

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 45

28<sup>th</sup> May 1925

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

## C O N T E N T S

G. Chicherin: The Relations of the Soviet Union to England.

### Politics

Georg: Germany and the Guarantee Pact.

### The Balkans

The Language of the Gallows.

The Events in Bulgaria and Bulgarian Social Democracy.

### The Tcheka Trial

Willi Münzenberg: The Leipzig Tcheka Sentence. — A Threefold Judicial Murder.

### Economics

Eugen Varga: Economics and Economic Policy in the First Quarter of 1925. II.

### The Labour Movement

Georg Schwarz: 44 New Victims of Ruhr Capital.

### In the International

Albert Inkpin: The Coming Congress of the British Communist Party.

### For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement

Report of Comrade Tomsky on the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Conference at the Plenary Session of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions.

For an International Unity Conference, without Pre-Conditions.

### Our Martyrs

Dimitri Grantcharov.

Nikolai Petrini.

Peter Abadshiev.

Dimitri Daskalov.

Blagoy Kamburov.

## The Relations of the Soviet Union to England.

By G. Chicherin.

### Extract from the Report on the Foreign Political Situation at the 3rd. Congress of the Soviet Union.

We print below that portion of Comrade Chicherin's Foreign Political Report dealing with the relations of the Soviet Union to England. Ed.

#### The Combinations of the Great Powers.

Everywhere, no matter where we look, in the last resort we encounter the chief combinations of world politics, that is, the world politics of the great Powers which are stretching out their feelers in all directions, which are active in Poland, in our Western neighbouring States and in the whole of the Near and Far East. And here in these main combinations of world politics we can distinguish two categories, two important, one could say, antagonistic tendencies. The one category consists in the formation of a united front against us.

The combinations of the other kind consist in the efforts, arising out of the antagonism of the great Powers and which seek to draw us into one or the other combinations of the capitalist States. For example, in France in the press and in the statements of statesmen in the period of Herriot government — of course not of Herriot himself — the following combination was contemplated: France against England, that is, France and Russia

along with Poland and Japan against England, which latter on her part is allied with Germany. That was one of the recent combinations, while at the same time other combinations existed, for example, Germany along with us etc.

In the complicated political situation in which we have to conduct our policy of peace, our policy of creating peaceable relations upon the basis of the right of determination of the peoples, we stand between these two categories of international combinations: united front against us, or attempts by means of this or that combination to make use of us and draw us over to one or the other side.

One must say, however, that in recent times the first of these categories has prevailed. In the recent political situation, in connection with the strengthening of reaction in the most important countries of the world, the setting up of a united front against us is the main theme. If in the Geneva press, which is in close touch with the League of Nations, the League of Nations is represented as a possible basis of a united front against us, it is only the continuation of that policy of combinations which during the last six months has filled the press of all the ruling great Powers.

The chief role is still being played by England. England, however, is closely connected with America. In cases where it is a question of the immediate interests of the United States, the latter comes forward with decisive declarations and speaks in a tone of command, as the deciding factor.

The Dawes Plan, the results of which consist in the immediate domination of American capital over European conditions, is of so much interest to the American government that it threatens the European States with the withdrawal of its support in the event of the Dawes Plan being threatened by the disunity of the European States. As after the world war the world's gold supplies have accumulated in the vaults of the American Banks, that means, that as America is the present chief creditor and also the only possible chief creditor of the whole world in the future, it is quite clear that this threat of financial pressure can play a decisive role in international relations. If, however, American diplomacy, in some main questions which interest American capital, acts quite independently and in a decisive manner, in other cases of international daily life, where the minor questions of all countries are interwoven with one another and constitute the object of discussions, it is England and English diplomacy which plays the most active and influential role.

### England.

The English Foreign Minister has officially declared that he was not, is not and will not be the initiator and originator of any plans of a united front against us. Nevertheless we find many indications in the world press and in the English press, that English influence is playing a role in creating that atmosphere of general hostility against us in which we now have to work.

We have already mentioned that a deputation of conservatives approached the English government with the demand that relations be broken off with us. The Conservative press states that the English Foreign Minister declared that England could not alone venture on a breach with the Soviet Union. If these words are rightly reported, this would suggest that England as a member of a united front, would be capable of severing relations with us. This means that influential conservative circles, which belong to that Party which is in power, consider it important to support the idea of the united front against us.

Thus, whether this only represents a tendency within the Conservative Party, or whether we have to reckon with the possibility of government actions in this direction, we must at any rate reckon with the existence of an exceedingly strong tendency to the creation of a united front against us. And we must say, that it is one thing to make reassuring declarations regarding the general principle of a boycott, or the creation of a united front against us, while practical politics is another thing. We should like to express the wish that the real political actions of the English government were more in harmony with these declarations of the English Minister.

Meanwhile the official attitude of the English government towards us during the last few months has been vacillating. It has altered. At the commencement of the year, in that period when, in a whole number of questions, as Morocco, Tunis etc. England did not succeed in arriving at an understanding with the Continental States, the official position of the English government was as follows: the Soviet government may propose negotiations, we are prepared to negotiate; the Soviet government may make proposals, we will examine these proposals.

We declared at that time: we are ready at any moment and with the greatest pleasure to commence and conduct these negotiations, we only want to know in which respect the Treaty signed by MacDonald is unacceptable for the new English government. They said to us: "Submit a proposal": We, however, said: "There is the Treaty, show us wherein it is unacceptable and then we will know what proposals are possible." This however was not done.

### The Question of Propaganda.

The present standpoint of the English Foreign Minister is somewhat different. He says, that the establishment of friendly relations with the Soviet Union is impossible so long as it does not cease its propaganda. That is another question. That is the literal repetition of the words of Lord Curzon when we met in Lausanne.

When I asked him what possibilities he saw of improving our relations, he replied that no better relations were possible, so long as we did not cease our propaganda. I then asked him:

"What is propaganda? We have a government which has an official apparatus and employees at its disposal. The government and its whole apparatus pledges not to carry on any propaganda. The government, however, cannot accept responsibility for what any private citizen may say. If a private citizen infringes the laws or the Treaties, then he will be made responsible. We cannot however compel the Communist Party to cease to be a Communist Party. We cannot compel the members of the Communists to refrain from acting as communists."

And Curzon replied to me:

If it means that it is here a question, not of a 100%, but of a 50% propaganda being conducted, then the government of His Majesty cannot negotiate in this respect.

The same idea is to be seen in the declaration of Chamberlain: "Cease conducting propaganda!"

What is propaganda? We stand before the main question of our foreign political relations. Our government is prepared to accept, and accepts all the obligations bound up with international relations. If the English government proves that we are misusing our diplomatic connections, our diplomatic rights, our diplomatic apparatus, that this or that official person violates the international obligations, then we are prepared to agree to everything demanded of us in this respect.

If however we are told that all propaganda must cease in the Soviet Unions, this is tantamount to demanding that the Communist Party shall cease to be a Communist Party. Here it is a question of whether we shall continue to exist or not. It concerns the main question of our relations with the capitalist world by which we are surrounded.

If Chamberlain says to us: "All propaganda must cease, the Communist Party shall cease to be a Communist Party", then we must answer: "Faites le, citoyen chamberlain". "Do it, citizen Chamberlain!"

You have already attempted it, but you did not succeed. What do you really want? War? You do not want war. You cannot want war. A fresh intervention? You have already tried that. What then do you want? You must understand that between England and ourselves, between the capitalist States and our State, a *modus vivendi* must be created. But in order to create a *modus vivendi*, the English government must adopt its former standpoint, that is to say, regulate the relations from government to government. The English government must abandon its present standpoint which consists in demanding that the Communist Party shall cease to be a Communist Party. Everything that is possible with regard to the government's policy, with regard to agreements, obligations of the government as regards the official apparatus, our government is prepared to undertake and will undertake.

On this basis concrete demands can be discussed and definite agreements arrived at. We may mention that when, in 1921, we concluded a temporary Treaty with England, which today is the only valid Treaty between us and England, we proposed to England that it should not limit herself to this short and all too general agreement.

We proposed to examine all questions which are of interest to us, and in all these questions to create an acceptable *modus vivendi* between ourselves and England. This was rejected at the time. The government of Lloyd George did not desire such a conference. Even Macdonald did not undertake an exhaustive concrete examination of all disputed questions.

So long as this is not done, there will exist between us and England, and therefore in the whole of international politics, that element of uncertainty which the capitalist States find so painful today. And if Chamberlain says that the cause of this uncertainty is the existence of the Soviet Union, then Chamberlain is guilty for this, because he does not attempt to arrive at a compromise with us, which would be capable of removing, so far as is possible and so far as the present historical period permits, that element of uncertainty between us and England, and therefore the uncertainty of international relations in general.

The working masses of all countries must understand this. They understand and perceive that it is precisely our government that constitutes the element of peaceful settlement of those problems with which we are confronted, and that those actions which lead to further uncertainty in international relations do not proceed from us.

## POLITICS

### Germany and the Guarantee Pact.

By Georg (Berlin).

The German Foreign Minister, **Stresemann**, was right when he mentioned in his speech on foreign policy that the expression, "the question of security", had very little to do with the things which were discussed under this heading. As a matter of fact, it is not a question of the securing of peace or such like things, but on the contrary, of organising the next war, of preparing the groupings of powers.

**French imperialism** — represented today by a "left" government — understands by "security": securing its hegemony in Europe, the recognition and consolidation of its military alliances; the creation of a self-sufficing economic, and before all heavy industrial basis of its military power, and for this purpose to draw German economy into its sphere of power, further, to bind English imperialism by a military alliance in order to prevent its increasing armaments against France.

**English imperialism** understands by the same term of Security, something quite different. Weakening of the political influence of France, its separation from its European allies (Poland, Czechoslovakia etc.), its separation from Germany (expulsion from the Rhine and Ruhr district, separation from the German coke and German chemical industry), the drawing of Germany, as a future factor in World politics, in the wake of English imperialism in a military combination against the Soviet Union, playing off of Germany (military and economically) against France and France's allies, pressure upon France for the purpose of preventing its insane increase of armaments.

**American imperialism** understands by Security: the safeguarding of its money-lending business in Europe, securing of the European market for its goods and capital, setting the European powers one against the other, in order to enable America to carry on its business in the East undisturbed, and the formation of a united Bloc for the war against the Soviet Union.

If now each one of the great imperialist powers conceals such divergent interests under the mask of "security", what could bourgeois Germany hope to achieve with its well-known offer of a Guarantee Pact? Vanquished bourgeois Germany is not an independent factor and is endeavouring to cling to the skirts of one or other of the imperialist powers and thus to carry on an imperialist policy. This is what it calls "national realistic policy".

The German government of heavy industrialists and junkers, in making the offer to the Entente powers that the latter shall finally renounce the districts which are occupied in the West, to subject the frontiers drawn by the Versailles Treaty in the East and the South to a future arbitration court, and upon this basis to enter the League of Nations, is acting in the interests of English imperialism. For the discussion of this offer is calculated to arouse excitement among France's European allies, to arouse in them a mistrust of France and thereby make the first step towards the isolation of France in Europe (Czechoslovakia and Poland, and also other little States, only remain true to France so long as they are convinced that they can obtain support from France), to indicate to the allies of France that it would be more advantageous for them to link their fate, not with French imperialism, but to orientate to England and America, to clear France out of the Rhine and Ruhr district, in order to destroy the industrial foundation of French imperialism, and to attract Germany into the English grouping of powers against the Soviet Union and at the same time to compel France to enter this grouping under Anglo-American leadership.

It follows from this that England and America are straining every nerve to have this plan — which has been formally brought forward by Germany but in reality was worked out by them — publicly and thoroughly discussed in order to compel France openly to pronounce its attitude towards it. The most important means to this end are the pressure of America as the creditor of France, and the English offer of a partial military guarantee of the French frontiers.

French imperialism on the other hand, for the reasons mentioned above, has, of course, every cause to reject this plan,

that is to do everything in order not to commit itself. Thus French imperialism retreats to the platform of the so-called Geneva Protocol, which contrary to the Anglo-German offer of a guarantee, is intended to solve the "question of security" in the French sense, that is, by strengthening the French military alliances and the position of France in agreement with its continental allies. In the meantime, France wishes to gain time in order to see whether its position in Europe can yet be saved by bargaining with England in North Africa (Morocco war) and Asia (Syria, Mossul, Mesopotamia, Turkey). French imperialism, in its dilemma and very much against its will, is showing a more friendly countenance even to Soviet Russia in order to disturb the English group of powers directed against the Soviet Union.

The real purpose of the Anglo-German guarantee offer can be best seen from the secret document of the Foreign Minister Chamberlain, which was published in the American press. The main ideas of this memorandum are the following: the chief enemy of the capitalist world is the Soviet Union. Against the latter every group of powers must be directed. In this group Germany can play a very important role, thanks in the first place to its chemical industry (Rhineland!). A military alliance with France, with the inclusion of Germany, would promote the English war plans in the Baltic, but also weaken the disagreeable French rival by separating it from its European allies. For this purpose there is dangled before Germany the bait of an eventual revision of the division of Upper Silesia, of the Polish corridor and of the prohibition of the inclusion of Austria in the German Republic. By such means the bloc of the Little Entente and Poland would be undermined and brought under English influence.

If the French imperialist press expresses its fear of an approaching German-Austrian-Hungarian bloc, it really means the fear of an English bloc. If Germany maintains its offer accompanied by ambiguous expressions of friendship to the Soviet Union, this is the result of the all too justified fear (as the plaything of the imperialists, abandoned by the Soviet Union and completely isolated) of falling heavily to the ground between the various stools. In spite of this, counter-revolutionary Germany has no possibility of conducting any other policy, its only means of escape, which consists in a firm alliance with the Soviet Union, is closed to it by its counter-revolutionary nature.

Thus the "Security negotiations" are calculated to expose and to increase the insecurity of the capitalist powers, of its war preparations against the Soviet Union and against each other. The opposite pole of all these combinations, the Soviet Union, is the only power which is capable of manoeuvring in this chaos of intrigues with self-confidence and to its own advantage.

## THE BALKANS

### The Language of the Gallows.

For over a week Zankov has been announcing that he will employ the gallows. For over a week bourgeois Europe has been awaiting with curiosity to hear the crack of the broken necks of the communists who are compelled to swing from the gallows.

Not a single voice has been raised in the bourgeois press. Nobody has called out to the hangmen of Sofia: Stop! or, Enough!

The "Defenders of right and justice" seem to be employing their whole energies in cursing the red terror. The humanitarian bourgeoisie smiles with approval at the spectacle afforded in Sofia... The Bulgarian social democrats have likewise given their approval to the Zankov government. The corpses of Stambulisky and hundreds of peasant leaders had hardly grown cold, when the Bulgarian social democrats entered the government. And now, when this government is clinging desperately to power, and is reintroducing the medieval methods for suppressing the people's movement, the Bulgarian social democrats declare their approval of the executions.

The II. International, which during the trial of the counter-revolutionary social revolutionary terrorists and conspirators of Russia, attempted to mobilise the public opinion of the whole world and proclaimed on this occasion the inadmissibility of the armed struggle "between the various sections of the proletariat", finds not a single word of blame for the Bulgarian social demo-

crats. The II. International, which sent lawyers in order to defend the terrorists who had made attempts upon the life of Lenin, does not find it necessary to denounce the bloody reprisals of Sofia.

The telegraph announces: "Listen, listen! In Sofia they are going to hang the representatives of the working class and of the peasants whom they did not succeed in killing on their arrest."

"Listen!", we say to the proletarians of all countries, for the gallows of Sofia will speak their own language: "The acts of violence of Zankov teach you that in civil war there is no mercy. Proletarians of all countries, do not forget this! A day will come when the roles will be exchanged, when the representatives of the bourgeoisie will be in your hands! Remember then the lessons of Sofia! No Mercy! Those who do not understand how to hit the class enemy hard, will die at his hands. They or we!"

It is the language of the gallows which are set up in the Cathedral Square of Sofia. May we never forget this! This is the will of the reactionaries of Bulgaria and the world bourgeoisie. May the memory of these acts of violence be stamped in the heart of every proletarian child! May this picture harden us in the fight when we shall be the stronger!

Workers and peasants will be or are already hanging side by side. A roll of drums will draw their last words. We, however, will hear these last words and shall spread them throughout the whole world. Every peasant, every worker must hear them.

The martyrs of the Bulgarian Peasant Party cry to the peasants of the whole world: "Peasants, comrades, see! We, the Peasant Party of Bulgaria drove the bourgeoisie from power, but we did not venture to destroy it and feared to make an alliance with the workers. We did not understand how to create a point of support in the towns. We have not found among us any leaders for our troops. Among the peasants we have not found people who had been trained in the school of long fights against the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie understood how to throw the net of their conspiracies over us. They understood how to seize power again. Then they killed the best among us in thousands. They shot us and hanged us. May our example serve as a lesson to you. Remember, therefore, that the peasants can only liberate themselves from the capitalist yoke in brotherly alliance with the workers, and under their leadership!"

The communist on the way to his execution calls to his fellow-workers: "Comrades of all countries! We are perishing here because we have not understood how to unite with the peasant class. We did not support them in the fight against the bourgeoisie. We left it to their inexperienced hands to control power. We attempted to retrieve this error, but too late! And this is costing us thousands of victims. What is lost in one moment of history must often be won again in long years of pitiless struggles. Learn and strengthen yourself! Keep up your courage! Remember that on the day on which the working class and the peasants find themselves side by side confronting the bourgeoisie, side by side as the Bulgarian workers and peasants are now dying together, we will be victorious!"

The Bulgarian counter-revolution, and with it the international counter-revolution, are organising a demonstration in Sofia — the first of its kind — for the united front of the workers and peasants. They demonstrate that their victory means annihilation of the one as much as the other. We will do everything in order that this shall be understood. The ghastly spectacle of the world bourgeoisie and of the Bulgarian bourgeoisie will turn against those who have arranged it.

To the Bulgarian communists and peasants who are dying there, we send our last greetings! We know that they will go courageously to death. In their final hour they will neither find themselves alone nor forsaken. We are sure that their blood will be a fruitful seed. Over the walls of the bayonets they will see the millions of workers and peasants reaching out towards them, raising their hands in farewell and also in sign of an oath. We swear to revenge them! We swear that the working class will know how to scourge its executioners!

## The Events in Bulgaria and Bulgarian Social Democracy.

In a letter to the Press, **Malone**, one of the members of the English delegation, whose visit to Sofia coincided with the explosion in the cathedral, in describing the bestialities of the Sofia executioners, says:

"The most deplorable thing is the malignant attitude of the Social Democrats towards the Communists. Pastuchow, the chief editor of the social democrat newspaper "Epocha" and Sakassov, the former social democrat minister in Zankov's Cabinet, have published declarations stating that they wholeheartedly support the Zankov regime. The social democrats inveigh against Russia and suspect "Moscow" of being responsible for everything."

As a matter of fact, it is difficult to imagine anything meaner and more revolting than the part played by the Bulgarian social democracy, especially during the recent sanguinary events in Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian social democrats have already divested themselves of the last rag of a socialist sense of shame and have even surpassed persons like Noske and Horthy's social democratic lackeys. The social democratic party in Bulgaria long ago entered the camp of the bourgeoisie. As early as after the split of the old social democratic party into the "narrow-minded" and the "broad-minded" socialists in 1903, the latter took their stand on the opposite side of the barricade in the fight between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, although they were still eagerly coquetting with socialism. In this whole time, and especially during the war, they actively supported the bourgeois parties in their struggle against the masses of workers and twice participated directly in bourgeois governments.

In 1919, when the position of the Bulgarian bourgeoisie was terribly shaken, and the wave of revolution threatened to put an end to its rule, the social democrats were given three places in the Government, and their leader Pastuchow was even "entrusted" with the Ministry of Police, so that he could settle accounts with the rapidly increasing Communist Party, and suppress the discontent of the masses of workers and peasants which was spreading throughout the country. And the first responsible person to illtreat the workers and peasants was none other than the social democrat minister Pastuchow.

From this time onwards, the Bulgarian Menschewiki openly threw in their lot with the lot of the bourgeoisie. Their embitterment against the Communist Party which had long ago shattered them ideologically and which uninterruptedly unmasked the treacherous part played by social democracy, reached its extreme limits and even infected the masses of workers and peasants who marched under the banner of the Communist Party, as well as the peasants who were organised in the ranks of the Peasants' League.

The leaders of the social democratic party took part in the military and bourgeois conspiracy against Stambuliski's peasant Government. They supplied a minister for the Zankov Cabinet which came into being as the result of the overthrow of the government on June 9th 1923. At the time when their Minister Sakassov was a member of Zankov's Cabinet, the wellknown provocation of September 1923 against the Communists and the working masses of the country was undertaken. With their participation and their active support, the slaughter of the arrested communists and partisans of the Peasants' League was organised in September 1923, when more than 5000 of the workers, peasants, teachers, lawyers and other members of the active intelligenzia, who had been arrested by the government, were basely murdered. The social democrats not only consented to this, but in the maddest way egged on the Government to outlaw the Communist Party, the Red trade unions and the workers' cooperative association "Oswoboshdenije". They were the first to demand the dissolution of the legal Labour party which was then organised.

When however, under pressure from the 2nd International, which was alarmed by the exaggerated zeal of Pastuchow, the social democratic party withdrew its Minister from the Zankov Cabinet, it did not discontinue its active support of the terrorist regime. The most provocative, dastardly and fantastic insinuations, the most insolent calumnies against the communists and

against the Soviet Union were found above all in the Press of the social democratic party.

Shortly before the explosion in the Sofia cathedral, the social democratic parliamentary fraction organised, in connection with the discussion on the budget of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, a wild demonstration against the Soviet Union. Kalfow, the Minister for Foreign Affairs provided a credit for the Bulgarian Mission in Moscow and justified it on the grounds that Bulgaria, too, might at any moment be faced by the necessity of recognising the Soviet Union. The social democratic party which had never raised a single word of protest against the terror raging in their own country and against the annihilation of the best part of the working masses in Bulgaria, was roused to indignation by this paragraph in the budget and strongly protested against the Zankov Government which was preparing for Bulgaria to enter into diplomatic relations with the "Moscow malefactors". The social democratic Parliamentary fraction proposed a formal motion for the removal of the said paragraph from the Budget, but this motion was rejected by a majority of the Government itself.

After the crime in the Sofia cathedral, the military budget was discussed in Parliament of April 23rd. The social democratic party was of course as usual "at its post". In its name, the social democrat deputy Tschernookow, declared:

"At the moment when the Bulgarian army is making superhuman efforts to maintain order (?) within the country, the unpleasant task has fallen to my lot of explaining the vote of our parliamentary fraction on the military budget... The civil war which is being waged at present is no merely internal affair. The united front of the illegal conspirators appears to be a tool of foreign powers. In its striving after conquest, Moscow imperialism has found a good cooperator in the supporters of a united front (i. e. the communists and the members of the Peasants' League. — Ed.) and therefore the Bulgarian army is carrying on a war which is to all intents and purposes patriotic, against the external enemies and their internal agents who are working in harmony towards a common end." "Our place can be nowhere but in the ranks of the defenders of the nation" (!?) (From the Central Organ of the social democratic party of Bulgaria "Narod" of April 24th 1925.)

At the same time the social democratic leader Pastuchow wrote in the newspaper "Epocha" of April 28th:

"With the cold-bloodedness of the most blood-thirsty executioner, Moscow is using the inflammatory material in Bulgaria to set the Balkans and the whole world in flames, knowing beforehand that the first victim of this conflagration will be Bulgaria itself. Now this plan of Moscow's is unmasked before the whole world and its intrigues in Bulgaria will become the subject of international policy."

The editor of the "Epocha" on his part, hastened to say in the same number:

"Recent events here have created in Europe great indignation against Bolshevism, and mitigated the old feelings of hatred against Bulgaria. This new course is a real blessing to our country... It is our duty to give objective (!) reports on everything that happens. The Bulgarian Government will do its duty; and the individual parties must do the same. The Central Committee of the social democratic party has decided to send communications regarding the recent events in Bulgaria to the bureau of the 2nd International, and to ask for help in the fight against the bolshevist peril in the Balkans. The communications\*) will be sent to all the prominent socialists of the world."

At the same time social democrats are appointed in all Bulgarian foreign missions to give information to the foreign Press, to defend the sanguinary Zankov regime and to "refute" news about the horrible bestialities practised on Bulgarian workers and peasants, which may penetrate into foreign countries. One of these social democratic agents of the executioners at Sofia is the Dr. Tschitschowsky who is carrying on a "controversy" with Malone in the English Press. The real, treacherous nature of the 2nd International, this agency of bourgeois reaction in Europe, is now reflected in the sanguinary deeds of its Bulgarian section. The treachery and ignominy of the social democratic party of Bulgaria crown the counter-revolutionary policy of the 2nd International.

## THE "TCHEKA" TRIAL

### The Leipzig Tcheka Sentence — A Three-fold Judicial Murder.

By Willi Münzenberg (Berlin).

In none of the innumerable political lawsuits against German workers and Labour leaders, which have been staged since the forties of last century, was the law so brutally flouted, was the bias revealed so nakedly, with such cynical directness or with such a provocative challenge, as in the informer-case against the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany which has just come to an end at the Leipzig High Court of Justice.

This astounding openness combined with the autocratic arbitrariness with which the presiding judge conducted the proceedings — he even went so far as to have one of the defendants forcibly removed by the police — has roused justified interest and indignant protest far beyond the circles of the working class and beyond the borders of Germany.

It is significant in more than one respect of the general opinion as to the method of conducting the case, that even the "Deutsche Tageszeitung" finds

"the proceedings intolerable from more than one point of view" and speaks of the High Court of Justice as a court

"which can lay no claim to real objectivity which can stand its ground before the tribunal of history".

This is the astonishing thing about all bourgeois and social democratic criticisms: the verdict is considered unjust, entirely unfounded, one of the worst miscarriages of justice for decades, but the whole affair is treated as though it were a trifle, the judgment in a commercial or industrial dispute, and not a case of 80 years hard labour and three sentences of death, a matter concerning three human lives!

The verdict as well as the proceedings which led up to the verdict, mock even at the bourgeois sense of justice. The spirit of the accused was "curbed" during their imprisonment on remand by particularly hard treatment, and confessions were extorted from them under threats of death. Even the tribunal before which the tragedy was enacted was, as a Court, incompetent.

The High Court of Justice was originally created for the purpose of protecting the Republic against the Right monarchist danger. But it has done nothing whatever in this respect. Nothing has ever been heard of the High Court of Justice proceeding against the Hitler group and the Right ex-officers' Leagues with their almost similar programme. The High Court of Justice was created in order to liquidate the Right peril and the Right ex-officers' Leagues, but the "Stahlhelm", "Jungdo" and "Wehrwolf" and the monarchist peril have never been so strong as to-day, years after the republican High Court of Justice began its beneficent activities.

No, the High Court of Justice is no Court for the protection of the Republic. Under its protection, the Monarchists in Germany have so far consolidated their position that to-day they openly propagate an early restoration of the monarchy. From the day of its inauguration, the High Court of Justice has felt itself to be a High Court of Justice against the revolutionary workers, as a High Court of Justice against the Left. The High Court of Justice regarded itself as the heir to the Bismarck era, and considered its most important duty to be that of carrying on wholesale trials against the Communist Party, as Bismarck's Courts did against the party which at that time still called itself the Radical Socialist party. The lawsuit against Neumann, Poege and their associates was to be the crown of its work, it was to create the right atmosphere for a juridical extermination of the Communist Party of Germany.

#### The Leipzig Death Verdict Must be Rescinded.

The foundation of the verdict and the way the evidence was taken are untenable.

What were the object and significance of the long proceedings? The intention was to prove that the Communist Party maintains or has maintained special groups under the name of "Tcheka

\*) Already published verbatim in our last number (44, 1925).

groups" to whom is allotted the task of murdering leading German politicians of the Right and industrialists as well as traitors form their own ranks. An assertion the absurdity of which is obvious to anyone who has even a superficial knowledge of the fundamental attitude of the Communist International and its Parties towards the question of individual acts of terror, and knows how sharp a line is drawn precisely in this question between the Russian Bolshevik Party and the Social Revolutionary party of Russia, and how clearly and unmistakably all the Congress resolutions of the Communist International and the conference resolutions of the Party condemn with all the emphasis and precision that could be desired, any use of individual acts of terror and sabotage. It is significant that the public prosecutor could not, from a fairly compendious communist literature, quote a single paragraph, a single passage, a single line which could be interpreted as showing approval of individual acts of terror.

In order to be able to make such an assertion, the public prosecutor had to resort to circulars and letters of uncontrolled, obscure origin, which were said to have been "found" on the occasion of domiciliary visits. It could not be proved in a single instance that these circulars had actually been distributed by responsible bodies of the Communist Party. Just as in the well-known case of Skoblewski, the Russian refugee, who is said to be a Soviet commissary, although the public prosecutor has not a single shred of evidence to corroborate this statement, the Court accepted as "a proven fact" the assertion made by the public prosecutor in other cases as well. In this way, of course, it is easy to prove anything, even that not only Hindenburg, but also Ludendorff is a true republican.

The public prosecutor, realising no doubt this weakness in his evidence, tries to maintain that the Communists, though theoretically disapproving of individual acts of terror, actually resort to it all the more in practice. As evidence for this statement, the public prosecutor produces several revolvers, an automobile, a bottle of cholera bacilli etc., finally the corpse of Rausch, the police agent who was shot and — the confession of the leader of the alleged "Communist Tcheka", Felix Neumann.

Who is Felix Neumann? Who besides Neumann, made depositions of this or of a similar nature? One man does not make a group any more than one tree a wood. Where are the other members of the group? What have they stated?

In this connection it is important to point out that all the other so-called members of the alleged Tcheka group; indeed all except Neumann, made statements which differed considerably from those of Neumann, and that most of them first heard of a Tcheka group in the Court. It is just the important allegations of Neumann which are contested by others, and that with very convincing arguments. Neumann tried to increase the credibility of his representations by alleging that the reason for his detailed self-accusation, which so seriously incriminates himself and his comrades, was, that the Communist party had abandoned him after his arrest and that he now intended to pay back the party's treachery to himself by treachery to the party. This is not the place to investigate how far the supposition that Neumann had been employed by the police in former years is correct. Various incidents and facts strongly suggest it. We will even accept for the moment the point of view of the prosecution and suppose that Neumann only deserted to the camp of the police after his arrest.

One would think that an impartial Court would have been induced — merely by Neumann's hatred of the Communist party, the hatred of a man who has not only been in institutions several times for the observation of his mental condition, but whose grandfather, great uncle and other members of the family died in asylums — to examine and test the truth of his imaginative statements with particular care. But the Court did exactly the opposite. Everything that Neumann says is accepted as the truth; everything the rest say, even though the statements of several agree and contradict those of Neumann, is regarded as lies and inventions.

#### The Leipzig death-sentence must be rescinded.

It is untenable. Apart from Neumann, Diener and König have made incriminating statements — though only in regard to secondary questions. Both are convicted informers and police agents, well known to the law. This brings us to another very obscure chapter of the German police and judicial system.

During the last few years the informer service in Germany has increased to an alarming extent and has been developed into an actual system. The police has adopted the habit of sending agents and informers into the Communist party, commissioned to use sanguinary phrases and make inflammatory speeches and, incredible as it may sound, to try to deposit arms etc. with members of the Communist party and to seduce individual communist members to commit acts of violence and sabotage. Grave, perhaps the gravest possible accusations which could be made against the police of a "well-ordered constitutional State", which Germany still claims to be!

The informer König who foisted guns on the workers only to discover them the next day as a Communist store of arms, is crown witness in the Leipzig case, his declarations have helped in the pronouncement of the verdict. Why should an informer have only tried to deposit rifles? May he not equally well have tried to deposit hand grenades, forged circulars or cholera bacilli, or anything else?

Diener, the second crown-witness at Leipzig, also exposed as an informer, was allowed to walk about freely from morning till evening and drove about with officers of the criminal department, pointing out the Communists to them, in spite of the fact that he had been accused of and arrested for murder.

The cases quoted prove that the German police make extensive use of informers in their struggle against the Communist Party, and that these informers try to act the part of agents provocateurs within the CP. of Germany, and that several of the most able of this guard of honour are the chief wirepullers in the Leipzig case, while the Court, knowing the despicable rôle of these individuals, nevertheless uses and values them as witnesses for the prosecution.

If there were no other reasons, this alone would be enough to bring about an immediate revision of the case and to cause proceedings to be taken against all those authorities who use such criminal measures as the organised employment of provocative agents in the fight against Labour parties.

The verdict, the whole case, regarded merely as a case, is incomprehensible, absurd and, as hundreds of important voices proclaim, juridically untenable. But in this lawsuit it was from the beginning not a question of right or wrong, of guilt or innocence, but from the beginning it was a question of the Communist party, the Communist International. The blow was aimed at it, it was to be morally judged, to be juridically strangled. The informer case was intended to supply material for the proceedings against the Central Committee.

It was hoped that the informer case would create the atmosphere necessary for the dissolution of the Communist party. Those who hoped this, were bitterly disillusioned. Thanks to the courageous behaviour of the greater part of the accused, the infamous swamp of espionage revealed in Leipzig, brought about a moral Waterloo, not for the CP. of Germany but for the present day State, its police, its administration of justice and the High Court of Justice. With few exceptions, the whole Press unanimously condemns this plague spot.

The Communist party continues to exist in spite of this cunningly staged lawsuit which was to have an intimidating effect, in spite of all sentences of death and of penal servitude, and measures of terror, and, in spite of the monstrous flood of calumny which the bourgeois and social democratic papers are pouring over the CP. of Germany, the latter is constantly gaining ground in the workshops, in the trade unions, among the broad masses of workers, employees, small peasants and all workers. No power on earth can now arrest its advance. A party, the members of which are, on the evidence of informers, condemned to death or to spend 15 years in penal servitude, and who, while awaiting their death sentence, can say with a smile, as did the heroic Margies: "Condemn me, kill me, it will be water for the mill of my party", such a party is invincible, to such a party belong, come what come may, the future and victory.

One of the next tasks of the Communist party of Germany will be to kindle a movement which will be strong enough to enforce the rescission of the Leipzig verdict and to restore these victims as well as all other victims of White Justice, all political prisoners in Germany, to liberty.

The death sentence of Leipzig must be rescinded!

# ECONOMICS

## Economics and Economic Policy in the First Quarter of 1925.

By Eugen Varga.

### II.

#### General Section.

##### General Survey of the World's Economics.

A general survey of the world's economics in the first quarter of 1925 shows us the following essential features:

The general trend towards economic prosperity observable in the last quarter of 1924 has not been maintained. Divergent economic conditions are again to be seen in the various countries.

In the United States production has been at a high level, about that of a year ago, at the time of the boom. But the reports published by the American trade journals show that at the present time production greatly exceeds consumption. Towards the end of March a commencement was made with the limitation of production, especially in the iron and steel industry. At the same time the prices for iron and steel were considerably reduced.

In England stagnation prevails. No improvement is observable in the most important industries. Unemployment has diminished slightly. This is however to be ascribed to the season. The decisive fact is that the number of unemployed is greater by almost 150,000 than at the corresponding period last year.

In France economic conditions continue to be fairly good. But distinct symptoms of worsening may here too be observed. It is the first time for years that there has been any unemployment in France whatever, however slight. A few weeks ago the first unemployed demonstration was held in Northern France. The bourgeois economists are filled with fears for the future.

In Germany conditions differ in the various branches of production. We see an acute crisis in the coal industry, moderate activity in the iron and steel industry, favourable conditions in the majority of the industries working up metal, serious stagnation in the textile industry.

Although the degree of economic prosperity thus differs in the most important capitalist countries, a common crisis is observable in some of the leading branches of production: The whole of the capitalist world is labouring under a coal production crisis. Despite the strict limitations put on production, this exceeds consumption both in the United States and in England, Germany, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and of late in France as well. Huge stocks of coal are accumulating at the pit-heads. This crisis is to be partly ascribed to the abnormally warm winter, which considerably reduced the demand for household coal. But this is only a partial cause. The actual fact is that the forced increase of coal production in Germany and France, the attempt made everywhere to bring the coal output up to the pre-war level, has brought about a general over-production.

We observe similar symptoms in the considerable fall in the prices of metal; this applies especially to iron, then chiefly to copper, zinc, lead, etc. The crisis in the world's shipping is unchanged, and has even become acuter during the period covered by this report.

From the standpoint of economic policy, the fact of the continued stream of American and English capital to Central Europe is of great significance. It means a tendency towards the equalisation of the difference between "rich" and "poor" countries. A part of this capital has been received, chiefly by Germany, in the form of gold, and the Reichsbank has been able to increase its gold reserves by a not inconsiderable amount during the last few months. The greater part of this gold has come from the United States, where efforts are being made to dispose of the superfluity of gold in the form of credits. Up to now these efforts have not been attended with any great success. We give the data below.

The greater part of the credits granted have, however, not taken the form of gold, but of goods, and large quantities of industrial raw materials and grain have been sent to the continent of Europe, mainly to Germany. This procedure has led to a temporary improvement in economic conditions, both in the states granting and the states receiving the credits. In the

states granting credits it has led to increased exports and thus to increased economic prosperity. For Germany, hampered by shortage of working capital, the influx of goods not requiring immediate payment has meant the possibility of increasing production. Both of these effects are bound by their very nature to be merely temporary, as we have already pointed out above.

The increase of production brought about by the large scale granting of credits, both in the states granting and the states receiving credits, has had the effect of rendering the question of finding markets more acute than ever. Competition in the world's market is becoming continually keener. The economic policy pursued by the bourgeoisie of the industrial countries appears to be tackling the problem in an inconsistent manner. On the one hand we observe in all industrial countries an effort to secure the home markets exclusively for home industries. This gives rise to the increased duties and new customs tariffs in France and Germany, to the creation of institutions in England rendering it possible to introduce protective duties in branches of industry which are particularly threatened, to the efforts being made in the United States, with the aid of extended protective tariffs, to render American economics even more self-sufficing. The tendency in this direction is apparently inconsistent with the tendency towards the formation of international cartels. This latter tendency has already led to a definite result in the potash industry, in which an understanding has been arrived at between the French and German industrialists possessing an actual world monopoly in potash. The agreement among the German, Dutch, and North American incandescent lamp manufacturers again represents almost a world monopoly. In the iron industry negotiations are still being carried on, and in various other branches of industry. The formation of international cartels is, however, only apparently contradictory to the other tendency towards securing home markets for home industries. For these international cartels are based mainly on securing the home markets, and the agreements made are concerned with the regulation of the conditions of sale in foreign territory.

There is every indication that economic conditions will change considerably for the worse within the next few months, and that as a consequence the antagonisms between the imperialist powers, the struggle for markets, will assume even more sharper forms than now. This will be likely to lead to great stagnation in international credit transactions. Under these circumstances it is very doubtful whether the hope cherished by the international bourgeoisie, that this year will already witness a restoration of free gold traffic in the most important capitalist countries, and with this a real stabilisation of the currencies concerned, will be fulfilled. The events in France are bound to lead to a renewed depreciation of the French franc, although this has been prevented up to the present by means of extensive intervention purchases.

#### Rates of Exchange.

During the period covered by this report currency values show a degree of stability equal to that in the last quarter of 1924. The fluctuations to which most of the European currencies have been subject, calculated in monthly averages, are no greater to-day than the customary pre-war fluctuations. We give the table of rates of exchange:

#### Rates of exchange in New York (monthly average).

Cents per one foreign unit (for £ sterling, dollar).

	July 1924	Dec. 1924	Jan. 1925	Feb. 1925	11. April 1925
Germany . . . . .	23.80	23.81	23.81	23.81	23.81
Poland . . . . .	19.29	19.25	19.25	19.25	19.25
Sweden . . . . .	26.58	26.93	26.93	26.93	26.94
Switzerland . . . . .	18.19	19.38	19.33	19.25	19.31
Holland . . . . .	37.92	40.36	40.36	40.14	39.89
Finland . . . . .	2.51	2.52	2.52	2.52	2.52
England . . . . .	4.25	4.70	4.78	4.77	4.78
Spain . . . . .	13.31	13.95	14.17	14.22	14.23
Denmark . . . . .	16.04	17.62	17.80	17.79	18.40
Norway . . . . .	13.42	15.05	15.26	15.24	16.01
France . . . . .	5.12	5.40	5.39	5.28	5.18
Belgium . . . . .	4.56	4.94	5.06	5.07	5.05
Italy . . . . .	4.30	4.30	4.16	4.11	4.10
Czechoslovakia . . . . .	2.95	3.02	3.00	2.96	2.96
Jugoslavia . . . . .	1.19	1.50	1.63	1.62	1.62

Roumania . . . . .	0.43	0.51	0.52	0.51	0.47
Greece . . . . .	—	1.82	1.76	1.61	1.73
Bulgaria . . . . .	—	—	0.74	0.74	—
Austria . . . . .	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014	0.0014
Hungary . . . . .	0.0012	0.0013	0.0014	0.0014	—

It will be seen from this table that of the European currencies, only the French, Italian, and Roumanian have shown a tendency to fall during the period of this report, whilst the newly stabilised currencies: German, Polish, and Austrian, and those of the neutral states, show no fluctuation whatever, calculated by the monthly average. It is important to notice that the hope of bringing the English currency up to gold par has not yet been fulfilled. The slight disparity in the rate of exchange of the pound to the dollar has not disappeared during the period of this report. We shall deal further on with the problem of the restoration of free gold traffic on an international scale.

#### Movement of Prices.

The index figures of wholesale trade, in so far as these are already at our disposal, show a stability corresponding to the stability of the currencies, but with a certain downward tendency, mainly caused by the great fall in the price of corn, and by the reductions in the price of coal, iron and other metals.

#### Wholesale Trade Index (1913/14 = 100) Monthly averages.

	U. S. A. Bureau of Labour	England Economic	Germany Official returns	France	Italy	Poland	Sweden	Switzerland	Soviet Union Gosplan	Japan	British India
1924 February . . . . .	152	182	116	544	573	—	162	180	187	208	178
1924 November . . . . .	153	180	128	504	621	117	167	170	168	214	176
1924 December . . . . .	157	180	131	508	640	118	168	171	172	214	176
1925 January . . . . .	160	177	138	514	657	120	169	171	178	214	171
1925 February . . . . .	161	174	137	515	660	125	169	170	183	210	172
1925 March . . . . .	—	171	134	513	659	—	—	—	190	—	—

The gold level of international wholesale trade prices, as calculated by the American Federal Reserve Board, shows an upward tendency as compared with the paper money prices during the last few months. Here the relative changes in English and American prices are especially remarkable. Whilst the English gold prices were formerly lower as a rule than those of the United States, the last few months have brought a rise in English prices as compared with American. Prices in Germany, and still more in France, remain far below the American and English prices. We must however emphasise, as we have frequently done on former occasions, that these index figures, though compiled on the same basis, cannot be very well compared with one another, since the basis of price calculation adapted to the conditions obtaining in the United States gives an entirely distorted picture when applied to the totally different structure of French or German economics.

#### Gold level of international wholesale trade prices (1913 = 100)

	U. S. A.	England	France	Germany	Japan
1922 Average . . . . .	158	150	136	89	175
1923 Average . . . . .	164	159	124	91	183
1924 Average . . . . .	159	160	121	123	166
1924 November . . . . .	160	167	123	129	162
1924 December . . . . .	165	171	126	131	161
1925 January . . . . .	168	175	127	138	—
1925 February . . . . .	—	—	—	137	—

#### Unemployment.

During the period of this report unemployment has shown a tendency to decrease in most countries. This in itself is only natural, as the seasonal unemployment prevailing during the winter months always tends to lessen in the spring. The fact of decreased unemployment does not therefore offer any sufficient evidence of a general improvement in economic conditions. In order to find a suitable basis for comparison, we must compare

the figures with the figures for the corresponding period of the previous year, as has been done in the introductory part of this report with reference to the years since the war.

#### Percentage of Unemployed among Workers organised in Trade Unions.

	England	England of all insured	Belgium	Holland	Denmark	Sweden	Norway	Germany	Germany (part timers)	United States (Degree of occupat. = 110)
1923 December . . . . .	9.7	10.7	3.6	15.9	16.0	14.1	14.0	28.2	42.0	99
1924 November . . . . .	8.6	11.0	3.8	11.0	8.6	10.5	7.8	7.3	7.5	91
1924 December . . . . .	9.2	10.9	5.1	12.9	13.2	15.5	8.8	8.1	6.5	93
1925 January . . . . .	9.0	11.5	6.1	15.1	16.3	14.6	10.0	8.1	5.5	93
1925 February . . . . .	9.4	11.6	—	—	16.6	—	—	7.3	5.3	95
1925 March . . . . .	9.0	11.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

If we compare the absolute figures referring to unemployment, we find a considerable increase of unemployment in England and in Austria as compared with last year; a considerable decrease of the number of unemployed in Germany; and about the same number in most of the other countries. Taken on the whole, unemployment is at about the same level as it was a year ago.

#### The International Partial Crises.

##### a) The International Crisis in the Coal Industry.

In the year 1924 the world's coal output was some millions of tons less than in 1923. But here great differences are to be observed in different parts of the world. America's production sank from 581 million tons to 506; the production of the whole of Europe rose from 494 to 554<sup>1)</sup>. This increase in the European output took place in the second half of the year, and led to an alarming accumulation of coal by the end of the year. The period covered by this report witnessed a complete world over-production crisis: reduction of prices, accumulation of coal, short time, limitation of production. We append a table of comparative outputs in the most important countries, showing the outputs of the corresponding months of last year:

#### United States:

##### Monthly output in million tons

	1924	1925
January . . . . .	54.9	53.8
February . . . . .	46.4	46.2
March (2 weeks) . . . . .	23.6	21.4

In the United States the present output is far behind that of last year; the decrease already amounts to more than 10%.

#### England:

##### Average weekly output in mill. tons

	1924	1925
January . . . . .	5.20	5.08
February . . . . .	5.67	5.35
March . . . . .	5.75	5.24

By March the reduction of output amounted to half a million tons weekly, or about 10 per cent as compared with the previous year.

#### France:

##### Monthly output in mill. tons

	1924	1925
January . . . . .	3.8	4.2
February . . . . .	3.6	3.8
March . . . . .	3.8	—

#### Germany:

##### Monthly output in mill. tons

	1924	1925
January . . . . .	8.8	11.0
February . . . . .	9.7	10.4
March . . . . .	10.8	11.4

<sup>1)</sup> Calculated for 1913.

<sup>1)</sup> „Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung“, 13. March 1925.

In Germany and France the output is still somewhat above that of last year, but shows a decided downward tendency. The difficulty in finding markets has led to an acute crisis in all coal producing countries.

The present difficult position of the English coal mining enterprises is generally known. The "Times" of 16. March 1925 states that the depression in the coal industry, caused chiefly by the great reduction of exports, has brought about a serious degree of unemployment among the miners, that at the end of January of this year more than 100,000 workers were in receipt of unemployment benefit while the situation in Durham is causing serious anxiety, and that it is many years since there has been such an alarming situation. The miners' trade union in Durham states that the number of pits laid idle has increased to 43, and 23,000 men and boys have been discharged... There are about 40,000 miners in Northumberland, and when the notices which have been served come into force, there will be 26 idle pits and 9500 unemployed.

In the Belgian coal industry a crisis has existed for months. The import of foreign coal is stated to be the chief cause of the crisis:

"At the general meeting of the Charbonnages de Res-saix, the chairman made a few statements showing the difficult position of the Belgian coal mines with relation to their competitors. Whilst under normal conditions the imports amounted to five million tons, balanced by exports to the like amount, imports have increased to 9,247,609 tons since the tariff treaty was made with Luxemburg, whilst exports have fallen to 2,111,420 tons. The equilibrium has been destroyed. Despite the reductions in price which have been made, we have not succeeded in holding the Belgian market against our competitors." ("Börsen-Courier", 9. April 1925.)

It need not be said that the Belgian capitalists are attempting to make use of the crisis in order to reduce wages.

Equally alarming reports are being circulated in the German press with regard to the German coal mining enterprises. But here a considerable rôle is played by the internal disputes between the purely coal mining undertakings, the mines connected with iron works, and the coal dealers. At the present moment the selling organisation is actually dissolved in consequence of the crisis, and it would appear as if a process of concentration is going forward, to be accomplished at the expense of closing down the inferior pits of southern Germany:

"The Ruhr mines are suffering from market crisis such as no one can remember having experienced before. For months past the output has been limited to 55% for coal and 40% for coke, by the common agreement of the colliery owners in the coal syndicate, the present Ruhrkohle A. G. Despite this, coal has accumulated at the pit heads and in the syndicate's coal yards during the last few months, to an extent giving rise to the gravest anxiety. These accumulations amount at the present time to about eight and a quarter million tons, so that approximately a full month's output lies unsold. The coal syndicate must be held chiefly responsible for the acuteness of the situation, for it has not proved equal to its task." ("Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung", 10. March 1925.)

According to the statement of the "Bergwerks-Zeitung", 2. April 1925, the coal reserves accumulated in the Ruhr area have increased as follows:

	1000 tons
End of 1913 . . . . .	1589
End of 1922 . . . . .	844
End of 1923 . . . . .	2400
End of 1924 . . . . .	5100
End of February 1925 . . . . .	5876

To this we must add the reserve stocks of the syndicate itself; by the end of March the total reserves amounted to over eight million tons. It may be that some of these statements are exaggerated, but the existence of a severe crisis cannot be doubted. Various districts — Aix-la-Chapelle for instance — have succeeded in forcing the output up to prewar level, but this has only led to increased difficulties in selling.

In Czechoslovakia conditions are not better than in Germany. The lack of markets is catastrophic. The heaps of accumulated coal are rising higher and higher, despite extensive limitations in output and the many pits laid idle. The competition of cheaper Upper Silesian coal is taken to be the main cause of this. But in

Poland, and especially in Upper Silesia, matters are no better.

The international coal crisis is being felt least in France. At least at present. But the restoration of the devastated coal districts is almost completed, and prewar output nearly regained. There will be no need to wait long for the crisis.

Our reason for thus dealing so exhaustively with the international coal crisis is our conviction that it is to be regarded as the forerunner of a general worsening of the international economic situation in the near future! The coal crisis is further of importance on account of its being systematically exploited everywhere in order to worsen working conditions. In the United States the capitalists are commencing a determined attack upon the trade union organisation of the miners, which gives the latter a privileged position in the mines in which it predominates. The output of soft coal produced by non-organised workers is said to be already 55%. In Virginia the largest coal mines have either closed down, or have given their workers notice, the object being to break the resistance of the trade unions, to abolish privileges, and to reduce wages. ("The Annalist", 23. March 1925, page 410.) In Belgium and in Czechoslovakia we find the same thing. In England and Germany where wages are already extremely low, it is the working hours which are the object of attack. We can therefore expect the sharpest capitalist attacks in the course of the coming year.

#### b) The Shipping and Ship-building Crisis.

For years past the shipping crisis has presented an acute problem, and no sign of improvement has been observable. On the contrary, the world's shipping is in a more unfavourable position at the present time than ever before.

The following table shows the amount of idle tonnage in England during the past year.

Date	No. of ships	100 net tons
1. January 1924 . . . . .	317	630
1. April 1924 . . . . .	255	410
1. July 1924 . . . . .	310	410
1. October 1924 . . . . .	278	334
1. January 1925 . . . . .	332	488

The amount of idle tonnage has increased since October, but lessened as compared with last year. This does not however signify that more ships are running, but that the low freight rates of the last few years have caused the inferior ships to be scrapped. About three million tons of old ships were scrapped last year.

The revival experienced in the shipping market at the beginning of the year receded rapidly again during the period of this report, this being mainly due to the reduced shipment of grain to Europe consequent on the collapse of the grain prices. The shipping index published by the "Economist" shows the following development, 1913 being taken as 100:

Average 1922 . . . . .	122.0
Average 1923 . . . . .	109.7
Average 1924 . . . . .	113.4
March 1924 . . . . .	122.1
January 1925 . . . . .	114.5
February 1925 . . . . .	116.0
March 1925 . . . . .	106.6

The present rate is thus 15% less favorable than that of the same time last year. As shipping rates usually reach their minimum in July and August, it appears probable that this year the summer rates will again be below the pre-war level.

The crisis in the world's ship building trade continues undiminished. According to Lloyd's register the tonnage in course of construction at present (31. March) is 2,396,000, approximately one million tons less than in 1913. This tonnage is distributed as follows:

In course of construction in Great Britain and Ireland	1,165,000
In other countries . . . . .	1,231,000

Compared with the past quarter, 132,000 tons less are in course of construction in England than at the end of 1924, and 308,000 tons less than a year ago. On the other hand the tonnage of the ships being built outside of England has increased by 58,000 tons as compared with December.

The number of ships in course of construction is, however, no criterion for ship building activity, as work has been stopped on many ships, and work proceeds much slower than before

the war. The following figures, furnished by the German ship building trade, illustrate this:

	In course of construction		Finished	
	gross	reg. tons	gross	reg. tons
1920	1,583.800		241.200	
1921	1,667.027	" "	404.733	" "
1922	1,171.576	" "	598.320	" "
1923	597.404	" "	380.774	" "
1924	379.000	" "	151.000	" "
1913	1,296.800	" "	423.900	" "

In England the situation in the ship building trade continues to be exceedingly bad. At the end of January the number of unemployed was 80,939, equal to 31.7% of the total workers. In Scotland the conditions are even worse. Here the number of unemployed was 30,222.

In Germany the situation is also far from being favourable in the ship building industry. (See "Börsen-Courier", 29. January 1925.)

Under these circumstances it is not to be wondered at that when in February a great English shipping firm gave an order to the Deutsche Werft in Hamburg for five 10,000 ton motor ships, a painful sensation was aroused in England. The English shipping firm pointed out that the difference between the tenders sent in by the Deutsche Werft and the English ship builders amounted to £ 60,000 per ship. The shipping firm informed the English yards of the German offer, and offered to pay the English firms 10,000 pounds per ship more than the Germans demanded. But as the English ship builders could not supply the ships even at this increased price, the order went to Germany.

As we have already said, this fact aroused a tremendous sensation in England, and was discussed in thousands of articles in the daily press and in periodicals. The question most frequently put was, of course: why can the Deutsche Werft deliver 40% cheaper than the English shipyards. The cheaper steel prices in Germany were pointed out, the lower wages and longer working hours of the German workers. Special emphasis was laid on the fact that the Deutsche Werft specialises in motor ships. But even after all these points had been accorded due consideration, an inexplicable difference in the price still remains, and the English finally expressed the opinion that the Deutsche Werft either loses on this order, or receives a subsidy from the German government.

We cannot say whether the German Werft actually received a subsidy for this special order<sup>1</sup>). But the German newspapers have quite openly discussed the fact that German shipyards have actually received subventions, or state aid, from the government, this being given in the following manner:

At the beginning of the year an agreement was made between the shipping companies, the German government, and the shipyards, according to which the German government granted the shipping firms 50 million marks out of the funds for productive unemployed benefit, for the purpose of ship building, with the stipulation that the shipping firms devoted the same sum for the same purpose. These conditions are extremely advantageous to the shipping firms and the ship builders alike. The interest demanded on the credit is as follows:

During course of construction . . .	0.5 per cent
1 year after delivery . . . . . 4	" "
2. and 3. year after delivery . . . . 5	" "
4. and 5. year after delivery . . . . 6	" "

but invariably remains at least 1% under the Reichsbank discount ("Frankfurter Zeitung", 31. March). It is not explained whether this sum is only to be paid once, or every year.

The great shipping firms and the shipyards thus actually receive interest free credits from the government whilst the ships are being built, and this is equivalent to a very generous subvention when we remember the high rates of interest at present obtaining in Germany. But even when this is taken into consideration, the enormous difference between the German and the English tenders cannot be explained by this fact alone, for the difference for these five ships alone amounted to 300,000 pounds sterling, equal to 6 million gold marks, more than the

interest gained through the credits. Assuming, of course, that the shipping companies have not been in receipt of non-official subsidies, as in the case of the Ruhr industrialists.

The loss of these orders has aroused the greatest excitement in the whole of the shipbuilding industry in England. The employers' organisation has invited the trade union leaders to a common conference, in order that the situation may be discussed and a common committee of examination appointed. The object of this conference, it need scarcely be said, will be to worsen working conditions for the English workers, the inferior working conditions of the German workers being taken as a justification.

### c) The Agrarian Crisis.

The fall in grain prices long expected by us actually came about during the period covered by this report. The prices fell rapidly to 25% beneath the highest level. We append the wheat prices in gold francs:

#### Wheat prices in gold francs at the beginning of the month:

	Average 1913	December 1924	January 1925	February 1925	March 1925	6. April 1925
Canada:						
Winnipeg (Manitoba I) . . . . .	16.8	31.2	34.72	36.22	36.01	26.33
U. S. A. Chicago (Winter 2) . . . .	17.2	29.7	33.70	35.04	34.97	26.90
Minneapolis (Northern 1) . . . . .	16.7	29.3	32.75	33.51	33.13	25.52
New York (Winter 2) . . . . .	18.5	32.8	35.85	37.85	37.04	29.13
India: Karachi (white) . . . . .	17.3	28.1	30.39	34.41	36.07	30.49
Argentina:						
Buenos Aires (Barletta) . . . . .	19.0	29.3	32.93	36.03	36.40	29.94
Import grain in London:						
Manitoba I . . . . .	20.9	35.4	40.16	43.44	42.58	32.85
Winter 2 . . . . .	20.7	32.9	37.48	40.60	40.02	31.23
Plata . . . . .	20.6	33.5	37.62	40.03	39.17	32.85
Karachi . . . . .	20.9	32.4	35.79	39.46	39.46	32.14
Native wheat in:						
Germany, Berlin (Brandenbg.) . . . .	24.3 (26.4)	29.26	30.86	31.85	30.31	
Belgium, Antwerp . . . . .	19.8	31.2	32.36	34.73	30.73	26.30
France, Paris . . . . .	27.9	34.9	—	37.88	36.99	32.52
England, London . . . . .	19.9	28.1	30.60	34.19	33.05	28.64
Italy, Milan (soft) . . . . .	28.1	36.3	39.49	45.25	42.16	32.99
Holland, Rotterdam . . . . .	21.9	33.6	—	35.50	31.03	38.18

(Data issued by the Rome Agrarian Institute.)

The course taken by the price movement may be seen even more plainly from the appended table. It will be seen that during March the terminal prices for wheat fell by 25%, the terminal prices for rye by 30%.

#### Grain prices in Chicago. (For May cents per bushel.)

	Wheat	Rye	Maize
Average of year 1913 . . . . .	69	70	69
Beginning of January 1924 . . . . .	109	75	76
5. January 1925 . . . . .	174	150	127
12. January . . . . .	185	159	131
19. January . . . . .	190	165	137
26. January . . . . .	197	177	132
2. February . . . . .	200	177	135
9. February . . . . .	191	167	134
16. February . . . . .	185	161	127
23. February . . . . .	188	162	129
2. March . . . . .	197	165	135
9. March . . . . .	184	151	129
16. March . . . . .	165	124	119
23. March . . . . .	170	123	113
30. March . . . . .	147	115	108
7. April . . . . .	150	116	104
14. April . . . . .	160	115	109

This survey of the price movement, the great fluctuations, often from one day to another, prove that there has been an extensive speculation in wheat in the United States. This is confirmed by numerous press reports. The collapse of prices in March is also attributed to speculation.

It need not, however, be said that the price movement cannot be wholly explained by speculation. As we have always maintained, the grain prices were higher than the market

<sup>1</sup>) The Company's balance recently published gives no information on the financial position of the Company. Its shares are in the possession of the Hamburg-America Line, A. E.G., and the Haniel concern.

justified during the whole season in 1924/25. Besides this, the calculations are of somewhat doubtful value, not only in the case of the crops themselves, but even more with regard to the consumption. In this last respect it is almost impossible to gauge accurately the carrying over of reserve stocks from one year to another.

The Rome agrarian institute, in the February number of its organ, attempts to give an estimate of both the wheat surpluses of the export countries and the import requirements of the import countries. This calculation is as follows:

**Wheat surplus of the export countries during the season of 1924/25.**

(in mill. double cwts.)	
Canada . . . . .	47,3
United States . . . . .	71,3
British India <sup>1)</sup> . . . . .	10,6
Argentina . . . . .	45,0
Australia . . . . .	33,2
Other countries . . . . .	6,0
<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>213,4</b>
<b>Needs of import countries about . . . . .</b>	<b>210,0</b>

The import requirements are estimated on the basis of the "apparent consumption" of 1923/24. This apparent consumption is calculated by adding the reduction of the import countries to the imports of the "grain year" following the harvest. Differences of over 30% arise in this calculation. Thus, for instance, the "apparent consumption" has been as follows:

	1921/22	1922/23	1923/24
Germany . . . . .	48,2	29,8	37
France . . . . .	92,7	78,6	89,5
Great Britain . . . . .	76,1	75,4	81,4

These great differences show how little reliance is to be placed on these calculations. Taking this calculation as a basis, we find a slight surplus of exportable grain in the export countries over the import needs of the import countries. A certain check is provided to this calculation by the export and import figures for the first half of the present grain season. According to the bulletin in the March number of the organ of the Rome Institute, the exports for the first six months amounted to the following quantities (the imports of the countries concerned being deducted):

In mill. double cwts.:	
Wheat . . . . .	95,267
Wheat flour . . . . .	18,180
<b>Import of the import countries:</b>	
Wheat . . . . .	73,000
Wheat flour . . . . .	11,000

These figures show that during the first six months of the grain year about 60% of the estimated quantity was actually exported, and about 45% of the estimated import quantity was imported. The estimate thus appears to be more or less correct. The amounts exported from the separate exporting states were as follows, compared with the first six months of 1923/24. In mill. double cwts.:

	1924/25	1923/24
Canada . . . . .	26,04	48,90
United States . . . . .	40,47	12,25
British India . . . . .	5,50	1,40

It will thus be seen that in this year the United States is the leading export country, whilst last year it was Canada. With respect to imports, the figures are not much different to those of last year. The great increase of imports to Germany is conspicuous. Compared with the first six months of 1923/24, these exports have been as follows, in mill. double cwts.:

	1924/25	1923/24
Wheat . . . . .	6,65	1,48
Wheat flour . . . . .	3,64	1,33

<sup>1)</sup> The portion of the Indian crop exportable by 31. July 1925 is not included in this calculation.

Export to Japan has greatly decreased on the other hand, and amounts to only a quarter of last year's.

All these figures afford but little information as to the development of prices; less, we believe, than the calculations made in our last reports. With regard to future prices, these depend chiefly on the area cultivated and the success of the crops during the current economic year. With regard to the extent of the area under cultivation, the March number of the bulletin issued by the Rome Institute gives a statement as to the countries of the northern hemisphere growing autumn wheat and rye, with the exception of China. This shows an increase of 3,9% as compared with last year in the case of wheat, whilst the area under rye cultivation has decreased by 3,8%. This last decrease is solely due to the reported lessening of the area cultivated in the Ukraine. Among the great wheat exporting countries the cultivated area has increased in the United States by 6,5%; and in Canada by 2,9%, whilst it has decreased in Roumania by 8,5%.

With reference to the prospective crops, in Europe the conditions are generally favourable, and the crops are reported to be progressing especially well in Germany. On the other hand, alarming reports come from the United States as to the probable failure of the winter corn. The estimate made on April 1. is 68,7% of a normal crop, as compared with 83% last year, and 81,2% on an average during the last 10 years. The estimate shows a worsening of the prospects of the crops by 12,3% between the 1. December of last year and 1. April. The total crops are estimated at 474 million bushels as compared with the final estimate formed of last year's crops which was 590 million bushels. The report was published on 9. April.

The prices will naturally depend upon the actual yield of the world's crops. We continue to be of the opinion that — assuming the world's crops to attain a normal yield, permitting Russia to reappear in the world's markets again as a grain exporter — there will again be a discrepancy between the prices of agricultural and industrial goods by the autumn, and that the agrarian crisis, interrupted this year, will reappear. The calculated increase of the area under winter wheat cultivation, 4%, signifies in itself an increase in the wheat crop to the amount of approximately 30 million double hundredweights. This amount represents a seventh part of the import requirements of the import countries during this year, a year in which the European crops were unusually bad. Should this year's crops in Europe prove normal, and there is every prospect of this, then the import needs will be proportionately decreased, supplies in excess of demand with resultant fall in prices of industrial and agricultural products, which will cause a continuance of the agrarian crisis, for there is little probability of any great increase of consumption under present economic conditions.

Strictly speaking it is incorrect to speak of the discrepancy between agricultural and industrial prices as merely being probable in the autumn! As a matter of fact it is there already! The quotations for September wheat, in which the exchange discounts the prices for the coming grain year, are today already approximately 130 cents per bushel in Chicago, that is, 50 cents less per bushel than the present wheat price. This price signifies that the discrepancy is already there!

At the same time the effects of the last similar price discrepancy are still observable in the United States.

"In the 'Middle West' the banks are continuing to collapse. No fewer than 674 banks were obliged to close last year in the district from Ohio to Colorado and from Minnesota to Missouri. The majority of these were small banks; hundreds of these had a share capital of only \$10,000, but the total obligations amounted to 260 million dollars." (Correspondent of the London "Economist", from Kansas City, 28. April 1925.)

The agrarian crisis not only continues to exercise effects upon the banks, but it has obviously called forth a far-reaching process of concentration among the American farmers who — contrary to the European peasants with their tendency to provide chiefly for their own needs — work entirely on the basis of the capitalist exchange of goods. In highly capitalist circles the ruin of millions of farmers is regarded as a welcome "salutary process".

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### 44 New Victims of Ruhr Capital.

By Georg Schwarz (Essen).

On Saturday the 16th May 1925, the "Ruhr Echo", the district organ of the Communist Party in the Ruhr district, published a poem, entitled "Ballad of the Workers' Death" by Franz Krey, a young miner and poet. In the evening of the same day the terrible news spread like wild-fire through the whole Ruhr district that an explosion had taken place in the Dorstfeld mine, pit V. and that the lives of the miners at work in the pit were in great danger.

The disaster involved 44 dead and 27 wounded.

Now everyone is seeking to find those who are responsible. The most absurd hypotheses are brought forward in the bourgeois press. Thus a report in the "Duisburger Generalanzeiger" of 18th May states that "there exists the possibility of a deliberate outrage". From assertions of this sort to a declaration that here it is a question of an outrage by a communist "Tcheka" group is only a step. The press hirelings maintained by Stinnes capital are capable of anything, solely in order to conceal the real causes of this terrible disaster.

It is not a mere chance that the number of accidents in the Ruhr mines has considerably increased since the coming into force of the Dawes Plan. Every day, four to five cases of death are recorded, which are attributable to the intensified methods of exploitation.

The Dorstfeld mine belongs to the Essen Steinkohlenbergwerk A. G. The chief shareholder in this is the firm of Henschel in Cassel, whose representative is a member of the board of directors of the Berlin Disconto Gesellschaft. The chief partner of the Disconto Gesellschaft, Dr. Salomonsohn, is the notorious Managing Director of the Gelsenkirchener Bergwerk A. G. who so shamefully slandered the 136 miners who were murdered in the "Minister Stein" mine. As is to be seen from the reports of the workers, there prevails in the Dorstfeld mine, pits I. to V., the most insane speeding up system. 150 workers were given notice, expiring on the 1st of June. It is quite logical it is certain that the explosives chamber, the explosion of which results from the discharge of the miners by the increased exploitation of the miners who are still retained.

The natural result is, of course, that all measures for safety are disregarded. The speeding up methods employed by the overseers and other officials cause the safety rules to be ignored. It is certain that the explosives chamber, the explosion of which led to the disaster, is not the sole cause. It is much more probable that, in the first place, a gas explosion took place which led to the explosion of the explosives chamber. That is the view of all the miners. Gas explosions are only to be avoided if all precautionary measures, sprinkling and removal of coal dust, are strictly carried out.

\* \* \*

The miners and their relatives waiting at the pit's mouth could tell a story of the brutality of the administration of the Dorstfeld Mine. The miners working in the same pit, in the 7th section, when they heard of the disaster demanded that they be allowed to leave the mine, but they were ordered by the foremen to fill the waggons still remaining empty and to employ the rest of the time remaining of the shift in carrying out repairs.

They had to insist on being allowed to come to the surface.

This event shows clearly and beyond dispute how the gold and profits of the heavy industrial exploiters is minted out of the blood of the mining proletariat. It is a piece of hypocrisy in this connection to describe the disaster as an "accident". One disaster in the mines follows the other. Hecatombs of miners' lives are sacrificed, but it is all an "accident".

For months past the Communist Party and the Union of Hand and Brain workers have been demanding of the Miners' Union a common fight of all workers in the mines:

For workers' control

For the extension of the rights of factory councils

For the abolition of the speeding-up system

For the seven hours shift and 40% wage increase

For adequate support for the dependents of the victims of the mine disasters.

The leaders of the German trade unions, the Husemans and Limbertzes, reject the united fighting front of the miners for the extension of the rights of the workers with scornful laughter.

How particularly necessary is the fight for the dependents is shown by what has happened in the case of the victims of the "Minister Stein" disaster. The Communist press pointed out clearly and openly at the time, that all the bourgeois charity activity was an obvious fraud. The relatives of the killed and injured in the "Minister Stein" disaster have already to appeal to the public, because they are in bitter need and up till now only 30,000 Marks have been distributed to the victims concerned out of a total sum collected of nearly a million. In view of this scandalous treatment of the relatives and dependents, the communists again demand for the dependents of the present disaster:

Payment of full wages for this month, a permanent pension of 60% of the years' wages for the widows, and 20% for every dependent member of the family; permanent supply of coal and the right to reside in the miners' houses belonging to the company.

The capitalists have clearly shown by their attitude hitherto that, for them the families of the fallen miners are mere dirt. At the graves they speak a few words of comfort, which are only hypocrisy. In reality, by their speeding up methods, they drive the miners to death.

\* \* \*

The miners see quite clearly that it is nothing else than the system of murder which is killing their brothers. The present disaster must therefore be a warning signal to fight for the abolition of the speeding up methods in the mines.

In two crowded meetings, which took place on Sunday in Dorstfeld and in the adjoining district of Marton in which comrades Schwan and Sobottka spoke, the miners demanded in detailed resolutions the taking up of the fight in the sense of the demands of the C. P. of Germany.

It is necessary to drive home to the workers that only a united strong, mine workers' organisation, under revolutionary leadership, can abolish the murderous speeding-up system in the mines. For this reason the fight for trade union unity in the Ruhr mines is an urgent necessity.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### The Coming Congress of the British Communist Party.

By Albert Inkpin (General Secretary, C. P. of Gt. Britain).

The seventh national congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain opens at Glasgow on May 30th. Glasgow, on the Clyde-side, is known the world over as one of the "red" centres of the British labour movement. It was a storm centre of proletarian opposition to the imperialist war. It sends a Labour contingent to the British parliament that includes some of the most genuine and uncompromising fighters for the working class. Its highly industrialised nature, covering not only heavy industry, but light industry and textiles as well, makes Glasgow a favourable ground for revolutionary activity. No more appropriate place for the holding of a Communist Party Congress could therefore have been chosen.

This Congress will be the most momentous and important congress in the history of the British party. It will meet at a time when the demand is rising from the workers in the four quarters of the country for united action against the ever increasing encroachments of the capitalists and in support of their own wage demands, and when the "yellow" leaders of these workers are conspiring with the employers as to ways and means of countering those demands and keeping the workers' ranks divided. Within three days of the conclusion of the Party Congress, a conference will be held in London at which representatives of the mining, engineering, railway and transport workers' unions will discuss the formation of an industrial alliance — a conference which may decide the fate of the organised working class movement in the struggles which will inevitably take place this year.

The subjects for discussion at the Party Congress will be in keeping with the atmosphere in which the Congress will meet.

They cover the whole range of revolutionary working class politics, national and international. There is hardly a single aspect of the workers' struggle that is not dealt with in the agenda, or in the theses or resolutions arising therefrom, which will confront the Communist workers from the localities when they assemble to review the past year's work and discuss the future tasks of the party. The national and international economic and political situation, the burning question of trade union unity, the war against imperialism and the exploitation of colonial and subject peoples, the bolshevising of the British party and its development into a real mass party of the workers — these as well as many other important matters will all be dealt with.

The report of the central executive committee to the Congress is the most comprehensive and thorough report of its kind that the party has yet issued. On its political side the report reveals a record of activity since the sixth congress that is extremely rich and varied in its range, and in which sustained campaigns against the Dawes slave plan and in support of the full and unqualified recognition of the Russian Workers' Government have occupied a foremost place. The Party's exposure of the treacherous and compromising policy of the Labour Government of MacDonald; the relations of the Party with the Labour Party, arising out of the attempt of the "yellow" leaders of that body to exclude the Communists from its ranks; the Party's work in the development of the minority movement in the labour unions, and the endeavours made to crystallise the left wing movement in the parliamentary labour party and among the masses, are all brought into review.

The organising report is no less comprehensive in its scope. It presents a complete picture of the party organisation, and whilst it emphasises the progress that has been made, it points also with the utmost frankness to the weaknesses and defects that have manifested themselves, and states the steps necessary to be taken to remove them. During the past year the party membership has increased by over 1,100 and now stands at just above 5,000. These figures prove that the British party is still lamentably small. But it can be said, without question, that the Communist Party is relatively the best organised and most effective workers' party there has ever been in Britain. This is because it is steadily building up a party discipline and establishing a party tradition for hard, organised work; and by that process it is weeding out the ineffectives. Its membership could easily be increased three or fourfold if membership involved merely the payment of dues and attendance at an occasional meeting. Nevertheless, the party is still very far from being a mass party of the workers. That is why the question of recruiting new members will occupy a foremost position at the coming party congress.

Equally important in the development towards a mass party is the question of transforming the party organisation on to a factory group basis. When the sixth congress was held there was not a party group in existence in a single factory. But now the orientation of the party towards the factories and workshops is proceeding apace. Factory groups are being formed daily. The party is slowly finding its feet, and is planting them firmly in the industrial fabric. The process is slow but is increasing in momentum. There are hesitations, timid efforts, tentative attempts in the forming of groups. There are still important industrial districts, rich in potentialities to the Communist party, where the drive into the factories and the formation of factory groups has still to be commenced. There are reluctances to change, and organisation, that many comrades have yet to overcome. There are many party members who do not yet comprehend what a factory group is, and many more who do not understand how a factory group should function when it is formed.

But understanding is coming with the doing. The report of the central committee states that there were 70 factory groups in existence when the report was prepared, most of them actively functioning. That number has since considerably increased. There are 28 in the London district alone, embracing 20 per cent of the party membership in London. The hesitation of comrades working singly in a factory or workshop, and the fear of victimisation, are being overcome. Many are now taking steps to gather their active workmates around them, bring them into the party and establish a factory group. And in every case where a factory group has been set going, the membership of the group has been speedily doubled or trebled. The group activity — especially the running of a factory paper — has welded these

workers together and has brought them into the party. The fact is definitely emerging that the best way of getting a mass party is by forming factory groups and keeping them active with the content of the class struggle.

Factory group papers are now springing up all round. In the early days these were confined to London; but Glasgow has now more than twelve, and other districts and locals have made a start. In London there are now 18 factory group papers, some of which have a regular circulation of several hundred copies. These factory papers are becoming the literary voices of the factory. The matter appearing in them relates to actualities — workshop conditions and grievances, wrongful dismissals, hours, wages and overtime, etc. They do not attempt long or involved articles on policy or theory; they are natural growths from within the factories.

Other matters of an organisational character that will come before the Party Congress include party training, especially of factory group leaders and the development of qualities of leadership, fraction work in the trade unions, co-operatives, and political labour organisations, and the extension and development of the party press.

With the example of our Russian comrades before us, with the development of our continental brother parties towards becoming real mass parties of the workers, the coming Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain will strain every nerve to set its feet on the path to victory and to conquer power in this citadel of international capitalism.

## FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

### Report of Comrade Tomsky on the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Conference at the Plenary Session of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions.

#### The Antecedents of the Conference.

The campaign for unity was begun by the Red International of Labour Unions. After long correspondence with the Amsterdam International, the latter declared that it was prepared to enter into negotiations with the All-Russian Central Trade Union Council on condition that the R. I. L. U. should be excluded from these negotiations. This ended the first stage of the negotiations.

We saw that the offensive of capital continued and that the post-war achievements of the working class were in danger of destruction. Everywhere political reaction is following close on the heels of economic reaction. And we believed that we had no right to seclude ourselves within our comparatively favourable position. We have never regarded our revolution as, in the narrowest sense, a national revolution. When, in Oct. 1917 we carried out our insurrection, we knew that our revolution was doomed to defeat unless we had the support of the workers of Western Europe. And we were right. The English intervention in Archangel failed because the English soldiers, amongst whom were English workers, refused to fight against us any longer. The French intervention in Odessa was a failure, because on the French iron-clads, the workers, stuck into naval uniforms, mutinied, and also because the English workers declared with sufficient emphasis: "Hands off Soviet Russia!". Since the West European proletariat has given us such support, we cannot remain passive with regard to them.

When the black flood of reaction will have inundated the whole of Western Europe, and we find ourselves in a Fascist environment, that will not be a matter of indifference for the fate of the Soviet Republic. It is this circumstance which compels us to pursue, not a national but an international Labour policy, under the banner under which our revolution gained the victory. On the other hand, we take into consideration and grasp the fact that the interests of the West European working class demand the utmost concentration of forces.

After the well-known resolution of the Vienna Congress, our relations to the Amsterdam International entered on a new phase. I have said repeatedly that the correspondence which took place in this period resembles a petty bourgeois penny-

dreadful, the peculiarity of this story being that it does not in the usual way end with marriage and happiness; our romance could not end with such a marriage, as no Amsterdam bride consented to meet the Moscow bridegroom.

The condition laid down was that we recognise the resolutions of the Vienna Congress. We on our part replied that we wished to discuss in common the questions relating to the restoration of international trade union unity, but without any preliminary conditions. We cannot in advance bind ourselves to any resolutions, in the passing of which we in no way participated.

The tactics of the Amsterdam International prove, that, at a time when the imperialist blockade already belongs to the realm of history, the trade union blockade is obviously continued by the leading circles of the Amsterdam International.

### The Approach between the English Trade Unions and Our Own.

Our trade unions and the English ones have proved to be the most consistent adherents of unity. Our greatest and most lasting achievement in the treaty made with the MacDonald Government in London — and this is all that is left of that treaty — was our connection with the English trade unions. The Conference at Hull and the visit of the English delegation to us have further strengthened this tie.

At the Meeting of the General Council of the Amsterdam International, the English upheld our point of view; the diplomatic resolution proposed by Stenhuis was, however, passed.

This resolution states that a conference will be called when in their opinion, it seems possible, and after the Russian trade unions have, without reservation, declared themselves prepared to join the Amsterdam International.

America represents an independent International. In Europe there are two Internationals, and there is still a whole number of countries and organisations which as yet belong to no International. In the meanwhile capital is operating and manoeuvring on a scale which is neither European nor semi-European. In such circumstances the question of unity could naturally not be exhausted by our trade unions joining the Amsterdam International.

We know, however, that every careless word dropped by us, will be interpreted by the leaders of the Amsterdam International as meaning that we did not desire unity.

We could not entirely break off negotiations without an authoritative resolution of our plenum. If we regard negotiations as entirely broken off, what is then to be done? Are we then to enter on a new attack, a new cannonade with all guns against Amsterdam, and engage in a last fight until we destroy one another? Would that correspond to the idea of unity? Is that Amsterdam's intention?

We could not make up our minds to such a step after the approachment which has taken place between ourselves and the English trade unions. We submitted the question to the English trade unions as to what they would advise us to do in these circumstances.

As a result, our London Conference was called on the basis of a mutual agreement.

The bourgeois Press understands the interests of its employers thoroughly, and of course received us in such a way that if we had troubled about it at all or excited ourselves about its articles, we should have died of consumption within three days. Fortunately Comrade Jarotzky did not read these papers to us until after dinner, and apart from a hearty laugh which contributed to good digestion, the articles had no effect on us. It said, for instance, that "the red robber chieftain Tomsky, with his band of agitators had now arrived", and that it was incomprehensible why they had been allowed to enter the country.

Naturally, neither the English Conservative Government nor the German Government which was friendly disposed to us, wanted to admit us, though the latter was prepared to allow us a meeting with the representatives of the English trade unions, not in Berlin, but very kindly in Frankfurt, not however in the well-known Frankfurt on Main but in Frankfurt on the Oder. Nevertheless the English trade unions were able to bring pressure to bear on the Conservative Government so that we did not have to avail ourselves of the German hospitality. We were even held worthy of two interpellations in Parliament; it was

asked why we had come to London and whether we had not some deep designs. The bourgeois Press interpreted the matter by saying that malignant agitators had now entered the country, who wished to corrupt the gentle and modest trade unionists. Each of these "innocent youths" whom we were to "corrupt" was at least half as old again as the oldest of us, and had furthermore twice as long a past in the Labour movement as we.

### The Course of the Conference.

In spite of the custom at similar conferences of choosing a chairman from each of the parties, on our proposal a single chairman was chosen: Comrade Swales, the chairman of the General Council of Trade Unions.

It was proposed to us that we should read a report, in accordance with which, on the basis of our statements, the agenda should be settled.

Our time for speaking was not limited, and therefore we had the opportunity of expounding our views as to the unity of the International Labour Movement.

At the conclusion of our report, the British representatives wished first of all to discuss the resulting conclusions amongst themselves.

At the second meeting of the Conference, we heard the reply of the British delegation to Comrade Tomsky's statement. Our delegation thought it necessary to have a thorough discussion about this declaration of the English delegation. After a few corrections had been accepted, both declarations — ours as well as the English — were passed by the Conference.

The Conference then unanimously resolved to issue a common declaration in the name of the whole Conference. For the drafting of this declaration, a committee was elected composed as follows: Chairman Swales; members: of the English delegation Bramley and Purcell; of the Russian: Tomsky and Melnitskansky. Next day the commission passed the text of the declaration unanimously. The last day of the conference was devoted to the discussion of this declaration. The declaration was also unanimously passed by the plenum of the Conference.

### The Significance of the Declaration.

The fact alone that the representatives of eleven million organised workers, belonging to different Internationals and living under different conditions, found a common language and a common view as to the task of the International Labour movement, is an eminently important factor in the history of the Labour movement.

The bourgeois Press understands very well the danger which arises from eleven million workers having found a common aim, the aim of a struggle for the unity of the International Labour Movement. The unification of all the proletarian forces in a world-wide measure must oppose the class of wage-earners in one battle-front to the capitalist class. And when class stands up against class, it means not only an economic but also a political struggle.

The Conference recognised the significance of this struggle. It did not remain within the narrow bounds of the economic struggle, but declared war against the danger of new wars as one of the preliminary conditions of unity, new wars however belong to the very nature of capitalist conditions.

These eleven million workers however not only found a common language, but they also gave certain organisational foundations to co-operation in the interest of the realisation of the aims they had set themselves. When the organised masses of workers of the two strongest trade union organisations of the world join in trying to reach an aim which at first sight appears a very modest one — the unity of the International Labour movement —, this represents a force which must be taken seriously. The Anglo-Russian Advisory Committee is not yet organised, but it is already, among many millions of workers, the most popular organisation in the world. We shall see how those people who can see no further than the end of their nose into the depths of the international movement, will be able to resist this alliance, those who dare to assert that the Russian trade unions can have no significance in the West European Labour movement. Our firmly united trade union movement can give the International Labour movement not only 6½ million organised, closely allied workers, but another trifle — these

dreadful, the peculiarity of this story being that it does not in the usual way end with marriage and happiness; our romance could not end with such a marriage, as no Amsterdam bride consented to meet the Moscow bridegroom.

The condition laid down was that we recognise the resolutions of the Vienna Congress. We on our part replied that we wished to discuss in common the questions relating to the restoration of international trade union unity, but without any preliminary conditions. We cannot in advance bind ourselves to any resolutions, in the passing of which we in no way participated.

The tactics of the Amsterdam International prove, that, at a time when the imperialist blockade already belongs to the realm of history, the trade union blockade is obviously continued by the leading circles of the Amsterdam International.

#### The Approach between the English Trade Unions and Our Own.

Our trade unions and the English ones have proved to be the most consistent adherents of unity. Our greatest and most lasting achievement in the treaty made with the MacDonald Government in London — and this is all that is left of that treaty — was our connection with the English trade unions. The Conference at Hull and the visit of the English delegation to us have further strengthened this tie.

At the Meeting of the General Council of the Amsterdam International, the English upheld our point of view; the diplomatic resolution proposed by Stenhuis was, however, passed.

This resolution states that a conference will be called when in their opinion, it seems possible, and after the Russian trade unions have, without reservation, declared themselves prepared to join the Amsterdam International.

America represents an independent International. In Europe there are two Internationals, and there is still a whole number of countries and organisations which as yet belong to no International. In the meanwhile capital is operating and manoeuvring on a scale which is neither European nor semi-European. In such circumstances the question of unity could naturally not be exhausted by our trade unions joining the Amsterdam International.

We know, however, that every careless word dropped by us, will be interpreted by the leaders of the Amsterdam International as meaning that we did not desire unity.

We could not entirely break off negotiations without an authoritative resolution of our plenum. If we regard negotiations as entirely broken off, what is then to be done? Are we then to enter on a new attack, a new cannonade with all guns against Amsterdam, and engage in a last fight until we destroy one another? Would that correspond to the idea of unity? Is that Amsterdam's intention?

We could not make up our minds to such a step after the approachment which has taken place between ourselves and the English trade unions. We submitted the question to the English trade unions as to what they would advise us to do in these circumstances.

As a result, our London Conference was called on the basis of a mutual agreement.

The bourgeois Press understands the interests of its employers thoroughly, and of course received us in such a way that if we had troubled about it at all or excited ourselves about its articles, we should have died of consumption within three days. Fortunately Comrade Jarotzky did not read these papers to us until after dinner, and apart from a hearty laugh which contributed to good digestion, the articles had no effect on us. It said, for instance, that "the red robber chieftain Tomsy, with his band of agitators had now arrived", and that it was incomprehensible why they had been allowed to enter the country.

Naturally, neither the English Conservative Government nor the German Government which was friendly disposed to us, wanted to admit us, though the latter was prepared to allow us a meeting with the representatives of the English trade unions, not in Berlin, but very kindly in Frankfurt, not however in the well-known Frankfurt on Main but in Frankfurt on the Oder. Nevertheless the English trade unions were able to bring pressure to bear on the Conservative Government so that we did not have to avail ourselves of the German hospitality. We were even held worthy of two interpellations in Parliament; it was

asked why we had come to London and whether we had not some deep designs. The bourgeois Press interpreted the matter by saying that malignant agitators had now entered the country, who wished to corrupt the gentle and modest trade unionists. Each of these "innocent youths" whom we were to "corrupt" was at least half as old again as the oldest of us, and had furthermore twice as long a past in the Labour movement as we.

#### The Course of the Conference.

In spite of the custom at similar conferences of choosing a chairman from each of the parties, on our proposal a single chairman was chosen: Comrade Swales, the chairman of the General Council of Trade Unions.

It was proposed to us that we should read a report, in accordance with which, on the basis of our statements, the agenda should be settled.

Our time for speaking was not limited, and therefore we had the opportunity of expounding our views as to the unity of the International Labour Movement.

At the conclusion of our report, the British representatives wished first of all to discuss the resulting conclusions amongst themselves.

At the second meeting of the Conference, we heard the reply of the British delegation to Comrade Tomsy's statement. Our delegation thought it necessary to have a thorough discussion about this declaration of the English delegation. After a few corrections had been accepted, both declarations — ours as well as the English — were passed by the Conference.

The Conference then unanimously resolved to issue a common declaration in the name of the whole Conference. For the drafting of this declaration, a committee was elected composed as follows: Chairman Swales; members: of the English delegation Bramley and Purcell; of the Russian: Tomsy and Melnitschansky. Next day the commission passed the text of the declaration unanimously. The last day of the conference was devoted to the discussion of this declaration. The declaration was also unanimously passed by the plenum of the Conference.

#### The Significance of the Declaration.

The fact alone that the representatives of eleven million organised workers, belonging to different Internationals and living under different conditions, found a common language and a common view as to the task of the International Labour movement, is an eminently important factor in the history of the Labour movement.

The bourgeois Press understands very well the danger which arises from eleven million workers having found a common aim, the aim of a struggle for the unity of the International Labour Movement. The unification of all the proletarian forces in a world-wide measure must oppose the class of wage-earners in one battle-front to the capitalist class. And when class stands up against class, it means not only an economic but also a political struggle.

The Conference recognised the significance of this struggle. It did not remain within the narrow bounds of the economic struggle, but declared war against the danger of new wars as one of the preliminary conditions of unity, new wars however belong to the very nature of capitalist conditions.

These eleven million workers however not only found a common language, but they also gave certain **organisatory foundations** to co-operation in the interest of the realisation of the aims they had set themselves. When the organised masses of workers of the two strongest trade union organisations of the world join in trying to reach an aim which at first sight appears a very modest one — the unity of the International Labour movement —, this represents a force which must be taken seriously. The Anglo-Russian Advisory Committee is not yet organised, but it is already, among many millions of workers, the most popular organisation in the world. We shall see how those people who can see no further than the end of their nose into the depths of the international movement, will be able to resist this alliance, those who dare to assert that the Russian trade unions can have no significance in the West European Labour movement. Our firmly united trade union movement can give the International Labour movement not only 6½ million organised, closely allied workers, but another trifle — these

6 $\frac{1}{2}$  million workers are in the possession of power, they have the power literally in their hands.

In the scales of the struggle between Labour and capital, every thousand workers is of importance. And wherever there are three workers, we must go and organise them so that none remain unorganised. This is how we must regard the tasks of the International Labour movement and our duties in the struggle against capital.

### The Immediate Prospect.

We ask for approval of our work which we have carried out under extremely difficult and complicated circumstances. We steered a straight course for unity, we showed that for us it is no matter for jest, but that we are ready to work with earnestness and perseverance in the interest of this aim. We have already achieved something in this direction, and it is not for nothing that the bourgeois Presse has raised such a hue and cry against us. The "Times" declares that the declaration is written "in the language of belligerent class-war" and contains dangerously ambiguous phrases. "And" — says the Times — "class-war means, in the language of the Communists, seizing arms and actually fighting."

Mr. MacDonald, in his Easter message to the workers, issues a new slogan: the necessity of a bloc between the English and German trade unions. There is no need to be a British ex-Prime Minister in order to understand that such a bloc has existed already for ages and is confirmed by the fact that the trade unions of both countries belong to the same International.

Cramp, the well known leader of the British railwaymen proposes founding a Continental International. If he were consistent, he would arrive at the conclusion that every country ought to have its own International. Cramp proposed leaving Russia and the East to the Red International of Labour Unions, America to the American Federation, of Labour, while the whole of Europe, with the exception of Russia, should belong to the Amsterdam International.

We know that MacDonald, round whom the Right leaders of the General Council are gathered, is preparing for a great attack on our comrades, on the eve of the approaching Congress of the Trade Unions. The bourgeois Press on the other hand is trying to compromise the leaders of the trade union movement, and clamours: "They have capitulated to Tomsky without resistance and unconditionally." The bourgeois newspapers further write that "the plan accepted by the Conference is reminiscent of a military alliance between two States".

All these attacks of the bourgeois Press are merely witness to the fact that the proletariat is on the right path. The British Comrades and we ourselves are faced with a difficult task, and we must find the best means for mutual support in all the difficulties we shall meet by the way.

We do not in the least understand why the Amsterdam International will not even meet us. Are Oudegeest and Sassenbach afraid of us? Is it possible that they are afraid we shall corrupt them if they sit at the same table with us? We have nothing to fear, we have nothing to conceal from the workers, and we say: "Let us discuss our proposals together!"

We are convinced that in spite of all difficulties, in spite of all the intrigues of the bourgeois Press, we shall achieve our objects and overcome all obstacles. No one will be able to arrest the many millions of workers in their elementary efforts for the unity of the International Labour movement.

## For an International Unity Conference, without Pre-Conditions.

Moscow, 19th May 1925.

The Foreign Commission of the General Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union have addressed the following letter to the General Council of the Amsterdam International:

Dear Comrades,

The session of the Plenum of the General Council, for various reasons and in consequence of the London Conference between the English trade unions and the trade unions of the Soviet Union, could not take place until the period from 30th of April till 3rd. May. The Conference of the trade unions of England and of the Soviet Union have discussed in the fullest

manner the question of unity, as well as the relation of the General Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union to the Amsterdam International. The Plenum of the General Council of the trade unions of the Soviet Union approved of the work and the decisions of the London Conference and instructed the Foreign Commission to reply.

On the basis of these decisions we consider it to be our duty to inform you, that the decision of the General Council of the Amsterdam International of the 7th February has made a very profound impression upon our trade unions. We had thought that the result of our exchange of letters would have been a greater mutual understanding and a meeting of our representatives with the representatives of the Amsterdam International, in order to examine together the question of the unity of the trade union movement, as a first attempt to approach this question in a concrete manner. In our opinion, this question is the most important and essential for the workers of the whole world. We only wished to achieve a joint Conference between the representatives of the trade unions of the Soviet Union and of the Amsterdam International without preconditions.

Your resolution rejects our proposal and stipulates that the meeting can only take place after a previous declaration on our side that we are prepared to affiliate to the Amsterdam International. This means affiliation to the Amsterdam International as it is, that is, upon the basis of its principles and statutes. Enormous importance is to be attached to the declarations of Oudegeest and Jouhaux, in which this standpoint is confirmed. We state with the deepest regret that these interpretations and declarations will do even more than the Amsterdam resolution to sharpen the differences, but they will in no way render more easy the question of unity.

We declare once again, that we are for the united International. Our aim, and the aim of the majority of the class conscious workers of the world, is the creation of a united International of the trade union organised workers of all countries who stand upon the basis of the class struggle for the final emancipation of the working class from the capitalist yoke. In comparison with this great aim, the question of the statutes is of subordinate importance. The trade unions of the Soviet Union are prepared to affiliate to a trade union International whose statutes would not differ very widely in the main from the statutes of the Amsterdam International. The enumeration of the aims of this united International could contain all the aims set forth in the statutes of the Amsterdam International. The trade unions of the Soviet Union, however, have had no possibility of participating in the drawing up of the statutes of the Amsterdam International.

We are of the conviction that a united trade union International should embrace, not only the trade unions of the Soviet Union, but all those who are at present not affiliated to the Amsterdam International. In order to achieve this, full regard must be had to the differences and traditions of the historical developments and political peculiarities of all countries.

How is this to be realised? How is the existing mistrust between the various sections of the divided trade union movement to be overcome without personal contact and all-round concrete examination of these important questions?

The mutual acquaintance of the representatives of the trade union movements of England and of the Soviet Union, the mutual desire for common methods, for common language for the realisation of the mutually sincere efforts for trade union unity, will doubtless bring about very good results. The recent London Conference undoubtedly promoted the strengthening of proletarian solidarity between the workers of England and of the Union of Soviet Republics. In the same way, a meeting of the representatives of the trade unions of the Soviet Union, and of the Amsterdam International, provided there existed mutual good will, could serve as the commencement for the realisation of the unity of the whole trade union movement.

We therefore consider it desirable if the General Council would revise the decision of the Executive of the 5th to 7th February, and would convene, together with the General Council of the trade unions of the Soviet Union, a Conference, without preconditions, to discuss the question of the unity of the trade unions.

Signed: President Tomsky,  
Secretary Dogadov.

## OUR MARTYRS

### Dimitri Grantcharov.

Dimitri Grantcharov was murdered on the 29th April. He was 42 years of age. He had worked illegally in Sofia, from whence, on the 27th April, he fled from the persecutions of the brutalised Zarkov agents to the village of Darvenitza.

Grantcharov was one of the most active workers among the peasants and was formerly a member of the left wing of the "broad" socialists, from whom he broke away in 1921. He proved himself to be a convinced and consistent supporter of the united front of the workers and peasants, especially after the fascist putsch of 1923. He had written a number of pamphlets on the question of the united front and also edited a whole number of left wing peasant newspapers which were constantly confiscated by the Zankov government.

### Nikolai Petrini.

Member of parliament, a member of the left wing of the Agrarian Union and a close collaborator with Grantcharov, Petrini was one of the the most decided supporters of the united front of the workers. The Bulgarian secret police had repeatedly attempted to hunt him down and kill him. He was killed in the bloody massacre which the Zankov bands carried out in the night following on the Cathedral explosion

### Peter Abadshiev.

Peter Abadshiev who was 24 years of age, was a member of the Communist Party and of the Young Communist League of Bulgaria. The secret police considered him to be the "leader of the terrorist group in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria". He took a very active part in the trade

union movement. Owing to the enormous unemployment in Sofia, and being quite without means, he was compelled to emigrate to Germany, where he devoted himself with renewed energy entirely to the revolutionary movement. An excellent comrade and a staunch revolutionary, he always acted with great foresight and deliberation.

### Dimitri Daskalov.

The indictment of the prosecution described the above comrade as one of those who had bribed the sacristan of the Cathedral. He was a metal worker, aged 18, from the town of Kratovo in Macedonia. He was exceedingly devoted to the labour movement and to the Young Communist League, and was also at the same time an active worker in the metal workers' trade union and in the workers' sport movement. This young revolutionary, who was filled with the joy of life, was prepared to sacrifice everything for the workers' movement.

### Blagoy Kamburov.

This 19 year old student from Thrace had eagerly participated in the movement in Thrace and Macedonia. In the Summer of 1924 he was a delegate to the Macedonian Congress. Without being a communist he was closely connected with the revolutionary movement in Bulgaria, and was profoundly devoted to the cause of the working class and the peasantry of Bulgaria.

#### Correction.

We have received a communication from comrade Bell regarding our report in No. 41 of the Inprecorr. of his speech at the Information Conference of the Enlarged Executive meeting in March. Comrade Bell says the statement imputed to him that the Labour Research Department is under party control is inaccurate and misleading. No such statement was made. We gladly accept the correction of a mistake which was inadvertently due to summarising his remarks.