Another Step Forward

By A. Lozovsky.

The International Conference at Frankfort carried us another step forward on the road to uniting all proletarian forces for the struggle against war and Fascism. This conference aroused the greatest interest among the workers, and rightly so. It was the first international conference which had been held since the occupation of the Ruhr valley, at which all questions were thoroughly debated. The soul-saving speeches which the leaders of the Amsterdam International delivered on the subject of the Ruhr invasion need not be counted. Of course nobody has thought of taking these reformist tea-parties seriously; even those who took part in them knew perfectly well that nothing would come of them. When Fiume reflected on the passivity of the Amsterdam International, and began to shed tears, his colleague Odger was a bit taken aback at his endeavor to prove that these speeches of Fiume were to be explained by his “exhaustion”. We do not know whether Fiume is really exhausted or not, or whether it was the proletarian conscience which spoke in him—but it is an unalterable fact that the leaders of the Amsterdam International admitted their own impotence; any more, they admitted that they have no wish to carry out the resolutions passed at the Hague.

That which both the Amsterdam and the 2. International failed to do, has been accomplished by the Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions. The communist parties and the revolutionary trade unions, and these alone rose up determinedly against the predatory invasion by French imperialism; they alone roused the masses to a real struggle. These revolutionary actions have been welcomed with the greatest sympathy by many workers still belonging to reformist organizations. The Frankfort conference was not only attended by communists and revolutionary syndicalists, but also by workers belonging to the German social democratic and independent social democratic parties. The social democratic workers took part in the conference against the will of their leaders. When they were faced by the alternative of either submitting to the anti-proletarian decisions of their leaders, and of thus weakening the struggle against war, or of acting against their leaders’ decisions and lending their aid to strengthen the anti-imperialist and anti-Fascist front, they chose the latter course: they acted as real proletarians. In this way a united front has been actually created, a front upon whose strength the life of the working masses hangs in the most literal sense of the word. It is true that but few social democratic workers attended the Frankfort Conference (only ten in all), but this small group, which preferred a united front with the revolutionary workers to a united front with the bourgeoisie, mirrored the ever-growing indignation of the broad masses against the anti-class policy of their leaders.

But the Frankfort Conference was not only a manifestation of the ever-increasing united front of the proletarian, it was above all a consultation held by men of ripe revolutionary experience who set themselves concrete questions as to the most effective methods to be adopted in the struggle against war and Fascism, as to the means to be taken for combining the broad masses in united organizations with one united will, and for assembling the scattered proletarian forces in order to lead them against the growing reaction. The Frankfort social democratic journal, the Volksstimme, ironically named our conference “conference of war”. This newspaper wanted to stigmatize us by such a designation, as the social democrats were not pleased with my declaration that we were no peace conference, but a class war conference. In this sense the Frankfort Conference really was a war conference. Its task was to collect the experiences gained in the class struggle in every country, to sum up these experiences, and to work out practical forms and measures for the class war. — We are quite prepared to admit the designation of our conference as a war conference, for it indicated the lines on which the class war is to be carried on. Our army is the whole working class; our front forms a zigzag line, traversing every country in a thousand directions. We have the largest army in the world. But a part of our army is still in a state of complete passivity, is still under the influence of bourgeois ideology; one part of it is poisoned by reformism, and only one part of it is gathered round the flag of class war. It was the work of our conference to weld the revolutionary workers more closely together, to build a bridge between the revolutionary workers and the workers who are members of reformist organizations, or who belong to no labor organization and stand apathetically aside from the social struggle developing around them—to draw all these over to the side of irreconcilable class war.

Was the Frankfort Conference successful in fulfilling these tasks? Undoubtedly. Above all, the conference adopted a number of practical measures calculated to create new fulcrums for our struggles: the control commissions, committees of action, international fraternities, etc. All these are new centres of organization, whose task lies in drawing the masses more closely together for their struggle against imperialism. The culmination of all the organizations formed is the International
Committee of Action, a body standing outside of party, and commissioned to lead the work of the revolutionary workers of every political trend, to enter into close relations with all labor organizations, and to do its utmost to convene an international labor congress.

The International Conference passed a number of concrete organizational resolutions, and in addition to this imparted concrete instructions to the revolutionary workers. The most important one was the proposal to create immediate tasks under present circumstances, and pointed out the subjects on which the proletariat of each country must concentrate under existing international conditions. The program has been worked out carefully; and this program is the product of a mere national movement. It is a product of the experiences gained by the revolutionary movement in all countries.

The Frankfort Conference differed from the Hague conference in that it did not occupy itself with pacifist speech-making. The men who met in Frankfort were no pacifists, but revolutionists: no pacific makers, but men of action; and they were thus able to enter into every question of our complicated class strategy.

The most important strategic question for the working class is that of the international co-ordination of action. We have seen how the Amsterdam and 2. Internationala which were restored with so much trouble after the war, resolved themselves into their national constituents as soon as the war clouds lowered in Europe. The pacifist gossips of all countries made lame excuses to the “entente” of the Nations, and inveighed against Poincaré for his ungenerously behavior, but all the same they continued to prefer the cultivation of national narrow-mindedness, and the preference of “national interests” to class interests. The Frankfort Conference has provided an actual lesson of what the International and the Communist party can accomplish.

While the French and Belgian reformists were making drawing-room speeches, the French communists and revolutionary syndicalists appeared at the Frankfort Conference and there declared, both as spokesmen of a work of unities, that they would endeavor to break the neck of rampant imperialism. And they were not deterred from acting by the conference by the fact that dozen of communists and syndicalists are still in prison for participating in the Essen conference. In such manner do the | comunists and the Internationala go about the problem in a manner different from that imposed upon them by the international complications and international conflicts of today.

The leaders of the Amsterdam and 2. Internationala did not wish to appear at the Frankfort Conference, but as they had to do something in view of the Ruhr occupation, or otherwise they might lose the support of all workers, the reformists of Italy, France, England, and Belgium assembled in Paris at the same time as the Frankfort Conference was being held, for the purpose of seeking a solution for the problems agitating the International. V. Emanuele, Massimino, and Modigliani, resolved to send a deputation to Berlin to negotiate with the German social democrats on the reparations and on the Ruhr occupation. A strange decision to come to! In the Frankfort conference we call it a work of the Entente lands together first, why not have invited the German reformists at once? The thing is perfectly clear: The reformists of France, Belgium, and of the countries diplomats-is connected with them felt themselves to be in the position of victors with regard to the German reformists and settled upon a course with regard to them just as the Entente bourgeoisie acts towards the German bourgeoisie. As soon as two representatives of Entente reformism are gathered together to work out the reparations question, we have only France and Belgium which were devastated by the war. All this is perfectly incomprehensible so long as we regard the reformists as representatives of the working class, but as they now regard them as representatives of the “Nations”, that is, of their own bourgeoisie, their proceedings become perfectly comprehensible.

Fascism, recognized as a preventive counter-revolution, was accorded great attention by the Frankfort Conference. Fascism is raising its head everywhere. It hopes to finally establish a definitive division between the workers and the bourgeoisie for long decades. But what is the difference between Fascism and ordinary, non-Fascist reaction? The fact that Fascism misuses the working masses by demagogic methods, that it endeavors to utilize the most radical watchwords, that it attempts to form large labor organizations, tries to split them up from within, to demoralize them, in order to be better able to strangle them. Not only is Fascism the highest form of reaction, it is at the same time the embodiment of the extreme bellicose nationalism, leading inevitably to fresh wars. Therefore the Frankfort Conference not only worked out a program for combating war, but at the same time laid down the lines of struggle against Fascism.

The Frankfort Conference has shown us that it is not only the communists and revolutionary syndicalists in the working class who are desiring of fighting against war, but many other working class elements as well. It has shown that the unification of the trade-unionists and the C.I.S.L. and the R.I.L.U. have their source in a profound need of the broad masses.

The Frankfort Conference was the highest consummation of international solidarity in another sense also, in that the separate groups faced the possible results of their impending joint struggles against the whole bourgeoisie. The International Conference, in declaring that the first task of the revolutionary workers of Germany is the overthrow of the Cuno government and the establishment of a workers’ government, faced the fact that this may lead to a war on the part of the Great Entente against Little Entente against the social revolution in Germany. No one doubts for a moment that the workers’ government in Germany signifies an alliance for life or death between revolutionary Germany and Soviet Russia. To a conference of internationalists such an alliance is a matter of course. It would be a strange thing if Soviet Russia would permit the strangulation of the social revolution in Germany. This was so perfectly obvious to everyone that the question did not even give rise to discussion. All were fully convinced that when the German proletariat has overthrown its bourgeoisie, and finds itself confronted by European imperialism, then the Russian proletariat and the Red Army will fight hand in hand and shoulder to shoulder with the German workers until the end, until complete victory over the bourgeoisie.

The most obstinate and conservative reformist is now forced to recognize that it is only the revolutionary workers who are carrying on any effective struggle against the Ruhr occupation. It is true that all the results of the Frankfort conference are not yet apparent. But the signs are unmistakable. Great Allies, the German social democrats, continue to repeat, day after day, that the German communists are agents of Poincaré; at the same time the whole yellow press of France maintains that the German communists are the representatives of the paid hirelings of Cuno. This insolence is nothing new. It is a well known line of tactics, invariably followed by ruling classes and discipline: to represent the revolutionists of their country to be agents of a foreign power. Let them say what they will, let them be races by the more advanced of the other countries, the Frankfort Conference has taken the second step in the same direction: An international committee of action has been formed, national and district committees, commissions, fraternities, etc., have been called into existence. The path is traced out before us. It only remains to work, to work, and once more to work—and victory is ours!

**POLITICS**

**What has Mr. Vandervelde to say?**

By Karl Radek.

Moscow, March 10, 1923.

Our readers will recollect how the one-time royal minister of justice Vandervelde, caused us to blush with shame by declaring, at the S.R. trial: "In our country, in Belgium, the communists may do as they like, write what they like, and say what they like." Mr. Vandervelde added, with a grinace: "This does not trouble us; nobody is afraid of them; we are a powerful Belgian laboring people." And the West European Press took up the tune.

To-day the wire brings us the news that 20 Belgian communists have been arrested, among them three members of the party leadership of whose names we are not informed. They will be accused of some frightful crime, perhaps even of high treason. But what has happened that democratic Belgium, whose abnormalities were everywhere remarked, and even praised, when Soviet Russian barbarity, has suddenly become so disturbed?

The Communist Party of Belgium, though young and weak, has manfully protested against the participation of Belgium in the rapacious raid on the Ruhr. The Belgian bourgeoisie declared that the workers of Belgium that they were obliged, on principle, to support the national interest. The Belgian communists reminded the Belgian miners that, despite the enormous gains of the colliery owners, they are living in want and misery. They issued the slogan: No campaign against the German miners (whom the representatives of Belgian capitalism are treating precisely as General Beseler and other
representatives of the then victorious German militarism (treated the Belgian miners), but a campaign against the Belgian capitalists. When the movement began among the Belgian miners, Mr. Vanderwerve's party ran for help to the Belgian capitalists, and began to hunt down the communists. But it turned out that the Belgian communist party, despite its youth and weakness, had the support of the masses, and that the fit of jingoism evoked by the German invasion of 1914, and the subsequent sufferings of the Belgian working masses, and even more by the victory of the Entente, is now over. The miners did not follow Mr. Vanderwerve, but rather responded to the appeals made by the Belgian communist party. They ran for a parliament with a program of peace and social progress.

As soon as this happened, it appeared that Belgian democracy is as unapproachable as a chariot maiden unmoored to the temptations of life. The Belgian government tolerated the agitation of the communists so long as it was convinced that Mr. Vanderwerve and his party could cope alone with the communist danger. But so soon as it became evident that the communists can place themselves at the head of an elementary movement among workers who have lost their faith in Vanderwerve, then the Belgian bourgeoisie fell upon the communists, and flung open the doors of the prisons for their reception. It is possible that Mr. Vanderwerve, with the skill peculiar to him, will even protest against these arrests. Mr. Vanderwerve invariably makes a point of protesting whenever the bourgeoisie, with his assistance, prosecutes its aims. Then he washes his hands in innocence claiming: "I am not responsible for this. It is nobody's manoeuvre on Mr. Vanderwerve's part. He and his party aided their bourgeoisie to maintain power at the moment when it was tottering. Now they protest, with their tongue in their cheek. But the workers, who are the people through which this is ever made more instructive: The bourgeoisie plays with democracy so long as it is not dangerous to it. But as soon as democratic liberty permits the working class to organize any form of struggle, as soon as it facilitates any preparation for attack on the part of the working class, then the bourgeoisie throws democracy overboard, and bourgeoise conjurers manufacture laws on treason against the state.

What has Mr. Vanderwerve to say to this?

From Westminster Palace to Santé Prison

By R. Albert (Paris).

"...and thus the paths of the flunkies and the revolutionaries cross each other..."

Within three days of each other—March 17 and 20—two socialist conferences took place in Paris. The agendas of both conferences are of utmost importance to the occupation. Both conferences were occupied with questions unfolded by M. Poincaré, the spokesman of the Comité des Forges: The Kuhm, the coming war, the great capitalist threat against the world peace.

Two socialist conferences. A symbol.

One took place in the great hall of the trade union buildings. Here there were thousands crowded together who had marched hither direct from their places of work, working men in old-worn clothes, the weariness of the day's toil in their bones, the same time in their hearts. The everyman of Paris possesses of revolutionary hope and confidence, courage and will to action.—Outside of the hall, in the darkness of the night, a pack of despicable beings prowled about, around this mass of workers, like hungry dogs ready to make a snap at any mouth-watering chokes and pelicans.

The speaker's platform was occupied by a man with hair just turning grey, a man of high stature, with clear eyes—he spoke with outstretched hand. The foreign accent was scarcely noticeable in his voice. Had the chairman not just introduced him, it could have been asserted that he belonged to this mass of Parisian proletarians.

Höllein, communist member of the German Reichstag, was speaking... The hall re-echoed with the thunders of applause from the thousands of Parisian working men and women; hands and faces were raised enthusiastically to welcome this German, and the strains of the "International" filled the great hall. For there was not one present but felt that the conception Frenchman and German belong to the past, and that the terms "heute" and "welche" are infamous designations. A German worker was speaking to French workers, a communistic to communists. They all understood only too well what he was saying. The misery of the German children? In the suburbs of this opulent Paris there are as many indigent children as in the slums of the plutocrat Stütten? Ah, did not the Comité des Forges have the class brothers of the workers here assembled, shot at Le Havre only yesterday? The monstrous plots in Munich? The bourgeoisie and the "Action Française" elements were also represented in the hall by their spies. The imprisonment of German revolutionists in France the leaders of the workers are also sitting behind bars and...

This German communist was felt to belong to the same common stock as all those present in the hall. He came from a country where, four times within five years, the proletariat has unfolded its red flag and shed its blood in insurrection. And the thousands of workers listening here in Paris were well aware that for them, before the war, a connection between the bourgeoisie and the entire French working class was begun under the bourgeois regime, that there is no salvation without the inexorable struggle of the exploited against exploiters...

After leaving this mighty meeting, the speaker was arrested and taken to prison.

Höllein came here to bring proletarian Paris the fraternal greetings of the German workers, and for this he is charged with plotting against the security of the state; it seems as if the plain words of the communists contain something especially dangerous. Höllein is now in a cell of the political department in the Sänté. Cachin is "dwelling" near him; thus the representatives of two democratic parliaments are living under one roof in a prison of the French republic.

The other socialist conference took place three days later in the comfort and tranquility of the Palais Bourbon (French parliamentary building), surrounded by the servile respect of the servants, discreetly guarded by some of the more superior spies from the police. The railroad companies made sure that no-one disturbed the socialists at their work... Here the socialist deputies from four allied countries unfolded their portfolios (which did not yet look quite ministerial), and took their ease as well-remunerated shepherds of the peoples. Here the flower of European socialism was represented (except those of the enemy countries), or what the II. International regards as the flower. A choice selection of one-time and future ministers: Citizen Vanderwerve, the signatory of the Versailles peace; citizen Renaudel, his cronies Treves and Modigliani, the one receiving an offer from Mussolini, that they black his boots in some sub-secretariat of state. Citizen Ramsay Macdonald from the English Labor Party...

Ramsay Macdonald, who had just come from the banquet in Westminster Palace, where he had dined well at the table of His Majesty the King of England; where his majesty had condescended to speak to him just as the champagne or liqueur was being passed around... Who will ever give us a report on this aspect of the history of socialism?

Did George V. perhaps speak with him on the future of the British working class, or even of the fate of those 172 Hindu peasants who were condemned to death "in the king's name" somewhere in the great dependency?...

And this is a socialist conference of the II. International passed a resolution that... passed a resolution that... resolved that a commission, also inter-parliamentary, should be sent to Berlin to negotiate with the leaders of the party of Ebert, Scheidemann, and Noske...

Among these socialists there was not one who knew manual labor or daily want, or had not found time to forget them. Not one who knew prison. Not one who preached mass action. Not one who had an idea beyond hypocritical and lying phrases. Not one who was a revolutionist. Not one who was an honorless, dishonest, honorless, down-trodden, nameless, nameless bourgeois power. Two socialist conferences. A symbol.

The citizen Ramsay Macdonald came from Westminster Palace...

Höllein went to Santé prison...

...and thus the paths of the flunkies and the revolutionaries cross each other...

Open letter to Mr. Beneš *)

Dear Sir,

You are a member of the League of Nations, and one of the aims of this League is to see that justice is administered in this world, for which purpose, as you will be aware, it boosts quite a large number of citizens into the next world, by protecting every imaginable war adventure. You, as member of this honorable institution, as Minister for Foreign Affairs in a democratic republic, probably find the following of interest. Your Moscow representative visualized my passport, and it was specially

*) Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia.
noted on the passport that I was going to Marienbad for a course of treatment. When I appeared at the police headquarters in Prague I was informed by the police officials, in the charming manner peculiar to them, that I had to leave Prague for Marien- bad in three days, and that my passport would be prolonged to three days). Although deeply moved that the police should be so anxious about my health, I asked the chief of police why I could not remain in Prague for five or six days. He replied gruffly that he had his orders. I was able to obtain a new passport, but the police could not inform me of the new validity period, although I am obliged for your three days hospitality, I leave Czechoslovakia with the feeling that the Soviet air of my own country will do my health much more good than the healing waters of Marienbad, when these are mingled with police supervision. I was not permitted to stay in the hotel in which I had booked a room, and had to move to a cheaper hotel. How can you explain to me why your democratic police pretend to see me outside of your frontiers? If I were General Degoutte, and should trample in my soldiers' boots over the necks of the unarmed population of the Ruhr area, I could live in Prague as long as I liked, and as my boots would be those of a worthy representative of the French Exchange, the chief of police would polish them with his own hands. If I were Admiral Stark, and should sell ships which are the property of the Russian state, and appropriate the money for myself, your country would naturally extend its hospitality for a longer time. If I were a White Guard officer, and had attacked the Red Army from behind, under General Wrangel's command, when it was fighting against the Poland of the landowners, then you would not only permit me, I beg your pardon, but you would not oblige to inform me of the new validity period, although I am obliged for your three days hospitality. But I am not a French general, I do not indulge in speculation, I have not sold Soviet Russia either wholesale or retail; I am not even a whining S.R., but something much worse—I am a Bolshevik. Hence this limitation of hospitality in Prague.

And so, was it necessary for me to spend a few days in Prague? I wanted to form an idea, if only superficially, of the unemployment, the position and form of organization of the trade unions, the administration, the forms of book keeping, and of all the difficulties which hinder the development of the labor movement in your country. These were my "criminal" intentions. This sufficed to ex-pose me to the impudence of your agents, who dogged my footsteps without intermission. And your agents do not appear to have worked in vain, for on the morning of the 13 March one of them caught me in the street and conducted me to the police headquarters, where a regulation was read to me showing that a decree dating from the year 1871 banishes me for ever from Czechoslovakia. Several dozen of soles accompanied me in the most friendly manner to the railway station. Then the foreign office of your government appeared to fear that if I had extended my stay in Prague even one day beyond the term granted, the country would have been endangered.

You must not imagine, Mr. Benes, that I am in the least offended at this agreeable treatment on the part of your chief of police! No; he is a pillar of democracy, and therefore suffering from anti-Bolshevism, and from love for White Guards and speculators. I merely establish the fact the Czech-Slovakian democratic republic receives every week thousands of homeless, anti-republican, anti-labor element of the whole world, but limits its hospitality as soon as it is a question of a communist, a functionary of the international trade union movement, serv-ent the working class. You can imagine how thoroughly satisfying it must be for your justification the fact that your republic is no worse than the French or the American—this is true. I have not the courage to try and decide which of these three republics is the worst. But you at least are on the same level as your French patron. Deeply moved, however, I am not overwhelmed with admiration for the pleasant impressions from Czechoslovakia—not from you or the chief of police, of course—but from those revolutionary workers who feel themselves organically related to the Russian revolution. I do not abandon the hope of being able to visit Czechoslovakia again, and of finding the workers of your country will show real hospitality to the repre-
sentative of the Russian workers. The so-called democratic republics are but passing phenomena, are they not, Mr. Benes?

With Soviet greetings.

A. Lozowsky.


ECONOMICS

Ruhr occupation—German and French economics

By E. Varga.

If there really were some people still naive enough to believe that after the world war, conflicts could be solved by the League of Nations or in some other peaceful manner, France's military proceedings must have sufficiently convinced them by now that within capitalism conflicts can only be solved by force. What is going on in the Ruhr area at the present time is war: the war of an unarmed population against an armed enemy.

Before considering the question of the economic significance of the Ruhr area, and of the consequences of the occupation for German and French economics, we must first emphasize the fact that in this case the same illusion is prevailing as during the world war. At that time there existed a general belief that a world war could not last longer than a few months, that modern economics were so interwoven that it was impossible for a war to last longer. Experience shows that a world war can last 4½ years. And in this case: it is believed that an occupation of the Ruhr area, attended by a cutting off of the supply of Ruhr coal, would lead to a speedy catastrophe in German economics. How often was it repeated, by the bourgeois press of Germany, that a railway strike in France, or a coal-miners' strike, would bring about an immediate catastrophe in the economic life of Germany, and must therefore be avoided at any cost. But now experience shows that after more than two months of Ruhr occupation, and after supplies of Ruhr coal and iron have ceased for a considerable time, a catastrophe in German economics. This proves, the first place, that this pretext for combating labor movements is based on a lie, and, in the second place, that German capitalist economics are exceedingly elastic.

The coal and iron problem.

The purpose of the Ruhr occupation is stated by France to be the necessity for getting pledges from Germany that the reparations are paid regularly. These are the so-called "productive pledges" which France hopes to obtain by occupying the Ruhr. But besides this financial aim, another factor has been decisive for the occupation, that of the special interests of French heavy industry. To make this clear, the following figures may be adduced:

Even before the war France had a large excess of iron ore as compared with her coal. A great part of the iron ore produced on the Lorraine frontier of France had to be exported, and was smelted in Germany. After the war, the disproportion between the iron ore and coal resources in Lorraine was made up partly by the iron ore produced in Northern France by the Germans; on the other hand, France's output of iron ore has been enormously increased by her possession of Lorraine and its ore mines. The change which has taken place may be gathered from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Coal (in millions of tons)</th>
<th>Iron ore (in millions of tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the present political conditions, the coal output of Europe is distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Coal (in millions of tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>395.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1913 the total coal output of Europe was over 600 million tons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Coal (in millions of tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>395.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Varga
Europe's output of iron ore, which amounted to 107 million tons in 1913, was distributed as follows:

- **Germany**: 22.6 million tons = 26.78% of total
- **France**: 21.5 million tons = 24.09%
- **Great Britain**: 16.2 million tons = 15.23%

By the loss of the Lorraine Minette, and by the surrender of the districts in the east, German iron ore production has dropped from 28.6 to 7.3 million tons (compared with 1913), i.e., about three-quarters; France's output on the other hand, has about doubled.

The following table shows the distribution of iron ore production in the present political districts, before and after the war, for the whole of Europe:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Germany, present boundaries</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Luxemburg</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>Poland (with East Upper Silesia)</th>
<th>Czechoslovakia</th>
<th>Great Britain and Ireland</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>39.91</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>39.14</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this may be seen that France's iron ore production from her present areas amounted to 40% of the total iron ore output of Europe in the year 1913. The result is thus: -

**7% coal output as compared with 40% iron output.**

It must be further observed that the quantity of recoverable iron ore (in the earth) is now in France's hands to a much greater extent than before; France, within her present boundaries, possesses 33% of the total iron ore reserves of Europe.

It is this disproportion between coal and iron which has induced French heavy industry to force an imperialist policy on the French government in the Ruhr area.

It is also possible to imagine a state of affairs in which the Lorraine ores would be smelted in the Ruhr area again; and the blast furnaces of Lorraine could be provided with Ruhr coal and Ruhr coke; the new frontier lines have not altered the geographical and transport conditions in the least. But the real question is, the determination of French heavy industry to extend its influence to the whole Rhenish-Westphalian heavy industry, in order to obtain a monopoly on the continental European iron industry (the heavy industries outside of Germany—Poland, Czechoslovakia—powerfully influenced by French capital). French heavy industry has not yet driven into its present policy by necessity of production, it is actuated by the desire for monopoly and for political power.

### The economic significance of the occupied territory

It must be specially emphasized that great tracts of Germany were occupied by the Entente before the occupation of the Ruhr; the Saar district, the district on the left bank of the Rhine, the bridge heads. If we include the Saar area, the territory at present occupied is 34,273 square kilometres in extent, and has a population of about 12 millions, that is, the fifth part of the total population of the country. But up to now the occupation had little effect on Germany's economic life, for the traffic had been kept open between occupied and unoccupied territory, and all territory remained under German administration, taxation, financial control, etc.

All this is changed with one stroke by the Ruhr occupation for all these districts are now cut off from free economic intercourse with Germany in respect to products of heavy industry.

It must be remembered that the Ruhr area is the very heart of German coal and iron production. It is the most industrialized district in the world. There is no district in the world, with so dense a network of traffic as the Ruhr area.

### The following survey gives an idea of the coal output of the occupied territory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Saar area</th>
<th>Other territory hitherto occupied</th>
<th>Ruhr area</th>
<th>Total occupied territory</th>
<th>Germany, present boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>9.695</td>
<td>7.689</td>
<td>6.965</td>
<td>25.967</td>
<td>130.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>9.846</td>
<td>5.654</td>
<td>5.605</td>
<td>22.105</td>
<td>130.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>9.894</td>
<td>5.654</td>
<td>7.689</td>
<td>23.134</td>
<td>130.114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cutting off of all export of coal and coke from the Ruhr area has naturally involved severe losses for Germany. But the harmful effects of this cessation of coal supplies is felt much more seriously than the production figures would prove. It is probable that the constant threats of occupation of the Ruhr area put under British control, on their guard, so that these had provided themselves with a good stock of coal. Moreover, the production of lignite has been energetically increased, and a great part of the shortage is compensated by the import of English coal.

In 1922, the import of English coal had already reached 8.3 million tons — almost that of the year 1913. We have no comprehensive data on the import of English coal since the Ruhr occupation, but there is no doubt that it is very high. At the present time, the demand for coal is being met from the Spanish and from the English coal. It is characteristic for the anarchy of capitalist economics that the same ships which carry English coal to the United States, bring American coal with them for Germany on their return journey; this is reported by the English technical journals.

The alarming stagnation of German economics at the present moment, expressed by the great increase of unemployment

---

*) see Shadwell's book: *Germany, England, America,*
and part-time, is not an immediate consequence of the Ruhr occupation; it is the continuation of a downward process which began six months ago, and has been rendered more acute by the stabilization. The Ruhr block, however, although the Ruhr occupation and the cessation of coal supplies has not yet led to catastrophic results for German economy, is up to now—apart from the Ruhr area—this does not by any means signify that this state of affairs could be continued for long. The Ruhr coal is running low, and will soon be exhausted, and the import of English coal cannot in any way replace the shortage of Ruhr coal; neither is England’s production large enough to do this, nor is Germany capable of raising the money required for the continuous purchase of exportable coal. With regard to the economic position in the Ruhr area itself, we must admit that no reliable data are obtainable. It is probable that the coal output has diminished very considerably—perhaps to less than half of normal—and that this coal is coked in the Ruhr area itself, and used for smelting the existing and imported iron ore, and that the iron goods thus produced are placed on stock for the present.

The Ruhr occupation and French economics. However incredible it may appear, the consequences of the Ruhr occupation are at the moment much more disastrous for French than for German economics. The French iron industry is completely dependent on German coal and German coke. Only very small reserves were on hand, have now been used up, and a large number of blast furnaces in the east of France, above all the Lorraine works, have been compelled to close down for lack of coke. For lack of coke, 50% of the output monthly is about 700,000 tons only, a very small amount of which is produced in France itself, or is replaced by English or Czech-Slovakian coal. The position is best characterized by the following survey given in the Paris D’Usines, the periodical of the French iron and steel industry: “We have now been in occupation of the Ruhr area for a month, and the situation of our iron industry is becoming more and more critical every day. When the government decided to adopt compulsory measures against Germany, sent officials to Paris to appeal under arms, and make the necessary preparations for taking over large amounts of coke. The results are sufficiently well known. We entered the Ruhr on January 11, and since January 19, our industry has not received a single ton of coke from the Ruhr area. Our factories are working today at about 60% of the January rate, that is, at 30% of their normal production. We are continually being compelled to extinguish additional blast furnaces, and the situation has every prospect of becoming worse.

The factories cannot work, or work scarcely a quarter of their blast furnaces. The small reserves are completely exhausted. It must not be forgotten that the German deliveries were always in arrears, so that it was impossible for our industry to take precautionary measures against possible crises, quite apart from all that it meant to us.”

When German or pro-German newspapers, attempt to represent the Ruhr occupation as an action undertaken at our instigation, this is very far from the actual truth. On the contrary, our industry is the first to suffer from the resultant conditions. It is precisely our industry which feels with the greatest acuteness the consequences of the policy pursued at present.”

It must not be concluded from this that French heavy industry abandons the idea of controlling the Ruhr industry. All that is proved is the old story of the great war: that the cost of defeating the enemy by far exceeds the profits gained; that the conflicting parties put themselves mutually in the struggle for economic power.

In conclusion, it may be observed that the cessation of coal and iron supplies from the Ruhr area, and the consequent stagnation of the considerable iron and steel industry, have led to a temporary revival of the markets in the other heavy industrial countries of Europe. England is the greatest gainer; her coal and iron industries are fully occupied at present, and at rising prices. The majority of the works are running at a cost of 70% against about 55% a month ago when the occupation gains ground so slowly. Czech-Slovakian heavy industry has also experienced a revival, but it is very difficult to get coal or iron transported across Germany from here to France. Germany is the chief buyer. American heavy industry is full of life, and is now in the position to supply the Ruhr competition which has disappeared from the world market; moreover, Germany is buying coal from America. But this revival is merely a passing phase, and will blow out with a protrusion of the Ruhr conflict.

The issue of the conflict. It is not our task to predict the probable termination of the conflict. But one thing appears to be certain: On no account will England permit France to carry off a complete victory in the Ruhr conflict. Such a solution, which would place the whole Rhenish-Westphalian heavy industry in French hands, will not be accepted by England. For this reason, the intervention of England and America in the conflict is inevitable. The difference is not open, and participation will be secured for English capital in Rhenish-Westphalian heavy industry. Further, there is no doubt whatever, despite the press campaigns and the official pronouncements, that the industrial policy of France and Germany, the national economies, the continual negotiations are going on between German and French heavy industries. We consider the most probable issue of the conflict to be—provided that the working class does not succeed in gaining decisive influence on the solution of the question by resolutions and strikes. It is probable that the Rhenish-Westphalian heavy industry will become the joint property of German, French, and English capital. This could be made technically possible by a loan to Germany, guaranteed by England and raised in England and America. For this reason, the intervention of England and America in the conflict is inevitable. This international loan would be secured by the real values of German industry, above all by those of the Rhenish-Westphalian industrial area, and a form would be found (for instance the issue of supplementary shares) enabling French and English capital to secure the desired participation.

This solution would probably be temporary only. The fact of the Ruhr occupation is in itself a proof that on the basis of the Versailles treaty there can be no capitalist balance of power. The political struggles for power which are expressed in the occupation of the Ruhr will lead to the collapse of economic foundations, and the gradual improvement observable during the autumn months has again been erased.


(Russian People’s Commissary for Finance.)

We frequently meet with the opinion that our traffic in paper money, like all traffic in paper money, must inevitably lead to a catastrophe; that the crisis which our paper money is undergoing is a deadly one, and that it is not possible to avoid the transition to gold currency, not merely in the sense of calculating on a gold basis but to the use of gold currency. But if we accord these opinions careful consideration, we find that the arguments on which they are founded are supported more by prejudice than by logic.

The classical instance most frequently adduced is that of the great French revolution, which attempted to put its economics in order with the aid of paper currency. When this paper money was devalued of value, it was replaced by metal coins, and after a crisis lasting some years France passed to metal currency again.

This historical analogy deserves a careful analysis, for such an analysis serves to disclose the extreme superficiality of this analogy, and also to prove that it is not a shadow of proof of the inevitability of the collapse of our paper currency. During the epoch of revolutionary crisis, France did not make the transition to metal coins because the paper money system had collapsed, the reverse was the case, the system of paper money collapsed because it was replaced by metal currency. And why? In the first place because coin currency was possible. There were such quantities of coins in the country (about 2/3 billions of francs), in the hands of private persons, that these sufficed to cover all requirements for circulation, and were more than the most important condition, and was a result of the then existing backwardness of banking activity, which had not yet reached the point of withdrawing metal from circulation in overwhelming quantities, and concentrating it in reserve funds belonging to the central banks.

Besides this, there were two other decisive factors. First, until 1793 France still had a favorable trade balance, and during the first year of the revolution this favorable commercial balance was able to prevent metal currency from leaving France. The revolution gave a positive meaning to foreign trade. Later on the revolutionary wars hindered the development of foreign trade, especially of tea trade. But — and this is the second factor — the Napoleonic wars brought about a tremendous increase of France’s gold reserves, for the gold of Italy, Holland, and other countries was confiscated. It may be asserted, without exaggeration, that almost all the gold reserves accumulated by the commercial states of the continent during the middle ages fell into the hands of the French bourgeoisie, which proceeded (for a time) to extend its political hege-
mony in France to an immediate political and economic hegemon in Europe. Even during the period of paper currency, France's finances were never on a purely paper basis. The government combined the system of issuing bank-notes with a system of paying in gold to bankers and business people who gathered around the government; the manufacturers supplying war requisites were almost invariably paid in metal coins.

During the whole period, up to the overthrow of Robespierre, the revolutionary government was supplied with considerable ratios of paper currency, and when the revolution finally came it was considerably as compared with the present fluctuations in the value of paper money in Russia, Germany, etc. At the time of Robespierre's downfall the paper money still retained 50% of its original value; it was not until after the revolution that the paper currency rapidly depreciated; in regard to which it must be observed, that the most acute deprec- ration occurred at a time when the government itself was anxious for the complete deprecation of the paper currency. Thus the bourgeoisie made a clean sweep of the paper money, and of the government based upon it.

With us there is no resemblance to this. Our industry is a state industry and our trade a state trade, and though these are equally anxious to rid the depreciated currency, and to have another basis of support than Soviet currency, still this striving is only for the present development, for the state industry and the state trade are much more in need of a firm Soviet power than a firm currency.

Thus the analogy drawn between the French and Russian financial crises is more than weak; in Russia there is not sufficient gold for paper currency, and to have another basis of support than Soviet currency, still this striving is only for the present development, for the state industry and the state trade are much more in need of a firm Soviet power than a firm currency.

The COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT

To all Co-operative Organizations!

The I. International Conference of communist co-operatives, as well as the IV. World Congress of the Comintern, decided that the co-operative societies have to take active and energetic part in all struggles of the proletariat.

At the present time the proletariat is threatened with a frightful danger. The greedy bourgeoisie of France, actuated by the desire to completely crush and exploit the working masses of Germany, has taken the step of occupying the Ruhr area. For the German people, this occupation signifies a source of immeasurable dangers, of suffering and misery. It is impossible for the German people to patiently tolerate this predatory raid. The extension of French imperial power is an enormous danger for the peace of Europe. Storm-laden war clouds are hanging over Europe and the whole world. Now, more than ever, all truly proletarian fighting organizations must redouble their efforts in the fight against the bourgeoisie, and the Russian co-operative must not take the last place in the ranks of the proletarian forces.

In the face of this tremendous danger, we must immediately commence agitation within the co-operatively organized masses, for the protection of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and against the war danger threatened through the action of the bourgeoisie. We must continually expose to the masses of coope- rators the policy of the social traitors, who pass resolution at their peace congresses, but fail to carry them out when the decisive moment comes.

We must devote all our powers to this struggle.

The attitude adopted by us to the question of the struggle for securing peace was clearly stated by Soviet Russia's delegation at the Hague conference. Our proposals to all labor organiz- ations of the world are as follows:

1. In order to secure the greatest possible measure of suc- cess for the proletarian struggle in the cause of peace, it is nec- essary to put an end to any class collaboration and any coalition with the bourgeoisie, and to draw a sharp line between labor organizations and bourgeois governments.

2. In order to prepare the arms and the broad masses of workers for effective war against the bourgeoisie, we must put an end to all legal and illegal collaboration with organizations, which shall carry on an uninterrupted, persevering, and systematic work of agitation and enlightenment within the army, and be ready at the decisive moment to lead the armies rising against the bourgeoisie.

3. Energetic mass fighting is to be carried on for the annulment of the war armaments treaties and other similar treaties; against the league of imperialist pirates sailing under the flag of the "League of Nations"; against the enslavement of the working masses of Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, and other countries, through the medium of the "reparations". The interna- tional bourgeoisie must be made to pay the full price for making good all the damage and devastation for which it alone is to blame.

4. The working and peasant masses of the semi-colonial and colonial countries, suffering beneath the oppression of the imperialist robbers, are to be induced to join in the war against war. Special attention is to be devoted to agitating against imperialism amongst the colored troops.

5. Stru{ē}rous efforts must be made for the immediate evac- uation of the territory of Germany occupied by Entente troops, and for the withdrawal of all occupation troops from all districts (Near and Far East, Africa, etc.) which, according to the orders of the League of Nations, that is, according to the right of might, are to remain until further notice.

6. A continuous fight must be conducted for the disarma- ment of the White Guard organizations of the bourgeoisie, for the arming of the working masses, and for the establishment of workers' governments whose task it will be, to carry out these demands against the workers' rule only.

The events in the Ruhr impart a special significance to this resolution at the present time.

We appeal to all the workers and peasants of Soviet Russia to be organized in co-operatives, and call upon them to voice their revolutionary protest against the danger of fresh carnage now being raised by the imperialist bourgeoisie of France, aided by the late Entente.

The Committee of the "Zentrabosays".

THE WHITE TERROR

In Yugoslavia

By W. Vayovitch.

The reign of White Terror in Yugoslavia, which began towards the end of 1920, was not only revealed by the dissolution of the Communist Parties and of the trade unions, and by the imprisonment of thousands of workers; the Terror was further expressed by the spectacle of exhorting confessions from the imprisoned communists, in order to obtain material to prove to public opinion how necessary it is to place the communist outside of the law.

In Bosnia, where 300 miners were kept awaiting trial for a year, eleven comrades fell victims to an inquisition whose cruelties surpasses all imagination. The death of these eleven
comrades best characterizes the regime obtaining in the prisons of a "civilized" country. The communist trial which took place in Belgrade last year revealed numerous facts plainly showing that reaction is determined to shrink from no means in order to supply the criminal court with "proofs" based on the "confessions" of the accused. Comrade Tchaki was so beaten during an examination that he practically lost consciousness; for an hour after the interrogation, cold water was poured over his head to restore him to consciousness. After the proceedings were ended, he was forced to sign the protocol of this "hearing". During a hearing of this description four of his comrades were sentenced to life imprisonment.

The prisoners were crowded in hundreds into cells intended for 30 to 40 men at most. Here they were left for several days, in unbearable heat, without bread or water. They were continually ill-treated, for no other reason than that they were communists.

The notorious "chimney" of the Belgrade prison certainly represents the most refined torture practised by Yugoslavian "civilization". It is a narrow cell in which a human being can only stand upright. Our comrades were frequently confined in this for 48 hours at a time, or even longer, without bread or water; at the same time smoke was allowed to penetrate into the narrow space, which naturally caused the most intolerable torments. Comrade Kolatchek was beaten till he bled. This beating was carried out with a hideous, hideous whip. After this ill usage he was carefully cleansed of blood, and incarcerated in the "chimney" for some hours. It would require a thick volume to recount all the numerous methods of torture employed, but the real horror behind the scenes suffices to illustrate the appalling conditions obtaining in the Yugoslavian prisons.

Comrades Steith and Tchaki, one condemned to 20, the other to 30, years of imprisonment, in "light irons", are in a frightful situation. Their cells are unhealthy and damp, the food detoxified all description, and in addition to this, they have to drag about with them iron fetters weighing 15 kilograms. According to the Serbian law the weight of light fetters should only be 5 kilograms but as these comrades are incarcerated in a prison of Yovovina—a district belonging to Austria before the war—they are forced to carry a heavier weight because the Austrian prisoners were only provided with such fetters.

A young comrade from Slavonia was recently condemned to two years strict solitary confinement. The sentence contained the further regulation that the prisoner, once a month, had to pass 24 hours without a bed, on the concrete floor, and without any food whatever. And this cruel sentence was passed for no other reason than that communist literature had been found in the prisoners' house.

But despite all these persecutions and ill usage, the Yugoslav proletariat holds true to the revolution, and has carried through several successful struggles within the last few months; this may best be seen in the founding of an independent labor party, and in the excellent development made by the independent trade unions in recent months. But the Yugoslav proletariat will also find a way to fight for the liberation of its political prisoners.

In Pilсудski's Poland

By A. K. (Warsaw).

For decades the Polish revolutionaries have never had a month's peace. The dictatorship of the Polish bourgeoisie followed immediately on the heels of the Czarist regime of occupation, rule. Despite the Morawski's government arrests and murders were the order of the day, and all the institutions which followed of whatever description, pursued the same policy of arrests and murders against the revolutionists.

"Pavulon", "Pawiak", "Serbiya", "Mokotow" (well known Warsaw prisons), and dozens of provincial prisons, returned to their most notorious traditional methods. Nothing was changed but the uniform and the badges. The one-headed eagle was not an iota more humane than his double-headed predecessor. And beneath his sway the system and practices of the prisons remained unaltered for many a year. Many of the occupants of the prisons returned to them. Hundreds of revolutionary fighters, who had already spent half their lives in Czarist gaols or in exile, made fresh acquaintance with the prisons of "Pilсудski". Poland, the community deputy of the Yudin, Slech, Królikowski, just recently set at liberty, has undergone eight years of Czarist imprisonment, followed by two years of incarceration watched over by Pilсудski's gendarmes. During the few years of existence of "independent" Poland, many of our comrades have scarcely enjoyed liberty for a few months. An idea may be gained of the extent of the reprisals being carried on in Poland, by a glance at the present code which contains the names of more than 400 prisoners, of whom at least three quarters have already been imprisoned for two years, and all of whom are condemned to long terms of imprisonment. Five to fifteen years has hitherto, as a measure of punishment meted out to the communists; in one time Russian-Poland, the legal basis for this punishment is derived from the Czarist code of laws. In Galicia and Pozen it is derived from the Austrian or Prussian code of penal laws.

It has often been asked who has adopted the most brutal measures against revolution and the revolutionists: Czarsim or the Polish Skallons, Kozakowks, Gruns, Ithofs, and Alexandrovs, as represented by such scoundrels as Witecki, Sarski, Gorzkowski, Morawski, and their fellow accomplices. That such a question can be asked at all is significant enough in itself. It is extremely difficult to reply for it is hard to compare the data, and moreover the intensity of the repressive measures under both regimes, has varied at different times.

If we do not consider separate details, but wish to characterize the period as a whole, we may say that, in the first place, mass repression was formerly never exercised for such long and uninterrupted periods, and, in the second place, such repressive measures were never so extensive as at the present time. We have seen that 160 political trials were formerly unknown, can enter into competition with Warsaw and Lodz. There is no doubt that this period is filled with shameful deeds, such as were unknown to the earlier history of Polish revolution. Furthermore the murder of the Soviet Russian Red Cross commission, with the old political convict Vreckovski at the head, in December 1918; or the murder of Brozas, stabbed by a bayonet; or the murder of comrade Pola Maciejovskaya in Kattowitz, and the pogroms among the female political prisoners in Wronki.

Such excesses as were committed during Morawski's government have occurred in Poland at various times, and under the most various circumstances. The responsibility for these horrible crimes falls to the Polish Scheidemanns: Morawski, Baszynski, and Silvinski. Six months ago, under Silvinski's government, an arrested man was forced to make a confession by means of torture, and the role of executioner was not played by a gendarme or by the Definitive (Polish secret police), but by Lubomir, the judge of the court of inquiry. During the electoral campaign a group of youths, who were arrested at an electoral meeting had their heads shaved like criminals, and in addition chained like convicts. In earlier times prisoners were certainly never subjected to such systematich psychological tortures as is now the case in Polish prisons. There are prisons in which as many as 10 hunger strikes have taken place in the course of a year.

The struggle raging in Poland against the communist movement is being carried on, as it has always been, under the leadership and active participation of the Polish Scheidemanns who sit in the offices of the Defensive, and openly and secretly cooperate with these secret police. Despite the struggle thusforthing from the extreme right, these elements are still terribly afraid that the chains may be removed which hinder the development of the labor movement. A number of sharp lessons on the part of the right are first required, in order that the working class may revolt against these tactics of its leaders, and close its ranks for a united struggle against the repression hindering the development of the labor movement.

Notice to our Readers:

In subscribing to the "INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDANCE", send your check or money order thru:

U.S.A.: Equitable Trust Company, New York, N.Y.
ENGLAND: Swiss Bank Corporation, London.
NORWAY: Centralbanken for Norge, Christiania.
SWEDEN: A. B. Göteborgs Bank, Stockholm. An order may also be placed at any large book store.

Making it payable to:

Bett Simon & Co. a/c Imprcorr. Berlin

Rates: $ 3.00
for 6 months: $ 6.00
for one year.

Readers of the "Imprcorr" who have not yet paid up their subscriptions, will be stricken from our mailing list.

Printed by Friedrichstadt-Drukteor E. o. m. b. H., Berlin SW. 48