

Trotsky on the General Strike in England.

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 46

10th June 1926

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

CONTENTS

- David Olsson: The Government Crisis in Sweden.
- The Miners Struggle in England.**
L. D. Trotsky: Preface to the Second German Edition of "Where is Britain Going?"
Beth Turner: British Women and the General Strike.
A. Lozovski: Useless Declaration.
The International Conference of Communist Women Support the British Miners.
- China.**
Tang Shin She: A New Phase in the Chinese Revolution.
- Politics.**
G. Peri: After the Capitulation of Abd-el Krim.
Jar: The Surrender of Abd-el Krim and the Imperialism of Primo de Rivera.
Moskovitch: The End of the Disarmament Conference.
Molnar: The Proceedings and the Verdict in the Franc Forgery Trial.
J. B.: The Syrian Revolt Unbroken.
- Economics.**
R. Mikkelsen: Capital Concentration in Denmark.
- The Labour Movement.**
K. D.: The Class Struggle in Norway.
The Chinese Seamen's Union.
- In the International.**
Ernst Thälmann: On the Tactics of the C. P. of Poland.
- For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.**
Aquila: The United Front Campaign of the C. P. of Italy and the S. P. I.
- The Youth Movement.**
Friedl Fürnberg: On the Report of the Executive of the Young Socialist International to the Amsterdam Congress.
- Union of Soviet Republics.**
St. Natonek: The Fight against Illiteracy in the Soviet Union.
- The White Terror.**
Against the Persecution of Spanish Communists.
- In the Camp of Social Democracy.**
F. Berlioz: The Party Conference of the Socialist Party of France.
- The Co-operative Movement.**
L. Chinchuk: The Antwerp Conference of the Executive Committee of the International Co-operative Alliance.
- Obituary.**
A. Nin: Joseph Tommasi.

The Government Crisis in Sweden.

By David Olsson (Stockholm).

The social democratic government in Sweden has now suffered a defeat in parliament and must give place to a bourgeois government. This means the collapse of the social-democratic-liberal collaboration and the creation of a united bourgeois bloc.

The period of the social democratic government provided the way for the bourgeois policy. One of the most important questions, the basis of this collaboration, was the law against strikes which are dangerous to the community. For several years the capitalists have attempted from all sides to persuade some of the social democratic leaders to acknowledge, in principle, in such cases a violation of the law. This has succeeded beyond all expectations, as both the Prime Minister and the Minister for Labour have openly acknowledged this.

Another question which was very pressing was that of unemployment, and, in connection with it, the question of unemployment insurance. At the beginning of the year parliament rejected a bill regarding unemployment insurance. That was against the principle of "co-operation" and the result, of course, was that the "Labour government" withdrew its bill. The same thing happened in regard to a number of other questions, such as the bill regulating the working day, insurance against industrial accidents, sick insurance and maternity insurance.

Ever since the government came into power after the elections in 1924, has this class-collaboration policy been carried out which has now led to the overthrow of the social democratic government. The Liberal Party, which has 28 seats in

parliament against 100 social democratic seats, promised from the commencement "to examine in a thorough and concrete manner the bills which the government may submit to Parliament". And in the event "of these bills, being acceptable, in the opinion of the Liberals, then they would be supported by them".

The entire social democratic government policy since 1924 has thus been a purely bourgeois policy, supported by the capitalists. This was quite clearly to be seen in the debate on the regulations regarding provision of work which has now led to the defeat of the government. All the bourgeois parties hastened to declare "that they did not wish to overthrow the government". In the debates on the budget the government received from the State Council seven objections, one of which was that the government had not prohibited the instructions issued to the soldiers by the Communist Party. All these objections clearly showed that the government depended for its support upon various bourgeois groups.

There are in Sweden at present about 100,000 unemployed, of whom only an extremely small number receive support in the form of so-called emergency work. The employers have made use of this tremendous unemployment in order to depress wages, and, on the basis of the regulations regarding provision of work, unemployed workers have been sent to the mines of Stripa where there is an industrial dispute. The government declared that the conflict was justified and that therefore the provisions must not be enforced. The capitalists have another opinion regarding this, and the Liberals brought forward a motion in parliament rendering more strict the regulations on provision of work. This motion provided that regardless of the causes of a labour dispute and regardless of the circumstances under which it may have broken out, the unemployed can be sent by the Labour Exchanges to such work places even when they have been boycotted by the trade unions.

This raised a storm of protest on the part of the organised working-class. The Communist Party called upon the workers to demand the resignation of the Unemployed Commission. As a result of this powerful storm of protest, the social democratic government did not venture to give way to the bourgeoisie.

When the question came up for discussion in the Parliament the Communist Party issued an appeal to the working class and submitted to the social democratic government the following demands:

"Immediate dissolution of the Second Chamber and new elections;

Real fight against any attempt to legalise blackleg work; Rejection of every attempt to abolish the right of the workers to strike;

A real social legislation: unemployment insurance, health insurance, maternity insurance and good labour protection laws;

Reduction of the duties on food and transference of the burden on to the shoulders of those able to pay."

The slogan was, a clear labour majority in the Second Chamber.

During the last few days huge labour meetings have been held in the largest industrial districts of the country, and which were convened partly by our Party and partly by the social democratic party. The resolution submitted at the social democratic meetings of workers states:

"A government which arises from a crisis of this sort is bound to become a government fighting against the Swedish working class. Its setting up will lead to severe political struggles in which the unity of the working class must be established at all costs."

The Swedish working class therefore understands the intentions of the bourgeois government and is anxious to fight. The social democratic leaders, along with the late government, wish to avoid the least struggle and speak of the parliamentary elections in the year 1928 and of the rallying of social democracy against the bourgeoisie.

The policy of the future government will consist in the first place in attempting to restrict the freedom of the Swedish trade union movement, and in this case, according to the utterances of social democratic leaders, there will be necessary "a period of collaboration of the left". The government will

not be able to carry on without the support of big capital and must therefore, in spite of the co-operation of the Liberals, conduct a policy dictated by big capital.

The Liberal Party originated from a split of the old Liberal Party, and its leader, C. G. Ekman, in the year 1923 defeated the Branting government, — likewise on the question of provision of work — after the alliance with the social democrats had existed a year. The political career of the new government will therefore undoubtedly be a short one. It is a fighting government against the working class, a government of strike-breakers.

The slogan of the Communist Party is: "No retreat, but forwards to the fight, to victory!"

THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

Preface to the Second German Edition of "Where is Britain Going"?

The following was written by Comrade Trotsky on May 6, i. e. six days before the calling off of the general strike by the General Council. Ed.

More than a year has elapsed since this book was written. The Conservative Ministry has had its honeymoon. Baldwin preached social peace. As MacDonald had nothing to oppose to conservatism, he competed with it in hatred against revolution, civil war and class war. The leaders of all three parties proclaimed that the British institutions were quite sufficient to ensure peaceful co-operation between the classes. The prognosis for the immediate future of British imperialism made in this book, was of course described by the whole British Press — from the "Morning Post" to "Lansbury's Labour Weekly" — as hopeless nonsense and Moscow phantasmagoria.

Now the situation is somewhat changed. England is convulsed by the greatest mass strike. The Conservative Government is carrying on a policy of furious attack. From above everything is being done to provoke civil war. The contradiction between the social factors of power and the lie of an out-of-date parliamentarism has become manifest in England as never before.

The mass strike arose from the contradiction between the present situation of British economics in the world market and the traditional conditions of production and relations between the classes within the country. Formally the question was: reduction of the miners' wages, longer hours of work, loading part of the sacrifices which are necessary for a real reorganisation of the coal industry on to the shoulders of the workers. Formulated in this way, the question is insoluble. It is perfectly true that the coal industry, as indeed the whole of British industry, cannot be reorganised without sacrifices, even serious sacrifices, on the part of the English proletariat. No one but a fool however can imagine for a moment that the English proletariat will consent to submit to this sacrifice on the old basis of capitalist property.

Capitalism was proclaimed to be a regime of permanent progress and of the systematic improvement of the lot of the working masses. To a certain extent this was true for some countries in the course of the 19th century. The religion of capitalistic progress was stronger in England than anywhere else. In fact it was this that formed the foundation of the conservative tendencies in the Labour movement itself, especially in the trade unions. In England, the war illusions (1914--1918) were, more than in any other country illusions of capitalist power and of "social" progress. Victory over Germany was to be the final crown to these hopes. And now bourgeois society says to the miners: "If you want at least to ensure yourselves an existence such as you had before the war, you will have, for an indefinite time, to accept a lowering of all your conditions of living." Instead of the prospect of steady social progress, which was recently proclaimed, it is now proposed to the workers that they should descend one step to-day so as to avoid tumbling down three or more steps at once to-morrow. This is as good as a declaration of bankruptcy on the part of British capitalism. The general strike is the answer of the proletariat which will

not and cannot admit that the bankruptcy of British capitalism should be the beginning of the bankruptcy of the British nation and of British culture.

This answer however is dictated far more by the logic of the situation than by the logic of consciousness. The English working class had no other alternative. The struggle — no matter what was the mechanism behind the scenes — was forced on them by the mechanical pressure of the whole situation. The world situation of British industry could not offer any material basis for a compromise. The Thomases, MacDonalDs etc. are like windmills which turn their sails when there is a strong wind, but do not yield a single pound of flour as there is no corn. The hopeless hollowness of British Reformism in the present day was revealed with such convincing force that nothing remained for the Reformists to do but to join in the mass strike of the British proletariat. This revealed the strength of the strike — but also its weakness.

The general strike is the most poignant form of class war. After the general strike comes the armed insurrection. This is why the general strike, more than any other form of class war, demands a clear, resolute, firm, i. e. revolutionary leadership. In the present strike, the British proletariat shows no trace of a leadership of this kind, and it cannot be expected that it will suddenly rise in complete form as if conjured up out of the ground. The Trade Union Council began with the ridiculous declaration that the present general strike was in no way a political struggle, still less an attack on the state power of the bankers, the manufacturers and the landowners and on the sacred British Parliament. This declaration of war on the part of faithful subjects appears not to convince the Government at all, which feels that, through the effect of the strike, the real instruments of power are slipping from its hands. The power of the State is not an "idea" but a material apparatus. If the apparatus of administration and suppression is paralysed, the power of the State will also be paralysed. In modern society, no one can rule without having in his hand railways, shipping, post and telegraph, electric plants, coal etc. The fact that MacDonalD and Thomas deny on oath that they have any political aims, characterises them as individuals, but not the nature of the general strike which, if it is carried on to the end, places before the revolutionary class the task of organising a new State power. Those however who, by the course of events, have been placed "at the head" of the general strike, are fighting against this with all their force. And this is the chief danger; men who did not wish for the general strike, who deny the political character of the general strike, who fear nothing so much as the consequences of a victorious strike, must inevitably direct all their efforts to keeping the strike within the scope of a semi-political half-strike, i. e. to deprive it of its power. We must look things straight in the face; the chief efforts of the official leaders of the Labour Party and of a considerable number of the official trade union leaders will not be directed towards paralysing the bourgeois State by means of the strike, but towards paralysing the general strike with the aid of the bourgeois State. The Government, in the person of its most obstinate Conservatives, will doubtless provoke a civil war on a small scale so as to be in the position to resort to measures of terror even before the struggle develops and to suppress the movement. By robbing the strike of its political programme, by disintegrating the revolutionary will of the proletariat and by leading the movement into a blind alley, the Reformists force the individual groups of workers on to the path of isolated revolts. In this sense, the Reformists are one with the Fascist elements of the Conservative party. Herein lies the chief danger of the fight which has begun.

It would be out of place at this moment to prophesy as to the duration of the fight and its development, to say nothing of its issue. Everything must be done from the international point of view to help the fighters and to promote conditions for their success. We must however clearly recognise that success of this kind is only possible in the measure in which the British working-class, in the process of the development and the intensification of the general strike, realises the necessity of changing its leaders and succeeds in doing so. An English proverb says that one must not change horses while crossing the stream. This political wisdom however is only true within certain limits. It is never yet been possible to cross a revolutionary stream on the horse of Reformism, and the class which entered the battle with the Opportunist leaders, is compelled to change them under

the enemy's fire. In this way, the position of the real revolutionary elements of the British proletariat, particularly of the Communists, is predetermined. They will support the unity of mass action in every way, but they will not admit of any appearance of unity with the opportunist leaders of the Labour Party and the trade unions. The most important piece of work for the truly revolutionary participants in the general strike will be to fight relentlessly against every trace or act of treachery, and mercilessly expose Reformist illusions. In doing so, they not only help forward the chief and permanent task of developing new revolutionary cadres, without which the victory of the British proletariat is altogether impossible, but they contribute directly to the success of the present strike by intensifying it, revealing its revolutionary tendencies, pushing the Opportunists on one side and strengthening the position of the revolutionaries. The results of the strike — both the immediate ones and those which lie more in the future — will be all the more important, the more decisively the revolutionary will of the masses breaks down the barriers and obstacles of the counter-revolutionary leadership.

The strike in itself cannot alter the position of British capitalism and the coal industry, especially in the world market. This requires the reorganisation of the whole of British economics. The strike is only an emphatic expression of this necessity. The programme of the reorganisation of British economics is a programme of the new power, the new State, the new class. Herein lies the fundamental significance of the general strike; it sharply puts forward the question of power. The real victory of the general strike can only be expressed in the conquest of power by the proletariat and in the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. In view of the hopeless situation of British capitalism, the general strike should be regarded less than ever as an instrument of reform or of partial conquest. To put it more exactly, if the mineowners or the Government were to make this or that concession under the pressure of the strike, these concessions would, in view of the whole situation, have neither a deep nor a permanent significance. This by no means implies that the present strike is faced by the alternative of all or nothing. Had the British proletariat been under a leadership which to some extent was in keeping with its class strength and the maturity of conditions, power would have passed from the hands of the Conservative into the hands of the proletariat in the course of a few weeks. As it is, we can hardly reckon with an issue of this kind. This again does not mean that the strike is hopeless. The more widely it develops, the more violently it shakes the foundations of capitalism, the more completely it rejects the treacherous and opportunist leaders, the more difficult will it be for bourgeois reaction to take up a counter-offensive, the less will the proletarian organisations suffer, the sooner will the next, decisive stage of the fight be arrived at.

The present class conflict will be a tremendous lesson and have vast consequences, quite independently of its immediate results. It will be clear to every proletarian in England that Parliament is not able to solve the fundamental and vital tasks of the country. The question of the economic salvation of Britain will now present itself to the proletariat as a question of the conquest of power. A death blow will be aimed at all mediatory elements with conciliating, compromising and pseudo-pacifist tendencies. The Liberal party, however its leaders may turn and twist, will come forth from this test even more insignificant than it was before it entered the fight. Within the Conservative party, the die-hard elements will gain the predominance. Within the Labour party, the revolutionary wing will increase in influence and will find more complete expression. The Communists will push forward resolutely. The revolutionary development of England will advance enormously.

The course of events has shown that the questions raised in this book a year ago, will now, from the political point of view, brook no delay. Seen in the light of the mighty strike which is at present developing, the questions of evolution and revolution, of peaceful development and the employment of force, the question of reforms and of class dictatorship, will, in their full intensity, occupy the consciousness of hundreds of thousands, nay millions, of British workers. Of this there can be no doubt. The British proletariat which was kept in a condition of terrible backwardness as regards its ideology by the bourgeoisie and its Fabian agents, will now bound forward like a lion. Material conditions in England have long been ripe for Socialism. The strike has made the substitution of a proletarian State for the

bourgeois one, a question of the day. If the strike itself does not bring about this change, it will at least greatly hasten its approach, though in what period of time, we cannot of course say. We should however be prepared for the possibility of a near date.

Crimea, May 6th, 1926.

L. D. Trotsky.

British Women and the General Strike.

By Beth Turner (London).

One of the most remarkable things in connection with the general strike in England was the way in which the women responded to the call for the unity of the working class in the struggle.

Prior to the strike, thousands of pounds had been spent by the capitalist class in trying to win the allegiance of the women folk from their class.

Every device known to capitalist ingenuity had been employed. Women organisers had been sent into the industrial districts — particularly the mining areas — and there organisers were tireless in their efforts to induce the women to attend meetings, free socials etc., where the case for the employers, thinly disguised as an "impartial view of the mining situation", was put before them.

Appeals were made to the sentiment of the women, and the suffering and hardship which the women and children would suffer in the event of a clash between the miners and mineowners, was skilfully depicted.

These activities culminated in a big women's demonstration which was held in London on April 17th. Organised by **Flora Drummond**, a notorious agent of the capitalist class and ex-feminist, this demonstration was supposed to express the desire of British women for industrial peace in 1926.

In spite of the fact that the whole thing was very well stage-managed, it was easily apparent to the most casual observer that the demonstration was a farce.

The number of working women who took part was small, and it was frankly admitted by many of them that they had taken advantage of the demonstration because it provided a cheap trip to London. The numbers were made up by women Fascists, wives of small shop-keepers and society ladies. The leaflets distributed by Communist women were eagerly read by many of the women demonstrators, in spite of the instructions given to them by their organisers not to touch the leaflets.

These attempts on the part of the employers roused the fury of the women throughout the industrial areas of the country, and they replied by organising meetings and demonstrations locally and turning out in their thousands at the May Day demonstrations.

Resolutions were passed at all meetings of working women's organisations pledging their support to the miners. The spirit and determination of the women was so clearly shown that the **Miners Federation** seriously began to consider the necessity of organising the wives and women folk of the miners and so maintain close contact between them and the Federation.

When the general strike commenced the women did not waver. Women who were employed in trades involved in the strike, came out with the men. At all meetings of women strikers or strikers wives held by the Party, we found a ready response to the Party's point of view. Women who had previously never taken part in any organisation, marched in demonstrations carrying their babies in their arms or pushing perambulators. One demonstration in **Manchester** in which I took part was remarkable for the number of women who marched for miles with the procession. And everywhere the women's part of the procession was greeted with loud applause and messages of encouragement.

Joint committees of representatives of various women's organisations were set up and these organised deputations to **Guardians** and made applications for relief for strikers wives.

After the betrayal of the strikers by the reactionary leaders the women were loud in their indignation. Party meetings were well attended by women, and the first indication of the effect had on working women by the great betrayal was the information received, almost immediately, that one **Labour Women's** section had come over to the Communist Party en bloc.

The experience of the general strike in England is bound to mean a **big influx of women members into the Party**; and it is our duty to see that these women are trained and fully utilised in the struggle for the emancipation of the British workers.

Useless Declarations.

By A. Lozovsky.

We all followed with the greatest eagerness the general strike in Great Britain, and are following from day to day with breathless attention the struggle of the British miners. The great strike and its little leaders will serve for a long time as an object of study for the workers of all countries, who will learn from this example how **not** to conduct a strike. Of the greatest value for those who are interested in the fate of the international labour movement are the statements of those who participated in this strike, and in particular the statements of the members of that **General Council** which so shamefully ended the magnificent strike. For this reason the declaration published in "**Lansbury's Labour Weekly**" of three Left members of the General Council, **A. B. Swales, George Hicks and Ben Tillet**, and which is addressed "**To Comrades, National and International**", arouses the greatest attention and the greatest interest.

Nevertheless the more one reads this declaration, the more the feeling of interest gives place to one of indignation. This is because one **seeks** in the document, but finds **something** else, that one seeks for a living word from eye witnesses, for the truth regarding the events, but one finds...

The first question which arises after a careful perusal of the declaration is: "What is the use of such a declaration?" What is the object of the three members of the General Council in issuing this document? We will obtain an answer if we proceed to analyse this declaration.

The document in question contains **correct things**; it also contains **obviously incorrect things**; but it does not contain the chief matter. It is true that "the strike was a demonstration of power", but it is not true that the "strike has served the purpose of urgent and necessary defence". It is true that "the government and their satellites met our gesture of comradeship with an armed force". It is true that the "strike showed the economic grip of the workers upon all industries", that "it closed a virulent and vehement capitalist press", but it is not correct to represent the calling off of the strike as a "courageous gesture of peace".

It is still more incorrect to accuse the government and the employers of having "with williness and chicanery endeavoured to misrepresent the logical (!) meaning of our act as being one of surrender". That is to say that the General Council has not capitulated? It has concluded an honourable peace? It is strange that no one has noticed this honourable peace. All three protest against the "cowardly travesty of the truth". In this question the "cowardly travesty of the truth" is not on the side of the government or of the employers but on the side of those who desire at all cost to represent the defeat as a victory.

It is also true that the strike "brought forth from the Russian Trade Union Movement a spontaneous gesture of goodwill". But it is wrong to refrain from saying a single word as to how this "gesture of goodwill" was rebuffed, thanks to the "courageous gesture of peace of the General Council". Is it not strange that even in this question the three did not have the courage to call a thing by its right name?

I do not think it necessary to give any further examples. Those given reveal the true character of the declaration, which every obvious truth is followed by a series of unimportant, obviously false and apologetic assertions.

But this declaration is **not only of interest on account of what it contains, but mainly on account of what is omitted from it**. As a matter of fact those responsible for the capitulation have, some days after the powerful strike when the results of the capitulation were already apparent, forgotten to explain to us how the "demonstration of power" was converted into a powerful demonstration of impotence. The authors have forgotten to say who betrayed the strike and why.

only that, they even endeavour to defend the monstrous capitulation by describing that which the British workers call treachery and cowardice as a "courageous (!) gesture of peace". Further, the miners are continuing the strike. Are the miners right or are they not? Ought they to have joined in "the courageous gesture of peace" of the General Council, or continued the struggle? One must either support the miners or not.

In this manner this declaration conceals the shameful role of the General Council in the strike; it diverts the attention of the workers along the wrong path, it conceals the treachery and the cowardice with empty phrases and justifies the crime committed against the working class of Great Britain.

It is of no great interest what the three members of the General Council intended to say, but that which they published must arouse the profound indignation of all honest workers. The "Sunday Worker" is wrong, a thousand times wrong, when it welcomes this action of Swales, Hicks and Ben Tillet. Such declarations merely discredit those who write them. The British and the international proletariat need the naked unadorned truth and not self-deception and beautiful declarations

The International Conference of Communist Women for the Support of the British Miners.

The International Conference of Communist Women which met on the 2nd of June 1926, declared their solidarity with the struggle of the British miners and expressed their greatest admiration for the fighting spirit and the perseverance with which this unequal conflict between exploiters and wage slaves is being conducted by the British mining proletariat.

The International Conference of Communist Women notes with special satisfaction the devotion and the spirit of sacrifice of the wives of the British miners, without whose steadfast support the fight would be much more difficult and its success would be in question.

The International Conference of Communist Women regard it as one of their immediate and most urgent tasks to mobilise the working women of all countries for practical support of their fighting class comrades in Great Britain and, by a wide-scale action in the shape of propaganda, holding collections and providing care for the children, to furnish a concrete proof of their class solidarity.

CHINA

A New Phase in the Chinese Revolution.

By Tang Shin She.

In the People's armies which, as their name implies, regard it as their task to protect the people and which hitherto only sympathised with the Canton government, voices have been raised since their defeat at Peking, demanding that the people's armies be converted into real national revolutionary troops like those of the Canton government. They are demanding that they be placed under the direct command of the Canton military commission. They further desire that the Kuomintang and the Communist Party shall carry on work of enlightenment among the soldiers. All this means that the people's armies are losing their opportunist character and are on the way to developing into real national revolutionary forces.

Regarded from the military standpoint the present position of the people's armies is a difficult one. The Mukden troops (Chang Tso Lin) want to push forward from Jehol to Tolon; the Shansi troops wish to push forward to Datung, and the so-called "Anti-Red Troops", the allied troops of Wu-Pei-Fu (soldiers of the province of Hupe, Honan and Chili) and the troops of Chang-Tso Lin (soldiers of Manchuria, Shantung and Chili) wish to advance from Peking to the Nankov Pass. All three groups have as their final aim the encirclement of Kalgan, the headquarters of the people's armies. For the people's armies the two last named fronts represent the greatest danger, because direct railway connections exist there. Recently, however, the Kuomin armies were able to drive the enemy back a considerable distance, the result of which was that the Wu Pei Fu group was obviously defeated.

Immediately after this defeat Wu Pei Fu dismissed his deputy, Field Marshall Chin Yu Nao, on the ground that the latter had avoided the fight against the people's army. Chin Yu Nao had hitherto been Wu Pei Fu's right hand man. He had 140,000 soldiers under his sole command. His removal however is not, as is alleged, to be attributed to his avoiding battle against the people's armies, but to the fact that this General has for long been dissatisfied with Wu Pei Fu and, as a result, has not complied with his wishes. Chin Yu Nao had for long been demanding the post of governor of Honan, which was not granted to him; later he asked for the post of governor of Shantung, which was also refused him. After this his brother Chin Yu Pung (the former Prime Minister) mediated the alliance between Wu Pei Fu and Chang Tso Lin, whereupon the latter wished to entrust him with the task of forming a government; but Wu Pei Fu was also against this.

The dismissal of Chin Yu Nao has not only resulted in the defeat of the Wu Pei Fu clique, but the struggle between Wu Pei Fu and Chang Tso Lin has thereby been considerably intensified. The above-mentioned facts, of course, mean a great advantage for the people's armies, and thereby for the national revolution in North China.

In South China, in Canton, the imperialists have attempted, along with the Chinese reactionaries and the Right Kuomintang people, to split the Kuomintang Party and to destroy the successful co-operation of the Kuomintang people with the Communists. As a result of the explosion which occurred in Canton some little while ago, and the arrest of the recently deposed Police President of Canton in connection with it, the intrigues of the counter-revolutionaries were exposed. The Communists and the Kuomintang people will now work more closely together than ever.

The Canton government, at the request of the population of Hunan, has sent an expedition into this province against the white terror of Wu Pei Fu. That is the first direct advance of the Canton government against the Yangtse district. Wu Pei Fu is thus threatened by a direct danger from South China.

Sun Chuan Fang, the military ruler of Central China, some time ago issued a proclamation in which he declared his five provinces: Kiangsu, Chekiang, Fukien, Nganhui and Kiangsi to be an independent State. This State however is not new. It has already existed since last year when Wu Pei Fu went from Yochow to Hankow in order to attempt, for the second time, to play a role in Chinese politics, and when his former follower, Sun Chuan Fang, set himself up in direct opposition to him and declared the Lower Yangtse provinces to be independent of him. When he today again proclaims the independence of the five provinces and causes the European newspapers to take note of this, it means that he has turned from Wu Pei Fu and Chang Tso Lin and transferred his sympathies to the Canton government.

Sun Chuan Fang occupies a central position in the present political situation of China. Should he go over to Wu Pei Fu and Chang Tso Lin, then these would undoubtedly be victorious; if he allies himself with the Canton government and the people's armies the latter will obtain a great advantage. The people's armies and the Canton government have, therefore, been endeavouring for a long time to win him over to their side. The imperialists, who immediately took note of this and knew where this might lead, intrigued against the Canton government and sought to prevent any rapprochement. The proclamation now shows that the imperialist trickery was futile and that the Canton government has been successful.

Who is Sun Chuan Fang? He is a personality with advanced democratic sympathies. He is working for the Chinese bourgeoisie who are followers of American Christian teachings. He has very friendly relationships with America, which brings him into opposition to the military rulers Chang Tso Lin and Wu Pei Fu who are the agents of Japan and England.

As regards the aims of Sun Chuan Fang, he of course does not go with the Canton government which is striving to achieve the national revolution. Whilst, however, the other military rulers fight directly and brutally against the liberation movement, Sun Chuan Fang employs the methods of the imperialists, that is to say, he does not directly oppose the Kuomintang, but fights against the Left wing and seeks to attract the Right. For example, the Right wing has been able to settle down freely in his district; they were also allowed to celebrate May Day in Shanghai, which the Left, along with the Communists, were

strictly prevented from doing. Sun Chuan Fang is also the one who has been conducting a large scale "anti-red" propaganda in the whole of China.

If he nevertheless allies himself with the Canton government it is because it is, to a certain extent, necessary for him to do so. In the first place the population of his district demands solidarity with the Southern Chinese government, and secondly his two provinces Fukien and Kiangsi border directly on the territory of the Canton government; in fact a portion of the national revolutionary troops are already in both provinces. In addition to this his army is not particularly strong, and finally, some of the generals in his provinces are only working with him more or less under compulsion, because they are unable at the moment to do anything alone.

The whole of the recent events in China show that the power of the counter-revolutionaries is more and more decaying, while the revolutionary front is becoming more firm every day.

POLITICS

After the Capitulation of Abd-El Krim.

By G. Péri (Paris).

It is now over two weeks since the conclusion of the Riff war. Thirteen months of fighting, the loss of 20,000 men and the squandering of 2 million Francs on the part of France have forced Abd El Krim to capitulate. After the breaking off of the negotiations at Ujda which had been initiated under the pressure of American and English financiers and which ended with the triumph of Spain and the French military party, it was easy to foresee the further development of the Riff war. After the fierce offensive of the allied French and Spanish troops, and after the capture of Targist the issue of the operations was no longer in doubt.

In this last phase of the military operations the Riff Cabyles obstinately refused to fight. In the last of May their leader submitted fresh peace proposals to the French government. When he became convinced that the game was lost for the time being, he had to decide on capitulation.

But no one should allow himself to be deceived in this matter: Abd el Krim has yielded, but peace yet remains to be realised. The present situation is full of unrest and mistrust. It is obvious that Abd el Krim represented certain forces which have not disappeared along with him. He represented the revolt of the suppressed people in a portion of that vast world known as Islam. His capitulation leaves the will for freedom of the suppressed slaves unchanged.

But the Riff war, as the economists have said often enough, was only the expression of that century-long struggle for the hegemony of the Mediterranean. Already before the war there had been a bitter rivalry between Great Britain and France for possession of the port of Tangier, the key to the Mediterranean. Great Britain, supported by Spain and Italy, wanted to internationalise the port of Tangier and in this way to keep France away from the neighbourhood of Gibraltar. French imperialism wished to impose upon Tangier an international statute which would allow France to set herself up as ruler in the international port. In the year 1923 France obtained concessions from Great Britain which placed British hegemony in this area in question. The French Foreign Ministry left open the question of the neutrality of Tangier in the event of war. It reserved the right to send troops and war material through the international port.

After France had delivered this blow to her British opponent she turned her attention to her Spanish rival. There is not the least doubt that for a long time French imperialism welcomed the victories of Abd el Krim over the troops of Spain. After the shattering defeat of Spain, French imperialism proceeded to solve the question of the Mediterranean to the disadvantage of Spain.

Now, when Abd el Krim has been vanquished, this question remains just as it was before.

At Ujda French and Spanish imperialism had set up two main objectives: the uniting of the lines of troops of France and Spain and the subjugation of Abd el Krim. It was a question of bringing these two aims into harmony with the autonomy which has been promised to the Riff Cabyles in the month of April.

The two aims of Ujda have now been achieved. The only thing remaining to be done is "to disarm the tribes" and to grant them the autonomy so solemnly promised them. Here however, we meet with complications. It was suddenly discovered that French imperialism cannot possibly reconcile the demands of its militarists, to make use of the victory to consolidate their position in the Riff, with the solemnly proclaimed aims of the war which pledge French imperialism to withdraw from the Riff.

If French imperialism abides by its proclaimed war aims, what then should its policy in the Riff be? What should be the Riff policy of Spain? What guarantees will they offer for security and peace? What will become of the treaties and of the Mediterranean statute if France, contrary to her pledges, settles down in the Riff? To all these questions the French Foreign Ministry has not yet given a clear answer, although the London and Paris newspapers persistently put forward these questions.

It is true that Great Britain and Italy expressed congratulations to the victor. It is equally true that in Rome the "Tribuna" and the "Popolo d'Italia" and in London the "Morning Post" and the "Daily Chronicle" have emitted a discreet sigh of relief. How could this be otherwise? A victory of the Riff Cabyles would have enormously encouraged the rest of the Arab world. The Italians are now fighting against the Senussi tribes, while the British find themselves in an unfavourable situation with regard to Zaghul Pasha, who has just gained an enormous victory at the parliamentary elections in Egypt.

So long as it was a question of rejoicing over the defeat of the insurgent Rifis, the European colonial powers were of one mind. But afterwards the antagonisms make themselves apparent. Great Britain, just as Italy willingly permitted France to defeat Abd el Krim, but neither country is willing to let France go too far, for both of them are striving for the domination of the Mediterranean. And, therefore, there again arises in all its acuteness the tragic conflict which existed between France and Great Britain up to the year 1904, between France and Germany up to the year 1914 and between France and Spain up to the year 1924. But that is not all. It is whispered in the French Foreign Ministry that the publication of the notes exchanged with Abd el Krim could evoke a real international scandal.

On the one hand Great Britain continues to regard Tangier as an immediate threat to Gibraltar, and in order to secure for herself the control of the Mediterranean, endeavoured to prevent the formation of a bloc of the Latin powers. On the other hand Italy proclaims the Mediterranean to be a "Roman Lake", while both powers are looking askance at the game of French imperialism. As Abd el Krim is now defeated, they are again raising the question of the statute of Tangier and demanding a new Algeciras.

It should not be forgotten that similar rivalries, similar antagonist greed, preceded the imperialist world war of 1914.

The Surrender of Abd-El Krim and the Imperialism of Primo de Rivera.

By Jar (Madrid).

The policy of corruption carried on by General Steeg on the French side and by mining capitalists from Bilbao such as Eschevarrieta towards Abd-el Krim, has at last succeeded. Abd-el Krim, who for five years bravely fought for Riff independence, has given up the fight and surrendered to the French authorities. He is a fresh victim of the policy of corruption carried on by "European Civilisation", as were Muley Aflis and the Raisuni some years ago.

In 1920 Abd-el Krim was a "Riffian in the service of Spain". He was one of the correspondents of the "Telegrama del Riff", the militarist organ of Melilla. His brother Mahomed was studying mining engineering in Madrid. The mineral riches of the Riff were so great that the two brothers considered it desirable to have a mining expert among the natives.

The two brothers led the powerful movement which in 1921 resulted in the insurrection of the Cabyles against Spain. Abd-el Krim was the real military and political chief of the tribesmen in their struggle for independence. Before 1921 the Rifians had only carried on isolated struggles. Abd-el Krim

created the necessary unity, aroused a real feeling of independence among them, and was the real inspirer of the rebel movement against the French and Spanish militarists.

Abd-el Krim has surrendered to the French military authorities, but the Cabyles' movement for independence is not ended. The feeling for independence that he has aroused has taken deep root in the Riff population. The reports published every day in the French and Spanish press regarding the surrender of various chiefs have no particular significance. The greater portion of these chiefs have on different occasions been "in the service of Spain". They will in future fight once again on the side of their brother tribesmen, in spite of all the savagery of French and Spanish militarism and the policy of corruption carried on by the imperialists and the mining capitalists.

The assaults carried out in the Riff by French and Spanish troops were dictated by the mining interests. **Yebel Haman** has been captured by the Spanish troops. This mountain was most greedily desired on account of its being the most rich in minerals of all the Riff, and has on various occasions been the very objective of Spanish military operations. The retention of this mountain has cost hundreds of victims. The youth of Spain has been sacrificed once again in order to hand over this part of the country which is so rich in gold, to the greedy clutches of the mining capitalists. Each attack of the Spanish troops means an increase in the value of the mining bonds. Two days after the capture of **Afraw** the newspaper "Euzcadi", the organ of the Biscaya capitalists, stated: "The territory of Afraw having now fallen into the hands of Spanish troops, the firm of 'Sociedad Hispano-Africana de Minas' is ready to develop the mines. In order to commence the preliminary work our friends Monje, Ormilla and Orcoreca have set out for Africa". The three men mentioned are mining capitalists.

The surrender of Abd-el Krim does not mean that the resistance of the Riffians is at an end. In **Ghomara** and **Djeballa** there are some chiefs possessing great fighting courage. Although **Primo de Rivera** does not permit the press to publish any news regarding the resistance put up by the Riffians to the Spanish attacks since Abd-el Krim's surrender, it is known that **Kheriro**, the leader of the tribesmen from **Beni-Hozmar** is opposing the Spanish troops. **Kheriro** is a Riffian chief who possesses a military prestige among the Cabyles superior even to that of Abd-el Krim. He has great personal courage and the Riffians have great confidence in his military ability. It is also affirmed that **Faih Bou Tahia**, leader of the Cabyles from **Beni-Arous**, is continuing the fight for Riffian independence.

The Riff war has cost Spain about 100,000 men and milliards of Pesetas. The State budget for the year 1924/25 amounted to 2,941,724,294 Pesetas, of which 1,084,572,181 represents military expenditure, that is 37% of the total State expenditure and 39% of the revenue. 279,433,000 have been squandered on Morocco. In addition many extraordinary credits have been granted by **Primo de Rivera**. From the years 1900 to 1925, 6000 millions have been spent on Morocco.

The political situation in Europe resulting from the surrender of Abd-el Krim is more acute than that previous to the Statute of Tangier. In the first place there has set in a fierce competition between the various mining firms. The "Mining Arbitral Committee" of Paris is already busy with litigation regarding the ownership of the various mines.

General **Primo de Rivera** aims at developing a complete, imperialist policy in Morocco. Abd-el Krim's surrender to the French authorities has provided the occasion for fierce attacks by the Spanish nationalist press upon **France**. **Primo de Rivera**, learning **Briand's** success in his negotiations with Abd-el Krim, published on May 29th an official communiqué attacking the French government. "**La Nacion**", **Primo de Rivera's** organ, has not concealed the latter's antagonism to France. **Primo de Rivera** is an advocate of the "strong hand". He is demanding Abd-el Krim's execution, and in order to justify this demand he accuses Abd-el Krim of atrocities against the Spanish troops. But he does not speak of the cruel savagery of the Spanish foreign Legion, these "representatives of civilisation", one of the favourite amusements of whom is to ride over Riffian prisoners with tanks.

The Spanish imperialists are claiming the right to decide the fate of Abd-el Krim. They are also demanding a reform of the Tangier statute. This is causing uneasiness to France,

as the statute is necessary to enable her to continue her imperialist policy in Morocco. The "Temps" of May 29th stated:

"If Spain again raises the problem of the statute of Tangier, it is possible that not only Italy, but also England and even the U. S. A. will demand that they be consulted, and Italy will, as did Germany before the war, attempt, on the basis of these new negotiations, to increase to the greatest possible extent her influence in Morocco".

This is a clear warning on the part of France to **Primo de Rivera**. It must also be remembered that up to last year, when the Conference of Madrid was held, France and Spain had always been rivals in Morocco. The Spanish press repeatedly denounced the French for protecting the Riffians in the latter's war with Spain. The antagonism between the French and Spanish imperialists will very soon assume a most acute form.

The "Times" correspondent in Tangier has ventured to call for the publication of all Abd-el Krim's documents. The European Communists should join in this demand. If these documents were published, they would very clearly expose all the intrigues of European militarism and at the same time those of the "Times" correspondent in Tangier, the agent of British imperialism in Morocco.

The End of the Disarmament Conference.

By **Moskovitch**.

After eight days of fruitless and empty discussion the meeting in Geneva of the so-called Preparation Commission for the Disarmament Conference came to an end. The next meeting of this Commission has been postponed for an indefinite period, while at the same time no agreement has been reached as regards the programme nor as regards the date for which the Disarmament Conference itself is to be convened. As regards the latter, according to the statement of the Belgian delegate, **De Brouckere**, this will only be convened — as has been decided by the League Council — when the Council of the League of Nations consider it possible to realise the complete security of all countries.

One could hardly find a more striking example of hypocrisy than this declaration of the Belgian delegate.

The security of every country in capitalist Europe does not depend upon the existence of one or several Guarantee Treaties, but on the fact of its neighbours not having at their disposal the necessary military forces for attack. If such forces exist, then all the treaties in the world cannot guarantee security. As no country is likely to disarm before the proposed Disarmament Conference is convened, none of the military authorities of any of the European States will display a tendency to reduce armaments. On the contrary, European military statistics show in the most cold-blooded manner the ever increasing armaments of the various countries. It is clear, therefore, that the League of Nations, by making the convocation of the Disarmament Conference dependent upon the possibility of realising the complete security of all European countries, is postponing it to the Greek Kalends.

We predicted this and have already previously exposed the whole hypocrisy of the present European "Peace-makers". We have declared that in face of the existing capitalist contradictions which inevitably lead to armed conflicts, any talk of disarmament is futile.

The facts have proved our assertions to be correct. The Preparation Commission, whose decisions have no binding force on the governments of the countries which are represented in this Commission, has dispersed without having brought about an understanding even in one of the fundamental questions. The decisions adopted by the Commission have a platonic character and not only cannot bring about disarmament, but cannot even result in the slightest reduction of armaments.

This is quite obvious in view of those differences existing between England, France and the United States with regard to the disarmament question. As is known, the programme of each of these States constitutes a thorough disarmament plan for its present or possible rivals. Under such circumstances it is of course impossible to arrive at any positive agreement.

In addition to these fundamental differences other differences of opinion have made their appearance.

When the Council of the League of Nations decided to convene the meeting of the Preparation Commission of the disarmament Conference in Geneva and thereby rendered impossible the presence of representatives of the Soviet Union, we remarked at the time, that the refusal of the Soviet Union to send its representatives would be taken advantage of by a number of its neighbouring States as a reason for refusing to disarm. These fears have proved true. Already at one of the first sessions of the Committee the representatives of the Baltic States as well as of Poland and Roumania, declared that it was impossible for their countries to disarm as the Soviet Union was not taking part in the Conference and thereby stood outside of any pledge to disarm.

At the closing session of the Commission the representatives of these countries not only did not say one word regarding any disarmament measures, but on the contrary demanded the strengthening of the measures provided by clause 16 of the Statutes of the League of Nations, in other words, they demanded the increase of military aid on the part of bigger States.

A similar standpoint was adopted by the Greek representative, who pointed out that Turkey is not a member of the League of Nations and consequently was under no obligation to disarm.

It is exceedingly interesting to note that in the fundamental difference between the English and French standpoint on the disarmament problem, Greece has placed herself definitely on the side of France. That, by the way, is one of the symptoms of the change of orientation on the part of Greece.

Immediately before the conclusion of the "labours" of the Commission a new difference arose between England and France. As is known, Boncour, among other things, proposed to the Conference that the principle of the necessity of unanimous decisions on the part of the Council of the League in regard to the measures provided by Paragraph 16 should be abolished. The English representative Lord Cecil immediately declared himself against the proposal of Boncour. This opposition of the English delegate places the question in a new light.

In the first place it must be remembered that the standpoint adopted by Germany in the question of possible sanctions against the Soviet Union, has, in spite of the pledges which Germany had adopted, it is true with some reservations, caused further uneasiness to England and also to France. The fear that Germany, as a member of the Council of the League, might refuse to vote for the application of sanctions against the Soviet Union, was still further increased after the signing of the Russo-German Treaty of 24th of April. The object of Boncour's proposal is to enable the sanctions against the Soviet Union, even in the event of opposition by Germany, to be carried out on "legal grounds". And if Lord Cecil opposed this proposal of Boncour, this was not because England was in any way against the speediest application of sanctions against "the disturber of peace" -- a term which, from the standpoint of the English "pacifists", naturally refers to the Soviet Union. If England insists upon the principle of unanimous decisions, it is because this principle renders it impossible for any opponent of England to carry through any decision in the League of Nations with which England is not in agreement.

The United States refrained right up to the end from putting forward its standpoint. Right from the commencement of the Conference the United States adopted an extremely sceptical attitude to the Geneva comedy. There was a time when the government of the United States, under the influence of the famous report of the American Ambassador in London, Houghton, almost refused to take part in the Conference. When, however, the United States finally decided to take part, the delegates received the instructions not to recognise as binding for America any single decision which the Conference might adopt. On the basis of these instructions the American Ambassador in Switzerland, Mr. Gibson, declared at the Conference that he would abstain from voting.

The United States which is striving for European disarmament in order to secure the peaceful investment of its capital in Europe, possesses full powers to bring about the disarmament of individual countries, not by the aid of the Geneva charter, but by appropriate economic pressure.

The Italian press gives the following reasons for the complete failure of the Geneva Conference:

1. lack of sincerity in the negotiations;
2. lack of a common basis of negotiations on the various proposals;

3. the non-participation of the Soviet Union.

"Therefore", declares an Italian paper, "the chances for the inevitable failure of the Conference are a 100 to 1."

One can already say today that the failure of the Conference is practically certain. The Geneva wire-pullers will again, as usual, endeavour to cast the blame for the failure of their undertaking on to the Soviet Union. We definitely repudiate this charge. The Soviet Union was not given any opportunity of submitting its disarmament programme, which is based on the real wish -- so far as it is possible in the present circumstances, in which the Soviet Union is surrounded by capitalist countries -- to reduce the burden of militarism which is pressing on the broadest masses of the people.

The "disarmament" comedy is at an end. The uninterrupted piling up of armaments goes on as before.

The Proceedings and the "Verdict" in the Franc Forgery Trial.

By Molnar (Buda Pest).

The president of the senate appointed for the trial of the franc forgers, the ill-famed Fascist Törek, who had to pass judgment on his political partisans and to some extent his political leaders pronounced the verdict and its motivation, this worthy conclusion to the farce of the trial, with the most serious mien, as though it were a question of a real verdict and not of masking a more or less pre-arranged game, not only between the Government and the court, but also between these two factors and the accused. -- Nadossi and Windisch-graetz were sentenced to 4 years penal servitude, the other accused to imprisonment and hard labour for periods varying from 6 months to 2 years. -- With the exception of Nadossi and Windisch, all the accused were set free and, in the present Hungary, where even Fascists who are "condemned to death" are set free after a few weeks of easy confinement, the two first named will certainly not spend long in prison. -- A striking characteristic of the verdict is that Szörtsey and Baross, the exposed leaders of the chief organisation of the Fascist leagues (Te Sz) were acquitted in spite of their complicity having been formally proved in the proceeding.

This fact alone shows the political character of this trial which the Government, with the help of the whole Parliamentary Opposition, including the Social Democrats, at first tried to pass off as an ordinary, unpolitical judicial affair. This was Bethlen's intention as long as he considered it the best way of hushing up the complicity of the Government which had become indisputable very soon after the matter was discovered. When, however, the affair had developed into an enormous political world scandal, this extremely naive method was no longer effectual. For this reason Bethlen had to resort to a political trial; he made every effort, however, to give the political side of the trial an aspect which was in his favour. -- The chief task of the court was therefore to exculpate the Government from all complicity in the franc forgery affair.

For this purpose of course, the accused had to be won over. They were prepared to cover the Government if it was made possible for them in the trial to pose as martyrs to patriotism and as pioneers in the fight against the Peace Treaty of Trianon. This was done, and they did their best to avoid concrete incrimination of the Government. The court concentrated almost the whole proceeding on this almost impossible task of whitewashing the Government, and it was not its fault that it failed. Three quarters of the motivation of the verdict was devoted to explaining the "innocence" of the Government. The rest of it was devoted to fulfilling the obligations agreed upon in return, that of emphasising the honest patriotic motives of the accused. Legal proceedings were taken against the deputy Hir who seriously incriminated the Government.

The clear water of the strange unanimity between Government, court and accused was only muddied by the legitimist monarchist aristocrats who -- although some of their partisans cannot be quite innocent in the affair -- had no interest in

exonerating Bethlen. On the contrary, they made use of the dust which had been raised to undertake a further assault against the Government and to extend the political hegemony which they already possessed over the Liberal-Democratic-Social-Democratic Opposition. The evidence of the Legitimists boldly confirmed the generally known complicity of the Government. They partly won over Windischgraetz to their cause; he, though according to his agreement he made no statement against the Government, yet did not refute the evidence which incriminated Bethlen and declined to give any evidence in this respect, on the grounds that, as a gentleman, he could not lie, but that the statement of the truth would at the present time not be expedient for the country.

As regards Horthy, the court had an easy task, although he was implicated in the affair at the beginning and, apart from other incriminating factors, no one can believe seriously to-day that Nadossi, one of his best friends, could have undertaken the "action" without his knowledge. The whole bourgeoisie is said to have combined in the first phase of the scandal, for various political reasons to "maintain Horthy's innocence". After slight resistance, the leaders of Social Democracy joined this united front.

The course of the proceeding itself, in spite of excellent stage managing, exposes the whole of the Hungarian "upper ten thousand" in its naked degeneracy.

Anyone who has followed this trial with the least objectivity, must admit that even the scandalous history of the counter-revolution of post-war times has seen no more pitiable group of criminals than these former and present Premiers, princes and counts, public prosecutors, police presidents, bank directors, bishops, "national heroes" and other pillars of the State of Hungarian counter-revolution which has been exposed to the core by this trial. These revelations of the bourgeois State which have been witnessed by millions and millions of workers in Hungary and abroad, are, for the proletariat, the most important result of the trial. With the exception of a few misguided Fascist petty bourgeois, no one will believe that these people, who called "hostile" Roumanian troops into the country to overthrow the Soviet Republic, who, up to the present, have in the name of the "fatherland", done nothing but murder, plunder and torture workers, were guided in their franc forgery by honest national and anti-imperialist motives. The Hungarian proletariat whose revolutionary vanguard alone has seriously carried on the fight against the imperialist Peace Treaty of Trianon and against enslavement under the name of reconstruction, regards this new scandal as merely the completion of the crimes which the counter-revolution has committed year by year for seven years, for "patriotic motives".

As regards the effect of the affair on foreign politics, **English imperialism**, in the footsteps of which the foreign policy of the Hungarian counter-revolution trades, saved its protégé from worse complications, even at the beginning of the scandal, when the French Government was still dramatically brandishing its own sword and that of Czecho-Slovakia. In the meantime the French Government and the "Left" which supports it have calmed down. The sedative used was the Franco-Hungarian economic treaty, which is nothing more nor less than hush-money since it offers immeasurable advantages to the French bourgeoisie, putting Hungarian industry at its mercy, without even gaining any benefit for agriculture.

It is thus nothing but cheap theatrical pose when the French bourgeoisie, with such liberal gifts in its pocket, renounces all claim to compensation, and when the representative of the **Banque de France** begs the Hungarian nation not to allow the steps taken by the French authorities during the enquiry to cast a shadow on the "friendship" between the two nations.

The crisis of Hungarian economics and of the Hungarian State which has not been removed by "reconstruction" but only transferred to another basis, is further intensified by the effects of the franc forgery affair, while, on the other hand, it will stir up the masses which have hitherto been inaccessible to any revolutionary propaganda, to fight against the counter-revolution.

The Syrian Revolt Unbroken.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

A short time ago, the French newspapers once again spread the news of a great victory in Syria. The conquest of Sueda, the Druse capital, was inflated into a great success of the French arms and de Jouvenel, the French High Commissioner again prophesied that the whole Syrian affair would be settled in a very short time.

What is the real state of affairs in Syria? Have the French been decisively successful anywhere? Can we speak of the pacification of Syria being completed? Certainly not up to the present. It is true that, by staking large masses of troops — the French Spring army in Syria is estimated to be 60,000 strong, which means that there are about three French soldiers to every armed rebel — the French have reconquered some of the points which had been occupied by the rebels.

It would however be a complete misunderstanding of the character of the war in Syria, which for a long time has been a **guerilla war**, if we were to attach great importance to the conquest of individual towns. It is just the strength of the insurgents and that which has made them equal to the French during a year's fighting in spite of their numerical inferiority and bad equipment with arms, that all their columns are mobile, i. e. not bound to a centre, but always able to evade mass attacks and to attack the French in the rear. Success therefore does not consist in the occupation of this or that point, but only in the destruction of an insurgent division or the subjugation of a rebel tribe.

In this respect, the French have not yet achieved anything of importance. On the contrary, the French losses were enormous at both the battle of **Medjdel Sham** and of **Sueda**, so enormous that even the French General Staff had to admit it and expressly to deplore it in an army order. The **Druses** on the other hand have once more withdrawn into the interior of their country and have kept their main forces intact. The Druses have cleverly transferred the chief scene of action to the neighbourhood of Damascus, where **Dr. Shabandar**, the political leader of the insurrection, has reorganised the revolt in the **Ghuta** district and conquered the south part of Damascus. The French then repeated the bombardment of Damascus with much more intensity than in October of last year. Terrible devastation and destruction was caused without the main object of the bombardment, that of driving the insurgents out of the Damascus district, being accomplished. In the northern part of the country also, in the neighbourhood of **Aleppo**, the bands are still carrying on military operations.

If therefore, the French reports of great military success in Syria is in any case exaggerated and does not correspond to the truth, the political position of the French has, if possible, become even more difficult. The nomination of a son-in-law of the **Turkish Sultan** as administrator of Syria, the attempt to win over part of the Syrian population by the proclamation of a **sham amnesty** (side by side with which of course the death sentences of the emergency court are calmly carried out as before), the proclamation of a bluff Republic in **Lebanon**, are the continuation of the manoeuvres which **de Jouvenel** has tried to carry on since his arrival; they are however quickly seen through and rejected by the Syrian population who, in the course of the insurrection, have acquired political maturity with astonishing rapidity.

The political question is after all the one which in the end is decisive. Even though the French succeed in recording military success against the insurgents, Syria is nevertheless (and this is the essential difference between the Syrian revolt and the war of the Rif in **Morocco**) a territory which is **economically advanced**, which requires a firmly welded apparatus of administration and which, having once been roused to revolt, will not again find peace and be able to develop, until the preliminary conditions, which in this case are complete independence, are established.

The Syrian revolt is still unbroken. Since the capitulation of **Abd el Krim** it is now isolated and thus of course exposed much more than previously to the danger of being literally choked by having enormous masses of troops sent against it. Once again the Syrian insurgents are placing their hopes on the intervention of the French and the international proletariat, which would put an end to the imperialist horrors in Syria and

help the Syrian workers and peasants in their heroic fight, to enforce their most elementary demands for freedom. An end must now be put to the fight in Syria on the basis of direct negotiations with the insurgents; it must be made impossible for the French generals in Syria, who are thirsting for revenge, to drown the Syrian insurrection in blood.

ECONOMICS

Capital Concentration in Denmark.

By R. Mikkelsen (Copenhagen).

Denmark's neutrality during the war brought a rich harvest of profit to the capitalists of that country. There also took place an unprecedented concentration of capital, which continued unabated after the cessation of hostilities and still continues under the present Social-Democratic Government.

The losses which followed the period of speculation (those on the "Landsmandsbanken" alone amounted to 500,000,000 Crowns) were foisted upon the broad masses of the public with the aid of a provisional law according to which the State assumed responsibility for all losses. During the past parliamentary session this law was prolonged for a further five years by the Social-Democratic Government; on this occasion the fact was disclosed that the loss is 150 million Crowns heavier than it was formerly assumed to be.

Thanks to these methods, big capital is in a position to continue its growth.

An examination of the Danish companies with share-capitals of over one million Crowns shows the extraordinarily strong influence which big capital exercises through the banks. There are altogether about 350 companies with share capitals of over one million crowns and the aggregate capital of these is about 1,650 million crowns. Of these companies the four big banks control:

1. The "Privatbanken" 46 companies, agg. share-cap. 350 millions; 2. The "Handelsbanken" 30 companies, agg. share-cap. 150 millions. 3. The "Nationalbanken" 18 companies, agg. share-cap. 107 millions 4. "Revisionsbanken" 23 companies, agg. share-cap. 82 millions.

(Upon the liquidation of the Revisionsbanken the connections were distributed among the three remaining banks.)

Altogether these banks control (apart from their common connections) 109 companies with an aggregate share capital of 557 million crowns or about 50% of the total share-capital.

Similar influence is exercised by several of the big trading companies, prominent among them the East-Asiatic Company; several other banks play a lesser part in the same sphere.

The nine largest companies, including the four big banks, control 46% of all companies with two-thirds of the total capital.

As regards the persons interested in these big banks and stock-companies it must be said that a few of them wield the major influence.

At the head of the controllers of capital there is the General Director of the East-Asiatic Company, N. N. Andersen, the most influential and powerful person in Denmark; next in order comes the Director of the "Privatbanken", C. C. Clausen, who is a partner in eleven of the biggest companies with share-capital of 250 million crowns or 15% of the total capital.

Inquiry concerning the influence of the Copenhagen big capitalists shows that 25 persons control 40% of all companies and 75% of the total capital.

"Open competition" is hampered in a very marked degree by the fact that the same persons have seats on the boards of the various companies.

In many industries a complete, but veiled, trust-organisation has developed.

This development has made Denmark one of the countries where capital has become most concentrated.

In regard to technical concentration, however, Denmark is a long way behind other countries, especially in the textile and iron-industries. On this account several industries are at present undergoing severe production crises, which, in conjunction with an "artificial lock-out" in other branches, accounted for a loss of 100 million working-days in 1925 or twice as many as in

previous years. At the same time wages and salaries are declining.

The Social-Democratic Government at present in office has not taken a single step towards improving these conditions.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Class Struggle in Norway.

By K. D.

The great lock-out in Norway which came into force at the end of April still continues. It includes the five most important industries — the railway, mining, building, textile and shoe industries, along with over 30,000 workers. Shipping is also completely at a standstill. In the meantime tariff negotiations have been carried on in a whole number of other branches of industry. In some cases the negotiations have already been broken off without result. Only in a few individual factories have agreements been arrived at between the workers and the employers, mostly on the basis of reduction of wages of 10 to 12 per cent in accordance with the fall in the index of food prices.

The situation is very serious: of the 200,000 industrial workers in Norway, 40% have either been unemployed or locked out for some weeks. It is no wonder that feeling is very tense. This is proved, for example, by the situation in the cement industry and the strike of the tramway workers in Bergen.

The struggle in the cement industry has been going on since Christmas. Three big cement factories, employing altogether 1500 workers, wanted suddenly, while the collective agreements were still running, to bring about considerable wage reductions, and as the workers would not agree to this the factories were simply closed down and the workers locked-out. The cement manufacturers who have formed a Trust, have now, in order not to lose their customers and at the same time not to have to give way to their workers, commenced importing cement from abroad. This has aggravated the situation. The national trade union federation has, at the request of the chemical workers trade union, decided to impose a blockade on cement imported by the Norwegian cement trust.

The tramway strike in Bergen has assumed even sharper forms. As a result of the dispute between the directors and the employees, tramway traffic has been at a standstill for several months. In April the directors attempted to carry on a service by means of blacklegs, who in fact were quite unskilled. This called forth tremendous indignation not only among the tramway workers, but also among the rest of the working population of the town. The tramcars were held up in the streets, the windows smashed and in several cases the blacklegs had a warm time. The police on their part became more and more nervous, so that even the wives of the tramway workers who remained standing on the tram lines, were arrested. The police rained down blows with their truncheons, wholesale arrests took place and, finally, the atmosphere in Bergen became so heated that the blackleg cars only ran from half past eight in the morning to four o'clock in the afternoon; they were obliged to return to the tramway depots before the workers came out of the factories in the evening! From Saturday midday until Monday morning there is no tramway service whatever.

It is quite obvious that the Norwegian capitalists are contemplating a general attack upon the working class and their organisations. They are attempting to intimidate the workers by closing down the factories and discharging the employees. The great lock-out is intended in general to bring about a reduction of the standard of living of the working class. And now the bourgeois legislative machinery has been put into motion in order to break the resistance of the workers and to render ineffective their only weapon — organisation. A draft bill has been submitted to the Storting which can rightly be characterised as a "peon law". It is an attempt to worsen the existing law regarding labour disputes, in the first place by providing "effective protection for those willing to work", and further by extending and rendering more severe the penalties with regard to so-called "illegal" cessation of work.

A further worsening of the law is the clause which renders the trade unions responsible for the "misdeeds" of their members. Up to now the plaintiff was obliged to prove that the trade union was responsible for the breach of the collective agreement or the unlawful cessation of work on the part of its members. Now, however, the onus of proof rests with the trade union. The draft bill also provides that, in cases of conflict of interest which hitherto had to be submitted to a court of arbitration but without the parties being bound by the award, the award of the court of arbitration from now on shall be compulsory.

The new bill can be characterised as a new class law against the working class. It is therefore necessary that not only the Norwegian workers, but also the working class of all other industrial countries protest sharply against its being passed into law.

According to the provisions of the existing law regarding labour disputes, if a "legal" strike has lasted a month, the arbitration authorities must again take action and attempt to inter-mediate. The arbitration commission has, therefore, again met, and the question remains whether it will succeed in bringing the great lock-out to a conclusion or whether the struggle will continue in a still sharper form.

The Chinese Seamen's Union.

The Chinese Seamen's Union is based on the industrial principle and includes in its membership the Chinese seamen who do the long distance traffic and the coasting trade along the coast of the Pacific Ocean, as well as those who are employed on harbour-and-river boats.

The central committee of the Chinese Seamen's Union has its headquarters in Canton, and is administered by the most independent and most trustworthy of the Chinese revolutionary seamen who endeavour to introduce proletarian class politics in their Union.

According to the last reports made by one of the most reliable leaders of the Chinese Trade Unions movement, the Chinese Seamen's Union includes over 30,000 Chinese seamen and river boatmen and has its branches in all the larger ports of the Chinese coast, such as Canton, Shanghai, Hongkong, Amoy, Tsientsin, Swatow etc.

The strongest and best organised branches of the Chinese Seamen's Union are in Canton and Shanghai.

The branches in the other seaports represent relatively more recent organisations which are gradually getting stronger, and spread their influence over an ever increasing bulk of Chinese seamen.

The bulk of Chinese seamen has a distinct class feeling and supports the revolutionary elements among the seamen. Conditions in all the ports, except Canton, are very difficult.

In the registered enterprises of the Imperialists the Chinese seamen are unscrupulously suppressed. The same is done by the Chinese police which is at the disposal of the Chinese militarists.

Owing to such a situation the Chinese seamen in Shanghai are exposed to continued persecutions. For the same reason the Shanghai section of the Chinese Seamen's Union is not able to publish its own periodical, which the Chinese sailors in Shanghai badly need.

Although there is a strong revolutionary spirit among the Chinese seamen in the port of Shanghai, this disposition is not openly expressed by the leaders of this section, who often overcome their class feeling and keep up a connection with the Shanghai Chamber of Commerce with which they work together.

It was pardonable that they adopted such a policy at the time of the Shanghai general strike, when the Chamber of Commerce financially assisted the striking Chinese workmen, joined the workmen who fronted the Imperialists, and supported the national liberation movement in China; but the leaders of the Shanghai Seamen's Union section cannot be pardoned for maintaining the connection with the Chinese bourgeoisie after the strike, as the Chinese bourgeoisie agitates against the Chinese workmen and thus sets up a contact with the Imperialists.

The General Congress of the Chinese Seamen's Union acted correctly when it endeavoured to change this system of cooperation.

The other sections of the Chinese Seamen's Union are under the management of class-conscious Chinese seamen.

On December 27, 1925 the central committee of the Chinese Seamen's Union had convoked a General Congress of Seamen which was attended by 200 Delegates of all the branches of the Chinese Seamen's Union. Shanghai alone was represented by 20 Delegates.

At the Congress of the Union, held under the administration of revolutionary seamen and communists, it was decided definitely to join the Red International of Labour Unions from January 1st 1926 by becoming members of the International Propaganda Committee of transport workers. Owing to this resolution the Congress has put an end to any indecision and definitely adopted a revolutionary class standpoint.

This resolution formed an important point in the realisation of the International Unity of the Trade Union Movement and was a decisive answer to those reformist leaders of the Trade Union movement who continue their hostile policy against the Unity of the international Trade Union Movement. This connection between the Chinese Seamen's Union and the R. I. L. U. is, however, of still greater importance for the development of the class feeling of the Chinese proletariat, and leads the way to their complete liberation from international robber capital.

The Chinese Seamen's Union has taken the first step by putting the vanguard of Chinese proletarians — seamen and railwaymen — on the right proletarian way. The Chinese workmen of other branches of work must follow the transport workers on their way to the delivery of China from the international imperialist bourgeoisie.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

On the Tactics of the C. P. of Poland.

By Ernst Thälmann.

On the 23rd of May the Berlin "Rote Fahne" published a report by its Warsaw correspondent on the tactics of the C. P. of Poland during the recent events. This report reflects the outlook of certain circles of the Communist Party of Poland. We cannot avoid criticising these tactics in the sharpest manner. The author of the report proceeds from the thoroughly correct principle that the chief task of the Party consists in "separating the working masses from Pilsudski and his immediate supporters". But from this correct principle the writer draws the absolutely incorrect and unlenient conclusion that the means to this end was "to support Pilsudski's followers in their fight against the capitalists, big agrarians and reaction, and to bring the broadest masses of the workers and peasants into movement".

What is the significance of this so-called fight of Pilsudski against reaction? It is clear to every Marxist that the recent upheaval was participated in by two divergent and opposing elements: on the one side the working class and the working peasantry, the impoverished middle class and the suppressed national minorities; on the other hand, however, the military clique in the person of Pilsudski, whose aims are in no way revolutionary, but reactionary, who has set himself the task not of emancipating the proletariat from the yoke of the fascists and the bourgeoisie, but of betraying all sections of the working population in the name of "law and order", in the name of the bourgeois constitution, in the name of the bloc with the counter-revolution, in the name of lackey service to English imperialism. It is precisely in connecting this counter-revolutionary role with the simultaneous exploitation of the illusions of the broad masses, in hoisting the democratic flag over the white bayonets, that there consists the peculiar bonapartist character of Pilsudskism. It is here that is to be seen its fundamental class contradiction.

In these circumstances it was the task of the Communist Party, first to destroy the illusions of the masses regarding "Pilsudski's fight against reaction", and secondly to organise the independent, ruthless fight of the masses against Pilsudski and against the open reaction.

But if one speaks of a "fight of Pilsudski against reaction", then it is impossible to destroy the illusions of the masses with regard to Pilsudski; in fact one only increases them. If one speaks of the Communist Party "supporting" this alleged fight of Pilsudski against reaction, then one can neither organise the

independent action of the proletariat against its enemies nor the fight against the bonapartist, treacherous Pilsudski band. On the contrary, in this way one can only paralyse the class activity of the proletariat, prevent it from freeing itself from its illusions and thereby in practice, even if unconsciously, improve the situation of Pilsudski.

We find in the history of the bolshevist struggle a splendid example of how a Communist Party must behave at the moment of the armed conflict between the open white-guardists and petty bourgeois bonapartism. This fight of Pilsudski "against reaction" reminds one, in a certain sense, of the historical period of the fight of Kerensky against Kornilov in the year 1917. It is true there exists a great difference between the situation in Russia in 1917 and the situation in present-day Poland; but the class estimation of the fundamental historical problem remains quite correct for the given moment in Poland.

Lenin never permitted for a moment the possibility of a slogan, "support of the fight of Kerensky against Kornilov". Immediately after the advance of Kornilov on Petrograd, at the beginning of September, Lenin wrote a letter to the Central Committee of the Party in which he gave the following instructions:

"We must not even now support the Kerensky government. This would be a lack of principle. It will be asked: Shall we then not fight against Kornilov? Certainly. But that is not one and the same thing; there is a distinction. This distinction is disregarded by many Bolsheviki, who fall into "reconciliation" and allow themselves to be swept away by the stream of events."

Do these tactics mean that the Communists should be neutral in the fight of the working and peasant masses against white guardism? By no means. Lenin declared:

"We will fight, we are fighting against Kornilov, but we are not supporting Kerensky, but exposing his weakness. Therein consists the difference. That is a very fine but very essential difference and must not be forgotten."

It is this difference which is very fine, but very essential that has been overlooked by our Polish comrades.

In the same letter Lenin defines the new positive tasks of the Bolsheviki immediately after the outbreak of the struggle:

"Wherein consists our change of tactics after the Kornilov revolt?... In making clear to the people (who fought against Kornilov) the weaknesses and the vacillations of Kerensky. This has already been done. But it has now become our main task, therein consists the change" (thick type by Lenin).

The Warsaw correspondent of the "Rote Fahne" heaps error upon error. He regards it as the task of the Party that, "in the fight between fascism and the masses of Pilsudski's supporters, it must endeavour to strengthen the pressure of the masses upon their leaders in the direction of a real fight for power against fascism and the realisation of the demands of the working and peasant masses".

These tactics have nothing in common with bolshevism. These tactics have nothing in common with the following principle of Lenin:

"A ruthless struggle must be proclaimed against phrases regarding the revolutionary united front of the revolutionary democracy, regarding the support of the Provisional Government etc. etc., that is to say against phrases. Now is the time for deeds... Now is the time to act. The war against Kornilov must be conducted in a revolutionary manner, by drawing into it the masses, by rousing and stimulating them. (Kerensky, however, is afraid of the masses, is afraid of the people)". (thick type by Lenin).

The appeal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Poland which appeared at the moment when the armed struggle had become inevitable, states:

"The place of the revolutionary workers in this struggle is in the ranks of the opponents of the government, the fascists and the capitalists."

This amounts to recognising the military clique of Pilsudski as the real opponents of the Polish capitalists. It means "starting the main issue in the Polish events. It means substituting the "act" of the mass of the people under the leadership of the C.P. by "phrases" on the "revolutionary united front

of the revolutionary democracy". Lenin was a thousand times right when he stigmatised these tactics in the autumn of 1917. Every Party Communist, every member of the Communist International must in May 1926 condemn most emphatically these same tactics. We are firmly convinced that our Polish comrades and the C.C. of our Polish brother Party will speedily and energetically correct these errors. The Communist International, which fully understands the difficulties of the C.P. of Poland in the present situation and perceives the heroic fight of the Polish comrades, must help them by all possible means to correct their policy and to lead the masses along the Leninist way of struggle against Pilsudski, as well as against the fascists.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The United Front Campaign of the C. P. of Italy and the S. P. I. (Maximalists.)

By Aquila.

The United Front Campaign of our Italian Party — which is consistently and consciously pursuing its aim — is beginning to show its first, although at present very moderate success. Under the pressure of the socialist Party members — who in a good many cases had established the United Front with their communist fellow workers in the factories and had, in several towns (Genoa, Turin, Novara etc.) formed Unity Committees — the Central Committee of the S.P.I. realised the necessity of adopting a decision, according to which "it will consider the possibility in each individual case" of co-operating with the Communist Party and its Trades Union and Factory Organisations. Comrade Serrati, who, as the leader of the Trades Union section of the C.P.I. had to carry on the United Front Campaign in the free Trade Unions (especially against the Trades Union Committees of the S.P.I.), shortly before his death, criticised the duplicity and foolishness of the above decision of the maximalist Central Council, in several polemical articles. He pointed out that nowadays in Italy there are only three political tendencies: Fascism, Reformism and Communism, and he asked the leaders of the Maximalist party what was the real meaning of their "individual case" policy. Does it, perchance mean that in the Trade Union field the maximalist leaders reserve themselves the right for example, to co-operate with the Communists in the Woodworkers' Union, with the Reformists in the Metal workers' Union and with the Fascists in the Printers' Union, or do they wish to interpret their decision in a territorial sense, that is to say, that they will work with us in Turin, with the Reformists in Milan and with the Fascists in Rome? Or does the Maximalist Central Committee intend to make common cause with the Communists in the question of high prices, to join the Reformists in the parliamentary elections and to co-operate with the Fascists in some other matter?

In spite of the ambiguity of the decision of the Maximalist Party leaders, the Central of our Italian Party has taken advantage of this decision to concretise still further their United Front Campaign. The Trade Union Committee of the C.P.I. on April 25th addressed an open letter to the Trades Union Committee of the S.P.I. in which it asked the latter to come to an understanding with it in regard to the following concrete demands:

1. Campaign among the free Trade Unions in order to induce them to join the Anglo-Russian Committee.
2. United Campaign for the entry of further working masses into the free Trade Unions.
3. Joint efforts to secure the leadership of the Trade Union Federation which is now in the hands of the Reformists.
4. The sending of a Workers' Delegation to the U.S.S.R.

The Trade Union Committee of the Maximalist party tried at first to follow the ostrich policy. The pressure of its own supporters however was so strong that the Maximalist Trade Union Committee, after a month's silence, decided to descend to reply. The chief points of its answer were:

1. In order to induce the free Trade Unions to join the Anglo-Russian Committee, we agree that our partisans — without however forming permanent joint committees — make arrangements within every Union with your partisans, so that they prevail upon the official representatives of the Unions to join the said committee.

2. The Trade Union propaganda work must logically be done separately by the individual Trade Union committees; each of them must work in this direction within its own sphere of influence.

3. We do not exclude the possibility of making mutual programmatical arrangements immediately before the congresses of the individual Trade Union or the Congress of the Trade Union Federation, in order to wrest the leadership from the Reformists.

4. As regards members of our party taking part in Workers' Delegations to Soviet Russia, we call attention to the declaration of the Central Committee of our party, that any participation on the part of our party cannot result from pressure from outside, but can only be on the basis of obligations directly undertaken by the Central Committee.

As can be clearly seen from this answer of the Maximalist Trade Union Committee, the leaders are still endeavouring to work against our United Front Campaign, and refrain from adopting a definite attitude with regard to our clear and concrete demands. On the other hand the way in which they are compelled to wriggle shows that our straightforward and sincere demands (which aim at rallying the united forces of the workers against the fascist regime and the bourgeoisie, and for this purpose to destroy the influence of the reformist leaders in the Trade Unions) have met with complete understanding among the Maximalist workers, and also among the adherents of the reformists and of the politically unorganised workers, all of whom exercise a daily increasing pressure on their leaders. The concrete result of this success among the socialist youth is the formation of a joint committee for the province of Milan, along with our local youth organisation. This success proves the correctness of our policy and stimulates our Italian Party to go forward on the same lines with perseverance and still increased energy.

THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

On the Report of the Executive Committee of the Young Socialist International to the Amsterdam Congress.

By Friedl Fürnberg (Moscow).

During the last few days there was held in Amsterdam the 2nd Congress of the Young Socialist International. To this Congress — which took place exactly three years after the founding of the Y.S.I. — the Executive of the Y.S.I. issued a written report.

When, three years ago, there took place the amalgamation of the 2nd with the 2^{1/2} Youth International, it was trumpeted forth throughout the world that a new champion had arisen, a great international youth organisation, which would grow and which would overcome all its enemies. Today they are singing a humbler tune. The report of the Executive not only speaks of a lack of growth, but has to admit that there has been a considerable loss of membership in most countries. Not only in regard to the number of the membership, but in a whole number of other questions the report is nothing else than a great lamentation.

The Report is divided into two parts: the Report of the Executive (signed by Erich Ollenhauer) and the Reports of the Leagues. We must admit that the reports are all on a par; not one of them goes beyond the limits of a social democratic organisation for dances and games.

How great the actual loss of membership is is not given. We will make good this omission. In the Report, the number of members of the International is given as 202,000. In October 1925 the "Sozialistische Jugendinternationale" stated the membership to be about 240,000. It follows from this that there has been a loss of about 40,000 members, quite a goodly number. When it is remembered that this 202,000 includes the

number gained from the affiliation of the Scandinavian organisations (about 12,000—13,000), then it is obvious that the remaining organisations must, in addition, have lost a corresponding number of members, so one arrives at the result that, the Young Socialist International, according to its own figures, has, after two years of strenuous work, lost 50,000 members, or almost a fourth of its members. As however, the earlier and present figures are not correct, the loss actually amounts to about one third of the organisation.

There is given as a reason for the loss of membership the "difficult economic and political situation". Thus, when the working youth are experiencing bad times, when they are compelled — whether they want to or not — to fight for their economic interests, then they must abandon the Y.S.I. There could be no more open confession that the Y.S.I. has no longer anything to do with the struggle of the working youth. How otherwise could it have lost members precisely at a time when the young workers are experiencing distress.

One is compelled to laugh when one reads in this report the following:

"We can state today without exaggeration, that the Young Socialist International is at present the most effective and widely embracing international organisation of the youth."

Truly, an effective organisation! It is a pity however that it does not write anything about its achievements. The assertion that it is an international organisation, and an all-embracing one to boot, is not at all bad, when, in the same report one can read nothing of the non-European countries, with the exception of North America, while even with regard to such an important country as France the report only states that a commencement has been made with the work and that in this country, with a population of over 40 millions, the International has only a thousand members (and even this figure is exaggerated). In a great number of European countries there exist no sections of the Y.S.I. whatever. Thus in Italy, which is by no means a small country, the social democratic Youth League has been dissolved owing to decline of membership.

The social democratic youth organisations of the various countries have attempted and are attempting to check the decline in their membership by concluding agreements with the various proletarian organisations (trade unions, sport clubs, defence organisations etc.), which grant them the sole right to organise the youth in the organisations in question. Such agreements have been concluded in Holland, Belgium and Austria. In other countries they are being negotiated. The report shows that the Y.S.I. is everywhere trying to keep alive by means of these agreements.

It is quite evident that all these agreements are not only directed against the communists, but are also very injurious to the working youth, as they render more difficult, and often even impossible their fight for their interests.

These agreements however cannot prevent the final collapse of the Y.S.I.

The political activity of the various organisations has been so great that it was unnecessary to report anything about it. The political activity of the International was dealt with in a special section, in which it is stated at the same time that the International (after three years of existence) is at the commencement of its political work. We believe that in spite of that it will soon be at the end.

The report contains very little regarding economic struggles. In the whole 180 pages there is nothing reported regarding any success which has been won for the working youth against capitalism.

One seeks in vain in the report for any opposition to the capitalist States or any political attitude whatever. It contains only one political slogan: fight against the Soviet Union. In the middle of the report there suddenly appears an article by Abramovitch. This man is certainly not a young worker, nor does he write any report. The provocation of the International against its own members goes so far that this article is headed: "Is Soviet Russia a proletarian State?"

It would be going beyond the bounds of this article to deal with these effusions of Abramovitch. It is only necessary to state that in the whole of its 10 pages there is not a word regarding the youth.

But not content with that, the report on Georgia is even more monstrous. We do not speak of the stupidity of claiming 5000 members in this country. (No figures as to membership are given for Russia). But the report contains the following:

"During the revolt the youth took their place in the front ranks of the fighters."

They thus openly admit that their organisation fought with weapon in hands against the country of the workers and peasants. But there is something even better than that:

"It (the youth League) was in touch with the Youth Leagues of other parties in order, at the given moment, to be able to act together for the restoration of the independent democratic Republic of Georgia."

And this is contained in the report of the International. The Russian and Georgian working youth are not afraid of Abramovitch and Kundadse, but the working youth of the other countries must call the leaders of the Y. S. I. to account for seeking in this way to organise the fight against the Soviet Union.

If the Executive of the Y. S. I. writes that there exists no possibility in the near future of a temporary co-operation with the Young Communist International, this is due to the fact that it does not wish to fight. But the members of its organisations who are suffering the pressure of capitalism in the factories and workshops, will, along with their class comrades in the Young Communist International, take up the common fight for their interests, in spite of all the executives and Congresses of the Y.S. I.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

The Fight against Illiteracy in the Soviet Union.

By St. Natonek (Moscow).

On December 26th 1919, Lenin signed the decree according to which every inhabitant of the Soviet Republics is bound to learn to read and write either Russian or his own national language. In 1920, the "Extraordinary Commission for the Liquidation of Illiteracy" was set up with the object of carrying out this regulation. To-day the whole population of the Soviet Republics is taking part in the work through the gigantic mass organisation of the "League to Combat Illiteracy". This league had 244,000 members in June 1924, 542,786 in January 1925, and to-day the number of its members amounts to more than 1,700,000 and is steadily growing. The Soviet authorities and the whole population take the most active share in this work which, in view of the enormous cultural backwardness inherited from Czarism, is a tremendous one. Apart from actual courses of instruction, cinemas, theatres, lectures, exhibitions and wireless etc. are dispersing the dark ignorance in the villages; the staffs of individual Soviet authorities, factories etc. undertake to care for the education of individual villages or districts through the so-called Chief Institution; the publishing houses issue cheap or free copies of primers which are transported free of charge by the railways and shipping and are distributed free of charge by the post. In the fight against illiteracy, the youth organisations act as pioneers.

Unfortunately we have no exact statistical data as to the results of this work of enlightenment in the villages where, after all, the chief work is done. We have, however, reliable statistics concerning the work among the trade union members.

In 1922 there were still about a million trade union members who could neither read nor write. In 1925, this dreadful spectacle is no more to be seen. The following table gives information as to the results of the work of education:

Percentage of Illiterates:

Trade Unions:	January 1922	May 1925
Land workers	80%	13.3%
Miners	60%	14.0%
Paper workers	30%	4.2%
Building trade workers	20%	6.0%
Metal workers	14%	1.3%
Railwaymen	10%	none
Post and telegraph workers	2%	none

To-day the work among trade union members can be united to the new elements which stream in from the villages.

The most important work is done by the Red Army. In this army, the percentage of illiterates amounted to 80% in 1918, to 4% in 1924, to 1.4% in May 1924. To-day there is not a single illiterate soldier in the Red Army and every individual man is given careful general political and military instruction. Every year, masses of peasant youths who know nothing of reading and writing, stream from the villages into the red barracks and, at the end of their military service, they return to their village educated, and even as pioneers of the spread of culture and the fight against illiteracy.

Among the backward nationalities, the work could only be begun in 1923. This work meets with extraordinary difficulties. Whole districts came down to us from Czarism, in which no single person could read or write. Further, there were up to that time, many languages which possessed no written characters. In several languages, the first book appeared after the October revolution.

The active participation of the working masses themselves in the work and the interest in enlightenment and culture shown by the great masses are a guarantee that Lenin's last will which was that illiteracy should be abolished by the tenth anniversary of the October revolution, will by that day be fulfilled, if not completely, at least to a large extent.

THE WHITE TERROR

Against the Persecution of Spanish Communists.

Moscow, June 6th 1926.

The Red International of Labour Unions has issued an appeal to the workers of all countries calling upon them to protest against the threatening condemnation by the Military Court in Barcelona of six Spanish Communists, champions of the Spanish trade union movement: Solis, Mzurin, Colome, Rebul, Fremo and Rienzi who have already been in prison for many months. They are threatened with prison sentences from 15 to 25 years. In spite of the lack of evidence they will be condemned if this is not prevented by the protest action of the international proletariat. Organise protest meetings against the repressions in Spain! Send telegrams of protest to the government of Primo de Rivera! Let your voices be heard by the representatives of this government in your countries! Demand the immediate release of all arrested Spanish revolutionaries!

IN THE CAMP OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The Party Conference of the Socialist Party of France.

By F. Berlioz (Paris).

The French section of the Second International held its ordinary Party Conference from the 23rd to 26th of May in Clermont-Ferrand. This is the fourth National Party Conference of the French Social Democrats since the beginning of 1925. These frequent party Conferences are rendered necessary as a result of the progressive collapse of the Left Bloc which emerged victorious from the elections of 11th May 1924, as well as of the disillusionment of the electors.

In spite of the fact that the agenda did not provide for any discussion on the general policy of the Party, the debate on this question took up nearly the whole of the time of the Conference. Under the present conditions this could not be otherwise: we are witnessing a gradual pushing aside of the Left Bloc in favour of a collaboration of the centre parties, which are tending more and more to the Right, and also an acute financial crisis which the government intend to solve according to the dictates of the big bourgeoisie and of international finance.

All the speakers testified that profound discontent and discouraging laxity prevail in the Socialist Party, as well as in the country. The policy of supporting the government has not brought any benefit to the workers, peasants, officials and petty

bourgeois who had helped the Left Bloc to power. More than that, the parliamentary system is discredited. The Socialist Party which is before all an electoral organisation, cannot submit such a balance sheet to its electors. The terrifying spectre of the "lost period of legislation" dominates the mood of the social democratic leaders. It is necessary to escape out of the blind alley in which the Party finds itself and to attempt to smarten up the Party somewhat.

These circumstances have led to the formation of divergent tendencies in the French social democracy: the **Renaudel Group** which mainly consists of the old supporters of **Jaurès**, was at first in favour of participation in the government, but since the condemnation of this participation by the Party Conference at **Japy** in August 1925 it advocates unconditional support of the government. The Centre is endeavouring to avoid responsibility for the collapse of the Left Bloc policy and, after the overthrow of **Herriot** in April 1925, imposed upon the Party a policy oscillating between support and opposition. Finally, under the pressure of the proletarian elements of the Party, which are strong in the Federations of the Nord, Pas de Calais, Seine, Haute-Vienne etc., a Left was formed which will only agree to a pure socialist government, but within the frame of the capitalist regime.

The victories of the Centre in August 1925 and in January 1926 only increased the troubles of the constantly vacillating Party. There were continual fights between the Central Committee dominated by the Centrists **Bracke**, **Compère Morcl**, **Longuet**, **Paul Faure** etc. and the parliamentary fraction in which the **Renaudel group** dominated.

It was hoped that the Party Conference of **Clermont-Ferrand** would again restore the shaken prestige of the Party. Among the delegates it was the old parliamentarians, who have no contact with the working class, who had the most to say, whilst the few workers among the delegates spoke very seldom and could hardly obtain a hearing. Not a word was uttered regarding the increasing misery of the proletarians, the wages struggles which are taking place in the whole of France or regarding the fascists threats. The only thing the Conference was concerned about was to find a way out of the parliamentary situation.

The **Renaudel group** is still thinking of a new **Herriot** Ministry, which, even if the Socialists are not allowed to participate in it, will at least be supported by them under all circumstances. The **Right** condemned **Briand** who, by his hypocritical manoeuvres, destroyed the Left Bloc and whom they wish to see replaced by a Left Ministry with socialist support.

The **Centre**, composed of various undercurrents, is against any permanent alliance with the **Right**, and in its very emphatic demand for independence finds the desired pretext for fiercely combating the united front of the **Communist Party**.

With this apparent strict regard for principles the Socialist Party hopes that the masses will forget the recent past and will still give it credit. It hopes by this means to become at the next election the strongest parliamentary fraction and to be able to take over the government.

The resolution adopted at the Party Conference by a huge majority (2249 votes against 166 of the Left and 625 abstentions from the **Right**) is opposed to organic co-operation with any government or Party, but provides for elastic support of "any government which fights reaction and at the same time works to restore the economic and financial situation without overburdening the workers in an unjustifiable manner". The opposition to **Briand** must be "neither systematic nor demagogic", and may be expressed in the form of abstention from voting. The resolution condemns in the most emphatic manner the united front as a "bolshevist manoeuvre for splitting the forces of the workers".

The Party Conference showed itself to be wonderfully indulgent towards the breaches of discipline on the part of the **Right**, but terribly strict towards the small Left minority under the leadership of **Maurin**, which very timidly and with great confusion advocated occasional rapprochement of the Socialist Party to the **Communist Party**, and thus for the first time at a Party Conference of the French socialists provoked a great debate on the question of the united front.

The vote on the resolution of the Centre gave rise to lively incidents. The **Right** refused to take part in the Party leadership, but it can be assumed that, although still further friction between the Party leadership and the Party fraction is

to be expected, mutual concessions will render possible the maintenance of the united front against the threat of Communism.

The attitude of the **Right** is determined by the desire to obtain the support of the middle class and of the peasantry and thus to enter into the heritage of the collapsing **Radical Party**. The overwhelming majority of the Party, however, is driven by the fear that the disappointed workers may go over to the **Communist Party**.

The **Socialist Party** has now over 110,000 members, among them being 20,000 which it obtained since January 1926. In such industrial districts as the departments of **Nord** and **Pas de Calais** it numbers 18,000 paying members. It thus enjoys the support of many workers, and it is one of the tasks of the **Communist Party** to see that the workers who are turning away from the **Socialist Party** find their way to **Communism**.

As regards the Party Conference two further points are worth mentioning. The attitude of **Paul Boncour** in the **League of Nations** as the agent of **Briand** was strongly criticised, but nevertheless more from demagogic reasons, with an eye to the indignant workers than from genuine repugnance for the **League of Nations** and against the general policy followed by **Paul Boncour**. Regarding colonial policy which was one of the items of the agenda, no resolution was submitted to the Conference. But all the delegates who spoke on this question admired the civilising work of capitalist colonisation and merely demanded that it should be accompanied by "democratic guarantees".

From such a "resurrected" Socialist Party the bourgeoisie has really nothing to fear.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

The Antwerp Session of the Executive Committee of the International Co-operative Alliance.

By L. Chinchuk (Moscow).

At the last session of the Executive Committee of the International Co-operative Alliance, which came to an end on May 2nd, the following questions in dispute were on the agenda and called forth lively discussions.

Firstly the question of May 1st and the strike of the British miners; secondly the economic conference of the League of Nations; thirdly the fight against the destruction of the Co-operatives by the Fascists in Italy; fourthly the parallel drawn between Fascism and Bolshevism by the General Secretary **May**; fifthly the International Co-operative Day and its slogans; sixthly the revision of the regulation and the agenda of the Co-operative Conference in **Stockholm**.

§ 7 of the statutes deals with the neutrality of the Co-operative Alliance and under the pretext of neutrality, all action in common with any other form of the Labour movement of a trade union or political nature, is rejected. The interests of the Co-operative Alliance, however, as well as those of the whole Labour movement demand common action.

At the opening of the Conference of the Alliance on May 1st, I proposed a resolution emphasising the necessity of the Alliance taking part in the street demonstrations at the May celebrations and sending representatives to the workers' meetings in **Antwerp** in order to express the solidarity of the Conference with the Belgian working class. As the co-operative movement in **Belgium** is part of the general Labour movement, this expression of solidarity has special significance in that country.

I proposed another resolution to the following effect.

"The Co-operatives of the Soviet Union are following with intense interest the gigantic and difficult fight of the British miners against the mine owners and express their willingness to give evidence of their sympathies for the workers in their struggle by sending material help. I propose to the Alliance to help the British miners by appealing to all the national co-operative organisations asking them to give material and moral support to the miners."

The resolutions proposed by me led to passionate debates. The majority even declined the mere discussion of these pro-

posals for purely formal reasons, entrenching themselves behind § 7 of the statutes which forbids any interference in political life. The minority protested against an interpretation of this kind, but the chairman closed the debate arbitrarily, so that the Alliance did not express its point of view with regard to either the 1st of May or the struggle of the British miners.

Great debates also raged round the economic conference of the League of Nations. The Alliance considered it necessary to take a direct share in the work of the Conference. As, however, no organisations but individually elected persons took part, amongst them three co-operators (Erne — Sweden, Emmy Freundlich — Austria, and Chinchuk — Soviet Union), it was resolved to receive an informative report from the representatives of the co-operatives at the next session of the Executive Committee of the Co-operative Alliance.

In dealing with the question of the position of the co-operatives in Italy, the proposals of May, the General Secretary of the Alliance were accepted as a basis; they suggested that, in place of the National League of Co-operatives which had been suspended, a special bureau of the Alliance should be created in Italy at the head of which should be placed the former chairman of the suspended League, material and moral help being granted to him. I pointed out that Fascism rages not only in Italy and not only against the co-operative organisations, and that the co-operative, trade union and political organisations should carry on a fight against it in common.

Apart from this, I raised a vehement protest against the parallel between Fascism and Bolshevism, drawn by May, the General Secretary, in the "Bulletin". The comparison which in itself is untenable, is absolutely inadmissible when it is made by an official personality and in the official organ of the Alliance. Kaufmann — Germany, Poisson — France, Lustig — Czechoslovakia, Servy — Belgium and others took part in the debate, the first taking May's point of view.

In the question of the manifesto for International Co-operative Day, it transpired that the draft contained no single word on the struggle for peace nor any slogan whatever which might rouse the interest of the broad masses of the people. In spite of these defects, the manifesto was not altered.

A lively debate was called forth by the proposal of the Centrosojus, read by May, that two questions should be placed on the agenda of the coming Co-operative Congress: "The Co-operatives as defenders of the consumers' interests" and "The Co-operatives in the struggle against trusts and concerns."

This proposal was supported by Thomas Allen — Great Britain and Poisson — France, opposed by Kaufmann — Germany and finally handed over to the Central Committee of the Alliance.

Finally there were great discussions on the question of the statutes in the section regarding changes in the representation of the various countries in the C. C. of the Alliance. A number of speakers insisted on the necessity of regarding the Soviet Union as a single country which was entitled to be represented by the usual seven members in the Central Committee. I defended the rights of the co-operative organisations of the independent Republics of the Soviet Union and pointed to the necessity of taking as a basis for representation, not the measure of the contribution as has hitherto been the case, but the membership of the organisations and the amount of their turnover. I was supported by Poisson, Servy, Lustig and Suter — Switzerland, who proposed that, for countries of a federal type, the number of representatives in the Central Committee should be raised to fourteen. Nevertheless this proposal was rejected by five votes against five. I reserved the right to protest against this resolution in the Central Committee.

The chairman, on the strength of § 7, refused to admit discussion of a proposal of the Independent Labour Party of Great Britain with regard to calling a joint conference of the trade unions, co-operatives and Socialist parties with a view to taking measures against war.

Although our proposals were rejected in Antwerp, this conference is nevertheless of great significance for the international co-operative movement. Whereas in the past our representative was the only one to vote for our proposals, or at the best, with the support of Czecho-Slovakia, we got so far this time as to obtain as many as half the votes, our proposals thus being rejected with a parity of votes.

We must continue to follow the path we have chosen, firmly and unflinchingly.

OBITUARY

Joseph Tommasi.

By A. Nin.

On the 29th May last there died in Moscow our Comrade Joseph Tommasi, after a brief but painful illness. Comrade Tommasi was born in Paris on 26th July 1886. The whole of his short life was devoted to the Labour Movement. In the year 1904, when he was scarcely eighteen years of age, he entered the French Socialist Party. After the war he was one of the most eager and active advocates of the affiliation of the French Socialist Party to the Third International, and after the split which took place in the party at the Party Conference of Tours in 1920, he unhesitatingly identified himself with the majority of the party which had decided to transform the Socialist Party into a Communist Party.

In the ranks of the Communist Party of France, Comrade Tommasi proved himself to be an equally devoted and active worker as he had been formerly in the ranks of the Socialist Party. He was an excellent speaker who understood the ways of thought of the French proletariat better than anybody. He filled a number of responsible positions in the Party; he was a member of the Central Committee and of the Political Bureau of the Party, Party Secretary and Delegate to the Fourth Congress of the Comintern, but the centre of his activity lay in the trade union movement.

As Secretary of the Trade Union Federation of the Seine Department, which includes Paris, he conducted, before the split in the C. G. T., a tremendous amount of work in organising the workers of Paris, and took an active share in organising the revolutionary minorities within the reformist C. G. T. As representative of the revolutionary Minorities, comrade Tommasi took part in the first Congress of the Red International of Labour Unions, at which he played a prominent role.

As at that time syndicalist prejudices still prevailed in the French trade union movement, Comrade Tommasi was obliged to give up his position as Secretary of the Trade Union Federation of the Seine Department. But right up to the end of his life he never ceased to fight actively in the ranks of the French proletariat.

Those who fought along with him in the struggle will never forget this Communist, this splendid and devoted comrade, who was able to impart to others his revolutionary enthusiasm and his unshakeable belief in the working class.