

Theses of the E. C. C. I. on the Lessons of the British General Strike.

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 6 No. 47

PRESS

17th June 1926

CORRESPONDENCE

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

CONTENTS

- G. Zinoviev: The International Significance of the General Strike in Great Britain. I.
- The Miners Struggle in England.**
Theses on the Lessons of the British General Strike.
The Plenum of the Central Trade Union Council of the Soviet Union on the Results of the British General Strike.
- Politics.**
Iran dust: The Mosul Treaty between Great Britain and Turkey.
Axel: The Barrier to Revolution.
J. Smolan: The Three "Labour Governments" in Sweden.
- The Balkans.**
A. Timescu: The Refugee Question in Bulgaria before the League of Nations.
- Economics.**
M. Michailov: The Economic Consequences of the Massacre in Shanghai.
- Union of Soviet Republics.**
Vinov: New Economic Progress in the Soviet Union.
Frida Rubiner: The Third Congress of Worker Correspondents of the Soviet Union.
Kukel: The Successful Results of Electrification in the Soviet Union.
- The White Terror.**
A. K.: Growing Protest Movement against the Threatening Judicial Murder of Sacco and Vanzetti.
B.: Political Prisoners in Hungary on Hunger Strike.
- Workers' Correspondence.**
Louis Engdahl: Worker Correspondence in America.
- Red Sport International.**
Fritz Wiest: The Struggle for the Unity of the Workers' Sport Movement.

The International Significance of the General Strike in Great Britain.*)

I.

By G. Zinoviev.

The Industrial Decline of Great Britain.

Events in England placed us all at first under such a spell by the huge extent of their perspective that it is no wonder if at present a superficial observer sees reasons for being to a certain extent disappointed. It is true that at present only (only!) one and a quarter million miners are on strike. In point of fact, there is enormous significance in what is happening in England today in connection with the miners' strike. We should not only regret what the general strike did not bring, but should also rejoice at what it has brought us in spite of its unfortunate immediate results.

In order to understand the significance of this strike, we must sketch in brief outlines how England came to enter the revolutionary sphere.

After the events of 1918, in direct connection with the imperialist war, we all got into the habit of concentrating our attention on Central Europe, above all on Germany. We were all convinced that the spread of revolution from Russia would proceed via Germany. Both before and after the war, we were all much too much accustomed to regard the British labour movement as a pillar of Conservatism, to consider the fortress of British capitalism particularly impregnable and to believe that the time for revolutionary events in England was still in the far distant future. Nevertheless it is almost twenty years ago since England began to drift into the revolutionary sphere. At that time a revolutionary situation began to mature in England, which in May of this year developed almost into a directly revolutionary situation.

*) Lecture at a public meeting in Moscow on May 21st 1926. The proceeds of the entrance money to the meeting went to the benefit of the British miners who are on strike.

As long as England possessed the industrial world monopoly, the English bourgeoisie which is the best organised and educated, most skilful, clever and elastic in its methods of organisation and of administering capitalist industry, made use of its enormous super-profits, obtained from the colonies on the basis of its world monopoly, not only to enrich itself, but also in order to attach to itself an important upper stratum of the British working class by increasing their wages, and thus to create a "tame" working class. It created, as Engels wrote, a "bourgeois minded working class", a "bourgeois proletariat".

Even before the beginning of the imperialist war in 1914, the industrial monopoly of England began to disappear. In some fields Germany, in others America, began to catch up to England. The labour movement in England began to change its character even before the war. As is well known, the first great miners' strike in 1912 served for Lenin as the object of a serious investigation, as the result of which he came to the conclusion that the English working class was entering on a new epoch, that it was no longer the working class as we had known it in the period of the British industrial monopoly.

Although the actual result of the war was the victory of that group of Powers to which England belonged, it undermined still more the privileged position of English capitalism and, in some respects, destroyed it.

At present we can distinguish ten points which, in their totality, determine the descending line of English capitalism.

1. The coal industry is in a most difficult situation.

I only quote a few figures which characterise the decline of the English coal industry. In 1924 the output of coal in England amounted to 267 million tons and the export of coal to 82 millions; in 1925 the output of coal amounted only to 244 millions and the export to 69 million tons. In the course of one year the output of coal fell by 9%, the export by 15%. There is no other way out from this crisis than the nationalisation of the mines without compensation, and the transference of the whole coal industry into the hands of the State.

2. England's electrical industry is declining. In this branch of production, England is behind quite a number of countries. In this branch of industry also figures show that production fell by 6% between 1920 and 1924 and by 20% in the first nine months of 1925.

3. Shipbuilding was for many years, England's strongest industry. At present it is passing through a terrible crisis. In the domain of shipbuilding, England cannot even compete with defeated Germany and is compelled to order the vessels for her merchant fleet from the latter. Here also, figures are impressive. In 1924, 494 ships with a total tonnage of 1,440,000 and in 1925 only 342 ships with a tonnage of 1,085,000 were constructed in England. England's share in the shipbuilding of the world amounted to 64% in 1924, and to only 45% in 1925.

4. England's foreign trade has shown a larger adverse balance every year.

5. The colonies. England is losing more and more not only her political, but also her economic power over those colonies from which she used to extort the greatest extra-profits.

6. The Dominions. England continues to lose her political and economic influence over the Dominions.

7. America is gradually taking over the world hegemony of capitalism and is leaving England behind.

8. The Orient. The insurrections and fermentations in the East which we have witnessed during the last few years affect most seriously the rule of English capital throughout the world.

9. The working class in England has changed considerably since the epoch of British industrial monopoly. It is taking its historical place in the ranks of the international proletariat. The working-class of England has not yet produced a sufficiently powerful revolutionary mass party. It has however for more than ten years created the greatest difficulties for the English bourgeoisie. The working class in England is gradually becoming more and more revolutionary and is developing into a "third" Power. The "good" old times, when England only knew two parties, the Liberals and the Conservatives, are past. Apart from these two parties there is in England today a Labour Party, at the head of which, it is true, there are at present corrupt leaders,

but in which a Left wing is forming and constantly gaining in strength, the extreme group of which consists of the young Communist Party.

10. The victory of revolution in our country, the very existence of our Soviet Union shakes the power of the world bourgeoisie, especially of the English, to its foundations. For a number of political, economic, geographical and historical reasons, various antagonisms inevitably exist between the Soviet Union and bourgeois England, which find expression in the Orient more than anywhere.

The Communist International has, from year to year and from month to month devoted more attention to the lines on which England is developing, as it has always been aware of the great historical significance of events in that country.

This accounts for the fact that a number of literary works and Marxist investigations have, during the last few years, been devoted to dealing with the tendency of England's development. As one of the best of these works, I would point to Comrade Trotsky's book: "Where is Britain Going", which correctly and clearly describes the tendencies of the development of English capitalism and communicates to the public what Communists have written and spoken and those facts to which the Communist International has devoted so much attention.

Only when we take the above facts into consideration, can we understand why so vast a significance is attached to the movement of the miners in England. In the first place, the miners form the most numerous group of the English proletariat, their numbers amount to 1,200,000, with their families to three million. The miners' trade union is the strongest and most centralised trade union in England and the best able to fight. It is enough to mention that the South Wales miners struck for 4 months in 1893. In 1898 the miners' strike lasted for 6 months. In 1903, 400,000 English miners took part in the great strike which lasted for 5 months. In 1921, the miners embarked on an obstinate fight which at that time was frustrated by the same methods as was the general strike in May of this year.

The immediate causes of the strike are generally known. The mineowners tried to reduce the actual wages of the miners by 11%, demanded that the working day be prolonged by one hour and refused to conclude a collective agreement applying to the whole country. Though our class hatred for the mine owning millionaires is perfectly justified, we must, in the interest of objectivity, admit that from its point of view, from the point of view of its "normal" demands, capitalism had no other alternative than to declare war on the miners. If the mining industry in England is to exist under capitalist conditions, without nationalisation or transformation into State property, there was and is no alternative but that of reducing the standard of living of the miners. This fact puts a seal on the fate of English capitalism. The industrial and technical revolution in a number of countries and the decline of English industry have placed the ruling class in so difficult a position, that it only has two alternatives, either to hand over mining and after it other key industries to the State, or to exercise pressure on one side or other in order to maintain capitalist ownership of industry and surplus value, and to preserve the capability of competing in the world market.

The General Council and the Strike.

At first the Government hoped that it would succeed in isolating the miners and fighting out the battle with them alone. There is no doubt that at first neither the Baldwin Government nor the General Council wished for the general strike, for they merely "played" with the idea. The fighting spirit of the masses however and the revolutionary mood of the English workers, to which we had, up to then, not attached sufficient value, created a situation in which this playing with the idea of the general strike proved to be playing with fire.

The English bourgeoisie which has won the battle, now behaves as though this development of events were exactly what it had wished for. It maintains that it has only gained by having provoked the workers to fight, beaten them and made the labour movement harmless "for many years to come". In reality of course this is not the case. Even the present, selfish, narrow-minded, dull-witted Conservative Government in England did not enter on this strike of its own free will. No Go-

vernment, not even one like Baldwin's, dare play with fire. Now of course, when the affair has ended by the bourgeoisie "winning the game", these people pose as ingenious strategists who played the game as though it were a game of chess, deliberately provoked the workers, let them strike for 10 days, put an end to it on the 11th, thus demonstrating their brilliant strategical qualities to the whole world. What however were the actual facts?

A real class conflict has flared up in England. The commandship of the battle began to slip from the hands both of the Government and of the General Council. It is possible that some of the leaders of the General Council played this game on the side of the Government, i. e. by day they sat on the same side of the board, but at night, in the privacy of their chamber, they played with their partners on the other side of the board. Some of them perhaps actually sold themselves. It will not be surprising if at some time the game played by one or other of these gentlemen of the General Council is revealed as foul play. Nevertheless the affair was not so simple as a game of chess.

The atmosphere in England was charged with electricity. The working-class in England is rising gradually, its revolutionary mood is becoming more and more evident. In this electrical atmosphere, a dangerous game, a game playing with the idea of the general strike was begun in which a mighty group of workers, numbering a million and a half, was at stake. In this game, the question of leadership was of course of enormous importance. I recall some episodes from the epoch of the civil war in our country. We know that at that time it happened that one or other of the commanders of the army or of the chiefs of the General Staff played a double game. I recall an incident from the time of Yudenitch's attack on Leningrad, in which it turned out that the leader of the army which should have defended Leningrad was a White officer. He had managed to creep into our confidence; in reality however he conducted the operations on both sides; he gave orders to our Red troops and at the same time gave instructions to the enemy. To a certain extent, the General Council consists of gentlemen of this type, and this fact of course created a very difficult situation. The Russian working-class and its Red army won the fight in spite of our having traitors on the Staffs of our armies. It is however well known that we lost some battles through treachery, which of course resulted in great difficulties for our Red army.

Our first words when we learnt that the strike really was proclaimed were a warning to the effect that the movement was in danger from the Right leaders. The whole further course of events has shown that we were right. Only a few days after the strike had begun, we received a communication from an English comrade who had personally witnessed the events. He wrote that

"the real leader of the General Council is Thomas. All the other members of the General Council have voluntarily placed themselves under his lead."

Who then is Thomas? He is the Secretary of the Railwaymen's Union, one of the most opportunist leaders of the English Labour party. A living fragment from the old epoch of the English Labour movement, but a fairly weighty "fragment". It was this Thomas also who caused the shipwreck of the English miners' movement in 1921.

At that time the English miners could not mobilise all the workers of England in their defence, they succeeded however in creating the so-called Triple Alliance, i. e. an alliance between the unions of the miners, the railwaymen and the transport workers. These three unions were to have fought together. Exactly the same thing occurred then as now, only on a smaller scale, the only difference being that Thomas had already broken up the strike before it began. The outbreak of the strike which was fixed for June 15th, was frustrated, as Thomas had succeeded, at the decisive moment, in turning his railwaymen's union, especially its upper strata, against the strike, thus splitting up the Triple Alliance to the joy of the bourgeoisie. Thomas is well known from the fact that more than once he has betrayed his own railwaymen's union. It has often happened that Thomas could not speak in a single meeting of his trade union as, apart from the upper stratum of the trade union

bureaucracy, no one would listen to him; nevertheless he succeeded, with the help of the bourgeoisie, in exercising pressure from above on his own trade union.

It was just this Thomas who was at the head of the General Council at a moment of historical importance, at the moment of the general strike.

How did this happen? The general strike in England has swept away much trash, all that was staid, all that was hollow, all that was superficial, and has shown the true, actual forces which are opposed to one another in that country. The strike has done away with the idea that the so-called "Lefts" are at the head of the English General Council. This idea prevailed until the present strike. The strike has destroyed this illusion and shown who was the real master in the General Council of the English trade unions.

How did it happen that in the last few years a peculiar historical masquerade has been acted? The General Council formed an alliance with our Trade Union Council, created the Anglo-Russian Committee (friendly relations with communists not of their own country, but of other countries are sometimes suffered by opportunist business people), it pronounced itself in favour of international unity and seemed, at the first glance, to take a progressive attitude. Anyone regarding the matter superficially might have believed — and many did believe — that the English General Council, in contrast to the German or French trade union leaders, represented a really Left group. We are now witnessing a moment in England, when the page of history is being turned, when the voice of the English working class is breaking, when its mood is changing before our eyes. It is just for this reason that the leaders of the General Council have, during the last few years, assumed externally a "Left" character; they have been moulting. They have been carried on the crest of the great wave, the masses have forced them towards the Left. In order not to be detached from the masses, the leaders made certain external verbal concessions, they appeared to veer towards the Left and demonstratively satisfied some of the wishes of the working class. In essentials however, the old relation of forces persisted within the Trade Union Council. It was not until the present crisis that the mask was torn from the face of the present General Council and its true features revealed. Before the general strike, the leaders of the General Council could be heard making facetious remarks about Thomas; that he was on the shelf, that he belonged to a bygone day, that he had no influence on the masses of workers, that he was a royal lackey. In the meantime, the May crisis has shown that Thomas is still "active", that he still "leads". We were perfectly right therefore when, from the first moment of the strike, we warned our friends that the General Council had only placed itself at the head of the strike in order to betray it, that it had taken the head in order to behead.

We maintained, and in this respect also we were absolutely right, that Baldwin, the 50,000 policemen, the Fascist organisation, the O. M. S. (technical help in emergency) and the 160 aeroplanes for the war against the workers are less dangerous to the general strike than the traitors within the General Council, are much less dangerous than the "leadership" of the strike by the Right. Unfortunately these prophecies of ours have been fully confirmed. We have a number of communications from comrades who were eye-witnesses of events in England.

An English comrade, who was in London during the whole of the strike, describes the situation in a letter of May 8th as follows:

"The situation before the strike was as follows: above all Thomas' influence was extraordinarily strengthened; not only the Right but even the Left listened to him and were afraid of him. The members of the General Council flattered him. At the same time, in the last weeks before the general strike, a great lack of discernment in view of events in London became evident within the General Council and the leading circles of the trade unions.... The General Council as a whole did not desire a general strike, it was afraid of it and sought in various ways to bring about a compromise.

Hicks also lost his head — continues the comrade Purcell showed comparatively the most courage, but e"

he, only a few days before the strike expressed his solidarity with Thomas' attitude."

Well, Purcell declared his solidarity with Thomas' "attitude". When it came to the fight, Purcell allowed himself to be taken in tow by Thomas. This is a fact; it is written by a completely objective comrade.

The comrade describes the attitude of mind of the General Council as "firmness against their will."

I quote further extracts from the letter of our English comrade:

"The upper stratum of the Labour Party has got the wind up. Its leading section, the Parliamentary fraction, which is most detached from the masses, is horrified at the fight and is trying to mediate the whole time. It went so far that the "Daily Telegraph" praised the Labour party."

Note it well! On May 8th, when the movement was growing with an extraordinary rapidity, when it was showing promising fresh shoots, when the committees of action were organised and the strike committees, which resembled our district Soviets, were strengthened, when the whole mass went out on to the streets and, in London alone, a hundred thousand men were prepared to fight against the strike-breakers, when fraternization was taking place between the workers and the soldiers — at that moment the General Council gave the strikers the following advice: spend your free time in dancing and sport. Here and there this advice was followed, the strikers played football with the police — truly a picture in accordance with the spirit of Thomas. The vanguard of the masses however pressed forward, they went to the soldiers, there was fraternization between them and 150—200—300 arrests took place daily. Their spirits did not fall, but rose continually. And just at that period our comrade described the situation with the words: "The upper stratum of the Labour party has got the wind up, its leading section... is horrified at the fight." Anxiety, fear, that was the chief mood of the General Council and the leaders of the Labour party during the strike.

Some of the social democratic papers, for instance the Vienna "Arbeiterzeitung" (Otto Bauer), are now trying to justify the treachery in England by professing that wholesale strike-breaking had begun, that there was a constant stream of workers wanting to return to work. All the facts point to the contrary. All reports confirm that the capitulation of the General Council was a bolt from the blue for the great mass of the workers. In reality, the majority of workers continued to be in favour of the strike.

Comrade Murphy relates how the workers at first behaved towards the General Council. No one dared even to say a word against the General Council. If in those days anyone had criticised the General Council, he would have been thrashed. It reminds us of the mood in our country in the first days of the February revolution. Many comrades remember how the masses at that time behaved towards the Executive Committee at the head of which were Tscheidse, Kerensky & Co. At first the masses placed unlimited confidence in them. If at that time anyone wished to criticise Kerensky, he had to do so in a roundabout manner, he had to say that Kerensky was an honest man, whom we ought to love in spite of everything, and then carefully add why he nevertheless did not deserve complete confidence. A similar mood prevailed in England in the first days of the general strike. The masses of workers were glad that it was just the old official Centre which had placed itself at the head of the movement. They hoped that things would proceed almost painlessly.

The mood soon changed however. When the General Council had capitulated, the indignation of the masses was tremendous, and even today the houses of these "beloved leaders" of the English trade union movement are guarded by the police as there is reason to fear that the workers will destroy them (which in some cases has already happened). So quickly did the mood of the workers change, when they saw with whom they had to deal.

What Murphy has to say about the behaviour of the "Left" leaders is very interesting and very important for us.

"When the miners were generally attacked, Bromley was the first to join the Right wing. He was followed by

Hicks. Hicks' desertion was in connection with the question of the help of the Soviet trade unions. He proved to be even more talkative than the adherents of the Right wing. He "knows the masses", he "knows that the Russian gold is a curse for the broad masses" etc.

"Citrine tried to oppose Hicks, but in vain. The resolution which was passed is already well-known."

"In the General Council indescribable scenes occurred. All the meetings took place in a mood of panic and all ended in the same way, by the leaders trying to persuade the miners at any price to consent to a reduction of wages. The miners however remained unflinching."

The General Council capitulated without even having got into touch with the miners, with that storming group of the movement, on whose behalf the whole fight had arisen. It is difficult to imagine a more disgraceful bankruptcy. Not only have Thomas, MacDonald etc., the official arch-traitors become bankrupt, the rot has spread to the Centre and to the "Left" wing of the General Council. The decay spread from the dead to the living. Thus we see the bankruptcy not only of the official Right leaders, but also of the Centre and the "Left" with one single exception (Swales).

The General Council has a precautionary clause in its statutes, according to which all resolutions which are passed with any majority are regarded as passed unanimously. Even Swales regarded this clause of the statutes as more important than the attitude, the will to fight and the fate of five million strikers. The resolution for capitulation was therefore regarded as passed "unanimously".

The fact that the Government had declared the strike to be illegal, had a considerable influence. Some judge or other pronounced a verdict, according to which the strike was recognised as being "illegal". Attached to this judgment with regard to illegality was a small clause to the effect that the trade union leaders would be held liable along with their personal property. Some trade union leaders, as distinguished from real labour leaders have indeed something more to lose than their chains. This legal decision, which would have seemed ridiculous to a Russian revolutionary at the moment of a gigantic class battle which was on the verge of turning into civil war, at a moment when class was opposed to class, when, by the will of the workers, 15,000 trains were at a standstill, when the masses were in a ferment — this decision of some judge or other who was suffering from haemorrhoids must have carried weight, chiefly because, on the basis of this decision, some of the "leaders" would have had their "savings" taken from them.

I cannot refrain from saying that even Cook, who has proved himself one of the best among the English leaders and who is at present at the head of the miners' strike and is continuing the fight, that even Cook, of whom we hope that he will remain firm and fulfil his mission to the end, Cook, who is being pressed forward by the splendid English miners who in the past have more than once struck for six months, starving and going in rags — even Cook said (in his speech at Mansfield on March 21st, 1926)

that Baldwin is a reasonable man, but the same cannot be said of Jix his Home Secretary; that if Jix were Prime Minister, revolution would break out in our country within a month and that it is fortunate for us that we have a man like Baldwin.

And this was said by Cook, a Left among the Left, who is now honourably sticking to his post. (According to the latest communication — as is shown by his speech in South Wales on May 29th — Cook has returned to the right path and is now behaving as befits a leader who has the masses of strikers of the mining proletariat behind him.)

The resolution to decline international help, above all the help of the trade unions of the Soviet Union, had a vast political significance. At the moment when the General Council declined to accept the help of our trade unions, at that moment the strike morally capitulated, and it was just in this question, as we have heard, that the "Left" trade union leader Hicks exposed himself. The Berlin "Vorwärts" reports that the General Council did not refuse all foreign help, but only that of the trade unions of the Soviet Union. We have not been able to examine into the truth of this communication. A letter, however, exists from Citrine to Mr. Green, the pre-

sident of the American yellow trade unions, asking for financial support. Mr. Green is a worthy counterpart to Thomas and runs it close with him in deserving Judas' reward. The General Council did not consider it impossible to apply for material shareholder in several banks, a worthy successor to Gompers, help to that arch-reactionary, the "Labour leader" Green, a but it refused the help of the trade unions of the Soviet Union, Czech-Slovakia and Germany. I repeat, at the moment when the help of the international proletariat was refused, sentence was pronounced on the General Council.

The exact minutes of the capitulation meeting, in which the General Council informed Baldwin of the calling off of the general strike, was recently published in the "Times". The bourgeoisie acted very cunningly. The shorthand report describes in detail what took place. Who was present at this meeting?

According to the minutes, Baldwin, the Prime Minister, Evans, the Minister for War, Chamberlain, the Minister of Health and Horatio Wilson, the Secretary of the Minister for Labour, were present. The minutes enumerate also the other ministers and officials. The General Council was represented by Pugh. Pugh is the most humdrum, awkward figure in the General Council. He is "chairman". Swales was also present, of whom we know that he did not altogether agree with the "unanimous" capitulation. Further there was Citrine and, as the minutes say, "others" whose names were evidently considered not worth mentioning.

The speeches made at this meeting were so incredibly disgraceful, that they will eternally brand the forehead of these gentlemen from the General Council. The Prime Minister asked Pugh: "Will you be so good as to make a statement?"

Pugh, the Chairman of the General Council, made a stilted speech, roughly to the following effect:

Of course we know, that however long the strike lasted, we should sooner or later have to enter into negotiations. This being the case, the sooner the better; so we have come "as the result of our development in this direction" to inform you that the general strike is being called off. Pugh expounded his barren ideas in a tedious, muddled and awkward way.

The Minister interrupted him impatiently with the question:

"Then the general strike is to be stopped at once?" which was as good as saying: "Don't beat about the bush so much, but say straight out what it is all about". Pugh answered hastily: "Yes, at once".

In this spirit, the "negotiations" were carried on, in the course of which, the incorrigible Thomas, Thomas the Judas, spoke three times.

It is not the first time in history that we have witnessed such cases when the opportunist leaders act on the principle of "taking the head in order to behead", when they take part in the leadership of the strike and at the same time enter into telephonic and personal connection with the opposite side.

There are other historical examples. I recall the Magdeburg trial when it was a question of the participation of the late President of the German Republic, the Social Democrat Ebert in the 1918 strike which led to the revolution. Scheidemann and Noske, the future Minister and the leader of Social Democracy at that time joined the strike leaders in order to betray the strike. Whilst on the one hand they were members of the strike committee they, on the other hand, kept up relations with Generals Renner and Hindenburg. The Magdeburg trial, which took place a year and a half ago, revealed the part played by the Social Democratic leaders in the strike. Witnesses publicly stated that the heads of the Social Democratic party wished, "in the interest of the fatherland", to terminate the strike as soon as possible and that they therefore delegated Braun, Scheidemann and Ebert to the strike committee. At a Parliamentary Session in February 1918, the Bavarian Prime Minister expressed his thanks to the Social Democrats for having seized the leadership of the strike and so put an end to it.

(To be concluded.)

THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

Theses on the Lessons of the British General Strike.

1. The Crisis of British Capitalism.

a) The general position of British national economy in the world economic system and at the same time the general position of Great Britain as an imperialist State may be characterised as that of a steady process of decline. Even before the war the competition of a number of countries, above all Germany and U. S. A., threatened the monopolist position of Great Britain and gradually relegated her to a secondary position. The war and the post-war development greatly intensified this basic tendency, complicating and partly changing its forms. The growth of the U. S. A.; the economic and political strengthening of France and of Japan to a certain extent; the industrialisation of the British colonies and dominions, with an increase in their centrifugal tendencies; the National Debt with all the consequences arising therefrom; the limitation of the purchasing capacity of the markets still within the purview of Great Britain; the partial withdrawal of Russia from the former trading system; the growth of the revolutionary movement in the colonial and dependent countries (such as China); finally, the relative technical and organisational backwardness as compared with the U. S. A. and Germany due to the parasitic manifestations accruing from Great Britain's monopolist position in the world market, — all these factors are summed up in the chronic crisis of British capitalism. Great Britain can no longer be spoken of as the "workshop of the world". Her role as "monopoly ruler of the waves" is steadily disappearing.

b) A most important component part of the general decline of British capitalism is the chronic and increasing acute crisis in the British mining industry. This branch of industry, which is directly connected with about 8½% of the British population, with a yearly output of £ 250,000,000 and exports equalling 10% of the entire British exports, was the basis of British economic power. Thus, the decline of the coal industry is a decisive indication of the general decay of British capitalism. The output of coal shows a steady fall (270 million tons in 1909—13, 267 million tons in 1924, and 244 million tons in 1925). Home consumption from 1909 to 1925 inclusive decreased from 182 million tons to 175 million tons, particularly due to the decreased demands on the part of the metal industry. Exports of British coal have been and are being reduced most of all; in 1903—13 they comprised 88 million tons; in 1924 82, and in 1925 only 69 million tons (see Report of the Royal Commission on the Coal Industry p. 4.). British coal is being systematically ousted from a number of markets: in Germany, Italy, Poland, Spain, Belgium, in the South African and South American countries, in the East, in the British dominions, etc. This descending curve of the coal industry has both general and specific causes: the competition of other forms of fuel in connection with technical progress (electricity and "white coal", oil, progress in fuel technique); the technical backwardness of the British mining industry and the relative exhaustion of the coal mines, backward organisational forms of mining management; decreased purchasing power of the coal consumers; the competition of other countries including the Dominions, due to the development of their own industry and re-grouping of markets.

c) From the point of view of the main perspective of development, the profound crisis in the British coal industry connected with the general crisis of British economy and tremendous chronic unemployment will lead to a radical change in the method of production, i. e. to the basic task of the proletarian revolution. For the radical way out of the blind alley is to destroy the relics of feudalism (absolute rent burdening industry) the abolition of private property which is the only way of obtaining the necessary planned production and definite technical reorganisation; real guarantee of peace and collaboration in the field of international relations, including the "colonies", which is inconceivable on a capitalist basis; and finally to get the proletariat itself profoundly interested in the process

of production, which is only possible under the victorious dictatorship of the working class. The schemes for emerging from the cul-de-sac put forward by the bourgeois and social-reformist ideologists in present conditions are partly utopian (for instance, the plans for an International export cartel proposed by Messrs. Mond, Keynes, Brailsford, Hodges & Co.) partly propose pressure on the working class which will inevitably lead sooner or later to the revolt of the proletariat and raise the fundamental question of power in the country. The coal crisis is thus the barometer of the social revolution.

2. Great Britain's Decline and the British Labour Movement.

a) In line with the former long sustained power of Great Britain and her ruling position on the world market, a historically evolved type of labour movement developed. British capitalism of its classic period also begot the classic type of **British trade unionism**. Its social-economic bases were the surplus profits received by the British bourgeoisie from all corners of the globe and partially transformed into a component element of the British workers' wages. On this basis the proletariat raised its standard of living and productive qualifications. The British proletariat, therefore, became a specially privileged section of the International army of labour, a labour aristocracy, to a certain extent economically bound up with the general interests of their masters. This "bourgeoisified proletariat" (Engels) had the most skilled section of the workers in its midst, a 100% aristocracy which proved to be a purveyor of trained servants of capital, "the labour lieutenants of the capitalist class". The social condition of the British proletariat also created its opportunist social-consciousness: craft outlook, indifference to politics together with the fetish of legality, parliament, king and church; "Fabian Socialism" with admiration for gradualness and disgust for revolutionary violence; finally, "Guild" Socialism and the "constructive" Socialism of Mr. MacDonald which in substance denies the class struggle of the proletariat all along the front. It is on this basis that the open corruption in the upper sections of the labour bureaucracy arose.

b) The commencement of the decline of British capitalism and the accompanying process of decrease in the imperialist surplus profits of the British bourgeoisie produced a radical change in relations between classes and within the working class itself. The increase of class antagonisms led to a sharp decrease in the political importance of traditional **British liberalism**, which had been the prevailing ideology of the bourgeoisie and had systematically extended bourgeois influence over the proletariat. The strengthening of the Conservatives on the one hand, and the growth of the Labour movement on the other; the general leftward trend of the working class; the increased strike struggle (railwaymen's strike in 1911, general strike of miners in 1912, strike wave in 1913, Railwaymen's strike in 1919, strike of miners in 1921); the appearance of factory committees, committees of action, the formation of the **Communist Party** and the birth of the "**Minority Movement**", the campaign for rapprochement with the U. S. S. R., the constitution of the **Anglo-Russian committee** under pressure of the masses, the general strike and the present miners' strike -- all these are links in the same chain of development.

c) The process of liberating the British working class from the influence of opportunism does not proceed uniformly. The process of revolutionary development among the proletariat is not uniform because of the difference between the tremendous army of unemployed which is becoming a chronic phenomenon in Great Britain and the employed workers; the distinction between skilled and unskilled labour, the distinction between the workers of various trades in connection with the non-uniform development of the crisis; and finally the distinction between the organised mass and the bureaucratic official staffs.

The greatest hindrance to revolutionary ripening is the hierarchy of trade union and Labour Party officials with their leaders, who developed on the basis of former relations. The great majority of these are either conscious allies of the bourgeoisie and conscious enemies of a class labour movement, or else "**Left Wingers**" ("Centrists") who, thanks to their ambiguous attitude, political cowardice and policy of capitulation inevitably arising therefrom, go over to the side of the enemy at times of crises. The so-called "leaders of the working class"

manoeuvre against the growth of the revolutionary activity of the masses, both in their tactics and their ideology. The ideology of "constructive Socialism" as a means of preventative war against Communism, has widespread popularity amongst the higher political and trade union officials, while the development of the mass movement, despite vacillations and zig-zags brings the masses more and more under the banner of fighting revolutionary **Marxism, i. e. Leninism**.

3. The Coal Crisis and Preparation for the Strike.

a) The postponement of the conflict between the miners and the mineowners in July of last year is explained by the fact that the government did not feel sufficiently prepared: the mineowners had not the necessary reserve of coal, the State authorities had not yet mustered all the forces necessary for a final fight. The main strategic policy of the bourgeoisie was determined by the desire to gain time, to reform the ranks and enter the fight with the aim of smashing the main position of the working class and the subsequent carrying out of the "reorganisation of the industry" by bringing further pressure to bear on the working class and by increased exploitation. Hence the subsidies to the coal owners and postponement of a decision until May of the present year. The preparations of the bourgeoisie proceeded in various directions; these include: 1) measures of a military and police nature (special district civil commissioners, organisation of a special constabulary force, organisation of blacklegs throughout the whole country, getting the army and navy into fighting order) 2) measures for organising a central government in the event of a struggle (formation of a strong governmental "fist", division of labour between the "Die-hards" and Baldwin who was to play the role of a mediator and conciliator "above classes"); 3) measures for organising so-called "public opinion" (the Samuel Commission, reasons for the necessity of lowering wages, the frightening of the petty-bourgeois elements with the "terrible" consequences of "violence" on the part of the miners, the appeal to parliamentary and constitutional modes of thought on the part of the general public, etc.); 4) measures for organising spying and treachery among the labour leaders (arrangements with Thomas, MacDonald, & Co.).

b) Whereas the bourgeoisie did everything possible to mobilise its forces and disintegrate the forces of its opponent, the official labour "leaders" did everything possible to facilitate the work of the bourgeoisie and demobilise the forces of the proletariat. The Home Secretary, **Joynson Hicks**, stated on April 5th, that "the Cabinet was now more anxious than during the war". Meanwhile the official trade union leaders as far back as August were "convinced" that it was "impossible" to make preparations in time (See article by Brailsford in "New Leader" of May 21, 1926*). The main strategic policy of the **Right wing leaders of the General Council (Thomas) and of the Labour Party (MacDonald) who were giving the tone to the movement** consisted in holding on to the leadership in order to avert an acute development of the class struggle and in order to wreck the strike. Hence: permanent "contact" with the government and the mineowners, i. e. an open plot against the workers, a whole gamut of acts disorganising the proletariat as a whole commencing with the demonstrative "threats" to the government and ending with simultaneous opposition both to the miners' strike and to the contemplated general strike. (Compare for instance the estimation of the **Report of the Royal Coal Commission** given by the Communist Party which stated that the report is "a declaration of war against the whole working class", with the opinion of MacDonald that this report is our "triumph" and Hodges who proposed "accepting" this report, also compare the speech of the Labour Party member, Wedgewood, in reply to Joynson Hicks' injunction about "keeping the Labour Party pure and chaste"; also the continual pressure exercised on the miners with simultaneous promises of "fraternal aid, etc."). The Right leaders thus had their strategy, while the "Left Wingers" were in continual fear, had absolutely no independent position and were thereby doomed to be pulled along by the leading strings of the Right Wingers.

c) The working masses in general understood that the owners and the state were preparing a decisive attack on the working class. The lowering of the miners' standard of living was connected in the consciousness of the masses with the inevitable reduction of the standard of living for the workers of other trades. The masses, some consciously and others spontaneously, were all for

extending the struggle. The "Minority Movement" and the Communist Party consciously expressed this process. Already immediately after the appearance of the Coal Commission Report the Communist Party estimated it as a "declaration of war" (see above); on April 9th, at the Miners' Conference it issued the slogan for "mobilising the whole working class"; on April 23rd, it issued the slogan for a general strike in support of the miners and slogans for supporting them internationally, for the organisation of "Committees of Action", etc., developing these slogans still further (Workers' Defence Corps, leaflets to be issued to soldiers, agreement with the cooperatives, closing down of capitalist press, etc.) and warning the workers as to possible treachery on the part of the heroes of "Black Friday" (Thomas & Co.). In the same manner the National Conference of the "Minority Movement" and the conference of miners belonging to that movement put forward a number of slogans in the direction of preparing a general strike and developing the struggle.

4. The Trend of the General Strike and its Finish.

a) The trend of the general strike and its liquidation are a tremendous lesson for the entire International proletariat. On April 30th, the mineowners presented the miners with an ultimatum (reduction of wages, extension of hours, agreements according to district, and not on a national scale). With the refusal of the miners the **lockout** commenced. Under pressure of the masses the General Council decided for a strike, postponing its commencement until May 1st. On the First of May the workers demonstrated their mood in tremendous processions. In the interval the Government was taking energetic steps for suppressing the workers. On May 1st, martial law was declared throughout the entire country, troops were sent to Lancashire, Scotland and Wales and all the forces of counter-revolution were mobilised. At the same time Messrs. Thomas, MacDonald and Co. took command in the General Council and the "Left Wingers" pitifully retreated to the background. Thomas & Co. "pleaded" on their knees with the government but in reality were already at one with the government in its struggle against the approaching revolutionary crisis. In the words of Lansbury (article of May 22nd) "a fever of anxiety and even of fear" (fear of the masses above all) prevailed in the General Council. Whereas the strategy of the Thomases was to head the strike in order to **smash** it (see Thomas' statement in Court after the 1921 strike, where as a King's Privy Councillor he spoke of readiness to smash the strike when it might serve the ends of a "revolutionary party"), had its corresponding tactics which all the time were the tactics of smashing the strike which had commenced against the will of the Thomases. The fear of events and preparation for liquidating the strike were above all to be seen in the announcement of the "purely economic" nature of the struggle. Under this pretext the "mobilisation" proceeded in such a way that the General Council did not decide to publish its own paper, not issuing it until the governmental strike-breakers' paper appeared; under this pretext the "politicians" were instructed not to take any action (which did not prevent them acting in the opposite direction); under this pretext the masses were not summoned to persistent systematic organisational work, or what is more to conquest of the streets, but were called upon to engage in peaceful games of football; under this pretext a struggle was conducted against those revolutionarily inclined workers who entered the struggle without waiting for the orders of the General Council; for instance the General Council even feared bringing into the strike the workers of the vitally necessary branches of industry (electricity, gas, etc.). The leaders of the Labour Party and its parliamentary fraction behaved no less shamefully. As a matter of fact the strike developed not **thanks** to the leaders, but **against** their will.

b) Whereas the labour leaders pretended they did not understand the political nature of the strike the government and bourgeoisie saw this clearly and acted accordingly. The "Manchester Guardian" defined the government policy as "a struggle for a victorious finish". To smash the trade union movement, the basic form of the British Labour Movement, was at the same time put forward as the main task of the day. The "Times" wrote of the necessity of "breaking the dictatorship of the trade unions". The "Daily Telegraph" (May 3rd) characterised the struggle as a fight between the General Council and the "constitutional government of the country". "The memorandum issued on Saturday night" the paper wrote . . . "announcing the decision of the Executive Committees to call a general strike, is in fact the procla-

mation of a usurping authority. The fact is that the General Council is a usurping body, and there is no room for usurpers in our constitutional system . . ." In accordance with this the bourgeoisie acted with all the necessary energy. The more the "labour leaders" entreated and raved, the more energetically did the government conduct its policy of a "firm hand" (note, for instance the contemptful kicks that Baldwin gave Thomas & Co.).

c) The "Left" leaders of the General Council who have the majority on it, not only offered absolutely no resistance whatsoever to the conscious betrayal of the Thomas type, but all the time marched under the orders of the Right Wing. As a matter of fact Thomas & Co., led the General Council throughout the whole length of the strike. At the commencement certain "Left" leaders were openly against it. In the middle of the strike they almost entirely departed from the scene putting themselves at the disposition of Thomas' clique; at turning points in the strike they sometimes acted no less shamefully than Thomas (for instance Hicks and the "cursed Russian money"). They absolutely disintegrated the main force of the movement (the miners) persuading them to surrender. Only the tremendous pressure of the mass movement compelled them to trail at its tail. Thus the "Left Wingers" objectively played a still more criminal role, for they had the majority and bore the direct responsibility for leadership of the strike.

d) The mass movement developed with unprecedented force. All information decisively refutes the talks about any considerable or supposed growing number of strikebreakers. This legend was set going by the trade union "leaders" and afterward "worked up" by Otto Bauer in the Vienna "Arbeiter-Zeitung" and in reality is a shameful slander against the British proletariat, a slander all the more revolting as it served as a screen for real traitors. The evidence of such witnesses as Lansbury, Brailsford and others shows the growing enthusiasm of the masses everywhere, criticism of the leaders from the left, workers coming out in support of the miners even independently of the General Council, the creation of a number of mass organisations, etc. In some places the masses even spontaneously came out onto the streets and resorted to methods of revolutionary violence so hateful to the reformists (destruction of blackleg motor-buses, closing down of bourgeois papers, calling upon soldiers not to obey orders, etc.). The organisation of Committees of Action from below, the commencement of an ostensible spontaneous seizure of certain socially-important functions in various places (distribution of electric power, food, etc.) urged the development of the strike more and more towards higher forms of the movement.

e) The Second International and Amsterdam actually supported the policy of the Right Wing leaders of the General Council i. e. sabotaged the strike. The Social Democratic press systematically kept silent as to the dimensions of the strike, supported in advance a "compromise issue", raised scares about the difficulties of the struggle, emphasised the "merely economic" nature of the strike, talked about the tremendous number of strike-breakers (Oudegeest in "Het Volk" wrote of 50% of the unorganised providing strike-breakers), hurled invective not at the British bourgeoisie, but at the Communists (against their "superfluous efforts"; compare with the "strike gambling" of the Liquidators); "Vorwärts" conducted a campaign against "Moscow" and demanded a general strike in the U. S. S. R. The Amsterdam International turned down the united front with the R. I. L. U. sabotaged its own meetings devoted to the British strike. The Transport Workers International rejected the proposal of Fimmen "not to export coal through Rotterdam"; the German trade unions helped so long as it was not disadvantageous to the German bourgeoisie, etc. Only under pressure of the masses did the Second and Amsterdam Internationals decide on certain minimum steps by way of aiding the strikers. From the viewpoint of the development of the movement the policy of these organisations was a policy of sabotage.

f) The strike was liquidated because it was growing, for its leaders feared this very growth more than anything else. Brailsford wrote that "the pressure (of the masses) was so strong, that it was not a question of the difficulty of mobilisation but of the difficulty of holding them back from the strike". (2) The strike could only survive and win by developing further, i. e. with a further sharpening of the class struggle. The decisive turning point was already clear when the "leaders" refused to accept monetary aid from the Soviet Unions with whom they

had jointly formed the Anglo-Russian Committee, giving as a motive of their refusal the fact that they would be badly understood and the acceptance wrongly interpreted. Subsequently covering up this refusal by a refusal of foreign aid in general, they thereby isolated the British workers from the International proletariat. And no sooner did rumours circulate as to new attacks from the government being prepared (arrest of General Council, calling up of the reserves, law against the trade unions, confiscation of trade union funds), the "leaders", utilising the second appearance of Mr. Samuel, betrayed the strike. With the exception of the miners and certain sections of the labour movement, the working masses, who had already entered on the revolutionary path, did not expect such treachery and returned to work at the call of the General Council, which they still trusted. This trust turned into a wave of indignation. The most shameful, insulting agreements of the railwaymen and others were concluded under the direct "guidance" of Thomas & Co. The treacherous role of Thomas and others is officially documented in the British bourgeois press. For instance, the most serious bourgeois journal the "Economist" (May 15th 1926) writes: "The strike failed because most of its organisers did not want it and did not believe that it could succeed. The chairman of the General Council is a man of peace..." The former Stinnes organ "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" described the railwaymen's agreement as the "most astonishing capitulation of the trade unions conceivable after such a strike". The tactics of the government and bourgeoisie were tactics of a determined and calculated offensive. The tactics of the trade union "leaders" were tactics of treachery and capitulation. The refusal to turn the strike into political channels really amounted to a blow at the internal mobilisation of forces. The refusal of International aid was a blow against the mobilisation of the external forces of the proletariat. The order for liquidation of the strike put the finishing touch to the business. The working class demobilised by its leaders, lost the first great fight in its history.

5. The Miners' Strike and Subsequent Perspectives.

a) The present situation (end of May 1926) is characterised by a relative strengthening of the position of the bourgeoisie, a temporary disintegration within a considerable section of the working class, and the rallying of the revolutionary forces of the working class around the miners' strike with a simultaneous move of the bourgeoisie to a further offensive. The bourgeois press is conducting an unprecedentedly rabid campaign against the U. S. S. R. Together with some of the trade union leaders it is conducting the same hue and cry against the miners. The mineowners are making attempts to conclude agreements with the miners in separate districts. A Bill is being introduced into the House of Commons of changing the law on trade unions and the limitation of their rights is in preparation. The employers are endeavouring to utilise the defeat to tighten the screw still more. Under such conditions the miners' strike, its progress and its outcome have decisive significance for the entire coming period in the development of the British (and not only of the British) labour movement. Firstly, the possibility of a victory of the miners, of a subsequent growth of the movement on a new basis, of new sections of the working class joining in the strike is by no means excluded. On the other hand, the possibility of a defeat or compromise must also be taken into consideration, which would be followed by a frontal attack of the united forces of the Government, bourgeoisie and the Right "Labour" leaders against the proletariat with all the consequences arising therefrom: policy of isolation, pushing out and exclusion of Communists and supporters of the "Minority Movement" from the trade unions, a decisive swing round of certain groups of trade union leaders towards the American Federation of Labour and Amsterdam, a rupture with the trade unions of the U. S. S. R., etc., etc.

b) Therefore at the present time all efforts of the real friends of the British workers should be directed towards energetic support of the miners. The tactics of the Communist Party, the Minority Movement, the R. I. L. U., etc. should be based upon the most courageous and determined support of the miners both in Great Britain itself and on an International scale. Double attention should be paid to the work of jointly collecting funds in aid of the miners, boycotting coal cargoes, the extension of sympathetic strikes, etc. The widest possible mobilisation of the proletarian masses must be organised around the miners' strike. The Communists (with the exception of the unemployed) of all

countries are in duty bound to make regular contributions in aid of the miners. Without this most energetic intervention and without this aid the miners' strike may be lost, this will mean a great blow for the entire revolutionary-proletarian movement. All Sections of the Comintern are obliged to take a number of most extraordinary measures in order to ensure the carrying out of this lead.

c) In the present condition of struggle, the most determined resistance must be offered in all cases and in all circumstances to all attempts of the Right wingers to push supporters of the Minority Movement and Communists out of positions they occupy in the trade union movement. On the other hand the tendency which has already become fairly sharply manifest amongst the British working class — the tendency to leave the trade unions should be recognised as one of extreme danger. (See "Workers Weekly" May 21st article by A. MacManus against leaving the unions). While the rage of the most advanced workers can be very well understood, and while we can quite understand their just indignation at the treachery and scabbing of the official trade union leaders, on the other hand from the point of view of political expediency, there should be the most determined condemnation of tactics of leaving the unions, no matter in what alluring and quasi-revolutionary phrases about "new organisations", etc. they be arrayed. (See Lenin: "Infantile Sickness of Left Wing Communism"). The experience of the world labour movement, in particular the experience of the German movement during the last few years has shown with surprising clearness that the tactics of "self-exclusion" objectively supports the plans drawn up by the Right Wing leaders with the fully approval of the bourgeoisie. These tactics lead to the loss of connection with the masses, isolation of the revolutionary elements of the movement and renders a solution of the fundamental problem — the problem of winning the masses, impossible. In the event of the victorious development of the strike, the tactics of leaving the unions would greatly retard the process of conquering the trade unions; in the event of victorious reaction, they would lead to the isolation of the best sections of the working class.

d) The main result of the general strike and the complex of phenomena connected therewith will be a process of accelerating the differentiation within the working class. Whereas it is extremely probable, even inevitable, that there will be a definite Rightward process on the part of the upper groups of leaders (both in the trade unions and in the Labour Party), on the other hand equally inevitable is the process of further revolutionising of the masses. The economic basis of reformism in Great Britain has disappeared for ever. The shedding of parliamentary and constitutional illusions, the disclosure of the State as a class force, inevitable disappointment in the old reformist leaders and reformist methods, the ever clearer presentation of the question of power, these factors are bound to lead to a growth of class consciousness of the workers. On the background of the fatal decline of the capitalist system in Great Britain, this in turn will lead to subsequent inevitable revolutionary struggles. Therefore the immediate task of the Communist Party of Great Britain is the energetic continuation of the policy of rallying forces and the policy of the united front preparing the working class for resistance to the inevitable capitalist offensive and transforming this resistance into a wide revolutionary offensive movement of the proletariat.

6. Lessons of the Strike.

a) The great British strike completely confirmed the Comintern estimation of the general world situation as a period of relative and temporary stabilisation of capitalism, as opposed to the Social Democratic appreciation. The latter affirms that capitalism has already rid itself of the consequences of the war period, has secured new organisational forms for its international relations (League of Nations, etc.), while within various countries it has entered a phase of stable civil peace. Just as the colonial wars, the national revolution in China, the collapse of the Locarno Agreement, etc., display the whole unprecedented baseness of Socialist "pacifism", the civil war in Poland and the strike of millions of British workers, reveal the pitiful reformist Utopianism of Social Democracy on questions of the class struggle. These events very sharply emphasise the entire relative nature of stabilisation. The contradictions of capitalism have become unmasked (and therein lies the specific peculiarity of the present moment), but the sharpening of the crisis has not

yet led to a European revolutionary situation and even in Great Britain there is not yet a revolutionary situation in the narrow sense of the word. However, with a favourable trend of events, such a situation might arise. This would ensue in the event of the defeat of the British workers through the development of the miners' strike, or any other cause, being followed by a phase of new powerful revolutionary élan.

b) The strike of British workers has once more raised with tremendous force the question of general strike as a method of struggle. The history of the labour movement has not yet known a strike of the proletariat conducted in an industrial country in such dimensions and with such volume (The "Economist" of May 15th considers that about 5 million workers were drawn into the strike movement). The experience of the British strike has shown, despite all assertions of the bourgeoisie and renegades of the labour movement, that a strike is possible, that it can win, if it be developed. The main contradiction of this strike arising from its reformist leadership is the fact that the strike having brought out millions of workers and brought them in collision with the entire concerted apparatus of State power, i. e. being in the essential, a political strike, was conducted as a "purely economic" strike. This led it into a blind alley, the issue of which should have been to turn the strike into political channels, i. e. to transfer the struggle onto the highest phase of its development. The reformist leaders not only did not steer a course for revolution, but, terrified by the revolutionary perspective, they did not even utilise the strength of the masses to bring pressure to bear on the government and bourgeoisie in order to gain concessions of an economic order. They capitulated absolutely unconditionally, completely delivering up, not only the miners, not only the workers of the remaining branches of industry which took part in the strike, but the entire working class. The reformist leaders capitulated because they could not emerge from the confines of their reformism, because they dared not and could not consciously continue the main tendency of the strike: the change of economics into politics. The liquidation of the strike is not bankruptcy of the strike as a method of struggle, it is the bankruptcy of its reformist leadership.

c) In this bankruptcy is revealed the bankruptcy of both wings of opportunism: both of Right Wing opportunism, brazen, openly-treacherous, consciously serving the demands of the bourgeoisie, and of the hidden capitulative opportunism (Purcell) who, thanks to his bourgeois political lack of character and cowardice was together with the Right flank of opportunism at the moment of the crises. Therefore the position of the Communist Party of Great Britain adopted in its manifesto is absolutely correct. This manifesto states that "most of the so-called Left Wing have been no better than the Right. By a policy of timid silence, by using the false pretext of loyalty to colleagues to cover up breaches of loyalty to workers, they have left a free hand to the Right Wing and thus helped to play the employers' game". Manifesto of C. C. of C. P. G. B.). A necessary pre-requisite for further successes of the labour movement is a ruthless criticism and ruthless denunciation, not only of the Right traitors, but also of the "Left" capitulators of the General Council. Without smashing opportunism in the labour movement it is impossible to smash the capitalist regime.

d) One of the most important lessons of the general strike in England consists in the conclusions on the question of the role of the trade unions in this country. The original feature of the situation does not merely consist in the fact that the overwhelming majority of the population is comprised of industrial workers, but also in the fact that the Labour Party is entirely based on the trade unions, the process of the masses towards the Left has its direct reflection above all in the trade unions, and also the fact that the Communist Party is still young and numerically weak. The experience of the strike has clearly shown that the role of the trade unions in it was tremendous; the Committees of Action organised by the trade unions actually developed into district Soviets. The departments organised by the General Council already resembled in their structure and functions the departments of the Petersburg Soviet in the period of the so-called "dual power". The slogan first issued by the Communist Party — "all power to the General Council" in the given situation, together with the slogan "Down with the Baldwin Government, defender of the owners' interests" was quite correct and acquired most important political significance. With the victorious development of the strike it

would indeed be the General Council that would find itself in the role of a commander in chief and leading force. Comrade Lenin more than once said that the revolution in England might take different forms just because the trade unions are the main organisational basis of the British labour movement. Therefore a tendency to leave the trade unions and their organs instead of conquering them is specially harmful. Such a policy objectively would only profit the opportunists of the Amsterdam International and American Federation of Labour, giving the reformists a monopoly and thus isolating the Communist Party from the masses.

e) The general strike in Great Britain has emphasised with particular force the correctness of the course steered by the Comintern and R. I. L. U. for unity of the trade union movement and the formation of a united fighting International of trade unions. It is only the split nature of the world trade union movement and the hopeless opportunism of the Amsterdam leaders that can explain the inadequate aid rendered to the British proletariat during the strike. The struggle against national narrowness and opportunism is brought to the forefront. The attitude of the Second and Amsterdam "Internationals" to the strike should serve as a starting point for a long and energetic campaign for the formation of a trade union international and industrial internationals such as could organise real joint parallel activities of the workers of all countries for rendering real aid to a struggling section.

f) In this connection the exit of the Soviet trade unions from the Anglo-Russian Committee should be considered absolutely inexpedient. The workers of the U. S. S. R. sent their representative to the Anglo-Russian Committee, not by any means because they hoped by negotiations with the higher opportunist leaders to substitute the task of revolutionary transformation of capitalist countries. Whoever has nourished such illusions has had to suffer cruel disappointment. But the trade unions of the U. S. S. R. which have not had such illusions for a single moment entered the Anglo-Russian Committee for the sake of connections with the masses under whose pressure the trade union leaders turn to the Left. They entered the Anglo-Russian Committee in order to strengthen the fraternal connection between the working class of Great Britain and the working class of the U. S. S. R., in order to map out a path to restore the unity of the international trade union movement, just as in the most critical and counter-revolutionary periods of the Russian Revolution (for instance July 1917) the Bolsheviks by no means left the Soviets and their organs, did not even leave them when the Soviets disarmed the workers. The Bolsheviks ruthlessly exposed the Soviet leaders, but had the courage and patience, to work systematically for the conquest of the Soviets, not by leaving them for this would have shut them off from the section of the masses which "erred in good faith", which still followed the S. R. and Menshevik leaders of the Soviets. The trade union leaders of Great Britain agreed to enter the Anglo-Russian Committee under the pressure of the masses. If now — and this is not only possible but very probable — they turn round to the Right and, once more bringing about a rapprochement with Amsterdam, they themselves will endeavour to break up the Anglo-Russian Committee or to take it by siege, this will be a new self-denunciation, it will bring them up against that section of the masses which still follows them. Particularly now, when the British Government, entering the attack against the workers is inspiring a campaign of abuse against the proletarian republic for the aid rendered by the trade unions of the U. S. S. R. to the British miners, abuse which by its dimensions recalls the time of the Curzon ultimatum; when on the other hand the British Government is striving with all its strength to isolate the workers of Great Britain from the workers of the U. S. S. R. — the break-up of the Anglo-Russian Committee on the part of the leaders of British trade unions would be a demonstration against the workers which would considerably push forward the process of revolutionising the British working masses. Under such conditions the initiative for exit on the part of the trade unions of the U. S. S. R., despite the fact that the General Council refused to accept the money of the Soviet workers, would mean a blow to the cause of International unity and to the Anglo-Russian Committee, would be a very "heroic" gesture, but politically childish and inexpedient.

g) The experience of the international struggle for trade union unity which was the basic and direct object of organising the Anglo-Russian Committee shows that this step was absolutely correct. The accusations that the trade unions of the U. S. S. R. took the initiative in this act out of national-State considerations

have been smashed into pieces by actual facts and frequently decisively condemned by the Comintern. The return once more to these accusations hashed up by the petty bourgeois "revolutionaries" particularly in Germany, reflects the general attack upon the U. S. S. R. and the C. P. S. U. waged by the bourgeoisie. The Trade Unions of the U. S. S. R. entered the Anglo-Russian Committee not in any way tying themselves in the field of criticism, just in the same way as the Communists of Great Britain working in the trade unions or putting forward the slogans for entering the Labour Party, do not for one moment bind themselves in the field of criticism and denunciation of the reformists. A consistent pursuit of the tactics of leaving the Anglo-Russian Committee would lead to the withdrawal of the slogan for the entry of Communists in the Labour Party and to the tactics of leaving the trade unions. The task of the Leninists is not exit from the Anglo-Russian Committee but a struggle to change its composition as well as a struggle to change the composition of all leading organs of the General Council and local trade union bodies.

h) The general strike, as a method of struggle will play a proportionally greater role in England than in any other country. This is explained not only by the fact that for the entire economy with its sharply expressed industrial nature, the stoppage of work in industry and transport has a decisive significance, but also by the fact that Great Britain has a much smaller army. The main fighting force of Great Britain is the navy. The main composition of the population is proletarian; the peasantry constitutes absolutely insignificant dimensions as compared with the proletariat. All these circumstances make the method of the general strike of decisive importance. The general strike is not here an adequate condition for victory (it must be combined with still higher methods of the class struggle), but it is an essential pre-requisite of victory, a pre-requisite of extremely great importance especially in Great Britain.

i) The experience of the British strike has also given great prominence to the question of international aid on the part of the workers of the other countries. Real aid on the part of the trade unions of the proletarian republics has played and is playing an important role in the development of international solidarity. The workers of all countries can clearly see that the U. S. S. R. is in the foremost ranks of those who are giving active help to the struggling working class of Great Britain. Just as the attitude of the C. P. S. U. and the Russian trade unions in 1923 on the eve of the German events, so the present attitude of the revolutionary proletarian organisations of the U. S. S. R. and its proletarian masses, exposes the utter futility of the ridiculous talk about the "degeneration", the "kulakisation"*, etc. of the C. P. S. U. (B), talk indulged in by the open enemies of proletarian distatorship and also by such "ultra-Left" elements as Korsch and others. The enormous importance of international aid must be specially emphasised. It is essential to point out that the Communist Parties of other countries have not exhausted by far all the possibilities for giving aid. The lesson taught by the actions in connection with the British strike is that mobilisation on a much larger scale than before of all the forces and means is essential.

j) The experience of the general strike divulges to the British working class and also to the working class of other countries the meaning, the role and the class character of reformism as well as of the State power. The traditional attitude to the democratic State, as a power above classes, will inevitably undergo a radical revision on the part of the masses in spite of all the clever manoeuvres of Mr. Baldwin, the Prince of Wales, etc. The British bourgeoisie, more than the bourgeoisie of any other country, maintained its power by bribing the masses (excess profits!) and deceiving them ("glorious traditions of the British Constitution!"). The possibility to bribe no longer exists. The power of deception however, is still great. The masses have no longer a blind belief in the reformist leaders, as was formerly the case, but they have not quite lost faith in them. Once all the lessons of the strike have been digested, reformist illusions will collapse. Exposure of these specifically British "constitutional illusions" must be one of our foremost tasks of the present day.

* Kulak — a rich peasant.

k) To win the masses remains the main task of the Communists. The mood of the masses in connection with the treachery of the General Council points to differences within the working class. In spite of the decisions of the General Council the strikers represent the most developed section of the British proletariat. They have already partly emancipated themselves and are, through the experience of the struggle, emancipating themselves more and more from the influence of the reformist leaders. The number of voluntary strike-breakers and of those bought by the bourgeoisie is miserably small. Very considerable numbers of workers returned to work at the bidding of the General Council, but their composition is certainly far from uniform: All the information received goes to show that many of those who resumed work did it against their will and good judgment and are painfully digesting the experience of the strike from the point of view of its general issue as well as from the point of view of its leadership. As all the actions were under the leadership of the trade unions, the minority movement was bound to assume considerable importance. But it should be borne in mind that a considerable number of proletarians "are genuinely misled" which particularly applies to the workers behind the so-called "Left Wing" (Purcell and Co.). Relentless criticism of the leaders should by no means be accompanied by a closing of the ranks of the "Minority". On the contrary, those who form part of the "Minority Movement" and also all Communists must now more than ever penetrate right into the thick of the masses in order to reap a rich harvest of followers through a careful examination of the strike and its lessons.

l) The Minority Movement, which during the preparations for the general strike, during the strike itself and after its liquidation worked hand in hand with the Communist Party of Great Britain, has proved itself to be a truly revolutionary force. Already a long time before the strike, the Minority Movement demanded the mobilisation of all the forces for the pending May Day conflict. It issued the slogan: "Summoning of a special Trade Union Congress of Action to ensure full national support for the miners to achieve a victory over the mineowners" and proceeded to form committees of action in all localities. It brought pressure to bear on the General Council with respect to the miners' question, carrying on the struggle under the slogan: "Mobilise all forces behind the miners". Right at the beginning of the strike the Minority Movement warned against the danger of limiting the strike by purely defensive slogans. "In order to be victorious" — wrote the Executive of the Minority Movement — "it is essential to take up the offensive and to deal the capitalists a severe blow". When the strike was at its height, the Minority Movement endeavoured to give the movement a political course, it organised committees of action, anti-strike-breaking corps and workers' defence corps, it warned the masses against negotiations by the leaders behind the scenes declaring them to be fraught with the danger of betrayal, it issued the slogan of mass control over negotiations, it vigorously opposed the capitulation of the General Council and called upon the workers not to foresake the miners, to refuse to have anything to do with the shameful bargain, to refuse to resume work. The Minority Movement issued at that moment a slogan which gained great popularity among the masses: "Summoning of an emergency conference of strike committees and councils of action", in order to compel the leaders to continue the struggle. By its determined tactics the Minority Movement brought over to its side that section of workers who formerly followed the so-called "Left" leaders.

m) The Communist Party of Great Britain has on the whole, stood the test of political ripeness. The attempts to include the Communist Party of Great Britain into the arsenal of "brakes on the revolution" do not bear criticism. The Executive Committee of the C. I. was quite right when it unanimously approved the position of the Communist Party of Great Britain. The latter foretold the struggle and prepared for it. From the very beginning it drove the masses towards the General Strike, it issued the demand "all power to the General Council", pointing out the danger of isolating the miners. It demanded that the defensive should give place to the offensive, at the very start it issued the slogan of the overthrow of "the Baldwin Government which is defending the capitalists", the slogan of the "Workers' Government" and the slogans re power in the various localities being transferred to the Committees of Action (see for instance the Liverpool "Workers Gazette"). The Communist Party was quite right in its estimation of the liquidation of the strike

as a "terrible crime", it led a vigorous attack on the "Left", urged the continuation of the strike in spite of the order of the General Council, etc. Perfectly correct also were such slogans as nationalisation of the mines without compensation, full pay for the duration of the strike, suppression of the capitalist press, organisation of workers' defence corps, etc. Under the existing circumstances the C. P. G. B. must continue to support the miners, must expose the treachery of the leaders, must help the Minority Movement in every possible way and must do its utmost to transform the Party into a **Mass Party of the Communist Workers of Great Britain**, consolidating its position in the trade unions, in all their minor nuclei, and recruiting more and more followers. The Communist Party was the only consistently revolutionary force following a correct course. The treachery of the leaders and the enormous re-valuation of values on the part of the mass of the workers create a basis for the development of a mass Communist Party in Great Britain.

a) The General Strike brought the British proletariat face to face with the **problem of power**. It placed the proletariat before the necessity to set revolutionary methods against the capitalist methods, providing a way out of the capitalist chaos. Capitalism is endeavouring to save its life by condemning millions of people to war and unemployment and is systematically lowering the standard of life of the working class. The British Communist Party must give prominence to its revolutionary programme. It must show to the British workers that the victory of the working class is the only way out of the present blind alley. It must show that at the time of its struggle for power and after its seizure of power, the British proletariat will have a solid rear — the continental proletariat, that the Soviet Union would throw open its enormous markets to British Socialist industry, that the British proletariat would find allies and collaborators for the economic regeneration of Great Britain on a Socialist basis, such allies being countries at present struggling desperately against British imperialism.

7. Our Immediate Tasks.

A. The Immediate Tasks of the British Communist Party.

1. The most energetic support for the miners on strike.
2. Organisation of anti-strike-breaking corps and workers' defence corps.
3. Support for the slogan "nationalisation of mines without compensation and workers' control over them".
4. Campaign for the election of new trade union organs, including the General Council. **Workers' control over the leaders.**
5. Exposure of Right trade union leaders and Labour Party leaders as avowed traitors.
6. Exposure of the Left as people who capitulated in spite of their majority, and who carried on a Right policy, being thereby mainly responsible for the defeat.
7. Struggle against any attempt to condone and obscure the role of the so-called Left in this strike, and severe criticism of their attempts at self-justification.
8. Exposures of the treacherous role of the parliamentary fraction of the Labour Party in this strike.
9. Promotion of new trade union leaders from the ranks. Struggle under the slogan "make way for the new leaders".
10. Propagation of the idea of the general strike as a method of struggle.
11. Struggle against separation of economics and politics.
12. Struggle for the industrial type of federations, abolition of the relics of the craft spirit in the trade unions.
13. Increased attention to committees of action and factory and workshop committees.
14. Drawing unorganised workers into trade unions and carrying on ideological propaganda among them.
15. Work among unemployed, drawing the unemployed into active struggle, organising them, etc.
16. Struggle against dismissals because of participation in the May Strike.
17. Struggle that the decision re expulsion of Communists from the Labour Party be rescinded.

18. Consolidation and extension of the Minority Movement and concentration of all the forces on the capture of the most important branches of industry (mining, railway and sea transport, electricity, etc.).

19. It is essential to pay special attention to the preparations for the next trade union congress. This campaign should be conducted under the slogan: "Down with traitors and capitalists, elect to the Congress those who favoured the continuation of the struggle."

20. Establishment of a Communist daily and also of wall-newspapers, publication of leaflets, etc. Struggle against the bourgeois press and campaign in support of the revolutionary press.

21. In view of the growing sympathy for the revolutionary tactics of the Communist Party, organisation of recruitment of new members, especially in the industrial districts and in the most important branches of industry.

22. **Struggle for amnesty** for all those sentenced for participation in or support of the strike.

23. Propagation of the slogan **re power — down with Baldwin, defender of the capitalists, long live the real workers' government.**

B. The Tasks of the Comintern and Its Sections.

1. Determined and unconditional support of the British miners' strike under the slogan: "The miners cause is our cause."

2. Study and explanation to the masses of the trend, issue and causes of the defeat of the General Strike in Great Britain.

3. Explanation to the masses of the role of the Amsterdam International, the Miners' International and the International Social Democrats who practically undermined and sabotaged the strike.

4. Exposure of the treacherous role of the Right and so-called "Left" leaders of the General Council and the Labour Party.

5. More intensive struggle for the unity of the national and international trade union movement and for the workers' united front.

6. Struggle against the disruption and desertion of the trade unions. Struggle for the organisation of the unorganised.

7. Special attention to the preparation of the masses for the impending Social conflicts and to the establishment of autonomous organisations (committees of action, strike committees, factory and workshop committees, etc.) in the course of the strike.

8. Intensification of Communist activity in the trade unions. Formation of revolutionary minorities and consolidation of the Profintern and all organisations affiliated to it.

9. Special attention should be paid to support for the British Minority Movement on the part of the Comintern, the Profintern and all Communist Parties.

* * *

The characteristic feature of the present world situation is the position in the three main component parts of the world economy: the position in the U. S. A. — still a progressive stronghold of the capitalist order, the position in the U. S. S. R. — for the time being the main foundation of the growing forces of the international proletariat and the position in the countries of the old capitalism, the classical representative of which is the imperialist and colonial British Empire with the whole complex of its dominions and dependencies, from London to Peking and Calcutta.

The most characteristic feature of the present moment is: the classical state of old capitalism par excellence is becoming disrupted from two directions: from the East (China) and from the direction of the proletariat of the mother country (the strike). The national-revolutionary actions in China and the action of the British proletariat emphasised still more the utter relativity of capitalist stabilisation. And this is something new which is of paramount importance for the correct appraisal of the international situation. But to appreciate this situation on the strength of a definite historical period, one must take into consideration that in China and also in Great Britain we have to

reckon with the fact of a temporary defeat of the revolutionary forces. A definite revolutionary situation does not yet exist. Therefore, the declaration of the C. I. with respect to two possible perspectives for the near future remains in the main correct. British events have lent emphasis to the perspective of a revolutionary elan. Communist Parties must do their utmost in the struggle for the realisation of this actual perspective, and it is from this world point of view that the C. I. has to perform its duty towards the struggling British proletarians. United front tactics, the capture of the masses — as the main task — remain as before the foundation of the tactics of the Communist International. Vacillations within it are inevitable. Inevitable and essential is also the struggle against the Right as well as against the Left, — the struggle for a correct Leninist policy. But the formula about the struggle against the Right and the Left (this Leninist formula was on the strength of historical reasons and in connection with specific conditions in Germany substituted by the formula of struggle against the Right and ultra-Left) must not be applied eclectically and not from the viewpoint of all round justice, it must be concretely deciphered and the main blow must be directed towards the place where this or that peril is particularly great. Only such a method — Lenin's method — guarantees unity of the revolutionary will. It has stood the test of practical experience and is continually tested by the consolidation of proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet country where the proletariat has given one more proof of its Internationalism, a country which in spite of all the attacks of the international bourgeoisie, the reformists and the infuriated petty-bourgeois „revolutionaries”, remains the stronghold of the international proletarian revolution and of the vanguard of the Communist International.

*) N. B. Quotations marked thus + have not been verified with English original which is not available here.

The Plenum of the Central Trade Union Council of the Soviet Union on the Results of the British General Strike.

Moscow, 7th June 1926.

In the Plenary Session of the Central Council of the Soviet Labour Unions which was opened today, comrade **Tomsky** delivered a speech upon the British General Strike. He declared:

The British strike proved the correctness of the references to the united offensive of capitalism and of the fundamentals of the trade union movement of the Soviet Union concerning the inseparable connections of the political and economic struggle. Whilst the bourgeoisie carefully prepared for the eventuality of the general strike and had a clear line of action, the General Council was absolutely unprepared and held the method of a General Strike for impossible or at least unnecessary. The British strike could only win with the support of international solidarity, despite this, the General Council by refusing the financial support of the Soviet Labour unions, supported and shielded the action of the government concerning the retention of monies from the soviet labour unions to the General Council.

Tomsky then read a letter from Lloyds Bank to the General Council dated 11th May in which it is stated that owing to the instructions of the government it is impossible to pay out the 100,000 pounds sent by the labour unions of the Soviet Union to the General Council.

Tomski rejected the legend of the alleged mass strike-breaking and declared that the fighting spirit of the strikers was unbroken to the last day of the strike. A defeated strike is not so bad if after it the fighting spirit remains, but today there is no certainty that the most active elements will not be flung upon the streets, and such a defeat undermines the belief of the workers in their unions, in their own forces and in the weapon of the strike.

Despite the attack on the part of the leaders of the General Strike, the British miners are continuing their struggle and in this they prove that it is possible to fight.

Tomsky declared that the role of **Amsterdam** in the strike was practically nil. The tasks of the **Anglo-Russian Committee**, the connecting organ of the working classes of the two countries and the struggle for the real international unity of the proletariat have not been altered by the failure of a few British workers leaders. On the contrary, the strike has shown the British workers the incapacity of Amsterdam and the significance of energetic international solidarity and unity more than ever before. The recent events will have the effect of strengthening the Anglo-Russian alliance. Naturally, the soviet labour unions will nevertheless criticise the attitude of various British leaders. The working class of the Soviet Union did its duty during the General Strike and the British working class itself was splendid. The labour unions of the Soviet Union can only recommend their British comrades to produce more worthy leaders. The Anglo-Russian Committee must continue to exist without for one moment ceasing its work.

After Tomsky's speech spoke comrade **Losovsky**. He declared: It is clear that the General Council deliberately worked for the breaking off of the General Strike and the struggle of the miners. Even Right wing leaders of the Labour Party and the bourgeois press had to admit that the fighting spirit of the workers who demanded energetic action, was unbroken, and that the attitude of the General Council was cowardly and treacherous. After the defeat of the General Strike the need for a united fighting working class International is greater than ever. It is not the idea of the General Strike which has suffered a defeat, but the reformist leadership, the left phraseology coupled with right tactics. The British working class will understand the lessons of the strike, it will draw all the necessary conclusions from it."

After the speeches of Tomsky and Losovsky, the Plenary Session adopted a declaration to the international proletariat in which is pointed out that the labour unions of the Soviet Union and the trade unions of Great Britain are the pioneers in the struggle for international trade union unity and for the creation of an effective fighting international. The soviet labour unions stressed again and again the unavoidability of the attempt to reduce the standard of living of the British working class in order to bring pressure upon the less well-paid workers of other countries. The British workers answered this attack with the General Strike which was carried through with the utmost unity, enthusiasm and discipline and which demonstrated the whole world power of the industrial working class. However, in place of the expected victory the working class of Great Britain suffered a defeat which can only be regarded by the soviet labour unions as a partial defeat of the whole international working class. The soviet labour unions consider it to be their duty to declare that the defeat was result of the treacherous tactics of the heroes of "Black Friday", the Right Labour Party leaders **Thomas, MacDonald** etc. and the capitulation of the Left wing leaders of the General Council, **Purcell** etc. The left wing is still more responsible, because despite its tremendous influence upon the General Council it followed the conscious traitors and capitulated together with them to the class enemy. The events prove the correctness of the policy adopted by the Anglo-Russian conference they also show the impossibility of carrying through a logical and determined struggle of the working class against the capitalist class with the reformist compromising policy of the present corrupted leaders of the British trade union movement. In the most decisive moments of the struggle the British trade union leaders feared most of all being disloyal to the bourgeois state. They feared to take a class-conscious course, that is the course of the political struggle which the bourgeoisie mobilising all the forces of the state did consciously from the first moment of the struggle. The General Strike as a weapon of the working class has not proved a fiasco, on the contrary it has shown itself in its full strength. It was the leaders of the General Council who proved a fiasco. Elementary labour union duty unfortunately forces the soviet labour unions to point to this fiasco of the Right and so-called Left trade union leaders. To break off the General Strike unconditionally, to hand over the workers to the arbitrariness of the employers, to fling accusations at the striking miners means to forget the most elementary class duty of solidarity and to fail in the duties of working class leaders, to desert from the field of battle and to hand over the victory to the enemy.

It is the duty of the soviet labour unions to inform the international proletariat that the working masses of the Soviet Union who had collected with unparalleled enthusiasm in all parts of the immense territory of the Soviet Union to support their British brothers in their struggle, were indignant at the cowardly refusal of the General Council, quite apart from the fact that the chief task of the Anglo-Russian unity committee was the organisation of the mutual support of the working classes of the Soviet Union and of Great Britain in a common struggle against capitalism. The soviet labour unions declare that by doing this the General Council, which was intimidated by the government, supported and shielded the government in its prohibition to the banks to pay out the monies collected in the Soviet Union. The soviet labour unions are convinced that the opinion of the masses of the British workers who could see how the class allies of the British bourgeoisie in other countries helped the government, is very different. It is understandable that British capitalism and its government which declared the General strike as illegal has not yet declared the miners strike to be illegal but nevertheless threatens to confiscate the financial support for the miners. But for the working class of the Soviet Union the refusal of the leaders of the General Council to accept the fraternal assistance of the Russian workers is nothing else but an attempt to isolate the workers of the Soviet Union from their class comrades in Great Britain and to limit the extent of the strike, which is equal to a direct support of the mineowners and the government.

The soviet labour unions have always regarded the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee as an organ of the common struggle of the working class of both countries for real international trade union unity upon the basis of an active struggle of the workers of all countries against capitalism. Recent events have shown the British workers the necessity of the Anglo-Russian workers alliance which is not a sentimental phrase, not platonic sympathy, but energetic mutual assistance in a bitter class struggle. For this reason the Soviet labour unions propose despite the fact that the British trade union leaders have delivered a heavy blow at the British working class, the cause of international unity and at the Anglo-Russian Committee, not merely not to dissolve this committee, but to strengthen it in every way and to extend its activity which should not cease for one moment. The Anglo-Russian Committee must become more a committee of action, the connection between the workers and between the labour unions of the two countries must become closer.

At the present time all efforts must be concentrated upon assisting the British miners in order not merely to save them from breaking up, but to ensure them the victory. The international assistance for the miners must be strengthened.

The soviet labour unions are sure that the British workers after considering the great lessons of the General Strike will recognise the necessity for the struggle to obtain that all trade union organs are composed of class conscious leaders, including the General Council and the British representatives in the Anglo-Russian Committee. The cleansing of the trade union organs from the privy councillors, the rich share holders etc., is still more necessary because the capitulators on the General Council are carrying on the fight against the idea of the General Strike still further, they recommend the miners to capitulate, they shield the bourgeois government and, in actual fact, assist in the destruction of the organised working class movement in Great Britain.

The British General Strike once again showed the complete incapacity of the Amsterdam International to ever be a real fighting working class international. The complete passivity and indifference of Amsterdam in the face of the greatest strike in the history of the working class movement is exhaustive proof not only of the incapacity or of the lack of will to lead the international working class struggle, but it is also exhaustive proof of the incapacity or the lack of will to mobilise the masses and their unions in the cause of elementary solidarity. The events have once again proved the necessity of the struggle of the workers of all countries for international trade union unity, for a united class-conscious trade union international capable and willing to act. The soviet labour unions are convinced that the great British working class which has proved its solidarity and its will to win, will maintain its belief in its own forces, that it will produce new leaders from its own ranks and that it

will finally be victorious. The soviet labour unions are convinced that the workers of all countries will support the struggle of the soviet labour unions for real international trade union unity, for a real trade union international based upon the class struggle.

Long live the British working class! Long live the victory of the British miners! Long live the unity of the international trade union movement!

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Coming Conference of the Communist Party of France in Lille.

By P. Semard (Paris).

The Communist Party of France, at its annual conference to be held from 19th to 24th June in Lille, will deal with a number of political questions of the greatest importance and in addition, in order to fulfil the tasks which will be laid down by this Party Conference, will have to take steps for a thorough investigation of its reorganisation, in order to make all those alterations which have become necessary as a result of the experiences of the last fifteen months. For the last named purpose the Party Conference will be immediately preceded by an Organisation Conference.

In January 1925, at the time of the Party Conference of Clichy, our membership was reckoned at 76,000. At the end of 1925 it was ascertained that the number of paying members amounted to about 60,000. On May 1, 1926, the exact number of membership cards issued was 55,213.

Nevertheless, in spite of this decline, we have increased our influence among the working and peasant masses.

During the course of its campaign against the Morocco War our Party lost the more timid members. Thus the Federation of Algiers alone has lost 800 out of 1200 members.

In the reorganising of the Party on the basis of Factory Nuclei, which was first commenced in January 1925 — only the Paris district was reorganised — we lost members not only because many who were isolated or were not working in factories, did not join the factory nuclei, but also because the latter, owing to lack of politically active workers among them, were gradually abandoned by the new members. Whilst certain far too mechanical measures and a bad united front tactic led to the loss of members or rendered impossible the recruiting of new members, the chief failure was, that there was not set up at the same time as the factory nuclei, street nuclei which are indispensable for carrying on the local work.

As a result of these organisatory shortcomings, we were unable, in spite of our increasing influence among the working and peasant masses, to take advantage of the situation, and it frequently happened that workers who wished to enter our ranks, had first to seek out our Party.

The great weakness of our fundamental cadres, particularly in the rural districts, must be remedied as speedily as possible. Finally, we must also remedy the failure that political questions and tasks are not sufficiently connected with the work of reorganisation. These two things must be closely linked together in order that we shall obtain a politically enlightened, Party, well anchored in the factories and in the localities, and which is capable of leading the class action of the proletariat against capitalism in all fields.

Our membership of 52,213 is divided among 3188 nuclei, of which 1544 are factory nuclei, 1379 village nuclei and 265 street nuclei. 75% of the members are workers, 15% peasants and 10% belong to the middle classes. We have very few women in our ranks, scarcely 1% of the total membership. The members are, for the greater part, specialists or skilled workers, working

in small or middle sized undertakings. We have up to now made very little headway in the big factories, particularly in the metal industry.

Even in the Paris district, in which our influence is very considerable, our influence by no means corresponds to the numerical strength of our Party. In the big industrial districts of the Nord, of Lyons, of the East and Alsace Lorraine, our influence is indeed growing, but not sufficiently in comparison with the social democrats, and we are numerically too weak.

With the exception of the Paris district, the socialists are numerically stronger than we in all these districts of big industry and still have great influence on the proletarians. In the North the socialists have 18,245 members, whilst we have 6926; in the Lyons district they have 7795 members, we 3800; in the Mediterranean district they have 7887 members, we 3100; in the Limouges district they have 7181, we 3100. Their Party numbers 110,000 members, while ours is a little more than 55,000.

Certainly the "brief alliance" with the Left Bloc enabled them to regain strength. They have captured the greatest municipal administrations of France and possess an excellent apparatus for agitation and propaganda. In addition to this, they have the support of the apparatus of the C. G. T. and of the numerous co-operative societies led by reformist elements.

The Party Conference at Lille will have to realise the necessity of correctly and constantly employing the tactics of the united front, by advocating trade union unity and also winning the big factories. We must learn how to take advantage of the swing to the Left of the masses which has come about as a result of the chronic financial crisis and the constantly increasing prices. It must not be permitted that our membership, for example in the Paris district, in which we sell 75,000 copies of our Central organ, "Humanité", only amounts to 14,570 among a population of about 2 million workers in factories and offices. A similar state of affairs exists in the North, where the existence of mining works and industrial works has gathered together hundreds of thousands of workers, where our membership, however, only amounts to 6926 whilst our weekly organ, "L'Enchaîné" has increased its circulation in a few months from 16,000 to 27,000.

The press can serve as a measure of the development of our influence. The circulation of "Humanité" has increased in a year from 170,000 to 205,000!

On the other hand the Unitarian (revolutionary) trade union movement has retained its membership, but the fact that during this period which should have been favourable for its development, it has made no progress, proves to us that we must seek the causes of this standstill and adopt measures for creating mass trade unions.

The Party members must devote a good portion of their activity to trade union work. In the trade unions there are gathered all conscious workers who must be recruited by our Party; it is here that it is easiest to develop the influence of the Party, and beyond this the broadest masses of unorganised workers must be reached.

The C. G. T. U., in spite of its numerical weakness compared with the huge number of workers in France (nearly 13 million), comprises about 500,000 members, the great majority of whom are in political agreement with us. In spite of this the membership of our Party is weak and we have in our ranks only a very few of the organised portion of the proletariat who stand very near to us.

All these facts must be considered at the approaching Party Conference of the Communist Party of France, while the work to be done in all spheres must be mapped out, based on the decisions of our National Conference of 1st and 2nd December 1925 and the resolutions of the last session of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.

The inner Party situation has improved during the last

few months. The political life of our nuclei, sub-districts and districts is much more active, and the theses and resolutions to be submitted to the Party Conference have been discussed in all our organisations.

In the course of the Conferences of the town districts and districts, the Right have remained dumb. In the meantime some workers from the Right are now working with us, particularly in the lower Seine district. This is also the case with comrade Engler who is fulfilling the obligations undertaken by him in Moscow and working in the district Executive. We are on the alert and are determined to fight ruthlessly against any sign of social democratic tendencies.

The "centrist" tendency of Humberdot-Morin, whose opposition was almost exclusively confined to the Paris district, limited themselves to a criticism of the failures of the past and called for the employment of a "real democratic centralism", in which they characterised their opposition as a question of "tactics" and proclaimed their agreement with the theses and resolutions of the International and of the Party. The readiness of these comrades to work loyally with us has rendered possible a greater normalising of our Party.

The Party Conference of Lille will aim at bringing about a serious discussion of those tasks which must be fulfilled in order to create in France real mass trade unions and a Communist Party strong in influence and membership; it must confirm the consolidation of our Party by close co-operation of all its forces and all its members who affirm their agreement with the Communist International.

POLITICS

Mongolia and the Imperialists.

By S. Natsov.

The national liberation movement of Mongolia which broke out in the year 1921 and which was prepared and led by the Revolutionary People's Party, was a movement of the broad masses of the Arats (shepherds) of Mongolia who for centuries had been under the cruel yoke and subjected to the exploitation of foreign and native despots: Chinese mandarins and Mongolian feudals.

The movement was called forth by the following concrete circumstances which have arisen in Mongolia in the last ten years:

First, the violent abolition of the independence of Outer Mongolia by the Chinese militarists, led by the leader of the Anfu Club, General Siuj Shi Chan and the setting up of a regime of cruel military dictatorship in Mongolia by these militarists.

Secondly by the occupation of Mongolia by Russian monarchists and counter-revolutionaries in the shape of the hordes of white bandits of Baron Ungern who realised the political plans and predatory aims of Japanese imperialism.

The national emancipation movement of the working masses of Mongolia have been heroically striving to fulfil these tasks, hand, to drive the foreign invaders from the country and on the other hand to abolish the feudal, theocratic order and to set up a democratic form of state.

In the course of the last five years the working people of Mongolia have been heroically striving to fulfil these tasks, and which they have in fact to a considerable extent already fulfilled. In the first place the country is finally freed from the despotic rule, both of the Chinese occupation troops and of the white bandits of Baron Ungern, secondly a number of social and democratic reforms have been carried out, which have not only liberated the Mongolian people from feudal bondage, but also from the economic enslavement of foreign commercial and loan capital.

Thus the feudal-theocratic order has been finally abolished; the basis of a new republican order has been created by democratising the State apparatus; the natural resources of the country have been converted into national property; the treaties and agreements violently imposed by the imperialist States have

been declared to be invalid; a uniform economic policy is concentrated in the hands of the State; all the nonworking elements have been deprived of the right to vote. This applies equally to the former princes and the clergy, to the traders and money lenders who live on other people's work and from rent etc.

The real results of these gains are: a general improvement in the economic well-being of the country; the commencement and development of co-operatives and industry; improvement of the financial situation and increase of the State budget.

Before all, there is to be noted the increase in cattle breeding. According to the figures of the year 1913 there were in the whole of Outer Mongolia, including the district of Kobdo, 3,404,988 head of horned cattle, but according to the figures for the year 1924 the number amounted, excluding the district of Kobdo, to 4,159,263 head.

The cancellation of the debts to China plays a considerable role, as according to the statements of various investigators, 50% of the national wealth of Mongolia belonged to Chinese commercial and money lending capitalists.

The government of the Mongolian People's Republic is at present faced by the following three urgent tasks for the further improvement of cattle breeding: a) extension of veterinary institutions, b) organising of model farms for cattle breeding and c) gradual transference to improved farming etc.

In the sphere of land cultivation an improvement is also to be seen. In recent times there has been a partial settling down of the population in some districts. The question of organising agricultural co-operative societies is being approached. It is true they are only in their first stages and are still few in number, but in spite of this their appearance proves that the population are not only striving to improve their political situation, but also wish to establish an economic basis for their political gains. The government organs interested in developing land cultivation, are adopting serious measures for improving the State supply of seed. The State supply of seed will, in a few years, form the best means of agitation for persuading the population to go over to land cultivation.

Up to recent years the entire Mongolian market was in the hands of Chinese and Anglo-American capital. When the Chinese were politically defeated, they continued their economic rule in Mongolia by their trading activity. The Mongolian People's Government, right from the beginning, sought for measures in order to weaken the influence of commercial and money-lending capital. For this purpose national co-operative societies were founded, the Mongolian Central People's Co-operative Society (Monzenkop).

The Monzenkop was founded in the year 1921 with 70 shareholding members and a ground capital of 14,000 dollars. At present the ground capital of the Monzenkop amounts along with the advances of the government, to about 5 million dollars. The total turn-over of the Monzenkop in the year 1924 amounted to 16 million dollars, of which 533,876 dollars 19 cents represented net profit.

In order to work up the products of Mongolian economy on the spot and to manufacture a number of products which had previously been imported from abroad, a tannery and a felt shoe factory were established; likewise a confectionery factory and other undertakings. All these undertakings are said to produce products to the total value of 754,150 dollars. There thus exist the beginnings for the development of industry.

In order to secure the state revenue a customs reform has been carried out, a national currency has been introduced and the taxation system regulated. A commercial and industrial bank has been established for the regulation of trade and the improvement of the money circulation, the total capital of which amounts at present to 2,500,000 dollars.

The total state budget is growing every year. It increased from 4,700,000 Lan (a Lan is nearly three shillings) in the year 1923 to 8,800,000 in the year 1924 and to 10,700,216 Lan in the year 1925. In 1923 there was a deficit of 420,000 Lan, in 1924 one of 184,000 Lan, while the year 1925 showed a surplus of 885,000 Lan.

These are the practical achievements of the five years of national revolutionary struggle of the working people of Mongolia.

But these achievements of the Arat masses of Mongolia are distorted in the bourgeois press of all capitalist countries and

represented to the public in an obviously distorted manner. The imperialists everywhere raise a great outcry that Mongolia is occupied by troops of the Soviet Union, that "Red Imperialism" is triumphant in Mongolia and such like things.

It requires a shameless insolence and an unashamed cynicism to compare the policy of Tsarist Russia, which had as its aim the enslavement of the working masses of Mongolia, with the policy of the Soviet government which since the first days of the existence of the Soviet power, has had, as its one and sole aim, a disinterested and sympathetic attitude to the national liberation movement of the peoples of the East.

The imperialists cannot reconcile themselves to the fact that there exists and is developing a free Mongolia, for this fact serves as an example and a stimulus for the further development of the national liberation movement among the suppressed peoples of the East.

No legends and no fables will be able to check the further development of the national liberation movement of the peoples of the East, including the shepherds of Mongolia, and no power in the world will be able to bolster up the shaken rule of the imperialists in Asia.

The Mosul Treaty between Great Britain and Turkey.

By Irandust.

After nearly eight years of continuous struggle there was concluded on June 6, 1926 an agreement between Turkey and Great Britain over Mosul. The Turkish government recognises as the frontier between Turkey and Iraq those lines determined by the League of Nations at its meeting in Brussels on October 29, 1924 and leaves Mosul, Rewandus and other important strategical points within the boundaries of Iraq. Turkey renounces her sovereignty over all territory south of these lines and thereby recognises the loss of her right to Mosul. That the agreement is signed by the British Ambassador to Turkey, Lindsay, is proof that Turkey recognises the treaty between Great Britain and Iraq and, in accordance with the same, the right of Great Britain to represent the foreign policy of the kingdom of Iraq for 25 years.

The first thing in the treaty that strikes the attention is the abandonment by Turkey of her right to the rich province in Mosul.

The second remarkable thing about the Treaty signed in Angora is the fact that the League of Nations is not even mentioned in it, although Great Britain, according to the reports of the British press, had insisted upon a clause being inserted in the treaty to the effect that Turkey shall enter the League of Nations and Great Britain undertakes to carry this through in the Council of the League.

The fact that Turkey has not pledged herself to enter the League of Nations, proves that she has had the courage to proceed for years along her own way against the clearly expressed will of the so-called great Powers, and will also in the future preserve her independence and the freedom to determine her own inner and foreign policy.

The Mosul agreement means for the Young Turkish Republic the abandonment of the programme of national demands which was adopted by the revolutionary Turkish people in the year 1920, and constitutes a great and very painful sacrifice on the part of the Turkish State. Politically it can be compared with the Treaty of Brest Litovsk which secured Soviet Russia a breathing space and was the precondition for the further victory of the revolution.

What are the causes which have led to the Mosul agreement? The British press remarks that there was no unanimity in leading Turkish circles regarding the question of the political line and the estimation of the Mosul question.

While the main cadres of the Kemalists demanded a further persistent struggle, the second tendency, which is supported by the trading bourgeoisie, demanded the most speedy settlement of the Mosul dispute in order to obtain a breathing space at all costs. The first tendency was in favour of the continu-

tion of the "Eastern policy" and a further approachment to the Soviet Union, the second spoke of the necessity of a "Western policy" and an understanding with Europe in the form of co-operation with foreign capital. The last-named group was unable to carry out its aims solely owing to those economic and financial difficulties against which the Turkish Republic have had to fight for a whole number of years and which are at present developing into a crisis.

The retention of Mosul is for the Left tendency not only an economic and strategic question, but a question of the greatest fundamental importance for the next stage of the national growth of Turkey and a criterion for the correctness of the political course of the governing Party.

The Right tendency endeavoured to point out that the economic life of Turkey cannot develop further unless normal relations are restored with Europe, and that the policy of the Left Kemalists is leading the country to economic collapse.

The economic difficulties which the government of Angora is experiencing created a somewhat favourable ground for these assertions. In the financial year 1925/26 Turkey had a deficit of about 31 million pounds. The attempts to reduce the deficit by practising economy, were frustrated by the counter-revolutionary revolt of the Sheik Said, (organised not without participation of British agents) which in February and March 1925 broke out in the South East provinces of Turkey and which cost the Turkish Republic 20 Million Pounds.

The lack of any settlement of the Mosul frontiers and the possibility of constant armed conflicts were a heavy burden for Turkish economy. The draft budget for the current financial year 1926/27 contains, besides considerably increased items for the transformation of agriculture and industry, huge sums (37% of the total) for the defence of the country, i. e. 50% more than last year. According to the statements of the British press the Turkish government has in recent times been compelled to keep six annual groups of reservists under arms (120,000 men) and the Turkish army is twice as strong as in pre-war times.

The unfavourable conditions of the world market and in particular the lack of reserve capital in the country have brought about an adverse trade balance and have shaken the Turkish valuta. In the spring of 1926 there was in addition to this a severe market crisis, with the result that a whole number of branches of the economic life of Turkey, (cotton, corn, fruit nuts) have very sharply declined and a great number of Turkish commercial firms have been driven bankrupt. In a whole number of districts the peasants who had obtained agricultural machinery and supplies of seed on credit, were unable to meet their obligations, as a result of which the banks distrained upon and sold the property of the peasants.

The taxation policy of the Turkish government which transferred a considerable portion of the burdens from the peasantry on to the town bourgeoisie, but also imposes new taxes on articles of consumption, has led to an increase of prices of imported goods which, along with the fall in the price of agricultural raw products, has recently created a "pair of shears" in Turkey. This again created a market crisis for town products, aroused great discontent among the urban population and thereby caused an increase in the oppositional and liquidatory tendencies.

The general political situation of Turkey likewise promotes these tendencies. In order to exercise a political pressure British diplomacy resorted to every conceivable measure to isolate Turkey and to create a military threat to the security of Turkey from Greece and Italy.

Does the Mosul agreement mean for Turkey the beginning of co-operation with foreign, and particularly with British capital? Does it mean the adoption of the "Western" orientation by the government of Angora? There exists no basis for such assertions. On the contrary the Turkish press particularly emphasises that Turkey has not capitulated and will not capitulate in any way to Western capital, that the fight for the existence of Turkey is not yet at an end and that in this fight Turkey can be victorious against the bellicose West only by developing her inner forces and by securing her support in the East. The League of Nations still remains in the eyes of the Turks the symbol of the coalition of the imperialist West against the peoples of the East.

"The Barrier to Revolution".

By Axel (Warsaw).

Pilsudski has not accepted the post of President but has forced his puppet Moscicki on the National Assembly.

Why did this happen?

Pilsudski did not want to become a "prisoner of the Belvedere" (the residence of the President), which is the fate of the President according to the Constitution which holds good in Poland today. Pilsudski demands at least the Americanisation of the rights of the President of the State. He continues to reiterate this demand. Pilsudski's deed of "renunciation" also speaks of it. We read in it:

"I must once more state that I cannot live without direct work, and the present Constitution deprives the President of the Republic of such work."

If Pilsudski became a President without power, he would make it more difficult for himself to use his influence in effecting a change in the Constitution of such a nature as to give the dictatorial power into the hands of the President. Today Pilsudski has "only" the army on his side, and thus holds two trump cards. In this way he confirms the legend which prevails among the non-critical masses as to the personal disinterestedness of the "creator of Poland", while on the other hand he keeps a firm hold on the "whip" with which he threatened the Representatives of the parties on the day before the meeting of the National Assembly.

As a matter of fact, Pilsudski did not overcome his enemies in the National Assembly only because he had the army behind him. He carried off the victory because he had brought discord into the camp of the Government which fell in May.

In the ranks of the Witos party, in which the large peasants have the lead, many small peasants are also represented, who were ruined by the capitalist-large-agrarian Governments which have ruled hitherto. These groups and the whole landless population regarded Pilsudski as their saviour, and after the "battle of Warsaw" they forced the deputies of the "Piast" party, with the exception of Witos and a few other leaders of the party, to vote for Pilsudski. Pilsudski is today and will remain, until the nimbus disappears from the title "Marshall of Poland", in reality the uncrowned "King of the Peasants".

Pilsudski also broke up the Government block on the other side, that of the National Labour party. The majority of the deputies of this party had to yield to the pressure of the broad masses of workers and also vote for Pilsudski.

In view of this attitude of the army, of the "treachery" of Witos' adherents and of the National Labour party, the other opponents had also to take their stand on the platform of the National Assembly. The fact that, by way of provocation, Count Bniński, the well-known leader of the Posen "fronde", was put up as the candidate of the large landowners was, if anything, an evidence of impotence which wanted to demonstrate its opposition to the whole world . . .

It may be said that in the capitalist-large-agrarian camp of Pilsudski's enemies the intention to change their tactics can be more and more plainly seen. The "Kurjer Poznański" always, accuses Pilsudski of high treason calls him a bandit etc., but the tenour of Dmowski's leading articles is rather in favour of "unity". Stanislaw Grabski, who advocates the petty bourgeois line with its "general national" ideology in the National Democratic camp, directly called upon his adherents to vote for Pilsudski (in order to make him a prisoner of the National Democrats). The Monarchist large landowners, chiefly from the frontier districts and from Congress Poland, were the first to speak in favour of abandoning the fight against Pilsudski. A large number of industrialists regarded the election of Pilsudski as necessary ("so as to make sure that business would go on as usual"). Some of the clergy with Cardinal Kakowski at their head took the same view.

How did this happen?

The best historical explanation of Pilsudski's "act" is given by the very words and deeds of the "bandit and criminal" in the "Glos Prawdy" ("Voice of Truth"), Pilsudski's special organ. It wrote on May 30th:

"Pilsudski has saved the National Democrats not only from moral but also from physical death. The National Democrats of Poland, through their Governments which they were always forming in common with the Witos party, were leading to revolution..."

At the very last moment, Pilsudski took on himself the difficult task of managing the eruption of the volcano... He carried out the revolution with the help of the army, turned it quickly into legal paths and took his course on the lines of evolution..."

Anyone who is disinclined to believe these words of Pilsudski's special organ, the very organ which made him "the barrier to revolution", must be convinced by the Marshall's acts which followed on his victory. The prisons were not thrown open, the workers who had borne arms during the fights, were disarmed, he had his "deed" legalised by the National Assembly and avoided even a suggestion of social reforms which might threaten the possessing classes. Nothing — apart from "moral renovation!" And the bourgeoisie, like the "Schlachta" does not care a straw.

Pilsudski has twice saved the Poland of the capitalists and large landowners.

The first time was in 1918, when he gave the power into the hands of the bourgeoisie, and the second time in 1920, when he defeated the Red Army.

Why should not a third "miracle on the Vistula" happen, thanks to Pilsudski?

Pilsudski's dreams of Poland's power make him from the beginning the captive of the bourgeoisie and of large landed property. It is however, the misfortune of the possessing classes in Poland that the very part which Pilsudski wishes to play, that of a "barrier to revolution", robs him of power.

The seizure of power by Pilsudski is destined to put an end to the illusions of the masses of workers and peasants, of the working intelligentsia and of the nationalities oppressed by Poland, all of whom still cherished a certain faith in Pilsudski's Liberalism.

The peasants and workers, nay even the army, will soon be disillusioned as to the value of the revolution carried through by the "Marshall".

The Three "Labour Governments" in Sweden.

By A. J. Smolan (Göteborg).

Sweden was the first capitalist country in which a King by the Grace of God on the advice of his bourgeois counsellors put "the whole power" into the hands of the workers by appointing eleven Social Democratic "class fighters", who were to form the first "exclusively Labour Government" in the world. This was in the Spring of 1920 when the influence of the Russian and German revolutions was still being felt, when the bourgeoisie considered it expedient to wrap themselves in the cloak of true democracy — in order to entice the masses.

The "first Labour Government" gave its capitalist masters brilliant evidence of its "objectivity", it showed that it was as willing and capable as any bourgeois government of protecting with all energy the interests of the capitalist class.

This first "Labour Government" fell because, in view of the elections, it could not fulfil all the demands of the militarists, but the second "Labour Government", which appeared on the scenes shortly afterwards, proved to be as "unprejudiced and "objective" as the first and its "programme of disarmament" consisted in that, for reasons of economy, it proposed only to spend 130 millions instead of 160 millions as the bourgeoisie had intended. Its second great "deed" was that it squandered many millions of crowns from the National Treasury in order to prevent the bankruptcy of a private bank while, at the same time, it did everything in its power to cut down the meagre allowances of the unemployed.

This Government fell in 1923, because, with its eye on the mass of electors, it did not dare to force the unemployed who were entitled to the benefit, to break the strike; on this occasion

Branting announced to the bourgeoisie that it would be "a fight to the death".

The bourgeois politicians, however, did not consider that the time had yet come for establishing a clear class rule, and thus the third "exclusively Labour Government" came into being in the autumn of 1924. This Government — especially after Branting's death — humiliated itself in the most undignified manner before the bourgeois majority, it pocketed one defeat after the other, innumerable times it betrayed the class it was supposed to represent, it regarded clinging to the ministerial seats as the object of "governing"; it did everything to maintain at least the appearance of exercising power.

From the beginning it placed itself in a position of complete dependence on the insignificant Liberal party, it never dared — especially in social and political questions — to take up an independent attitude, its actions were determined by the leading articles of the Liberal central organ of the Liberal central organ; this of course applied particularly to questions the regulation of which would have brought some kind of advantage to the workers.

This "exclusively Socialist Government", while accepting kicks of contempt from these second-rate Liberals, took an all the more truculent attitude when it was a question of proceeding against the Communists, whose representatives in the Reichstag it insulted in the most despicable manner; it also showed an admirable independence when it was a case of maintaining "order" in the class State, or of protecting the strike-breakers, who were well armed by the capitalists, against the class-conscious workers. Never were so many class verdicts pronounced in Sweden for this reason, as precisely during the regime of the third "Labour Government".

Thus for instance, it tried, with all the means in its power, to suppress the anti-militarist propaganda of the Communists, while permitting the officers in its employ to organise the first Fascist formations; indeed these officers could with impunity proclaim an armed fight against their own Government whilst, during the same period, several Communists were sent to prison for anti-militarist agitation. The whole country laughed when the Young Communists' League distributed wholesale among the conscripts a small propaganda leaflet under the title of "Words of a War Minister", for everybody knew that Peer Albin Hansson, the War Minister and actual leader of the Government at that time, had written the brochure word for word when he still stood up for the class war and, with energy and force, conducted the anti-militarist propaganda of the Young Social Democratic League.

In his zeal to defend his newly discovered fatherland, Hansson, this worthy representative of the workers, went so far as to declare to an American journalist that the Swedish army was at present stronger than it had ever been and that it was prepared "in case the Soviet Union attacked the Baltic States or Finland, to hasten to the assistance of the neighbouring States which were attacked, in accordance with the terms of the League of Nations..."

In order to show its "preparedness", the Government invited the newly elected President of White Finland to pay an official visit to Stockholm — something which no bourgeois Government had previously dared to do — at the same time forbidding the demonstrations of the Communists which had been announced. Hansson had called out an enormous number of troops to protect the Finnish executioner. When the communist Press pointed out that President Relander represented a system which, after the defeat of the Finnish revolution in 1918, murdered more than 40,000 workers, the "Labour Government", at the express request of the Finnish Ambassador, had a charge brought against the communist central organ and had its responsible editor sent to prison.

Thus the third "Labour Government" also covered itself and the labour movement with shame and ignominy, and yet all its humiliations were in vain. At the meeting of Parliament on June 1st 1926, the Liberal Karl Gustav Ekman turned his thumb downwards, as had been dreaded, because his boon-companions had misgivings, exactly as had been the case three years previously and, after three months' reflection, refused to force the unemployed to break a strike. In ordinary circumstances they would have made this great sacrifice — but the mili-

cial elections are approaching, and the artful demagogues are compelled once more to take up Branting's slogan of combating the bourgeois "opponent" "to the death", at least at the election meetings.

THE BALKANS

The Refugee Question in Bulgaria Before The League of Nations.

By A. Timescu.

Hardly had Nansen's Conference on the evacuation of the Wrangelists from Bulgaria, held in May, come to an end without any results, when the June Conference of the League of Nations once again concerned itself with the regulation of the refugee question in Bulgaria. The question dealt with is something on the lines of a plan of reconstruction, in which a League of Nations credit for 3 million pounds is to be placed at the immediate disposal of the Bulgarian Government, so that it may solve the refugee problem.

It is long since Zankoff strained every nerve to ensure the support of international capital for Bulgaria. It seems as though the Liapcheff Government would now reap the fruits of these efforts. A report of a commission of the International Labour Office has just been laid before the Geneva Conference which on its part also proposes that the refugee credit be made available; there is thus no doubt that the delegates will grant the sum proposed.

It will be worth while to take a closer look at this report of M. Albert Thomas. Apart from the most careful statistical data, we gain a clear picture of the object of this International Labour Office as a tool of international capital.

The statistical basis of the Commission's report tries to establish the data as "objectively" as becomes a scientific institute financed by capitalist States. We learn that 30,000 Wrangelists are still living in Bulgaria, only 14,400 of whom have an occupation, the rest going to swell the large number of unemployed in the country. That these unemployed are not so badly off under the regime of Zankoff and Liapcheff, that the Terror organisations have kept them fully "occupied" — of these facts no word is mentioned in this "non-political" report. It satisfies itself with an obscure hint that the Bulgarian Government does not desire these emigrants to be sent home, on the contrary, it is prepared to ensure them the possibility of an existence in Bulgaria.

The Armenian emigrants — numbering 20,000 — are not dealt with so gently by the Bulgarian regime of blood. In their case, the report agrees with Nansen's idea that they should be accommodated somewhere in the territory of the Trans-Caucasian Republics.

The Commission's report estimates the number of Bulgarian emigrants from the neighbouring victorious countries, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Greece at 210,000, more than half of whom are unemployed. These unfortunate victims of imperialism and ultra-nationalism can find no existence in their Bulgarian mother country. The undeveloped industry of the country cannot employ the many unskilled emigrants; as it is the number of industrial workers has increased enormously (from 277,000—387,000). The consequence of this inundation is a tremendous reserve army of unemployed — numbering 128,000, and further a steady fall in the standard of living of the industrial workers. In the same way the eight hours' day only exists on paper and in the Commission's report.

The only solution of the refugee question would be to find occupation for the emigrants in agriculture. There is however not enough land to go round. The statistics of the Commission's report at any rate show that there is not enough landed property available which could be expropriated.

The authors of the report are indeed compelled to admit that Stambuliski's agrarian reform was sabotaged by his successors, so that for instance, in five years of agrarian reform, only 8700 emigrant families received plots of land. On the other hand the statistics still give an account of 936 large properties with an area of 85,000 hectares, which could easily be divided up. It is however easier and cheaper for the native rulers if the

marshy districts bordering on the Danube and the Black Sea are prepared for cultivation by means of an international credit and handed over to the land-hungry peasants. It was for this technical work and in order to provide the new owners of land with the minimum of necessary equipment that the Bulgarian Government and the Labour Office proposed the credits mentioned, amounting to three million pounds.

The Commission's report proves "objectively" that the Bulgarian Government could not raise this absolutely necessary sum for the regulation of the refugee question from its own means without endangering national finances. The objective Albert Thomas forgot to cast a fleeting glance at the new national Budget from which he could have seen that the three items of expenditure, army, police and increase of salaries for the bureaucracy amount altogether to two million leva, a sum which is almost twice as much as the sum which is now to be made available through the loan.

The reasons urged on behalf of the report however baldly reveal how "objective" are the gentlemen of the International Labour Office. Thomas and his collaborators attempt to soften the hearts of their capitalist employers in the following way:

"In the midst of the most incredible suffering, the refugees in Bulgaria become an easy prey to the subversive and militant propaganda which raises in them false hopes of a war of revenge which will enable them to return to their homes; it is revolutionary and mainly Communist propaganda which recommends them to reverse the present state of affairs, which can only be carried through quickly by a bold stroke. So far the majority of the refugees have resisted this propaganda, but their resistance and their capability of enduring suffering are not unlimited."

The inviolability of the peace imposed by imperialism and the Communist danger are the most effective arguments which can be used to advantage in Geneva. Zankoff, Liapcheff and Albert Thomas have not hesitated to ring the changes on these arguments. It will be no wonder if the gentlemen of the League of Nations consent to grant this credit. Apart from obtaining usurious interest, they want to make sure of their mercenary army in Bulgaria.

ECONOMICS

The Economic Consequences of the Massacre in Shanghai.

By M. Michailov.

The economic consequences of the carnage in Shanghai on May 30th 1925 have, up to the present, not had sufficient attention paid to them in the Press.

We have based the following account on the reports as to the foreign trade of Great Britain, Japan, the United States and Germany.

As the national revolutionary movement was directed chiefly against Great Britain, more harm has been done to the economic position of the latter than to that of other imperialist States.

Great Britain's exports to China fell from £ 20,343,000 in 1924 to £ 14,555,000 in 1925. The decrease of imports into China from Great Britain in 1925 chiefly concerned cotton goods. In comparison with 1924, the import into China of textile goods from Great Britain fell by 42%, i. e. by 5 million pounds. The Lancashire textile industry is passing through a severe crisis. A few days before the general strike in Great Britain, the Association of cotton manufacturers decided to stop work for a week in the textile factories of Lancashire, beginning on May 3rd. This measure affected 150,000 workers.

In Hong-Kong, in which about 25% of the whole foreign trade of China usually centred, there has been complete stagnation for more than ten months.

According to communications of the Hong-Kong Chamber of Commerce, not a single ton of freight has arrived at Canton from Hong-Kong since the boycott began. An insignificant amount of British freight reaches the port of Canton by the round-about-way of Hong-Kong, Shanghai and Canton; in this

case all traces of British trade marks are usually removed from the goods. This import of goods by such a long circuitous route, however, does not amount to any quantity worth mentioning.

According to communications from the same Chamber of Commerce, the export from Hong-Kong in the third quarter of 1925 alone has decreased by half as compared with the third quarter of 1924. In July, August and September 1924 it had amounted to £ 11,674,720, in the same months of 1925 to only £ 5,844,743. The number of ships which have entered Hong-Kong in the second half of 1925, sunk to less than a sixth. The shares of many Hong-Kong firms have depreciated by 30-70%. At the present time the Hong-Kong papers are full of cases of bankruptcy of various kinds which have come before the court.

The loan of three million pounds granted by the British Government has not alleviated the economic crisis in Hong-Kong nor relieved the serious position of the British firms. Only £ 300,000 were subscribed, and that only thanks to the high rate of interest, i. e. 9%.

The economic crisis in Hong-Kong has seriously disquieted the industrial and commercial circles in Great Britain which are in any way connected with China. Chamberlain tried to carry out a firm policy. Charles Bell, the English Inspector of Customs in Canton, closed the port. He was, however, compelled to give way in a few days and to re-open the port. Bell cannot well be satisfied with this customs' policy, for only a short time ago he received a thorough thrashing from Canton workers. The attempt to carry out a firm policy has failed; Canton is continuing the boycott and the strike in the British factories.

If the events of last year in China have caused a severe crisis in Hong-Kong and curtailed British exports to China, Japan has in every way turned Great Britain's difficulties to her own advantage. China's imports from Japan in 1925 exceeded the imports of the previous year by 113 million yen. The excess of China's imports from Japan over China's exports amounted in 1925 to 263 million yen as compared with 127 million yen in 1924. The losses suffered by the Japanese cotton manufacturers in Shanghai were amply compensated by the increase of imports of cotton from Japan into China. The import of cotton goods into China increased by 30 million yen in nine months of 1925 as compared with the same period in 1924.

The increase of imports of Japanese goods into China has continued in 1926. Japan's foreign trade balance for the first quarter of 1926 shows an increase of exports to China by 24,576,000 yen as compared with the first quarter of 1925, whilst the export from China to Japan decreased by 21,511,000 yen.

The reports of a number of Japanese shipping companies point to the excellent business done by these companies in China.

The events of last year in China have not had any special effect on the trade between the United States and China. The decrease of imports into China from the United States amounted in 1925 to \$22,169,000 (135,279,000 in 1924 and 113,110,000 in 1925). The exports from China to the United States increased in 1925 by \$54,085,000 (from 136,820,000 to 190,906,000). Only quite a negligible amount of United States' capital is invested in Chinese industry. For this reason the strike in the cotton factories has in no way affected American business men. Not a single one of the 118 cotton factories in China belongs to Americans. Of the cotton factories in China, 44 belong to Japanese, 5 to Englishmen and 79 to Chinese.

The boycott of British steamers proved to be very advantageous to the American shipping companies. The Dollar Line and other companies arranged services between Canton and the ports of North China and also between Canton and North America.

The boycott of British goods was an extremely favourable factor in the increase of the import of German goods to China. The export to China only increased, however, altogether by 5 million marks in 1925 as compared with the previous year.

Germany's trade with China in 1925 did not justify the expectations of German commercial firms. The additional

charges, to which the German Government was obliged to resort in order to meet payments according to the Dawes plan, increased the cost of the products of German industry to such an extent that it became extremely difficult for her to compete in the Chinese market. Germany was not able to take advantage of the great possibilities of increasing the export of her goods to China, which were opened to it in 1925. On the other hand German firms received a number of big orders for fitting up power works for Chinese cotton factories in Shanghai, and made use of the boycott of British shipping to increase its transport activity in China.

The events in Shanghai were a powerful stimulus to the development of home industries in China. When the foreign authorities in Shanghai withheld the electric current from Chinese factories during the boycott, the Chinese manufacturers drew the right conclusion, that they must possess power-stations of their own so as to be independent of the will of the foreigners. In the second half of 1925 therefore equipment for the Chinese factories to the value of 5,600,000 was imported into Shanghai. A large number of the Chinese cotton factories in Shanghai now get their current from power-stations of their own.

Chinese shipping has at the same time made enormous profits. Thanks to the boycott of British, and the temporary boycott of Japanese ships, the Chinese chartered Scandinavian, German and Dutch ships and made large profits. Many a Chinese ship which had laid idle before the strike, was taken into use again, when the strike began. Now the British fear that the coast and river traffic will be finally gone over into the hands of Chinese companies.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

New Economic Progress in the Soviet Union.

By F. Vinow (Moscow).

Whilst the economic difficulties, the symptoms of which were first seen in the autumn of last year, showed a certain mitigation in the month of March 1926, a very decided improvement in almost all fields is evidenced by the statistics published a few days ago of the Commission for Planned Economy on the economic development of the Soviet Union in the month of April and the data of the development in the first weeks of May as far as they are known at present. Improvement, not only in the sense of an absolute increase of production — for this was not even arrested at the time when the difficulties had reached their climax — but also in the sense that just those factors by the situation of which the difficulties were determined, have taken a decided turn for the better.

The success of the measures taken by the Party and by the Soviet Government to put a stop to the increase of prices or to cut down prices as the case may be, the measures for stabilising the currency, the measures for reducing the cost of production, can already be recorded in definite figures.

An increase of production in State industry is and always will be, of course, the most important factor in meeting the demand for goods and at the same time constitute the basis of construction on socialist lines. The production in the large-scale industry of the State in April amounted to 323.9 million pre-war roubles (657.5 million gold roubles according to present prices) which, compared with the March production of 312 millions, represents a monthly increase of 3.26%. This corresponds to an annual increase of 39%. As compared with April 1925, the increase amounts to considerably more, i. e. calculated at pre-war prices, 50%, calculated in gold roubles 59%.

An important feature is the comparatively great increase in the productivity of labour. The average monthly production of a worker amounted in April to 167 pre-war roubles, i. e. 330 gold roubles as compared with 161 (324) roubles in March, thus showing an increase of 4% (5%), whereas in the same month of last year there was a decrease of 3%.

As regards the individual branches of industry, almost every one of them is sharing in the general increase of production.

The only ones showing a temporary decrease are coal production (4%), which is to be attributed to a number of the miners having been given leave to do urgent agricultural work, and the production of Martin steel (4.5%) in consequence of the necessity of extensive repairs to several furnaces.

A general increase in production has become almost a "stereotyped" phenomenon in the Soviet Union. No month passes which does not bring with it an increase in industrial production such as pre-war capitalism, when it was still sound, only reached with difficulty in a whole year. The following facts are particularly characteristic of the development of industry in the Soviet Union.

The slight decrease in the prices of agricultural products in March, which we reported at the time, was no accidental fluctuation in the tendency to increase during the preceding months, but the beginning of a favourable turn of affairs. The producer's prices of the most important cereals in April showed, as compared with the March prices, a further and comparatively considerable decrease.

	March	April
	producer's price per pood in roubles	
Rye	1.06	1.00
Wheat	1.30	1.27
Oats	1.06	0.91
Barley	0.71	0.64

The average decrease of the wholesale prices for flour and leguminous foods amounts to 4.2%, for cereals 2%. This development was still more rapid in May. The increase in the first ten days of May amounts to 3.8% for cereals, 1.1% for flour and leguminous foods..

The production of corn also offers a very favourable aspect. The April figures, 36.5 million poods, do not indeed equal the record in February, for this depends on the season, they exceed however the production in April of last year by, in round figures, 150%. It is a favourable factor that among the quantities of cereals produced, wheat took the foremost place as compared to other months in this economic year, 44.0% as compared with 38.1% in March.

The favourable development of wholesale prices in agriculture has not yet been caught up by the retail and industrial prices; the latter indeed showed a further slight increase in April (1.1% in wholesale trade and 1.8% in retail trade); the first days of May show a decrease of the general cost of living by 1.3%, the first decrease since a long time.

Another important factor in the stabilisation of the internal value of the currency is the progressive recovery of the circulation of money. The amount of money in circulation amounted on April 1st to 1,204,200,000 roubles. It increased, it is true, to 1,222,800,000 roubles (about 1.5%), at the same time however the turnover of goods on the Moscow Exchange increased by at least 12% and on the provincial Exchanges by no less than 14%. In the first ten days of May the amount of money in circulation decreased absolutely and on May 11th only amounted to 1,181,100,000 roubles.

The results obtained hitherto show how justified and how opportune was the organisation of the economy campaign. Thanks to the measures of economy taken, the saving in the textile syndicate alone (the same amount of work being done) will amount in the six months April to September to 3,055,000 roubles, the total savings of all trusts and syndicates during the same period amounting to 23,741,498 roubles (about 50 million marks). This shows that the abolition of superfluous and unnecessary expenses has become a new and prolific source of accumulation and of the expansion of production.

The measures of economy have in no way affected wages. The average nominal wage in April shows an increase from 53.3 to 55.2 roubles (by 3.5%) which amply outweighs the increase in the cost of living in that month.

The results of the last few weeks are thus:

Industrial production is continuously increasing; the phenomena of inflation and the increase in the cost of living have been overcome; there is a progressive improvement in the circulation of money, a considerable increase in the productivity

of labour and progress in measures of economy, in the rationalisation of production etc. Up to the present the unhealthy phenomenon of the growing extra charges in retail trade, i. e. the far too great disparity between wholesale and retail prices has not been overcome. At the present moment the industrial authorities are devoting a good deal of attention to this question; a completely sound situation in this respect can however only be created after satisfying the demand for goods.

The progress recorded does not of course mean that all the difficulties connected with the disproportion between agriculture and industry, with the demand for goods etc. have already been overcome. The greater part of the difficulties which in winter interfere most with the socialist work of reconstruction, have already been surmounted. This fact and the way in which the end was achieved, show how comparatively easily the healthy body of the young proletarian industry overcomes the diseases through which it must inevitably pass, and that, not (as in the "reconstructed" capitalist countries) at the cost of, but to the benefit of the working population.

The Third Congress of Worker Correspondents of the Soviet Union.

By Frida Rubiner.

The 3rd Congress of the worker, peasant, young people and military correspondents of the Soviet Union was held in Moscow from the 23rd to the 30th of May. The long duration of the Conference, the participation of leading comrades, the enormous number of messages of sympathy — the whole affair testifies to the great significance which the Soviet regime attributes to the institution of the worker correspondents.

The first Conference of the worker correspondents of the "Pravda", which took place three years ago, was intended to lay the foundation of a wide-spread organisation such as exists in no other country. The 2nd Congress concerned itself chiefly with questions of organisation. This 3rd Congress which, like the two first, was called by the "Pravda" and was run by Comrade Ulyanova, woman secretary of the "Pravda" and Comrade Bucharin its chief editor, was attended by 500 delegates and carried out the work of a firmly-welded, strong organisation with clearly defined aims.

Comrade Trotsky, who spoke at the Congress on the significance of the Press and on socialist construction, emphasised that "socialist construction is only possible under the conditions of growth provided by the true revolutionary democracy of the working masses who react readily, consciously and independently to all questions of economic and cultural construction". Hence the definition:

"The worker and peasant correspondents are not an apparatus of the State, but an organ of the masses which exercises its effect on the State under the general direction of the Communist party."

This organ of the working masses is powerful. The Soviet Press has no less than 250,000 correspondents from the masses, of whom 150,000 are peasant correspondents. "The worker correspondent movement is growing like a snowball" said Comrade Krupskaya in her address. We quote as example the town of Saratov on the Volga which, on October 1st 1925 had 800 wall-newspapers, but in March 1926 1160 newspapers with a correspondingly increased staff of worker correspondents as collaborators in the wall newspapers and official newspapers.

This whole army of workers from the bosom of the masses, armed with the pen, who, only a few years ago were still dumb and without rights, and were only awakened to consciousness and active life by the Soviet Power, is, in the truest sense of the word, "the voice of the people". The times are long past when we were contented with the mere statement that cultural growth was spreading. The Soviet Republics are in the stage of the best economic construction. At this Congress also the effects of the worker correspondents was reported on from the point of view of economic results.

The textile factory "Trechornaya Manufaktura" in Moscow reports having effected economies to the amount of 30,000 roubles in the year on the basis of 75 practical suggestions of the

worker correspondents. In consequence of a criticism of a worker correspondent published in the "Ekonomitscheskaya Shisa", the German firm of Ekkert had to exchange the ploughs which it had supplied to the Soviet Union etc. etc.

Side by side with the industrial manager (Red Director) and the organs of the trade union, the worker correspondent is the third power in the factory, which brings the influence of the masses to bear on the management. There is hardly any field on which the communications of the worker and peasant correspondents do not touch. The worker correspondent movement is already so well trained that on the whole only important questions are reported on. The Supreme Soviet for National Economy receives daily dozens of communications from labour correspondents, and every single case is enquired into and thoroughly examined by this supreme economic organ of the State.

The persecutions of worker and above all of peasant correspondents which even go so far as actual murder, can only be understood from the fact that the reports reach into the very centre of the machinery of life and touch the most sensitive points of all elements which are hostile to the Soviets and to the workers.

The Moscow Congress discussed openly before the public the negative sides of the movement, i. e. among others that the contact between worker correspondents and the factory management, between worker correspondents and the trade unions is inadequate or even bad. Cases have occurred in which the engineer said: "Only rid me of the worker correspondents, and all will run smoothly." The functionaries of the party and Soviet do not however remove the worker correspondents but, on the contrary, try to turn them into an important factor of socialist construction, by strict control, organisation and training. The proletarian factory manager says: "I cannot supervise every detail in my factory, so that the worker correspondent is a welcome support to me."

As was pointed out by some of the speakers, it is indicative of the great part played by the worker correspondent movement in public opinion that bourgeois and even counter-revolutionary elements have tried to creep into the organisation or to work in their own interests in the Soviet Press by forming "circles of worker correspondents".

Among the questions of organisation with which the Congress dealt, the question of the Communist fractions held a special place. As the worker correspondent movement is an organisation which is above party and in which 40-50% of the members are now non-party, the question arose as to whether communist fractions should be formed in the worker correspondent movement just as in the trade unions. The Congress rejected this solution and decided in favour of close affiliation of the worker correspondent movement to the Party, of greater consideration by the Party and more intensive work for communist education by the Party.

The Congress dealt in detail with the negative sides of the movement both on the part of the worker correspondents (mere fault finding, superficiality, animosity to experts etc.) and also as regards the position of the labour correspondents. Comrade Bucharin reported on cases in which the worker correspondents considered themselves a special power in the State and, at the elections, tried to put up candidates from the "party of the worker correspondents". This shows the necessity of thorough political enlightenment.

Taken as a whole, this Congress bears witness to the enormous development of the Soviet Union in the last few years. This is not the only result of the Congress; the conference showed convincingly that in the institution of worker correspondents the Soviet Power possesses a new form of co-operation of the masses as it does in the Soviet form of government. Lenin, who, as far back as twenty years ago, preached the participation of the workers in the Press, wrote later:

"The most minute, the most careful attention should be paid to what is new, to what is socialist, to what the masses create in their daily work of construction."

The worker correspondent movement created by the Bolsheviks is a living illustration of this new, socialist construction.

The Successful Results of Electrification in the Soviet Union.

By S. Kukul (Moscow).

The current year has seen two great new victories of electrification in the Soviet Union. In Armenia, new water-power works, the Rykov works were opened near the town of Erivan, and another near Tashkent. Although these stations are comparatively modest in size (at present 2000 kilowatts which is gradually being increased to 4000), they have, for the two chief towns of the Republic, Tashkent and Erivan, the same significance as have the Wolshow works for Leningrad and the Shatura works for Moscow. They not only supply power and light for the development of industry and for increasing the well-being of the inhabitants, they also save the costly transport of fuel by replacing it with local sources of energy.

Local means have largely contributed to the construction of both stations. The fact that the inhabitants of the district have raised large sums for the work of electrification shows how great has become the demand for electric current. In the course of the current year not only will small and medium sized power works be constructed from local means with partial support from the National Treasury, but also large power works such as the Chuguiw works for Charkov, the Artemov works for Rostov and the power works in Kiev and Saratov. The proportion of local means in the total building capital amounts to from 20% (Charkov) to 66% (Kiev).

The construction of large power works in the town of Sverdlovsk (Ural district) will be completed in the near future.

Of the very large district power works, three will be opened this year; the water-power works "Volchovstroy" (56,000 kilowatts) near Leningrad and the district power works of Sterovka (20,000 kilowatts) in the Donetz basin will begin to work in the autumn of this year. The latter will be fed by anthracite waste. The new power works of Nishni-Novgorod (20,000 kilowatts), part of which was opened in October last year, will be in full working in the summer.

The need for electric current is growing very rapidly, chiefly for the following reasons.

1. We are not simply re-establishing our industry on the old basis, but we are rationalising it at the same time, which means that the demand for electrical energy in industrial undertakings is growing at a more rapid rate than the production of goods.
2. The new conditions of living considerably increase the demand for electric current for lighting the towns; — the workers' settlements are being very well supplied with electricity. Wherever the work of electrification has advanced, the cost of electric current is much less than before the war and before the revolution; thus for instance, in Moscow the kilowatt hour costs 16 kopeks instead of 25 in the old days. Electric lighting has ceased to be a privilege of the wealthy classes and has become one of the first amenities of civilisation for the whole population.
3. The electric works constructed before the revolution have become somewhat antiquated and worn out, and require to be replaced.

Consequently, general power works are being constructed during the present economic year, the total power of which (374,000 kilowatts) equals that of all the power works constructed before the revolution. The works which will be opened this year are equal in strength to 62% of all the pre-revolutionary power works (233,000 kilowatt). Apart from this, many factory power works which used only to supply the factory for which they had been built, now supply the neighbouring towns and villages also.

It is one of the tasks of our systematic electrification to turn to further account the special power works for general purposes and to extend on a large scale the basis for supplying the Soviet Union with electric current.

THE WHITE TERROR

Growing Protest Movement against the Threatening Judicial Murder of Sacco and Vanzetti.

By A. K.

Now that the supreme court of Massachusetts has rejected the appeal against the sentence of Sacco and Vanzetti, the danger of their execution is immediately imminent. The lives of these two class fighters who have been condemned to death can only be saved by the active solidarity of the international working class, which alone is capable of enforcing their pardon from the Governor of the State of Massachusetts.

Under the leadership of the International Labour Defense, the protest movement of the American working class is growing from day to day. Mass meetings and demonstrations have already been held in many towns, at which the workers have given expression to their indignation against the confirmation of the death sentences.

In Italy also, the native land of Sacco and Vanzetti, there has been commenced a powerful protest campaign on the part of the workers. The staffs of numerous factories in Turin, Genoa and Rome have passed protest resolutions and sent telegrams to the American ambassador in Rome protesting against the confirmation of the death sentences and demanding the reversal of the judgment. It should be noted here that the reformist leaders in Italy, true to their usual practice, are completely sabotaging the protest campaign. All that has been done up to now has been solely due to the efforts of the Communists, who have used all the means at their disposal in order to extend the campaign. Thus, for example, Comrade Grieco brought forward an interpellation in the Italian Chamber in which the government were asked what steps they had taken or were contemplating in order to rescue the two Italian subjects Sacco and Vanzetti.

The innocence of Sacco and Vanzetti is so obvious that even bourgeois humanitarian organisations have joined in the protest movement. For example, the League of Human Rights in Paris has requested the government of the United States to pardon Sacco and Vanzetti. The League, in its Petition, calls attention to the terrible fact that the two Italians have had to wait for five long years for the final judgment, with the sword of Damocles hanging over their heads, which in itself is equal to any death penalty, and add that, in its opinion, Sacco and Vanzetti have been quite wrongfully condemned.

The workers in the other countries must join in the actions being carried out in America and Italy, in order that the American government shall feel the pressure of the whole international working-class. The appeal of the International Red Aid: "Everything depends upon prompt and united action. Not an hour must be lost. Rally all your forces!", must everywhere be taken to heart and translated into action by the workers and their organisations.

Political Prisoners in Hungary on Hunger Strike.

B. B.

Budapest June 8, 1926.

The persecution of the leaders and members of the "Socialist Labour Party of Hungary", which, as is known, was founded by the oppositional workers who were either expelled from or who left the Social Democratic Party after the publication of the notorious Pact of the S. P. H. with the Bethlen government, has been particularly intensified during the last few weeks and months. The leader of the Party, Stefan Vagi, except for a few brief interruptions, has been in prison almost ever since the founding of the Party. Those functionaries of the Party who are not permanently resident in Budapest, in order to hinder

their activity, are being deported by the police to their native town or district; but pending the carrying out of these measures they are compelled to remain for weeks on end in the Budapest "Detention House", where the conditions are incomparably worse than in the worst prison. Here the prisoners are not allowed to communicate with their friends or relatives nor to receive any food from them, although the diet provided is quite inedible and injurious to health.

Since the 7th March, when the Party organised a great demonstration in connection with the franc forgery scandal, more than eighty further members of the party have been arrested. Of these the majority are still kept in the "Detention House", although no charge whatever has been brought against them, twenty five workers have already been deported to their native towns, and seventeen who are residents of Budapest, have been condemned to internment in their own homes. The latter measure provides that if the internees are not at home after nine o'clock in the evening, they have to spend eight days in the Detention House.

The social democrat leaders do not let any opportunity go by in order to denounce the members of this party, which is affiliated to the same II. International, to the police as "Bolsheviks" or "half-Bolsheviks", while the police naturally make use of these denunciations in order to intensify the persecutions.

The Party is not allowed to publish a newspaper or periodical; it has to confine itself to issuing bills and leaflets from time to time. The Party published such a leaflet on the 1st May with the result that several members of the Party, among them Stefan Vagi, and in addition the director of the printing works at which the leaflet was printed, were each sentenced to eight months imprisonment and to heavy fines. The director of the printing works, it is true, was released immediately after the sentence, while Vagi and the other condemned workers were conveyed to the Detention House. As their request that they either be conveyed to the prison of the Public Prosecutor, where they would be able to order their food and other requirements from outside, or that they be at least permitted to receive food from their friends and relatives has not been complied with, they have entered on a hunger strike. The rest of the political prisoners in the Detention House have, without exception, joined in the hunger strike which has already lasted over a week. Even according to the reports of the bourgeois papers every attempt at forcible feeding has been frustrated by the determination of the prisoners.

WORKERS' CORRESPONDENCE

Worker Correspondence in America.

By J. Louis Engdahl (Chicago).

Worker Correspondence is rapidly building on a firm foundation in the United States. When it is announced that The Daily Worker now prides itself on 450 correspondents in its campaign for "1,000 Worker Correspondents by January 13th, 1927", the third anniversary of our only English language Communist daily, the figures in themselves fail to tell the interesting story of the mobilization of worker-writers in America.

It has been a difficult, uphill struggle. American workers have never before been urged to write for their own publications. The socialist press often contained "correspondence columns", but these for the most part contained letters on party policies, hardly ever anything on shop conditions or work problems. "Open forums" are conducted in some of the trade union journals, but these are only open to contributions that support the policies of the reactionary officials. Many of these "open forums" were discontinued when left wingers demanded the right to discuss vital problems confronting the organised labour movement. Editors of trade union journals cannot conceive that workers are able to write intelligently enough to be given space in the publications they support through the payment of trade union dues. The workers were discouraged from writing.

This was the outlook that faced the Communist press when it came out of its illegal existence in 1922 and began the building of a mass press in the United States. Yet when the Weekly Worker, that preceded The Daily Worker, launched an agitation campaign in the steel mills in 1923, and appealed to the steel

workers everywhere to send in their stories of working conditions, the response was negligible. Workers in the steel mills are 80 per cent foreign-born. In order to overcome the language difficulty, the Weekly Worker urged that all stories be written in the language the worker best understood. It was promised that the articles would be translated into English. Even this appeal had no effect; not even when it was made through our foreign-language Communist publications.

Yet the problem was not entirely one of language barriers. The foreign-born workers did not even write to their own papers in any considerable numbers. It therefore became a question of popularising the idea of worker correspondence. It was on this basis that the agitation to win the workers to write for their own press was energetically launched with considerable misgivings shortly after the Daily Worker was established.

The results were meagre in the beginning. Individual workers sent in their contributions from various sections of the country. Then the first group of correspondents was organised by steel workers and coal miners in the Pittsburgh district. Now there are correspondence classes in half a dozen sections of the country, some of them conducted in conjunction with the Workers' (Communist) Schools.

The movement to develop correspondents in the English language has stimulated correspondence to our foreign-language press. This is especially true of our Russian, Polish, Jewish, Yugoslav, Slovak, Greek, Finnish, Lithuanian, Italian, Ukrainian, Hungarian and Scandinavian publications. Thus, in Chicago, there are correspondence classes in English, Russian, Polish and Jewish.

The growth of worker correspondence also draws in its wake correspondence from other sources. Youth and child worker correspondents join hands with the adult workers. Groups of youth worker correspondents are already functioning with results. The farmers, soldiers, sailors, students, housewives and other groupings have also started writing for their press.

These varying activities will be centralised through the publication of our "American Worker Correspondent", a monthly magazine, the first issue of which has now appeared. Considerable stimulation is hoped for through the holding, in all sections of the country, of joint Conferences of Worker Correspondents of all languages, at which all the problems confronting the movement will be discussed.

The magazine and the conferences will help to bring the correspondents of all the different languages and papers closer together, thus co-ordinating their forces.

At the annual celebration of the Chicago Workers' School, the correspondents produced a "living Newspaper" as part of the evening's programme. This was the first "Living Newspaper" in the English language in the United States. The correspondents of our Russian-language daily, Novy Mir, frequently produce such "Living Newspapers".

Thus the worker correspondents' movement grows to encircle the largest possible numbers of non-party workers, organised in Worker Correspondents' Groups on a non-party basis to co-operate with the editorial staffs of our Communist publications. While the number of non-party workers already drawn into this activity is small, nevertheless, the prospects are good.

It is very easy to interest the large masses of foreign-born workers in the United States in the working and living conditions in the countries from which they came. Worker Correspondence from every part of the globe, therefore, provides interesting reading in the American Communist press. Some worker correspondence already comes from the Soviet Union, but very little from other countries. It is hoped to improve this condition.

Worker correspondence cannot be confined within national boundaries. As common interests knit international labour closer and closer, the products of the correspondents of one country, when properly selected, become of exceeding interest to the workers of all other countries. It is on this basis that America hopes to make its contribution to the world worker correspondents' movement.

RED SPORT INTERNATIONAL

The Struggle for the Unity of the Workers Sport Movement.

By Fritz Wiest (Berlin).

In connection with the conference of the Young Socialist International in Amsterdam a meeting was held by the Bureau of the Lucerne Sport International. A week before the Enlarged Executive Meeting of the Red Sport International had taken place in Moscow. Both Sport Internationals had to deal with the question of international unity. The R. S. I. has, during the past years conducted an energetic campaign for the union of both Internationals, and the leaders of the L. S. I. had to take a definite attitude on the matter as large masses of worker sportsmen of the L. S. I. sections are more and more plainly demanding this unity.

The Sabotage of unity through the L. S. I. leaders is obvious, in spite of, or perhaps owing to the resolution of the Paris congress. Nevertheless the Workers Sport Unions of Finland and Latvia have arranged games and matches with the worker sportsmen of the Soviet Union. The Swiss Workers Gymnastics and Sport League wrote to the R. S. I. on April 13, 1926:

"The business administration of the League and the organising committee are — in compliance with the resolutions of November 1925, passed at the Paris congress of the Socialist Sport International — extremely pleased to invite the Red Sport International to their festival (the 3rd arranged by the League) at Berne."

Also the football committee of the Belgian Socialist Federation for Physical Culture, Brussels, sent a letter to the R. S. I. on April 21st 1926 in which they wrote among other things:

"During the past year we have followed your games in Paris with great interest. We should very much like to see your team in Belgium, and we believe that it would greatly forward the workers' sport movement."

On May 13th the Football Committee of the German Workers Gymnastics and Sport Leagues urgently demanded the consent of the League leaders to matches with Soviet Union teams, which the Union leaders had hitherto tried by all means to prevent. They were however forced to report at the football meeting that 12 districts and 50 clubs have already requested permission to play matches with worker sportsmen of the Soviet Union.

These facts show the sympathy of the bulk of worker sportsmen for the Soviet Union and the united front of both Sport Internationals. That the leaders of the L. S. I. continue however to prevent the formation of the united front is proved by the answer of the Bureau of the L. S. I. to the Red Sport International.

The telegram sent by the Plenum of the R. S. I. to the L. S. I. meeting in Amsterdam on May 19 was as follows:

"R. S. I. plenum session sends proletarian greetings. Plenum discussed unity question in detail. Proposes again to you joint meeting for settling question of sport co-operation and renewed discussion as to uniting both Internationals. Letter follows. We hope very soon to receive your affirmative reply and your suggestions. The reply of the L. S. I. Bureau was as follows:

"The Bureau of the Socialist International for Workers' Sport and Physical Culture states that the Russian sport organisations — contrary to the principles of the international workers sport movement — have of late been arranging an ever increasing number of matches with bourgeois sport unions. The International Bureau declares that, as long this attitude on the part of the R. S. I. remains unchanged, a closer connection between the two Internationals is — apart from other still prevailing differences of opinion —, for this reason alone, quite out of the question."

The Berlin "Vorwärts" commented on this on June 1st 1926 in the following words:

"The Soviet Sport Press openly admits that Russia arranges many matches of every description with foreign

Sport Clubs. The "Krasni Sport" of April 11th reports that matches have been arranged with Turkish national teams, such as have already taken place before. Moreover, matches are being arranged with the English Derby team with the French and Spanish national teams, with Sweden and Czechoslovakia. The only country which they dare not approach is Germany because this would mean the break-down of all their beautiful revolution phraseology."

The telegram, as proved by the article in the "Vorwärts" reveals the whole weakness of the arguments of the social democratic L.S.I. leaders.

What is the point in question? First of all the match with the Turkish team. A match had been played with them last year and now they have been invited to take part in the Spartaciade of the Near East next Autumn. Is this an offence or a crime against the interests of the working class? It is no more an offence nor a crime, than it would be a crime to play matches with Chinese teams, because in these countries the bourgeoisie plays an objective revolutionary role. This is the only concrete case which the Wildungs and Hummelhans' could quote. In the other cases they speak of "preparations". The R.S.I. and the working class sportsmen sympathising with it have no need to apologise, for the L.S.I. play with teams from England and Hungary which still belong to bourgeois leagues. The attitude of the R.S.I. is correct when the matches have for their aim:

"To liberate the working masses, who are still in the bourgeois sport movement, from the influence of this movement and the reactionary leadership, and to win them for the workers' sport movement, the following tactical measures are admissible and necessary:

The playing of matches and games with teams of the bourgeois sport movement is admissible when they serve

to strengthen the opposition of the workers and promote the formation of workers' sport organisations;

a) for countries where the proletariat does not possess a sport organisation of its own,

b) for Eastern countries (such as Turkey and China) where the bourgeoisie objectively still plays a revolutionary role".

This is the point of view of the R.S.I. It is (as literally reproduced above) contained in par. 4 of the resolution of the general meeting of the R.S.I. dealing with "The relations with the bourgeois sport organisations".

The Berlin "Vorwärts", in a demagogic manner, calls this standpoint, which is even shared by Wildung and is adopted by the L.S.I., as in the case of Hungary, a jesuitical standpoint.

The resolutions and the tactics of the R.S.I. are not contrary to the interests of the workers sport movement. On the contrary, the fight for the unity of the workers' sport leagues creates the pre-requisites for a successful fight against the bourgeois sport movement and the factory sport organisations under the patronage of the employers. The World Spartaciade which will take place in the Soviet Union in 1923 and to which all Workers' Sport Unions will be invited, will see the working class sportsmen in one front against the Olympiade of the bourgeois Sport Unions to be held in Amsterdam at the same time.

Whereas the leaders of the L.S.I. are trying to prevent the unity of the workers' sport movement and the co-operation of the members of the L.S.I. and the R.S.I. sections by calumniating the R.S.I., the united front of the worker sportsmen is progressing from below under the leadership of the Red Sport International. These are the most important facts to be drawn from both conferences.