and leading similar "violent" attacks in the very heart of the British Parliament. But what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander, according to the political ethics of the Labour Government and that section of the Labour Party which unconditionally supports the Government.

7. The theory that British Imperialism rules over India for the benefit of the Indian masses, has been made its own by the Labour Government. But it is under the Labour regime that socialists and labour agitators were for the first time prosecuted and sentenced to long terms of hard labour in India. Their "crime" was an unproved connection with the Communist International, and to have received letters from Indian communists abroad, advocating the organisation of a working-class party, having the overthrow of British rule for a point of its programme. The Labour Party is supposed to stand for replacing the capitalist system by a socialist order. Since His Majesty's Government so far is essentially capitalist, the Labour Party, by its desire to put an end to the capitalist system, can also be accused, by the same process of reasoning, of waging war against the King. Therefore Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues should today be residing, not in the mansions of Downing Street, but in the Tower of London! Again the same illogicality; Democracy at home — sacred responsibility in the colonies. The Labour Government believe in this doctrine.

It is maintained that the British Government of India must protect the masses from the irresponsible and demagogic nationalist agitators; but even under a Labour regime, Socialist and Communist literature is proscribed in India; Trade Unions are not legalized; there is no limit to the working-day; there is not a minimum wage fixed by law; women, and children under twelve years, are employed underground in the coal-mines; hundreds of thousands of men, women and children are employed in the plantations practically as bond-slaves; Feudalism is protected by law; any revolt of the exploited peasantry against the intolerable excesses of landlordism is suppressed by the armed forces of the government; the demand for the abolition or even the curtailment of the privileges of the landed aristocracy are denounced and persecuted as "Red Revolution" and "Bolshevism", and striking workers are shot down at the behest of the employers. What have the Labour Government done to redress these grievances of the Indian masses, the responsibility of protecting whom they have inherited from their bourgeois predecessors?

Ever since the Labour Government came into office, these grievances of the Indian working-class have been repeatedly brought to their notice. They have been urged by all means to intervene in the infamous Cawnpore Communist Trial. They have been requested to release others who are held in jail without trial as suspected "Bolshevik agents". They have been asked to remove the ban on Socialist and Communist literature entering India. The answer to all these demands on behalf of the Indian working-class has been always tacitly in the negative. Myself and my writings are excluded from India, because I am a Communist. I applied for permission to enter Britain to inform the British proletariat about the condition of their Indian comrades, and to work for the joint action of the two for mutual benefit. The Labour Government never gave me a reply, but their representatives in India replied by issuing a warrant for my arrest, sent to England for execution. If I entered England, the Labour Government would arrest and extradite me to India, acting under the instruction of the Indian police! Since when did Britain become a colony of the Government of India? An Indian Court has no jurisdiction over England, but this flagrant action has never been repudiated by the Labour Government.

Such in brief, is the record of the Labour Government in India. Now, is the Party Conference going to examine this record and declare that its nominees in office have betrayed the party programme in letter and in spirit? Will the Party Conference censure the Government, and direct it to take at least the first steps towards applying the principle of Self-deter-

mination to India? These first steps should be to accede immediately to the Nationalist demands, as expressed through the resolutions adopted by the Legislature, and the removal of the above-mentioned grievances of the Indian working-class. Nothing less; this is the irreducible minimum.

In conclusion, let it be remarked that the Labour Party should not approach the Indian question in the spirit of charity or humanitarianism. The dismemberment of the Empire and the consequent liberation of the colonial masses are conditions which will largely determine the end of wage-slavery in Britain. The fact that the bourgeoisie worship the Empire and will not countenance any tampering with it, should be sufficient to prove that this sacrosanct Empire is but a golden chain for the British proletariat. If the Labour Party would be the true leader of the British working-class, let it not defend, but help the break-up of the Empire.

Zurich, Sept. 27, 1924.

## The Elections in the United States.

By I. A. Mter.

The election campaign is in full progress in the United States. Although it has not reached its height, it is assuming all the violence of preceding elections — that is to say, violence in words. At the present time, and judging from the response that the three main candidates — Coolidge, Davis and La Follette — are receiving from the electorate, the main fight is between La Follette and Coolidge.

To understand correctly what these men stand for, it will be necessary to go back a little. Coolidge is the so-called Rockefeller man. That is to say, he is the candidate of the Republican Party, which Rockefeller is supposed to have in his pocket. Davis, the candidate of the Democratic Party, is a Morgan man. Of this there is no question, for he is an attorney for the firm of Morgan and Co. Now let us look at the vice-presidential candidates, and we get a different picture. Dawes is the vice-presidential candidate of the Republican Party. But Dawes is the agent of Morgan, and served his master in the arrangement of the Expert Commission report, which bears his name. Thus the Republican Party unites on its ticket both Rockefeller and Morgan. The Republican convention took place on June 10 — at a time, when the Farmer-Labour movement was growing strong and when La Follette was declaring himself definitely for so-called "radical" measures. Big capital, therefore, took no chances and united against what they feared would be a landslide toward the radicals.

The Republican convention advocated straight reactionary measures. Everything is peaceful and glorious in the United States, Coolidge is the best of all presidents and nothing better could happen in the United States than that he should be re-elected. The oil scandals did not bother Coolidge — for are not political scandals the rule in the United States? And Coolidge and Wall Street know that the American people care nothing about such things.

On the other hand, Coolidge boasted that he had reduced the national budget by \$ 2,700,000,000. That was supposed to be an achievement of real practical value which the farmers especially would recognize. The war budget was not reduced to any extent — but in view of the world situation, Coolidge felt that he could convince the voters of the necessity of "preparedness".

The Republican convention ran very smoothly. There was no dissension, the Old Guard (Lodge and his colleagues) were completely removed from influence and control, and Coolidge took charge of the Party. Judged by this "unity", the ranks of the Republican Party are well consolidated.

The Democratic convention took place on July 1. The Democratic Party is an opposition party. It regularly holds its convention after the Republican Party and says "no" to everything that the Republican Party says "yes" to. This time, however, there was not much difference between the two conventions. The Democrats are no longer for free trade. They advocate a tariff, but a moderation of the Republican tariff (which is pure demagoguery.) Only one "issue" stirred the Democratic convention: the Ku Klux Klan issue. Should the Democratic convention denounce the K. K. K. in name? There was a group that demanded it. It looked as if the convention would split, but a compromise was achieved — and the K. K. K. was not named. The question of candidates also threatened to end the convention. McAdoo, son-

in-law of Wilson, was supposed to be the "favourite". He managed to collect the votes of a large number of delegates, but not the two thirds majority required. Smith, the popular Catholic governor of New York, was the next favorite. But it was obvious that Smith could not be nominated — in view of the strong K. K. K. movement, and in view of the fact that Smith is a "wet" and would like the repeal of the Volstead prohibition bill. One hundred and three ballots, taking 16 days, had to be cast, before the "dark horse" was found. Davis, attorney for Morgan and Co. former ambassador to Great Britain, was acclaimed as the man to lead the Democratic Party. He is reliable. He knows what Wall Street wants and is proud to be Morgan's attorney.

On July 4, the Conference for Progressive Political Action held its convention. It came together to adopt the nomination of La Follette, who proposed himself at the very beginning. La Follette has a so-called "radical" programme. He demands nationalization of railways, water power and other natural resources. He demands liberal credits for the farmers, right of organization for the workers. He demands the passage of a bill giving Congress the right to repass a bill declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. But most of all, he demands the disruption of the trusts. He wants competition — and the trusts are monopolies. Back to the "good old days, when competition was the life of trade".

What, however, did the Conference for Progressive Political Action do? Whom does it embrace? The Chairman of the convention, William Johnston, president of the International Association of Machinists, stated it very clearly: "Our movement is broad enough to include bankers, manufacturers, business men, liberals, farmers and workers." And it includes them all. The financial backer of the movement is Rudolph Spreckels, the San Francisco sugar and coffee magnate. (It is said that he has put up \$ 3,000,000 for the campaign.) In the movement are all kinds of so-called "progressives". This is the Progressive Party, which although not yet duly incorporated, will be formed immediately after the elections. This is the "movement for the formation of a Farmer-Labour Party", which the C. P. P. A. once advocated. In reality, it is nothing but a hotch potch of all kinds of petty-bourgeois elements under the control of big finance. The big bourgeoisie has played its game well.

In the C. P. P. A. is the Socialist Party, who heralded the nomination of La Follette as a great victory. At last the workers were getting together in a Labour Party, for which the Socialists had fought so long. Debs considered it the achievement of 25 years of struggle — this "labour party" with Spreckels as its financial backer. But all is not smooth in the Socialist Party. A few days after the convention of the C. P. P. A., the Socialist Party held its convention. Abraham Cahan, editor of the Jewish "Forward" of New York, and leader of the Socialist Jewish masses, made a long, violent speech. He, too, rejoiced in the formation of the "labour party" — but he admitted it would be very difficult for him to convince his socialist readers of the necessity of voting for La Follette. He would be met with incredulity and defiance — but it would have to be done. He declared that the Socialists have been treading the wrong path in America for twenty-five years. "Marxism does not apply to America", he stated in stentorian tones. When warned by Hillquit, the leader of the party, that he was speaking not to the convention alone, but to the whole world, Cahan declared that the truth had to come out some time or other. Thus, the Socialists gave up the class struggle in America, too, as they have done all over the world.

That did not end the plight of the Socialists. Debs, in answer to a letter from Foster, in which the latter asked him how he could tolerate this piece of treachery on the part of the Socialist Party, replied that the Socialists do not formulate their policy to please the Communists, and that they have no "vatican at Moscow to give them orders". No, they have no Moscow to give them orders — and nothing else. The Socialists are now completely swallowed up by the C. P. P. A., the progressive movement — the third bourgeois party. And what has this entailed? In the State of Illinois, the "progressives" have nominated for governor a reactionary republican, Len Small, who last year was charged with embezzling State funds. And the Socialists must support him.

Before the convention of the Farmer-Labour Party, which took place on June 17, La Follette stated he would not accept the support of any organization containing the Communists, who plot the overthrow of the American government, who are acting under the orders of Moscow, etc., etc. The result was that at

the June 17 convention, at which the National Farmer-Labour Party was to be formed no party was formed, but only a National Executive Committee elected. The leaders of the Minnesota Farmer-Labour Party one of the largest organisations represented at the convention, were supporters of La Follette and wished to have him as the candidate of the Farmer-Labour Party at any cost. The majority of the delegates to the convention, however, were against La Follette. Nevertheless, a compromise was agreed upon to the effect that the convention should provisionally nominate its own candidates, who however should withdraw provided La Follette accepted the nomination only of the Farmer-Labour Party, that he accepted the programme of the Party, put himself under the discipline of the Party, and submitted the control of the election fund to the National Executive Committee of the Party. To be sure, he would not accept these terms, which should be regarded as a matter of course in any working class organisation.

The Minnesota leaders were not convinced by La Follette's refusal. On the contrary, they deserted the Farmer-Labour Party and went over to La Follette. This movement was followed by other groups, so that the Communists who had conducted the most militant campaign for the formation of the Farmer-Labour Party, were compelled to revise their plans. With the consent of the National Executive Committee of the Farmer-Labour Party, they withdrew the candidates and put up candidates of the Workers Communist Party, Comrades Foster and Gitlow. The Communist candidates are receiving the support of the farmer-labour parties that have remained loyal to the cause of a revolutionary-farmer-labour movement. Locals of the organised workers who have advocated the formation of a Farmer-Labour Party, are defying their renegade leaders and are supporting Foster and Gitlow. Gompers, much against his will (as expressed in his journal, the Federationist), has been compelled to support La Follette. But it will be a lukewarm support, with no movement to aid him.

The Communists, with very limited election funds at their disposal — in a country that demands the most sensational methods — are conducting a most vigorous campaign. All the Party members are heart and soul in the campaign. But it is a trying campaign. To get on the ballot, a large number of signatures is necessary. In the State of New York 15,000, in Ohio 20,000. Up to the present, the Communists have got on the ballot in six States, but hope to procure sufficient signatures to get raised in this campaign and the radical and revolutionary workers on the ballot in 15 States. In any case, the Communist flag is raised in this campaign and the radical and revolutionary workers and farmers are being faced with the real issues: against the Dawes plan, for recognition of Soviet Russia, against imperialism, land for the users, a moratorium for the farmers, the right of organisation for the workers, the guarantee of constitutional rights, the ending of child labour, for a Soviet Government in the United States.

La Follette, who is a Republican and still a member of the Republican Party, is centering his attack on Coolidge, and is completely ignoring Davis. He knows that Wall Street is behind Coolidge, who is just the sure reactionary and fascist that they need. Hence La Follette is going into the Republican States, and, according to the Republican papers, represents a real danger to the Republican Party. La Follette claims that he may capture New York, but is sure he will get the majority in all the wheat farming States, from Illinois to the western coast. Coolidge is now carrying on a vigorous campaign against La Follette in these States. The Workers Communist Party also recognizes that La Follette is its chief enemy. Being the counterpart of MacDonald in the United States, he is stirring up petty-bourgeois illusions in the minds of the American workers and farmers. The Workers Communist Party is unmasking the "honesty" and "sincerity" of Bob La Follette, who accepts the financial support of one of the big industrial and financial barons of the country.

The coming elections, will result in a realignment of political forces. The major bourgeois parties will combine. La Follette will form a petty-bourgeois "liberal" party, with bankers as its controllers, and against these two parties will be formed a Real revolutionary Farmer-Labour Party with the Communists as the inspirers and mainspring — the Communists, because all other working-class forces have turned traitor to the aims of the workers and poor farmers. Hence these elections are of great significance in the political life of the country.

## The Fight for Mossul.

By Irandust (Moscow).

Among the questions upon the agenda of the Council of the League of Nations which is now being held, is the "question of settling the boundary between Turkey and Irak (Mesopotamia)". Under this modest item is contained the very important international problem of Mossul and the petroleum resources of the province of Mossul. The League of Nations must decide whether Mossul is to remain within the boundaries of Turkey, or if it is to form part of the newly established state of Irak, which is a protégé of the English Colonial Office.

The Conference of Lausanne, which had to decide the fate of Turkey and of the near East, had already proved itself incapable of solving this question. The opposition which Lord Curzon and his substitute Rumbould met from the Turkish nationalists resulted in England agreeing that the question of the settlement of the frontiers between Turkey and Irak be postponed for nine months, in the course of which the parties were to arrive at an agreement regarding Mossul. In the event of the negotiations leading to no result, the question was to be referred to the League of Nations\*).

In pursuance of the above decision there was opened in May 1924 — that is already under the MacDonald government — in Constantinople an Anglo-Turkish Conference for the purpose of solving the Mossul question; at which England was represented by Sir Percy Cox, the originator of the notorious Anglo-Persian Treaty of 1919 and of the not less notorious Treaty between England and Irak of the 10th October 1922, the most highly interesting document of imperialist policy in recent times.

Already at the beginning of the negotiations it was clear that the English delegation had come with the fixed intention of sabotaging the conference. But why then was this comedy necessary? It was necessary because precisely at this time the National Assembly of Bagdad was dealing with the question of the ratification of the Treaty between England and Irak. With regard to the latter, the English gave it clearly to be understood that if the Treaty were not ratified, Irak would be left to its fate, and that without their support the Turks could easily obtain possession of Mossul.

The English High Commissioner Dobbs, gave a written pledge to the government of Irak that "in the event of a ratification of the Treaty none of the justifiable claims of Irak to the province of Mossul would be set aside in favour of Turkey".

As a result of this pressure the National Assembly in Bagdad on the 11th of June ratified the Treaty between England and Irak and at the same time adopted a resolution which clearly and definitely stated: "The Treaty becomes of no effect if England does not defend the whole of the claims of Irak to the Mossul district\*\*\*).

England is not only interested in the retention of Mossul by Irak in order to have the possibility of unhampered exploitation of the oil wells of Mossul, but also in order to maintain the validity of its Treaty with Irak and thereby further to strengthen its position on the way to the Persian Gulf.

The third reason for England's interest in handing Mossul over to Irak is the Kurdish question — as by retaining control of Mossul, which is the economic and cultural centre of the Kurdish population of the Eastern provinces of Turkey, English diplomacy will be in a position to make use of the Kurdish people, create a centre of influence among the Kurds, and exercise a constant pressure upon the government of Angora.

\* ) In the meanwhile the Council of the League of Nations has set up a subcommittee for the "solution" of this question. Ed.

\*\* ) The indignation of the mass of the population of Irak against the enforced Treaty, which delivers over the country for four years to the financial, military, legal and administrative control of the English advisers, continues to be so great that English diplomacy has recently started a fresh intrigue in order to ensure a welcome from the population as a "friend in need". It has let loose the Wahabites (a central Arabian tribe) — in the same way as has been done in Transjordan and in Hedhas — on the Southern portion of Irak for the purpose of holding these three Arabian border states of king Hussein and his two sons still more securely in complete subjection. Ed.

According to a memorandum of the Turkish Delegation at Lausanne, of the 503,000 inhabitants of the province of Mossul, 263,000 are Kurds, 146,000 Turks, 18,000 Jesids, 31,000 Mussulmans and only 33,000 Arabians. The English delegation submitted other figures, but they had to admit that the Kurds constituted far more than half the population of the province.

According to the declarations of the English, the Kurds, who constitute the most important section of the population in all the Eastern provinces of Turkey, do not wish to belong to Turkey but desire to be independent. The entire English policy in Kurdistan is aimed at creating separatist tendencies among the Kurds in Turkey, at attempting to organise an "Independent Kurdistan" with Suleimanieh as the centre, for which purpose they make all sorts of promises to the Kurdish leaders to induce them to take the lead of the separatist movement. At the time of the session of the League of Nations the whole of the Eastern provinces of Turkey were a scene of demonstrations and revolts of the Kurds and Aisories against the Turkish government. The Turkish newspapers remark that the entire efforts of England are directed towards demonstrating the impotency of the government of Angora in the Eastern provinces, and the lack of all authority on the part of the Turkish government among the Kurdish population.

Economically considered, the province of Mossul is closely connected with Anatolia. Situated on the old trade routes from the Black Sea to Bagdad, and from Persia to the Mediterranean Sea, Mossul is the centre of the economic life of the Eastern provinces of Turkey and the most important place of export for Turkish raw materials, which are exported in the direction of Bagdad and Syria. The strategical importance of Mossul for the safety of the new Turkey is beyond dispute. Its artificial separation would create an irredenta in the Near East, a gaping wound in the national body of Turkey, and would endanger every possibility of creating a balance in the Near East. There is little doubt that a confirmation by the League of Nations of the English solution of the Mossul question would evoke a sharpening of the national antagonisms in the Near East, which would lead to great complications.

## HANDS OFF CHINA

### The Soviet Union supports Suppressed China.

Comrade Trotsky in reply to a request from the Chinese Society for Combating Imperialism has sent the following telegram:

"To the Chinese Society for Combating Imperialism, Peking.

I subscribe whole-heartedly to the programme of the fight against world imperialism, which is aiming at the complete subjection of China. In your fight, the development of which will depend upon the growth of class-consciousness, upon the degree of organisation of the working masses of China and upon those elements among the Chinese intellectuals who are devoted to the cause of the people, you can, on the one hand, rely upon the conscious help of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world, and on the other hand, upon the unavoidable antagonisms between the imperialist world robbers.

The Soviet Union, true to the principles of its founder, stands wholly and entirely on the side of the oppressed against the oppressor.

By their insolent acts of violence the imperialists are tending to make the Chinese people hate all foreigners and everything foreign. The task of the Chinese revolutionaries consists in preserving the Chinese people from all chauvinism, and in teaching them to distinguish in every capitalist nation between two chief classes: the imperialist bourgeoisie and the revolutionary proletariat.

Only in alliance with the proletariat of the whole world will the Chinese bourgeoisie repel the new attack of the bourgeois barbarians organised by Mr. Hughes upon the independence, or what remains of the independence, of the Chinese people. It is the duty of every revolutionary, and much more of every communist, to support the emancipatory struggle of the working people of China.

L. Trotsky."

## Demonstration of the "Hands Off China" League in Moscow.

The "Hands off China" League which has been recently established is rapidly developing a great activity in the Soviet Union. The league recently held a mass meeting in the Grand Theatre in Moscow, at which Comrade Radek delivered the following speech:

China is no longer a medieval country; its foreign trade recently reached 3 million gold roubles (1½ million dollars) which shows that it has been drawn into the vortex of capitalism. The enormous extent of the country, which exceeds that of Europe, the great variety of its population, comprising 400 millions, and the limited development of the railway system accounts for the division of China into separate provinces.

Capitalism in China, which will bring about the establishment of national unity, is still too young. When the revolution in 1912 overthrew the dynasty, there existed no class to take over the leadership of the country. The bourgeoisie was too weak, the proletariat was even weaker. The revolution was strong enough to overthrow the hated dynasty, but not yet strong enough to set up a uniform power. Therefore power was shared among provincial officials and military leaders.

The fight which is now being carried on must solve the question whether China will be united under the leadership of the Northern, the Central or the Southern rulers. Besides this method of the bourgeoisie, which will be accompanied by fire and sword, it is possible to arrive at national unity along the path of democracy, which has already been followed by the West and must now be followed by the East. Struggles between political parties are developing in China. Three million industrial workers are taking their place in the arena of history; class differentiations are taking place in the country, on the one hand there is developing a big peasantry, on the other hand more than half of the Chinese peasants are agricultural labourers or small holders. The women are also being drawn into the political life of China.

The economic influence of England upon China has a long history. At one time 60% of all Chinese goods went to England, who in turn provided China with industrial products; even today 40% of the whole trade of China is in the hands of England.

Japan is the strongest and nearest military neighbour of China, in addition it is a powerful industrial country, which, however, lacks coal and iron, while in China there is to be found over 1 milliard tons of the best hard coal. When after world war there set in the English-American capitalist offensive against China, Japan, after the Washington Conference, was isolated and pushed into the background. After the earthquake of last year, England and America not only sent ships with condensed milk to Japan, but also aeroplanes, which were to ascertain whether the fleet and the petroleum stores of Japan had suffered. When they ascertained this they considered the time to be ripe for finally pushing Japan out of China.

In 1912 England and America rendered help to the Chinese revolution, now, however, they wish to strangle Chinese democracy. At the present time Japan is opposed to intervention in China and is in favour of its having full freedom of development, but this is only on account of Japan's temporary weakness.

The events in China also affect us, as is shown by the attempts to wreck the Treaty between the Soviet Union and China. We must mobilise the workers of all countries against the attack upon China. We emerged victorious from the civil war, because we were not only powerfully supported by our red army, but also by the workers of all countries. As the workers are not very familiar with the life of China the capitalists are endeavouring to deceive them by saying that they wish to bring culture and civilisation to China.

The "Hands off China" League must tear the mask from the face of world capital and acquaint the masses of the whole world with the struggle in China, pointing out to them that upon the issue of this struggle depends the position of the working class of the whole world. If the European and American proletariat permit the Chinese to be converted into slaves, the latter, as a source of cheap labour power, will become a dangerous under-cutter of wages.

At present it is not a question of financial or armed help, but of clear perception and correct understanding, as well as the expression of readiness to render help. Every worker must know that the fight in China is his fight.

## To the Adherents of the Red International of Labour Unions in England, the United States of America, France, Germany and Italy.

Comrades!

The Present crisis in China and the rôle being played therein by the foreign powers, has given rise to a most serious situation.

A halt must be called to the imperialist intervention in China. The slogan of the revolutionary workers, of the adherents of the R.I.L.U. in every country must be: Hands off China! You must reply with a unanimous opposition, with a mass protest to the interference of the capitalists of your country in the inner affairs of China, to their support of the campaign of the reactionary-military clique against the revolutionary people's government of Sun Yat Sen. You should convert this protest campaign into a far-reaching revolutionary movement, directed against the imperialist government of your country.

All revolutionary and national Trade Union organisations, the revolutionary factory councils, all adherents of the R.I.L.U. must in conjunction with the revolutionary and political organisations of the working class participate most actively in the setting up of "Hands off China" Leagues.

The question of imperialist intervention in China must be rendered thoroughly clear to the working masses. The "Hands off China" Leagues must maintain close contact with the masses and inform them regarding their activity.

In the near future a periodical information bulletin will appear dealing with the situation in China and the activity of the "Hands off China" League.

We hope, comrades, that you will set about without delay in organising these Leagues in your country, that you will be able to gain the attention of the broad working masses and that you will succeed in compelling the government of your country to cease carrying on their imperialist policy towards China.

With fraternal greetings,

A. Lozovsky,

General Secretary of the Red International of Labour Unions.

## ECONOMICS

### Economics and Economic Policy in the First Half Year of 1924.

By Eugen Varga.

VI.

#### The Smaller European States.

The economic situation of the smaller European states differs but slightly from that of the great capitalist powers. We shall therefore only deal with them briefly.

There are two small states which are to be counted among the industrial centres of Europe: Belgium and Switzerland. In both these countries we observe signs of the crisis which we have anticipated for the whole of the industrial countries of Europe.

As a general rule, economic life in Belgium runs on parallel lines with that of France. Belgium shared in the fall and recovery of the French franc.

The most important data relating to Belgian economic life show fairly distinct indications of the approach of a crisis. Production has been as follows:

	In tons	Crude iron	Crude steel	Finished steel
Average monthly output				
1913		207,058	200,398	154,922
January 1924		208,980	224,670	200,900
February		205,930	219,160	192,820
March		230,490	234,170	206,470
April		239,530	233,630	196,670
May		246,520	243,540	203,700
June		236,720	218,640	184,190
I. half year 1924		1,575,228	1,574,208	1,338,612
I. half year 1923		996,820	1,017,619	888,800

	In 1000 tons	Coal output monthly	Coke production	Coal reserve at end of year or month	Share of output per head in kg (daily)	Total number of workers
1913		1,903	294	955	525	146,084
January 1924		2,183	376	635	472	176,554
February		2,112	351	688	477	173,118
March		2,108	367	718	472	173,907
April		2,048	355	761	471	173,118
May		1,999	356	952	457	172,439
June		1,747	344	999	430	170,040
I. half year 1924		12,197	2,149	—	—	—
I. half year 1923		11,127	1,966	—	—	—

These figures show a continuous worsening of conditions in the course of the last few months: decrease of the number of workmen employed in the mines, accumulation of coal reserves, etc. Conditions are similar in other branches of industry.

In Switzerland and Holland the economic situation is vague. Switzerland is again profiting from its constant stream of visitors and in Holland conditions have improved somewhat during the last few weeks. The ship-yards in particular have succeeded in obtaining fresh orders, among others from England. Sweden has returned to gold currency during the period covered by this report, but with certain limitations. The economic situation has improved, especially the export of iron ore and wood to the United States. Norway and Denmark have had to struggle against currency difficulties.

The situation is more difficult in Czecho-Slovakia where industry is dependent to a large extent upon export. During the first few months an improvement was experienced in heavy industry, probably attributable to the better conditions in Germany, one of the best buyers of these products. The renewed crisis in Germany has been accompanied by a renewed decline in Czecho-Slovakian heavy industry. The textile industry suffers from a permanent difficulty in finding markets, and has to struggle severely against the competition of the Polish cotton industry in eastern Europe. The sale of machinery and other industrial articles to the East is also rendered more difficult by the endeavours of these countries to develop their own industry.

Hungary is passing through a severe crisis at the present time. Here — as in Austria — the League of Nations lent its aid towards a stabilisation of the currency, which has led to similar phenomena as those with which we are already familiar in Germany and Poland: scarcity of credit, bankruptcies, high prices, closing downs, extensive unemployment.

The Trade Secretary of the English Embassy in Budapest, Mr. J. E. Humphrey, gives in his official report heart-rending figures on the wretched situation of the working people in this land of the White Terror. According to his statements, the expenses of a workman's family of five persons, at the beginning of this year was 300,000 crowns weekly. The earnings of the head of the family did not, however, exceed 100,000 crowns. "The frightful and inevitable consequence of this low standard of existence, brought about by the increased prices, is a decrease of population. According to the latest statistical data, the deaths exceed the births by about 30%; the mortality among children is especially great. Phthisis is the main cause, and this frightful disease is spreading rapidly among the population." etc. ("Economist", 14. June 1924.)

We can well imagine the terrible misery prevailing among the proletariat when even the official report issued by an English embassy contains such statements.

The Balkans continue to struggle with their economic and Political difficulties. Economic conditions in Jugoslavia appear to be about the best, whilst Bulgaria is suffering severely from the sharp decline in the price of tobacco, the main export article of the country. Roumania has been fighting against difficulties of every description. All these countries are suffering from the agrarian crisis, and will scarcely be able to profit from the present high prices, as nowhere in the Balkans, do the crops appear to be good.

#### The United States of America.

The United States are in the midst of a far-reaching crisis. The production of the key industries fell by 9% in the course of the month of June, the proportion of employed by 3%. Pro-

duction has developed as follows in the various leading branches of industry.\*)

**Fuels.**

	Anthracite coal	Soft coal	Crude oil
	(million tons)		
December 1923 . . . . .	8.0	40.2	58.9
January 1924 . . . . .	—	50.8	56.4
February . . . . .	7.6	45.7	55.4
March . . . . .	8.1	39.9	59.5
April . . . . .	6.8	29.5	59.2
May . . . . .	7.7	31.2	61.5
June . . . . .	—	—	—

	Iron	Steel	Orders on hand, steel trust	Motor cars (1000 cars)
December 1923 . . . . .	2921	2844	4445	302
January 1924 . . . . .	3019	3600	4798	316
February . . . . .	3065	3781	4913	376
March . . . . .	3461	4146	4783	381
April . . . . .	3233	3386	4208	372
May . . . . .	2700	2630	3628	312
June . . . . .	2026	2056	3260	—

These figures, unfortunately incomplete owing to the fact that American reports do not generally state the absolute figures, but the relations of actual production to the capacity for production, show the sharp decline of heavy industry in the second quarter, after the first quarter still showed an upward tendency. An especially characteristic factor is the decline in steel trust orders. This retrogression has been continual — with slight interruptions — since March 1923, when the figure stood at 7,463,000 tons. This is at the same time an indication that the boom in the first quarter of 1924 contained some artificial element. At the present time the Steel Trust has the lowest number of orders on hand since November 1914. ("New York Times", 11. July.) Between March and June steel production sank to less than half; such a catastrophic decline of production has never taken place before in a crisis. At the end of June the steel works were producing up to 35 to 40% of the production capacity of the country, whilst the fresh orders coming in only amounted to 25%. ("New York Times", 19. June 1924.) The number of blast furnaces in work diminished from 270 at the beginning of April to 164 at the beginning of July.

The industries working up iron, especially the manufactories making motor-cars, railway engines, and carriages, have also considerably reduced their production.

**The Textile Industry.**

The boom did not bring such good business for the textile industry as for the heavy industry. The reason for this is that heavy industry received special impetus from the renewal of building and investment activity, paralysed by the war. The most important figures are as follows:

	Cotton consumption (1000 bales)	Number of spindles in work (millions)	Wool consumption (mill. lbs)	Production of shoes in mill. pairs
December 1923 . . . . .	462	34.04	45.45	26.8
January 1924 . . . . .	577	33.34	53.85	22.7
February . . . . .	507	32.68	50.63	26.5
March . . . . .	484	32.39	47.63	26.6
April . . . . .	480	31.87	44.36	27.9
May . . . . .	413	30.49	36.51	—
June . . . . .	350	—	—	—

\*) Data up to April from Fed. Res. Bulletin; May-June from newspaper reports.

The decline in production is best characterised by the reduction of consumption of cotton and wool: here the decline is 40% since the beginning of the year. The decrease in the number of working spindles is less, as part time is being worked.

In the famous textile town of Fall River, which forms the central point for the textile industry in the North of the United States, the inhabitants have been plunged into want and misery. Out of every 111 textile workers, 100 are only working part time, or not at all. 30,000 to 70,000 hands are out of work. In the southern textile districts, where better conditions were maintained for a longer time, the situation has become equally desperate.

All other branches of industry are in a similar position.

**The Cause of the Crisis.**

The general experience of capitalist economics showed that the crisis might be expected by the autumn of 1923. It may be of interest to inquire the reasons why the crisis occurred later than when due, and by what means it was postponed until the second quarter of 1924.

On the whole American Economists show but little insight into the causes of the crisis. Nevertheless, rather surprising remarks may be found here and there. Thus, for instance, it is pointed out that the productive capacity of many branches of industry — for example the shoe industry — is double the normal consumption of the population. We find the following in an interesting article published by the "Journal of Commerce" on 27. May:

"The inability on the part of foreigners to buy on credit, and the lack of means among a section of the home population, especially in farming districts, which render the purchase of means of production and articles of consumption equally impossible, is one of the cause of the crisis. But the question is, why has this cause led to a crisis at precisely the present juncture? . . . We must remember the declaration made two years ago by the Secretary of Finance, Mellon, that the lack of "capital" caused by the war has not yet been made good . . . There is good reason to assume that the building work which fell behind during the war, including houses and factories alike, has been caught up with again . . . We must recollect that the farmer has not since the war, regained his ability to buy industrial articles, and is hampered in his purchasing powers by the very high duties."

The high protective tariff, however — as we pointed out in an earlier report — does not seem to have brought about any essential change in American foreign trade. About the same quantities of goods were imported as before, but at prices made dearer by the duties. It must, however, be taken into consideration that 1923 was a boom year, little adapted to the drawing of comparisons. Until comparative observation is made of a complete industrial cycle, no correct judgment can be formed on the effect of the tariff reform. We must further remark that the President has several times in the course of the period covered by this report made use of his right to increase duties. Above all, the duty on wheat was increased, in order to prevent the inflow of cheap Canadian wheat over the northern frontier.

**Optimism in the United States.**

Despite the acuteness of the crisis, great optimism prevails in the United States press. It is hoped that the crisis will be of short duration. The month of July has already brought better reports on improved business in retail trade.

Many of these expressions of opinion are deliberately intended to keep up the spirits of the people. We are of the opinion that the depression will not be of such brief duration as the American politicians think, or pretend to think. Still we must not forget that the present crisis in the United States is of an entirely different character from the European crisis. It is merely a crisis phase of a capitalism in itself still sound, and still on an upward course. Although production has greatly decreased, it is still as great as it was during the previous boom period. State finances are in the best of order. Deposits have increased by a milliard dollars as compared with the year before. ("Journal of Commerce", 12. July 1924.) The savings deposited with the money institutions connected with the Federal Reserve System have increased during the past year by 546 million dollars, and amounted to 7,29 milliard dollars by 1. May 1924. Foreign trade is active. The gold reserves of the country increase from month to month. When we compare these conditions with those prevailing in Europe, we may well comprehend the optimism of United States economists. If there is anything which threatens

danger to the economics of the United States, it is superfluity of wealth. If the revolutionary movement makes further advances in Europe, more difficulties will be thrown in the way of the transfer of American superfluity to Europe in the form of capital investment. This threatens to greatly reduce the average rate of profit. The Dawes Plan and the London Conference are intended to create the political prerequisites for a large-scale investment of American capital in Europe. The American bankers will become the rulers of Europe . . .

**IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES**

**How the Mensheviki Prepared the Attempted Revolt in Georgia.**

The following has already been communicated to the press. Ed.

**The Chief Culprits:  
The II. International and the League of Nations.**

**The Origin of the Revolt.**

On the 28th of August, during the early hours of the morning, a band of 30 persons attacked the still sleeping town of Tschiatyri, arrested some leaders of the local party organisation, together with some of the administrative officials, and took possession of the town. On the following day, the 29th of August, this band was driven from the city, without the assistance of the regular troops, by 40 communists who hastened from Schorapan to the help of the comrades in Tschiatyri.

Almost all the former nobles residing in the district took part in the revolt. They were also joined by merchants, the clergy and speculators. After capturing the town the insurgents organised a "Provisional Government", imposed martial law, and addressed a manifesto to the inhabitants which declared that Tiflis was in the possession of the insurgents and that the whole of Georgia and Transcaucasia had risen against the Bolsheviks.

The peasants were in a very hostile mood towards the insurgents. It is characteristic that in the Senak district the insurgents carried out mass arrests among the peasants, for they feared — and not without reason — an organised action on the part of the peasants. In Senak a small band attacked the party committee, disarmed the police and took possession of the town.

In Gara-Kachety and also in Gombory, where the total "armed forces" consisted of two military police, there appeared a band of twelve men, who organised an armed group comprising criminal elements and former national guards. On the following day this band was completely overpowered by the local forces. The few peasants who had joined this band delivered themselves up voluntarily to our officials and declared that they had been drawn into this adventure by means of deceit.

A few attacks by bandits took place in the district of Sartachaly, Sugdidy and in the mountain district of Gurien. In East Georgia and Tiflis peace remained undisturbed.

The revolt in Tschiatyri was led by five former princes, Zereteli, and a tsarist colonel, Tschatschalidse. At the head of this "government" there was placed one of these princes. The leadership in Gara-Kachety was confided to the Georgian monarchist officer, Pagusija.

It must be specially emphasised that the peasant masses everywhere opposed the bands with weapons in hand. As regards the workers, they were prepared at any moment upon the call of the Communist Party to proceed with weapons in hand against the menshevik-aristocrat adventure.

**How and Where the Revolt was Organised.**

It is sufficiently well known how the former menshevik government of Jordania, Zereteli, Tschchenkeli and others supported by English bayonets, mismanaged in Georgia. It is also known under what circumstances this government was overthrown. Jordania and his confederates, however were not prepared to rest content with the mess they had made of things. They immediately proceeded to organise an armed revolt. They attempted to mobilise working class opinion under the slogan that the "suppressed Georgian people" were fighting for the right of self-determination. They solemnly swore that they only

wanted to employ peaceful means of struggle, that they most definitely repudiated the idea of armed revolt as a method of struggle, and they were determined to fight against dictatorship solely under the banner and in the name of democracy.

And now a portion of the bourgeois-social democratic press is spreading the legend that the revolt in Georgia is an "elementary movement" of the people. It is claimed that the Mensheviki have not taken part in the revolt, and that they only opposed that "bloody terrorist regime" in the name of the "highest ideals of democracy".

To this must be said the following: The mensheviki who have been driven out of Georgia organised five foreign centres: in Warsaw, Paris, Berlin, Constantinople and London.

At the head of the Warsaw centre there stood general Ssachalaja as political leader, and general Kasbek as military leader. These worthy gentlemen were of course in close connection with the Polish government and with the Polish General Staff. They were also at the head of the commission of the military experts of the "Georgian Government".

With the active help of the Polish ambassador in Paris, Count Zamoyski, and the Polish General Consul in Constantinople, there were rapidly concentrated in Poland 160 active officers, 120 army students, 72 flying officers, and 95 reserve officers of the former Georgian white guardist army. These officers were accommodated in Polish military schools and received 10,000 Polish marks a day. General Sacharjadse, the chief of the Georgian general staff, petitioned the second division of the Polish general staff that these officers be accepted in Polish military schools. Many officers served as spies and agents in the second division of the Polish General staff.

In this manner the diplomatic collaboration of the Georgian Mensheviki with the Polish government was supplemented by military cooperation.

As an indication of the mutual relations between the Georgian Mensheviki and the Polish government we quote the following note which the Polish government sent to the French government:

"I enclose herewith the memorandum of the Georgian Committee in Poland, which speaks in its own name and in the name of the Council of the Federation of Caucasian Republics, which is at present in Paris, and request you to hand over the same to director Peretti della Rocca with the following explanation:

The Polish government stands by the obligations it has undertaken and also the acts of friendship in regard to the Georgian Republic; its attitude towards the memorandum submitted by the Georgian Committee in Poland is therefore very favourable, having regard to the fact that the views expressed in it fully correspond to the intentions of the Polish government, which is a determined opponent of every kind of violation committed against liberated nations. The Polish government has therefore decided to exclude from the negotiations with the government which represents Russia, those questions which immediately concern the Caucasian Republics and in particular the Georgian Republic. In arriving at this decision the Polish government was convinced that any other attitude to this question would cause a cooling off in those relations which have recently been so happily established. I feel sure that the above will meet with the full agreement of your excellency's government and I should be glad if you would take note of the above explanation."

At the meeting of Georgian officers in Tarnow, the representative of the "Georgian government", Colonel Emelianov of the general staff, declared as follows:

"In order to demonstrate its "change of policy", the Soviet Government has released 300 social democrats from prison. We can now reckon upon these people as active co-operators with us. In addition to this, the Georgian officers who are now in Constantinople have declared their readiness to proceed to Georgia. I appeal to the officers in Poland, of whom there are over 300, to hasten to the aid of their native country and to proceed to Georgia, where revolts have already taken place in Kutais and Sugdidy."

**Poincaré and the Georgian Mensheviki.**

The Menshevik government, at the head of which is Jordania, chose Paris as its head quarters. This is not merely out of sympathy for France, but by reason of an invitation which the chief of the French military mission, Colonel

Corbette Chardonner, sent to the Menshevik government. After the arrival of the Georgian government in Paris, a conference of the representatives of all the Caucasian Republics was held, which was attended by **Tschchenkelli** and **Kamellekki** as representatives of the Georgian government. The Conference took place on the 3rd of February 1922, at which, according to the minutes of this conference, the following was decided upon:

"After an exchange of opinion it was decided to enter into negotiations with several politically active personalities, mainly with members of the French delegation at the **Genoa Conference** but also with **M. Poincaré**.

These will be informed that: 1. if the Genoa conference for any reason refrains from dealing with the Caucasian question, we shall have no objection; 2. if the said Conference deals with the question, the representatives of the Caucasian Republics must be admitted; 3. if the question of the recognition of Georgia arises, the Caucasian Republics must be separated from Russia; 4. whatever Russia offers we also are able to offer, as we will grant to foreign capital all required guarantees in order to provide it with the possibility to work under the desired conditions.

It is in this sense, that we shall ask for support."

The decision was handed over in the form of a note to the director of the French Foreign Office, **Peretti della Rocca**.

The government of **Poincaré** did not avail itself of the services of the Georgian Mensheviks for nothing. It placed **4 million Francs** at the disposal of the Georgian government.

The keen business instinct of the Menshevik patriots is shown by numerous documents; we only quote from one, which gives a remarkable insight into how very clever they have all proved to be in offering the natural wealth of Georgia as a bait to the imperialist capitalists in order to bring their counter-revolutionary aims nearer to realisation.

We take the following paragraph from a Paris protocol (Treaty of the Transcaucasian Governments):

"With the conviction that the Powers will not withhold their moral and political collaboration concerning the question of the independence of the Caucasian Republics, which have already been recognised by a number of international decisions, the governments of the above named republics will unite their forces in order to strengthen the political, industrial and commercial relations with the powers, and to create favourable conditions for joint work with foreign capital and for the exploitation of the natural resources of the Caucasus."

One of those who were immediately connected with this business deal is His Excellency **M. Toptschibashev**, the Chairman of the Paris Committee of the former Menshevik government of Azerbeidjan.

This business deal on the part of the "pure" menshevik **Toptschibashev** is still more clearly illustrated by the following letter addressed to him, in which he is referred to as "Your Excellency".

"According to our information, which is quite trustworthy, the former government of Azerbeidjan favours an agreement regarding the sale of petroleum wells to the former partners of the petroleum company 'Royal Dutch'. I should be greatly obliged to your Excellency if you would inform me by return of post the reasons which have induced the above-named government to undertake this step, which is not provided for by our mutual agreement.

Please accept the expression of my highest esteem.

Signed: **Bekir Sami Bey.**"

### Money! Money! Money!

For counter-revolution, as for war in general, one needs money. The Georgian Mensheviks have established their own financial department for the purpose of getting hold of funds. At the head of this financial department there stood a member of the Menshevik government of Georgia, **Kandelekki**. It was to him that the requests for money were sent from Georgia. The money flowed to Georgia in dollars and Turkish pounds, as is shown by the following letter.

"To Comrade **Kandelekki**, Paris.

Dear Comrade!

I must apply to you as the manager of the financial department of our centre with the following request:

"According to communications sent from Georgia (letter from Comrade **Georgi**), our comrades working in Georgia are suffering considerable financial embarrassment, particularly after the arrest of comrade **Noe**. We learn from your communication that you have sent to Germany for the account of comrade **Kordsay**, 2500 Turkish pounds and 1500 dollars, which comrade **Kordsay** forwarded on to Georgia through the medium of a German merchant (**Ernst Mulger** or **Munger**); but up to the present we have not received any news as to the receipt of this sum. I would ask you if possible to ascertain personally whether this sum has reached Georgia or not. At the same time we should be glad if you would send the money for our personal requirements regarding which we wrote to you in our previous letter.

Despatched on the 19th of Februar 1924, by post.

(Signature.)"

Therefore it was not the willingness for sacrifice of the Georgian people that the Menshevik ministers relied upon, on the contrary, the counter-revolution in Georgia, as well as the maintenance of the court of the menshevik leaders in emigration, was entirely financed from abroad. The latter pocketed fat salaries every month, which did not fail to have a disquieting effect upon the lower strata of the emigration.

These leaders did not shrink back from practising the "expropriation of the expropriators" — otherwise strictly tabooed — when the proceeds went into their own pockets. For example, they possessed a treasure-chamber in the Georgian catholic monastery in **Baumonti**, which contained numerous works of art and other articles of value which they had appropriated from Georgia. Among other things they put up for sale in France a Sevres porcelain service which they had taken from the palace of the Grand Duke **Nikolaj Nikolajevitch**.

The whole correspondence of these gentlemen naturally turns upon questions of money.

### The Mensheviks engaged in Military Espionage.

**Savinkov** recently stated before the Highest Revolutionary Tribunal of the Soviet Union, how he developed from a hero of the counter-revolution to a spy in the service of the Polish general staff. The "heroes" of the II. International have followed the same path. Thus the Tiflis organisation sent spies' reports abroad regarding the dislocation of military formations. These spies reports were then sold by the agents of the "heroes" of the II. International, **Jordania**, **Zereteli** and others, to the Polish, French and Turkish general staffs. This is the way in which these worthy gentlemen of the II. International promoted the cause of democratic pacifism.

### Acts of Terror.

These pacifists and social democrats, who pose before the working class as innocent angels, have worked precisely in the same manner as **Savinkov**. In this they did not shrink from acts of terror. The military leader of the Warsaw Committee, **Kasbek**, has, among others, addressed the following letter to **Noe Jordania**:

"To the President of the Georgian Republic!

Your instruction regarding trustworthy helpers and material support have been handed over to **M. Oragwelidse**, who has already started the work. With reference to the transfer of Georgian officers from Turkey, we have sent a request to the **Foreign Minister**, who has promised to give a positive answer in the course of two weeks.

We wish to inform you of the following: we have obtained the required number of illegal workers, but we have no leader yet; these people have elected from their own ranks the leader of the new group, **M. Ruchadse**, whose photograph I enclose.

We await your answer and instructions. After receipt of your instructions we promise to communicate the same to these people and to indicate to them in which way they are to set up connections with us.

We have received a collective protest of the Georgian Mensheviks against the Bolshevik state power, which has 261 signatures. The signatories promise to undertake an armed

rising against the Soviet power, but there are three hindrances in the way of a revolt:

1. Up to the present M. Oragwelidse has not distributed any material support.
2. The mutual mistrust prevailing.
3. The lack of support on the part of the Vortchalinsk group.

We give below the family names of the people we have nominated to carry out acts of terror:

1. Abduladse Evtichi, 2. Gvelesjani Ivan, 3. Guja Alexander, 4. Melja Joseph and 5. Matshavarjani David.

All the above were at the disposal of the Georgian Committee in Constantinople and have been placed at the disposal of the co-workers in the Batum district.

We have received the instructions you sent us through the medium of Madame Kasbek and will endeavour to send the same to Georgia. You will receive special communication regarding the receipt of these instructions. We have received instructions No. 1286, 457, 997, and 1870, No. 457 dealing with the purchase of weapons. With regard to the latter we have heard from Georgia that a member of the Centre has entered into negotiations with the commander of the No. 3 Infantry division, who promised to deliver the weapons, provided he was given sufficient dollars to enable him to leave the country or 5000 Gold roubles. This we are not in a position to do.

While M. Chararadse was working out confidential instructions for illegal workers he entered into a dispute with M. Odichlidse and we are now afraid that Odichlidse could betray us. We therefore request you to write to them that this must not happen again as the Soviet authorities suspect M. Odichlidse as being an engraver and on account of his not returning home in good time. M. Chasaradse requests that the notarial documents be given back to him, that he wishes to sell his house and go abroad.

Ruchadse writes from Constantinople that the Turkish police confiscated the orders he had when he was already on board the steamer. In addition to the papers there were 72 Lire which he had changed for our comrades.

I request you to write to the Nr. 3 Infantry division regarding the weapons. No. 7 group is sending information. The address is: Georgia Tiflis, Navtlugi, workers Co-operative.

Further information has already been sent from Georgia. We expect more every day. The Georgians living here ask for relief; the majority of them are poor and out of work.

The last meeting took place in Osorgeti, at which it was decided to organise a group and seize Osorgeti. The plan of revolt has already been worked out. During the revolt the Renski bridge will be blown up in order to prevent the Soviet army from coming into action against us.

We have four soviet functionaries belonging to our organisation and who are giving us support.

Signed: Kasbek.

Did Noe Jordania, the "president of the republic" raise a protest against these acts of terror which were planned? Did he repudiate these criminal methods of fighting against the Soviet power? Was the pacifist and social democrat Noe Jordania unaware that an attempt upon the life of comrade Trotzky was being prepared and organised during the latter's stay in Baku? Did he forbid his criminal agents to organise and prepare attempts upon the life of one of the oldest and meritorious Georgian comrades, Makharadse, and upon Mdivani, who was then chairman of the People's Commissariat in Georgia? Was the foreign centre ignorant of the fact that a whole number of Georgian mensheviks, who had turned away from the party with loathing and disgust had been foully murdered by agents? And has not the II. International rendered material and moral support to Noe Jordania and his party, who have carried on espionage and organised acts of terror?

The Pacifists who believe in armed Revolt.

The social democratic and bourgeois press made a great cry about "an elemental movement of the people", and denied that the Mensheviks had participated in the preparation and carrying out of the armed insurrection.

The letter of Jordania in which he gave instructions regarding the armed revolt has already been published\*).

\* See Inprecorr Nr. 70 of 2nd October in the article by K. K. Kun: "International Menshevism and the Georgian Revolt".

We therefore quote some further documents, which show beyond dispute how this "elemental movement of the people" was organised. Here is an example:

"Governmental decree: Beginning of the revolt — in Wedkrien. Oni and Namachvari will join in and maintain communications through the Manisonsk post. The Manisonsk post sends the news further through the post to the Gorzen Republic and to the organisation Prochla."

From Warsaw there was sent the following military instructions of the Menshevik staff:

"Commencing from the Rions railway bridge all subsections are to be subordinate to the organisation of Samtredi as district organisation. Samtredi maintains connections with the head organisation of the Bakum area."

Choni and the remaining divisions are subordinate to the nearest points to the centre and at the same time to Kutais. The Tiflis organisation only comes into action when reliable news arrives regarding the result of the revolt in other districts. The Tiflis organisation leads the neighbouring village organisations and supplies them with weapons.

Arms, money and instructions must be given out a week before the action.

The military organisations must hand weapons to every member of the party.

It will be the duty of the Poti organisation to maintain close connection with the commander of the steamship "Maria".

Note: This plan is to be carried out after the arrival of special instructions.

Talakvadze.

Members of the Commission: General Sacharjadse and General Kasbek.

Warsaw, 19th of March 1924."

The League of Nations and Georgia.

The League of nations, as every one has since become aware, intervened on behalf of the Menshevist government. The Mensheviks even made preparations for an "enthusiastic" reception of a delegation of the League of Nations by the "Georgian People", in order to give the members of the delegation the same favourable impression regarding the democratic inclinations of the people as Kautsky obtained. In order to bring about this favourable impression at all costs, they made use of other means as the following letter shows:

"The question of the liberation of Georgia has been raised by the League of Nations. In the name of this League a commission will be sent with whom we have connections and with whom you can likewise get into connection. The Commission comprises one of our own people, with whom we have already spoken and who has been bought by us. He will defend our interests.

All couriers must be provided with good credentials, which will give them the possibility of travelling to and from easily and of disappearing should necessity arise.

Signed: Talakvadse.

To the Instructor Michael M. Pittia."

Any comment would be superfluous. This "confession" not only characterises the "pure", "unselfish" Mensheviks, but also the League of Nations.

## UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

### The Budget of the Soviet Union.

Before the revolution the financial year in Russia coincided with the calendar year. In 1922 this was altered. In an agrarian country such as Russia, the conditions of the whole national economy and of the state finances depend for the greater part upon the result of the harvest. For this reason the financial year in the Soviet Union is now reckoned from the 1st of October to the following 1st of October. By this time it is possible as a rule to gain an idea of the agricultural and economic prospects for the approaching year. There is now being published in the press the trial budget of the Soviet Union for 1924/25. The total amount of this budget compared with those preceding is as follows:



1922	1000 million roubles
1922/23	1388 " "
1923/24	1880 " "
1924/25	2080 " "

The budget for 1924/25 differs from all previous budgets in Soviet Russia in that it is the first budget which avoids the issue of paper money. The preceding budgets (since 1914) could only cover the greater part of their expenditure by the issue of paper money.

Amount of the emissions for budget purposes:

	million roubles	percentage of the total budget
1921/22	350	43,7
1922/23	387	41,5
1923/24	185	15,6

The budget for 1924/25 will not include the income of 80 million roubles which the state will receive by the minting of silver and copper coins.

This is undoubtedly a great success, the more so because all the efforts aiming at the restoration of the finances of the Soviet Union have been carried on without any help or support from abroad. It was possible to achieve this, thanks to the general economic revival which has taken place throughout the country. The rapid restoration of all branches of national economy resulted in a considerable increase of the state revenue, and not merely a relative but an absolute reduction of the budget deficit.

The credit side of the budget to the Soviet Union in the last few years shows the following picture:

Year	Taxes	Income from state property and state undertakings	Total of the regular income	Deficit	Relation of deficit to total budget in percentage
In million roubles					
1921/22	450	—	450	351	43,3
1922/23	405	57	462	372	39,8
1923/24	623	155	778	407	34,4
1924/25	832	203	1035	200	16,2

Two years ago the deficit comprises almost half of the total budget; in the present financial year 1923/24 it has been reduced to one third and in the coming year 1924/25 it will only amount to one sixth. If the budget were to include the profits from traffic and transport, the deficit would be still less. The deficit still existing is chiefly covered by state credit operations. In the year 1923/24 these operations brought in 222 million roubles. For the year 1924/25 it is intended to repay the second loan (40 million roubles), an 8% gold guarantee loan, which constitutes an investment for reserve capital of the state undertakings (30 million roubles), and a peasants' loan (50 million roubles).

Reckoning the budget on the basis of the present rate of income we arrive at the following figures:

Year	National income (milliards pre-war roubles)	State budget	Relation of Budget to Income in percentage
1913	16,4	3,25	19,8
1923/24	8,0	1,25	15,6
1924/25	8,5	1,4	18,8

In comparison with 1913 the income of the Soviet of the Soviet Union is 59—52%, while the state budget only 38—40%. The present budget is therefore smaller than the pre-war time budgets.

In the approaching year 1924/25 the extraordinary expenditure will be reduced from 223 million to 172 million roubles, whilst the ordinary income will show an increase from 962 to 1063 million roubles. In comparison with the previous year the expenditure of the People's Commissariat for Education and of the People's Commissariat for Agriculture on the one hand, and the sums granted to the treasury for the minting of coins on the other hand, show an increase. It is important to note that in the budget for 1924/25 there is no subsidy for transport and traffic, as this branch of state economy has become solvent.

The budget of the Soviet Union therefore affords a splendid proof of the utility and the success of the money reform, as well as of the recovery of our entire economy.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### Newbold „Explains“.

By M. N. Roy.

In the columns of the Glasgow "Forward", Walton Newbold M. A. ex-M. P. explains his political somersault. He has made a great discovery: "there will be no further revolution in Europe for many a long year". So there is nothing else to do but to walk over to the camp of Reformism: — thus argues the ex- and would-be M. P., who wisely declares the present activities of the Communist International to be "melodrama, not Marxism". It is delicious. Since when did Newbold consider himself the greatest living authority on Marxism?

Newbold obviously does not know that others preceded him in this discovery, the logical consequence of which is the landing in the camp of the bourgeoisie. On his happy journey in the wake of those illustrious predecessors of his, we wish him God-speed. If he "conquers Motherwell" (this time for Newbold and not for Communism as he bragged last time) in the coming election, it will be entertaining to watch him participate, very reverentially, in those "parliamentary tomfooleries" which he ridiculed in his early enthusiasm.

In his article, Newbold endeavours to prove that he still remains a revolutionary, but only succeeds in giving out his motive in posing as such. He is one of those who have no particular objection to riding on the rising tide of revolution, but have no stomach for uphill work. Granted that the first wave of revolution has subsided, not to swell before a decade or two, as Newbold prophesies, what should be the duty of the Communist? Not to desert, but to keep the flag flying. But Newbold gallantly concedes that glorious job to Soviet Russia, for which he would "work might and main", while sitting comfortably on the uncomfortable benches in Westminster, "till the Blood Red Banner of Social Revolution is raised anywhere in Europe or Asia" by some other "romanticist or melodramatist" (epithets he hurls at the Communists). Meanwhile, it has become unprofitable to be a revolutionist. Why not, then, scramble for the loaves and fishes that are the rewards of reformism? This is the gist of Newbold's real argument.

The debacle of Newbold is likely to give a handle to the anti-parliamentarian comrades. There is another instance of a good man corrupted by evil communications. Contact with bourgeois political institutions corrupted a Communist. Such a conclusion would not be quite warranted. As against one Newbold there are hundreds of Communists who have attacked the parliamentary citadel of the bourgeoisie very successfully. We should be critical, not about the tried tactics of revolutionary parliamentarism, but of the Communism of our candidates. Newbold flopped, because his Marxism was hardly skin-deep; with him it was pure intellectual dilettantism.

In view of the fact that British Communists work in an atmosphere of corrupt proletarian outlook, and that this corruption of proletarian ideology strengthens the position of reformist illusionism, our Party must be armed with theoretical training, not of the pedantic nature that still persists within the Party, but based on the revolutionary practice of Leninism.

## APPEALS

To All English Labour Organisations and  
to All English Workers!

Comrades, Workers of England!

The present fascist government of Bulgaria came to power on the 9th of June last year by means of a military coup d'état. In order to maintain power this government subjected the working masses to an unheard-of white terror and provoked the September events of 1923, as a result of which over 2000 workers and peasants were murdered in the most bestial manner, while over 8000 were flung into prison and a further 3000 driven into exile. During these events the trade unions had to undergo great sacrifices. The secretary of the Tobacco Workers Union

St. Kiradjiev, was foully murdered in prison, another member of the central Committee of the Tobacco Workers Union, D. Herov, was hanged in prison without a trial. Hundreds of local trade union functionaries were killed.

After the September events the terror against the working class became even more acute and a special inquisition law "for the defense of the realm" was enacted.

We give the following particulars of a few of these acts of terror:

1. On the 1st of April last the General Trade Union Federation, numbering 35,000 members and which had for 20 years conducted the workers struggle against the employers, was dissolved.

2. The National Workers' Co-operative Society, "Osvojodnyie", numbering 70,000 members, was likewise dissolved. Its property and capital and even the shares of the members were confiscated, among them the shares of the co-operatives which run into 180,000 Leva.

3. All Workers' Clubs throughout the country have been closed. The property of the trade unions, along with their archives, amounting in value to 2 million Leva have also been confiscated.

4. The Trade Unions are not allowed to hold any meetings; when such mass meetings are convened they are broken up by the police. This is shown by the following facts:

a) On the 18th December 1923, the Vidin branch of the Tailors Union convened a meeting at which the labour protection laws were to be discussed. The police dispersed the assembled workers with great brutality. Peter Nikolov was arrested and beaten till he bled.

b) On the 5th of June a meeting of waiters in Burgas was broken up by the police.

c) On the 5th of August at a meeting of bank and commercial employees — in spite of the fact that the meeting had been previously notified to the police and their permission obtained — all who took part were arrested, the employers were ordered to dismiss the arrested.

5. All economic struggles of the workers are suppressed by the brutal attacks of the police and the army, as is instanced by the following:

a) On the 4th of November 1923, five hundred striking workers employed at the Sugar factory in Grona-Orenkhoviza were compelled by the threat of machine guns to resume work.

b) On the 12th of December last, 170 workers in the textile factory Nedev, in Sliven, struck for an increase of wages. The members of the strike committee were immediately arrested and the workers were dispersed with the point of the bayonet.

c) In December last, 800 striking workers employed in the sugar factory in Philippopol were suppressed by the police; it was only thanks to the forbearance of the workers that a blood bath, which was desired by the police, was avoided.

d) On the 26th of February this year, 750 dock workers were locked out because they would not accept a 25% reduction of their wages. Cavalry, infantry and machine guns were used to force the workers to return to work.

e) On the 26th of May last a strike in the textile factory of Kalov in Sliven was suppressed by the arrest of the strike committee and the internment of the strikers.

f) On the 19th of June last, 350 tobacco workers in Haskovo went on strike. The district commander threatened the strikers with arrest and declared that he would use weapons against them as if they were common robbers, and by this means broke the strike.

g) Four strikes of the bootmakers in Sofia and a strike of the metal workers in Plevna, as well as a whole series of minor wage struggles, were suppressed in the same manner.

6. The Trade Union press is subjected to tremendous persecution. Up to now four editors of labour papers have been summoned to appear before the court to answer charges. More than 20 papers have been suppressed. The papers which still appear are still being continually confiscated on no legal pretext whatever. In Berkovitz, Ferdinand, Lom, Plevna, Kardiyak, Stanineka, Chirpan, Burgas, Schumen, Pernik, and a whole number of other towns, no labour paper is allowed to appear and if anyone dares to subscribe to one he is persecuted, arrested and brutally beaten. In Sliven 20 workers were arrested and ill treated, merely because they distributed the

independent trade union paper "Rabotnishesko Edinstvo". The editor of this paper has been arrested seven times within 6 months and an action is now pending against him. The paper has been suppressed for over a month. The newspaper "Proletarsko Edinstvo" which has appeared in its place is subjected to the same persecutions. Every issue containing appeals from the trade unions is confiscated.

7. The fascist government did not even allow meetings and demonstrations in celebration of May Day. In Sofia a meeting of workers which took place in a park was dispersed by means of weapons. At Samokov the relatives of the victims of the September revolt were arrested during a visit to the cemetery.

8. Hundreds of workers are arrested every day and interned. Michael Dachine, a member of the local workers' council at Semokov was murdered in the open streets. The secretaries of the various trade unions have already been arrested several times.

9. In the "Pernik" mining works, the government maintains 300 fascisti and a great number of troops and police. Not a day passes without miners being arrested and brutally beaten. The arrested workers are removed by night to a neighbouring town, when pistols are pointed at them and they are called upon to "confess" that they belong to a revolutionary organisation. The secretary of the Miners' Union, Milenow, as well as well-known functionaries of the miners movement, have several times been arrested and are now interned.

10. The government is discharging all civil servants who are members of the civil servants union and is replacing them by Russian counter-revolutionaries — Wrangelists. Up to the present over 5000 officials have been dismissed; discharges are still taking place. The government orders the capitalists to discharge all organised workers.

11. The government is endeavouring by means of terror and threats to establish fascist trade unions against the existing trade unions. Fortunately the workers have not allowed themselves to be intimidated and the government has only succeeded in setting up an insignificant railwaymen's union. As a result of these persecutions the trade unions are being destroyed and the offensive is in full swing. The Eight Hour Day has been done away with in 80% of the factories, wages have been reduced by 20 to 50%, laws for the protection of the workers are disregarded, and unemployment is assuming enormous dimensions. There are at present about 50,000 unemployed workers in Bulgaria, a relatively high number for our small country; high prices and lack of housing are increasing beyond endurance.

#### English workers, Comrades!

In spite of everything the Bulgarian workers are not giving way to despair, they are conducting a bold struggle for the restoration of the liberties of which they have been deprived, and for a decent human existence. The Bulgarian fascist government, which is wading in the blood of the Bulgarian working class, derives strength and encouragement from the support of the English Labour Government. How long will you, English workers, tolerate that your government forms the support of the most reactionary government in the world? We address to you an urgent appeal for prompt, brotherly and moral support.

The Trade Unions in Bulgaria.

Sofia, September 1924.

## THE WHITE TERROR

Support the Amnesty Campaign of the German Proletariat!

By Ehrenfried Wagner.

Every day the German bourgeoisie is confining fresh revolutionaries behind prison walls. According to the opinion of the bourgeoisie, the economic peace guaranteed by the Dawes Plan can only be achieved if the revolution is stifled. This was proclaimed with open cynicism by the Marx government when it offered the Communist Reichstag fraction to liberate the 7000 political prisoners, provided the Communists agreed to abstain from voting against the Dawes Plan, in order to insure the acceptance of this measure.

rising against the Soviet power, but there are three hindrances in the way of a revolt:

1. Up to the present M. Oragwelidse has not distributed any material support. 2. The mutual mistrust prevailing. 3. The lack of support on the part of the Vortchalinsk group.

We give below the family names of the people we have nominated to carry out acts of terror:

1. Abduladse Evtichi, 2. Gvelesjani Ivan, 3. Guja Alexander, 4. Melja Josehp and 5. Matshavarjani David.

All the above were at the disposal of the Georgian Committee in Constantinople and have been placed at the disposal of the co-workers in the Batum district.

We have received the instructions you sent us through the medium of Madame Kasbek and will endeavour to send the same to Georgia. You will receive special communication regarding the receipt of these instructions. We have received instructions No. 1286, 457, 997, and 1870, No. 457 dealing with the purchase of weapons. With regard to the latter we have heard from Georgia that a member of the Centre has entered into negotiations with the commander of the No. 3 Infantry division, who promised to deliver the weapons, provided he was given sufficient dollars to enable him to leave the country or 5000 Gold roubles. This we are not in a position to do.

While M. Chararadse was working out confidential instructions for illegal workers he entered into a dispute with M. Odichlidse and we are now afraid that Odichlidse could betray us. We therefore request you to write to them that this must not happen again as the Soviet authorities suspect M. Odichlidse as being an engraver and on account of his not returning home in good time. M. Chasaradse requests that the notorial documents be given back to him, that *loci*, he wishes to sell his house and go abroad.

Ruchadse writes from Constantinople that the Turkish police confiscated the orders he had when he was already on board the steamer. In addition to the papers there were 72 Lire which he had changed for our comrades.

I request you to write to the Nr. 3 Infantry division regarding the weapons. No. 7 group is sending information. The address is: Georgia Tiflis, Navtlugi, workers Co-operative.

Further information has already been sent from Georgia. We expect more every day. The Georgians living here ask for relief; the majority of them are poor and out of work.

The last meeting took place in Osorgeti, at which it was decided to organise a group and seize Osorgeti. The plan of revolt has already been worked out. **During the revolt the Renski bridge will be blown up in order to prevent the Soviet army from coming into action against us.**

We have four soviet functionaries belonging to our organisation and who are giving us support.

Signed: Kasbek.

Did Noe Jordania, the "president of the republic" raise a protest against these acts of terror which were planned? Did he repudiate these criminal methods of fighting against the Soviet power? Was the pacifist and social democrat Noe Jordania unaware that an attempt upon the life of comrade Trotzky was being prepared and organised during the latter's stay in Soukhoum? Did he forbid his criminal agents to organise and prepare attempts upon the life of one of the oldest and meritorious Georgian comrades, Makharadse, and upon Mdivani, who was then chairman of the People's Commissariat in Georgia? Was the foreign centre ignorant of the fact that a whole number of Georgian mensheviki, who had turned away from the party with loathing and disgust had been foully murdered by its agents? And has not the II. International rendered material and moral support to Noe Jordania and his party, who have carried on espionage and organised acts of terror?

#### The Pacilists who believe in armed Revolt.

The social democratic and bourgeois press made a great cry about "an elemental movement of the people", and denied that the Mensheviki had participated in the preparation and carrying out of the armed insurrection.

The letter of Jordania in which he gave instructions regarding the armed revolt has already been published\*).

\*) See Inprecorr Nr. 70 of 2nd October in the article by Bela Kun: "International Menshevism and the Georgian Revolt".

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### Newbold „Explains“.

By M. N. Roy.

In the columns of the Glasgow "Forward", Walton Newbold M. A. ex-M. P. explains his political sommersault. He has made a great discovery: "there will be no further revolution in Europe for many a long year". So there is nothing else to do but to walk over to the camp of Reformism: — thus argues the ex- and would-be M. P., who wisely declares the present activities of the Communist International to be "melodrama, not Marxism". It is delicious. Since when did Newbold consider himself the greatest living authority on Marxism?

Newbold obviously does not know that others preceded him in this discovery, the logical consequence of which is the landing in the camp of the bourgeoisie. On his happy journey in the wake of those illustrious predecessors of his, we wish him God-speed. If he "conquers Motherwell" (this time for Newbold and not for Communism as he bragged last time) in the coming election, it will be entertaining to watch him participate, very reverentially, in those "parliamentary tomfooleries" which he ridiculed in his early enthusiasm.

In his article, Newbold endeavours to prove that he still remains a revolutionary, but only succeeds in giving out his motive in posing as such. He is one of those who have no particular objection to riding on the rising tide of revolution, but have no stomach for uphill work. Granted that the first wave of revolution has subsided, not to swell before a decade or two, as Newbold prophesies, what should be the duty of the Communist? Not to desert, but to keep the flag flying. But Newbold gallantly concedes that glorious job to Soviet Russia, for which he would "work might and main", while sitting comfortably on the uncomfortable benches in Westminster, "till the Blood Red Banner of Social Revolution is raised anywhere in Europe or Asia" by some other "romanticist or melodramatist" (epithets he hurls at the Communists). Meanwhile, it has become unprofitable to be a revolutionist. Why not, then, scramble for the loaves and fishes that are the rewards of reformism? This is the gist of Newbold's real argument.

The débacle of Newbold is likely to give a handle to the anti-parliamentarian comrades. There is another instance of a good man corrupted by evil communications. Contact with bourgeois political institutions corrupted a Communist. Such a conclusion would not be quite warranted. As against one Newbold, there are hundreds of Communists who have attacked the parliamentary citadel of the bourgeoisie very successfully. We should be critical, not about the tried tactics of revolutionary parliamentarism, but of the Communism of our candidates. Newbold flopped, because his Marxism was hardly skin-deep; with him it was pure intellectual dilettantism.

In view of the fact that British Communists work in an atmosphere of corrupt proletarian outlook, and that this corruption of proletarian ideology strengthens the position of reformist illusionism, our Party must be armed with theoretical training, not of the pedantic nature that still persists within the Party, but based on the revolutionary practice of Leninism.

## APPEALS

### To All English Labour Organisations and to All English Workers!

Comrades, Workers of England!

The present fascist government of Bulgaria came to power on the 9th of June last year by means of a military coup d'état. In order to maintain power this government subjected the working masses to an unheard-of white terror and provoked the September events of 1923, as a result of which over 2000 workers and peasants were murdered in the most bestial manner, while over 8000 were flung into prison and a further 3000 driven into exile. During these events the trade unions had to undergo great sacrifices. The secretary of the Tobacco Workers Union,

The Communists refused this base proposal, and the bourgeoisie, who failed to corrupt and to discredit the revolutionary party of the proletariat, started a campaign of annihilation against the advance guard of the proletariat. In the months of June till August 1924, 1770 revolutionaries were sentenced in Germany to 243 years 8 months hard labour, 748 years 9 months imprisonment, 73 years 5 months fortress imprisonment and 46,290 Mk. fines.

In the Highest Court of the Republic, one communist trial follows on the heels of another. From the beginning of May 1924 until August, thirteen trials were held in Leipzig against members of the Communist Party. These 13 trials resulted in sentences amounting to 104 years 6 months hard labour, 47 years 9 months imprisonment, 5 years 5 months fortress imprisonment and 30,000 Marks in fines. In September alone, 8 fresh Communist trials were held, all of them involving a tremendous number of accused persons. In addition to this there has been a systematic increase of penalties. Though even the judges could not deny that the accused had courage and held honest convictions, nearly all were condemned to hard labour under a paragraph by which most of the accused will undergo ten or more years imprisonment. Under the protection of its American friends, German Democracy feels strong enough to throw aside the beautiful cloak of humanity.

In almost all the trials which have taken place recently, the spy system of the German police has played an important role. Starving and desperate proletarians, who in October of last year have begged in the villages or at the bakers' shops for bread and food, were afterwards denounced by police spies as robbers and plunderers. A vivid light has been thrown upon this bourgeois police corruption by the exposure of a police spy named Buellesfeld, in the Düsseldorf Bludau process. The activity of such a spy shows how the bourgeoisie has set out quite systematically to annihilate the revolutionary elements.

But even in the prison itself the revenge of the bourgeoisie still persecutes the proletarian prisoners. In the German dungeons there are enacted such scenes of ill-treatment of prisoners as often constitute perfect orgies of sadism. In addition to this the majority of the German prisons, regarded from the hygienic standpoint, are perfect pest-holes. The cells are overrun with vermin and the food is bad and scanty. Sick prisoners are not given the necessary hospital treatment. It often happens that prisoners perish miserably as a result. It is no wonder that under such treatment the prisoners enter on a hunger strike. There is no big prison in Germany in which the political prisoners have not recently entered on a hunger strike. During their transport, communist secretaries and editors are treated like wild beasts. One prisoner was led through the streets of Berlin in broad

day-light with a rope round his neck. That is the "German culture" which it was at one time intended the whole world should enjoy.

In order to carry on the campaign of annihilation of the revolutionary proletariat as effectively as possible, the bourgeoisie have let loose their police hounds against organisations such as the "Red Relief", which provide support for the prisoners and their dependents. In this connection the Wurttemberg government has been particularly active. If the press appeals on behalf of "Red Relief" it is prohibited, while functionaries of the "Red Relief" are arrested. The government announces quite open and brutally, that owing to the existence of a relief organisation the prisoners do not come to feel the full measure of their punishments. The proletariat shall helplessly perish like dogs.

In view of the thousands of revolutionaries who are pining in prison, in view of the tremendous need which their dependents have to suffer, there is no other course than to mobilise the masses in the streets in order to tear the proletarian prisoners from the clutches of the bourgeoisie. The campaign for the proletarian political prisoners will reach its highest point at the opening of the German Reichstag. The workshops are already being mobilised. It is here that the proletarian united front for gaining an amnesty for all proletarian victims of white justice is being set up. Workshop meetings are passing protest resolutions, delegations from workshops are being sent to the Ministries of Justice. The voice of the proletariat will be heard in the streets and in parliament.

This mass struggle of the German workers must, however, find a wider echo. The proletariat in every country must follow this struggle with the greatest attention and also help to support it. Before all it is the duty of the press in these times to publish ample material regarding the terror in Germany. Meetings and demonstrations must also take place, which will show the bourgeoisie that the international proletariat is one and indivisible body and that the happenings in any one country find a reflex in all other countries.

And if the amnesty campaign of the German proletariat constitutes the beginning of a storm of protest, so there must also be raised at the same time, on an international scale, a mass protest against the fury of the white terror in all countries of the bourgeoisie.

May the struggle which the German proletariat is conducting in these weeks for an amnesty for its political prisoners and for a strong membership of the "Red Relief", also find an echo in all countries and become a struggle of the international working masses against the white terror of the world.

## Please Note, New Address!

The new address of the Inprecorr. to which all communications should be sent is:

**Vienna IX., Postamt 66, Schliessfach 213.**