

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 48

24th June 1926

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

CONTENTS

- P. R. Dietrich: The Result of the Plebiscite on the Expropriation of the Princes.
- Politics.
- J. Stalin: On the Recent Events in Poland.
- A. Neurath: The Demonstration of the Czechoslovakian Working Class.
- The British Government's Note and the Soviet Union.
- The Miners's Struggle in England.
- G. Zinoviev: The International Significance of the General Strike in Great Britain (Conclusion).
- Support the British Miners!
- Appeal of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union to the Working Class of the Soviet Union and of all Countries.
- Increase of the Relief Action for the British Miners by the Workers in the Soviet Union.
- The Youth Movement.
- R. Schüller: The Young Workers in the General Strike. China.
- Tang Shin She: Whose Interests does Sun Chuan Fang Represent?
- In the Colonies.
- J. B.: Two Mohammedan Congresses.
- For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.
- Harrison George: The Western Marine Workers' Conference at Montevideo.
- The White Terror.
- The Protest Movement for Sacco and Vanzetti must be Increased.
- Union of Soviet Republics.
- E. Deutschmann: One of the Most Important Achievements of the Russian Revolution.

The Results of the Plebiscite on the Expropriation of the Princes.

By P. R. Dietrich (Berlin).

Berlin, 21st June 1926.

The second phase of the fight organised and politically led by the Communist Party against the robber-campaign of the German princes and against the monarchist reaction, was concluded with the Plebiscite. Yesterday, 15 millions demonstrated their will to fight for the complete expropriation of the princes and against the monarchist reaction. Fifteen million votes, that is four and a half million more votes than the C. P. of Germany and the Socialist Party of Germany polled together in December 1924, and only 625,262 votes less than the C. P. of Germany and the Parties of the Weimar Coalition: S.P.G., Democrats and Centre, received in December 1924. Fifteen millions, that is 350,000 votes more than the candidate of the bourgeois bloc, Hindenburg, received at the presidential election. These 15 millions are equal to 50% of the total votes cast at the last Reichstag election and in the presidential election, and would correspond to 250 parliamentary seats.

Not only the parties of the bourgeois bloc, including the Fatherland Leagues, but also the second strongest party of the so-called people's bloc, the Centre, mobilised all their forces against the plebiscite. In addition, they had at their disposal the entire capitalist press and news apparatus. The employers contributed millions of marks for the counter-action. Not only the national government, but also all the provincial governments openly supported the princes' parties and tolerated the sabotage and all manoeuvres designed to create confusion. In innumerable cases even the state means of power were placed at the disposal of the princes' parties in order to fight against the plebiscite. This was particularly the case in Bavaria and Thuringia, where the election literature of our Party was confiscated, communist speakers arrested and election meetings arbitrarily dissolved and forbidden by the police. The highest point of the counter-action was reached by the monarchist parties in the agrarian districts such as East Prussia, Pomerania and Posen, where not only

black lists were set up with the connivance of the authorities, but open terrorist means were employed by the fascist bands in order to prevent electors going to the poll.

All the more significant, therefore, are the results, particularly in those districts of the Republic where the monarchist reaction had its strongest points of support. This is the case in Bavaria, where there was a relatively big increase of votes as compared with the referendum. Also in the other South German States, in Baden and Württemberg, considerable progress has been made. Still more significant, however, is the fact that our Party has succeeded in the big industrial centres, such as Berlin, Hamburg, Leipzig, and in the whole of Rhenish Westphalia, in mobilising almost the entire masses of the industrial proletariat. In three electoral districts in Rhenish Westphalia 350,000 more votes were cast than at the preliminary referendum. These figures clearly demonstrate the breach which has been made in the masses of the Centre electors, although precisely in this district the counter-action was led by the Catholic clergy with all the resources of the church at their disposal.

The results in Mecklenburg, East Prussia and Pomerania, where the vote did not even reach that which the S. P. of Germany and the C. P. G. polled at the parliamentary elections in 1924 are to be attributed entirely to the terror of the big agrarian organisations and their fascist auxiliary troops.

It is obviously self-deception when the monarchist parties now attempt to represent the remaining 25 million electors, of whom 10 million have never taken part in elections, as opponents of the plebiscite. It is certain that millions of agricultural workers, small peasants, catholic workers and also petty bourgeois masses, who are really on the side of the fight against the princes and against the monarchist reaction, were only deterred from casting their votes by the fearful terror and the fear that to-morrow they would be ruthlessly thrown on to the street and delivered over to starvation. Even however if that were not the case, the 15 million votes signify a tremendous success. They are a clear answer not only to the robber demands of the princes, but also an unmistakable answer to Hindenburg, to the Marx-Stresemann government, to the Reichstag, as well as to all the bourgeois parties, an answer which shows that the fighting will of the working class is growing, that the petty bourgeois masses in the town and country are refusing to follow the monarchist reaction any further, are beginning to turn to the Left and to realise that only side by side with the class conscious working class can they conduct a successful fight against their complete impoverishment. Whilst, on the one hand, there is a growing centralisation of the proletarian forces, on the other hand there is an increasing disintegration in the camp of the bourgeois parties, which has led in some cases to open rebellion against the party authorities.

There is no doubt that in this struggle, which is not yet concluded, still further decided successes could have been achieved if the social democratic leaders had been inspired with the same fighting spirit as was to be seen among the social democratic workers. In spite of the ever increasing desire of the social democratic workers for common action with the communist workers, the social democratic leaders continued their usual practice of sabotaging the united front movement. Instead of doing everything in order to render possible systematic and united organised action for every workshop and for every locality, they threatened with expulsion and dissolution those local groups who formed unity committees with the Communists. This attitude of the social democratic leaders was bound to lead to the splitting of considerable forces. In addition to this the social democratic leaders, directly and indirectly, supported the unheard-of manoeuvres of the Marx-Stresemann government aimed at creating confusion. In spite of its plain attitude against the plebiscite and its defence of Hindenburg and his Manifesto, the social democratic members of the Reichstag proclaimed their confidence in the Marx government and voted against the Communist vote of no-confidence.

Contrary to the attitude of the social democratic party authorities, the social democratic workers have completely fulfilled their duty. The united front tactics which were conducted by our Party with all energy, have resulted in the social democratic workers realising that only by the united front of the class-conscious proletariat, in and outside of the factories, can the interests of the working class be effectively represented and the attacks of the social and monarchist reaction be successfully repulsed. To strengthen and extend this conviction, to promote the will to unity, to augment the forces of the proletariat, to

make out of the 15 million voters a firmly-welded fighting front, these will be the chief tasks which the Party must fulfill.

That the social democratic leaders do not desire the strengthening and consolidation of the proletarian united front which has arisen in the fight against the princes' demands and the monarchist reaction, is proved by the attitude of the „Vorwärts“ after the plebiscite. According to the „Vorwärts“, „the fight will be continued in the Reichstag“. Not a word regarding rallying our forces, not a word as to strengthening the united front. A new parliamentary comedy is to begin, with the help of which the social democratic workers are again to be captured for the policy of the Party Executive, that is the policy of the big coalition, of alliance with the princes' parties.

The Communist Party has declared right from the beginning that the predatory demands of the princes and the danger of monarchist reaction cannot be fought with the ballot box. It has again and again exposed the character of bourgeois democracy, and has thus succeeded in getting the defenders of bourgeois democracy to expose themselves. This has ruthlessly destroyed the democratic illusions prevailing among the social democratic workers. The Party must and will continue this work of enlightenment among the social democratic workers and the petty bourgeois sections with the same energy as it will continue the fight for the complete expropriation of the princes and against the social and monarchist reaction.

Fifteen millions demonstrated their fighting will on the day of the plebiscite. Consciously to organise and strengthen this fighting will, to set up, instead of the parliamentary comedy of the social democratic leaders, new great mass movements against the government, against the parliament of deceivers of the workers, for the overthrow of the government and the monarchist president of the Republic, for the dissolution of the Reichstag, for the government of the workers and peasants, these are the immediate tasks of the Party.

POLITICS

On the Recent Events in Poland.

By J. Stalin.

(Extract from a Speech delivered at a Meeting of the Railway Workers in Tiflis on 8th June 1926.)

There exists the opinion that the movement led by Pilsudski is a revolutionary movement. It is said that Pilsudski is fighting for the cause of the revolution in Poland, for the peasantry against the big landowners, for the workers against the capitalists, for the freedom of the suppressed nationalities of Poland against Polish chauvinism and fascism. It is said that Pilsudski therefore, deserves the support of the Communists.

Comrades, this is entirely wrong!

As a matter of fact there is now going on in Poland a fight between two fractions of the bourgeoisie — a petty bourgeois fraction and a big bourgeois fraction —, a fight which has for its aim the consolidation and stabilisation of the bourgeois State, and not the defence of the interests of the workers and peasants, of the interests of the suppressed nationalities.

The Polish State has entered on a phase of complete disintegration. The financial system is breaking down. The Zloty is falling. Industry is crippled. The Non-Polish nationalities are being suppressed, and above, in the circles of the ruling classes, there prevails a perfect orgy of fraud and embezzlement, as it is quite openly admitted by representatives of all fractions in the Sejm. In this connection the bourgeois classes are confronted with the dilemma: either the disintegration of the State will proceed so far that it will open the eyes of the workers and peasants and drive them to the necessity of a revolutionary seizure of power from the big landowners and capitalists, or, the bourgeoisie must hasten to put an end to the disintegration, to do away with the orgies of fraud and in this way to prevent, before it is too late, the probable outbreak of the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants.

The question is, which of the fractions of the bourgeoisie shall undertake the task of stabilising the Polish State, the fraction of Pilsudski or the fraction of the people of Posen? There is no doubt that the workers and peasants hope that, as a result of the fight of Pilsudski, they will experience an improvement in their position. There is no doubt that the upper sections of

the working class and of the peasantry supported in this or that manner the fight of Pilsudski, because they regard him as the representative of the petty bourgeois and humbler gentry against the people of Posen, who represent the big capitalists and big landowners. But there is no doubt that the hopes of some sections of the working class of Poland are being made use of not for the revolution, but for consolidating the bourgeois State and the bourgeois order.

Here, of course, certain outside factors play their part. Poland is a small State. Bourgeois Poland is linked up financially with certain circles of the Entente. Poland cannot in the present miserable state of its finances do without the help of foreign loans. But the so-called Great Powers cannot finance a State, the leading circles of which unanimously countenance an orgy of fraud and embezzlement right throughout the State administration. In order to obtain loans, State administration must in the first place be "improved", a certain guarantee must be provided that the interests on the loans shall be paid etc. Hence the necessity of "nationalising" the Polish State.

These are, at bottom, the inner and outer conditions which have determined the present struggle of the two main bourgeois fractions in Poland. Poland at present shows a number of fundamental contradictions, which in their further development will inevitably create in Poland an immediate revolutionary situation.

These contradictions are connected with three main questions: the labour question, the peasants' question and the national question. All these contradictions can immediately come to the surface and provoke an outbreak if Poland enters on a war adventure, if she proves incapable of establishing good neighbourly relations with the surrounding States.

Can Pilsudski, can the motley Pilsudski group solve these contradictions? Can this petty bourgeois group solve the labour question? No they cannot solve it, for they must then enter into a conflict with the capitalist class, which they cannot and which they will in no way do, unless they wish to lose the financial support of the Great Powers. Can they, this group, solve the peasant question, for example, by confiscating the land of the big landowners. No, they cannot and will not do this if they do not wish to bring disintegration into the commanding sections of Pilsudski's army, which consists entirely of small and middling landowners. Can this group solve the national question in Poland in the sense of granting the right of self-determination to the suppressed nationalities, the Ukrainians, the Latvians, the White Russians etc.? No, they cannot and will not, if they do not wish to lose the confidence of those Pan-Polish chauvinists and fascists who form the main source of the moral existence of the Pilsudski group.

What remains, therefore, in such a case?

There remains one thing: after having militarily defeated the fractions of the bourgeoisie, to submit to this same fraction politically and to cling to its coat tails; provided of course the working class of Poland and the revolutionary portion of the peasantry do not in the near future take in hand the revolutionary transformation of Poland and drive out both fractions of the Polish bourgeoisie, the fraction of Pilsudski and also the fraction of the people of Posen.

In connection with this there stands the question of the **Communist Party of Poland**. How could it happen that the revolutionary discontent of a considerable portion of the workers and peasants in Poland brought grist to the mill of Pilsudski, and not to that of the Communist Party of Poland? This happened, among other things, because the Communist Party of Poland is weak, exceedingly weak, and that it has become still more weak in the past struggle through its incorrect attitude towards Pilsudski's troops; that in view of all this it could no take its place at the head of the revolutionary minded masses. A short time ago I read in our Soviet press an article by Comrade Thälmann, member of the C. C. of the Communist Party of Germany. Comrade Thälmann deals in this article with the attitude of the Polish Communists who issued the slogan of supporting the troops of Pilsudski, and criticises this attitude as unrevolutionary. I am sorry to admit that the criticism of Comrade Thälmann is absolutely correct. I must confess that our Polish comrades have, in this case, committed a very great error.

The Demonstration of the Czecho-Slovakian Working Class.

By A. Neurath (Prague).

The Cerny Government intends to take the following measure—a Czecho-Slovakian "Locarno". The economic crisis is to be overcome entirely at the expense of the industrial proletariat, of the masses of peasants and petty bourgeois. Czecho-Slovakian industry is to be made capable of competition by a deterioration in the conditions of living of the Czecho-Slovakian working class. Although not only the Communist party but the most important industrial and economic bodies regard closer economic relations with Soviet Russia as a definite way out from the desperate economic situation, the policy of the Czecho-Slovakian Government still remains dependent on the policy of the imperialist States of Western Europe. Czecho-Slovakia maintains an enormous military apparatus in the service of European reaction, the costs of which have to be borne by the working masses.

The Cerny Government intends to take the following measures. First of all, fixed agrarian duties are to be introduced which will result in an immediate rise of all foodstuffs. Secondly, railway tariffs and the taxes on sugar and spirits are to be raised, 100 million Czech crowns are to be given annually to the priests, the tenants' protection is to be gradually abolished, and added to all this, an offensive of the employers against the wages and conditions of work of the Czecho-Slovakian proletariat is to be organised.

It would be impossible for the National Coalition to realise these plans. The Czech Social Democrats and National Socialists, who possess more than 50 seats, belong to the National Coalition which has only a slight majority in Parliament. These Socialist parties have, as a result of the defeat at the last election, learnt the lesson that they must cease to support the reactionary plans of some capitalist Coalition Government or other, unless they wish to lose their influence over those workers who still support them. On the other hand the Czech bourgeoisie has no intention of permanently renouncing the co-operation of the Czech Reformists, for, like every other capitalist Government which cannot yet dispense with parliamentarism, it knows that in the future it will be all the more easy for it to carry through any reactionary plan, the more it can rely on the direct or indirect support of this or that Labour party. Only at the present moment it would be almost impossible for the Socialists, especially the Czech Social Democrats, to vote directly for the plans of the Government. In consequence of this, the bourgeois Coalition parties and the Socialist parties are acting in unison, although in a more or less concealed manner. While these bourgeois Coalition parties allow the Socialist parties or, in other words, their leaders, to amuse themselves by playing at opposition in Parliament, the said leaders on the other hand decline to take any serious step to establish united proletarian action outside Parliament. For the rest, everything seemed to fit in nicely. The Socialist parties went into opposition and the Czech Coalition parties concluded a peace with the bourgeois parties of the national minorities. First of all there are the "Ludaky" who have abandoned their opposition and come to an understanding with the Czech parties. This step of the Slovak opposition is, of course, only possible on the basis of various concessions which the Government has made to clericalism. The German Christian Socialists vote for the customs bill, while on the other hand the League of German Agriculturalists votes for the "Kongrua". Thus, as regards the law relating to customs, the Kongrua and some important taxes, the Government has succeeded in coming to an understanding with the national minorities. In spite of the opposition of the two Czech Socialist parties, it has a sufficient majority at its disposal. When all these measures have been carried out with the help of the bourgeois parties of the national minorities, the Socialist parties will again be able to enter the Government in order to "do positive work in an important, responsible position", as the Reformists always express themselves when they are about to take part in the capitalist Government.

So far all would run smoothly, if there were not the accursed Communists and the revolutionary workers. The Czech workers have no understanding for the clever and diplomatic parli-

mentary devices of the Czech Socialist parties; they intended to and still wish to take the opposition seriously, and therefore they readily respond to the invitation of the Communist party to supplement parliamentary action by action of the Czecho-Slovakian proletariat. The pressure from below became so strong that on Tuesday June 8th, a one hour's strike of protest took place in all the metal factories of Greater Prague. On the previous day, the masses of the Prague proletariat demonstrated against the policy of the Government. The Reformists talked themselves hoarse, against action outside Parliament and against every attempt to incite a strike. The Czecho-Slovakian bourgeoisie and the Cerny Government seemed indeed to believe that this timid, hesitating and cowardly behaviour of the Reformist leaders justified the conclusion that the whole movement was weak, and consequently they did not allow themselves to be disturbed in their parliamentary work.

On Friday June 11th, our Party summoned a new demonstration of the proletariat. The Customs Bill was to be finally dealt with in Parliament between Friday and Saturday. In spite of the bad, rainy weather, the masses rallied to the demonstration. Speeches were delivered from five platforms. The Government mobilised a considerable part of the armed forces; it was evidently of the opinion that it could deal as easily with the demonstration of the workers as with the parliamentary opposition of the socialist Reformists. They probably had the shock of their lives. The workers were not so easily put to flight by the armed troops of the Czech bourgeoisie, although the latter made use of fire-arms.

What followed on this despicable attack on the workers, is well-known. During the night the obstruction of the Communist Party in Parliament began; it assumed proportions such as have never been known and never experienced here. For weeks the Government had insolently ignored every demand of the Socialist parties to appear before Parliament. The Communist obstruction cured these gentlemen of their insolence in a few hours. The proceedings had to be broken off and could only be resumed after the Government had resolved to comply with our demands and to compel the Prime Minister to answer to Parliament for the shooting in Havlicek Square. Of course it was not the obstruction alone which forced the Government to show respect. The Coalition majority only yielded when it recognised that this fierce obstruction was a clear reflection of the resolution and the will to fight of the proletariat.

The advancing workers have upset the calculations not only of the bourgeois diplomats of the Czech bourgeoisie, but also of the experienced Reformist wire-pullers. Quite apart from the above-mentioned cooperation between the Reformists and the Czech bourgeois Coalition parties, the Socialists wished to give evidence of the fact that the Czech bourgeoisie could only with difficulty govern without the Socialist leaders. The Czech workers however would have nothing to do with parliamentary bargaining. In the course of the recent fights, it has become quite clear to them that, as a member of a capitalist Government, a Labour leader can only render service to the exploiters. Thus, whilst the Socialist leaders only wish to make use of the resistance of the workers in order to demonstrate to the bourgeoisie that the Reformists are indispensable in the Government, the workers fought not only against the Cerny Government, but against a capitalist coalition government of any kind. The revolutionary sense of the proletarian slogan: "A worker and peasant Government" has first become clear to a considerable number of the workers in the course of this fight.

The British Government's Note and the Soviet Union.

Leading article in the "Pravda" of June 15th, 1926.

The British Government's note addressed to the Government of the Soviet Union, deserves the attention of the proletarian public. First a few words as to the nature of the note. Of what does the British Government "accuse" our Government? Of having permitted the trade union organisations of the working class in our country to send money to the fighting proletariat of Great Britain. The press of the extreme Conservative Right

maintained with its usual insolence that the money had not been given by the trade unions but by our Government. The note does not go so far as to repeat that; it confines itself to accusing the Government of allowing the money to be despatched.

What is the state of affairs here? In our country there are strict regulations with regard to the export of currency. We require these regulations in order to protect the interests of our economics. If the export of currency is not contrary to the interests of our economics, it is permitted. This was the criterion of our measures in this respect. Our Government was of the opinion that the interests of sending help to the British workers did not in any way run counter to the interests of our economics. It was quite out of the question for our Government to adopt towards the trade unions of its own country the point of view of some other governments which mobilise the police, the army, the navy, strike-breakers and the other choice accompaniments of a "Constitutional" regime, against the trade unions.

The demand of the British Government, which proposes that the Government of the Soviet Union should behave towards the Labour organisations of our country in the same way as does the extreme Right with the trade unions of Great Britain, seems therefore truly ridiculous. The Workers' Democracy would cut a pretty figure, if the proletarian Government did not even allow the greatest proletarian organisation to send money wherever it wanted to! The demands of the British Government can only cause the indignation of the proletariat both of our country and of Great Britain.

Nevertheless, the mere fact that the note was sent and also the significance of this fact must not be underestimated. In its form, the note is written with great reserve. We know however from the general practice of Britain diplomacy what is the real significance of this "politeness". The note is the first step towards further pressure. It is the first "trial balloon". Further actions will follow, which are already being prepared and which will inevitably come to light.

The whole Conservative Press of Great Britain, i. e. the whole of the Government Press, has for a long time carrying on an infuriated campaign against the Soviet Union. This whole Press is full of the most calumnious attacks against and of the most insolent statements with regard to the Republics of the Workers. The extreme Right of the conservatives is using all its endeavours to embitter relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain, to tear up the commercial treaty between the Soviet Union and Great Britain, to mobilise forces for repeated fresh attacks on the Soviet Union.

That this policy is dictated by class instincts, is more blatantly evident than ever. If the French "rentier" send his francs to the "Relief Fund" of the British police, then all honour to him! If the Russian worker sends money to his British comrade, down with him, down with his Government, down with his country!

Every Russian and every British proletarian will discover this simple mechanism. The time is past, when the British Government sang choruses which "soared above all class", and wore the mask of the representative of "the whole nation". Now, it not only openly takes the stand of an enemy of the Labour organisations within its own country, even outside the country it behaves as an embittered opponent of the most elementary rights of the workers.

The proletariat and peasantry of our country cannot but give a firm answer to this gross attempt to interfere in our internal affairs, to this attempt to introduce the practices of the British secret police into our country, to subordinate our trade unions to the control of the British Government. There is no single worker, no single peasant in our country, who would not answer the note of British capital by a sharp protest.

THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

The International Significance of the General Strike in Great Britain.

By G. Zinoviev.

II.

As is well known, the bourgeoisie rapidly re-grouped its forces and changed over from defence to attack. As soon as the obstacle called the General Council, was overcome, it proceeded with a series of lock-outs: it began to dictate humiliating conditions to the workers and forced the Railwaymen's Union with Thomas at its head, to sign a contract according to which the trade union admits that it acted wrongly in striking and promises never to strike again except with the agreement of the employers. There are, to put it mildly, freaks who actually believe that the railwaymen are really forced on to their knees and will never strike again. They do not realise that this should be read differently; no, the English workers will never strike again — under the command of the bourgeois leaders.

What is the significance of the issue of the English strike? Attempts were made to represent affairs as though, in spite of everything, the English workers had won a partial victory, as though the issue of the strike had been a "compromise" etc. This is the spirit in which the Social Democratic Press wrote. I have before me extracts from the Italian "Centre" paper "Avanti", which considers itself Left and believes that it has a position between the Communists and the Social Democrats, and from other papers which maintain that a "compromise" was made at the most favourable moment, that the General Council called off the strike in good time, that the agreement between the General Council and the Government was a moral victory for the working class etc.

I do not believe that either the English workers or the international Labour movement require to have the truth gilded. For the time being, the workers in England have suffered a defeat and the Conservatives have gained a victory. The victory of the English bourgeoisie is however a Pyrrhus victory. A few more such strikes, and the English bourgeoisie will breathe its last.

Self-deception is of no avail in this case. We must openly admit that the immediate issue of the strike is no compromise, but a betrayal, no agreement, but a surrender, not a victory for us but for our class enemies who, with the help of their agents, with the help of the bourgeois politicians who have insinuated themselves into Labour circles, have achieved success. We must look at the facts in cold blood without in the least trying to deceive ourselves. Any glossing over of the real state of affairs is grist to the mill of Pugh, Hicks & Co., of all these Philistines. An "explanation" such as the "Avanti" gives, that the movement was reasonably brought to an end at just the right moment, would just suit these philistines.

Yes, there was a time when a "bourgeois" Labour movement existed in England, at the head of which of course were bourgeois "Labour leaders". The Labour movement in England is at present in process of becoming more and more proletarian, more and more revolutionary. To-day it of course deserves to have leaders at its head who are worthy of it, and these leaders will doubtless be found. There can be no doubt that the young but very energetic and very active British Communist Party which is excellently well informed on the whole situation, will grow. This party was the only force which, from the very first day, said that a wide-scale economic strike only has a prospect of victory if it is directed into political channels. When class is opposed to class, there can no longer be any talk of legality, of constitution. The strike was betrayed at the very moment when the General Council declared that the general strike was not a political fight.

III. The Idea of the General Strike and Experience in England.

The English strike has now put a number of highly important problems to the whole international working class. Once again the question of the general strike, which is theoretic-

ally and practically of enormous importance, the question of the relation between economics and politics, has become a question of the day.

The question of our attitude to the general strike has not been absent from the agenda of the international Labour movement for many years, even for decades.

There has been much confusion in this question. For a long time the II. International held a point of view which was entirely hostile to the idea of the general strike. The "theory" of the 2nd International was that the general strike was impossible because, if it lasted for any length of time, the working class itself, the workers themselves, would be most hardly hit, since they would be without food, without provisions, and therefore would suffer most from their own strike. This was the official point of view of a number of the leaders of the 2nd International.

It was the Russian revolution in 1905 which first caused a change in the attitude towards the general strike. When the general strike began to play an important part in our movement, such persons as Kautsky, who at that time was still a Marxist, took for the time being a different attitude towards the question of the general strike. The 3rd Party Congress of the Bolsheviks (1905) raised the question of a combination of a general strike with an armed insurrection. Bolshevism put this question clearly, not only from the theoretical but from the practical point of view. It rejected decisively the prejudices which prevailed in the international labour movement with regard to the question of the attitude towards a general strike. Up to that time, the general strike was propagated (and compromised) by anarchist and syndicalist groups who concerned themselves with vague talk about the general strike and turned this idea into a theory of "revolutionary gymnastics." Our revolution in 1905 was the first to understand how to represent the question of the general strike to the international working class in the right light. In 1917 this question was put still more clearly and impressively.

I am of the opinion that the English general strike has once more shown that those theorists of the international Labour movement from the camp of the 2nd International were entirely wrong in thinking that the general strike is quite out of the question in countries with old constitutional traditions. The English strike has shown that the working class can, even under the most unfavourable conditions, resort to so powerful a weapon as the general strike. The English working class has shown that it is possible to make use of so powerful a weapon as the general strike in a situation which cannot be called directly revolutionary, in a country with very bad reactionary traditions, in a country where the upper strata of the aristocracy of labour still have considerable influence. This great example will not be lost on the English workers nor on the workers of the world. The English worker is no longer what he was a week before the strike; he has seen his power, he has seen how, if he wishes to, he can stop the working of the most gigantic machine.

In this sense the question of the general strike was presented under a new aspect. The strike of 1905 showed that, in a situation in which the whole country was in fermentation against decaying Czarism, in which political passions flared up everywhere, the strike could easily be transferred to the political sphere and the question of the overthrow of the Tsarist Monarchy become acute. The English strike shows a different situation, in which the movement which originally got into its stride gradually on a purely economic basis, was led into political channels at a peculiarly slow pace.

The problem of the general strike was put before the whole International under a new aspect. All the "leaders" of the 2nd International, all the worthy colleagues of Thomas, Pugh & Co. will maintain that the events in England have demonstrated the bankruptcy of the idea of the general strike. The workers however who saw how they became equal to the strike, who saw that their forces would have sufficed to bring the affair on to a much higher level if they had had an adequate general staff — these workers will not believe such idle talk.

The general strike cannot be victorious in an advanced capitalistic country if its leaders set themselves the task of confining it within economic boundaries at any price. The general strike can only be proclaimed by those having resolution, will-power, endurance and energy, and recognise that it is impossible to stop half-way. The general strike will, of course

always meet with resistance from the ruling classes. Though it begin as an economic strike, it cannot be victorious unless it is transferred to political channels. The theorists of the 2nd International do not understand what with us is understood by every class-conscious worker.

In this sense, the problem of the general strike now presents itself to the working class of the world in a new light.

IV. The "Stabilisation" of Capitalism and the Events of Last Year.

The English strike puts the question of the "stabilisation" of capitalism in a new way and answers it in a new light.

We are justified in stating that the analysis of the world situation which the Communist International has given both in past years and also in March of this year at the Session of the Enlarged Executive, is now being confirmed. This is particularly shown by the example of the English labour movement. When we said that the English labour movement was in the process of being revolutionised, that the centre of gravity of the international revolutionary fight was slowly but surely making its transition to the old, ossified, rich and powerful England, this analysis of the Comintern was disputed by many. To-day it is proved, that the Communist International has rightly estimated the tendency to revolutionary development.

I believe that to-day the question of stabilisation is already decided. Had the English workers won the strike, the world revolution would have made great strides. The victory of the English working class would have been a victory for Socialism in England and in the whole of Europe. This has not yet happened. We have however every reason to say that what is now happening is anything else than stabilisation. In the immediate future, the English capitalists will try to turn their present victory to account, they will try, as in Germany, to carry out a rationalisation of production, thus throwing millions of fresh unemployed on to the streets. For some years now there has been chronic unemployment of 1½ million persons in England. In Germany, in consequence of "rationalisation", there is chronic unemployment of 2 millions. Things cannot indeed be otherwise under capitalism. Every technical improvement in production is a disadvantage to the workers.

A year ago, the storm broke over Shanghai. Let us look at the events of this year, from Shanghai to the general strike in England. What have we seen during this time? A mighty movement which shook China to its foundations and involved millions of persons in the fight, two colonial wars in Morocco and Syria, a new desperate crisis in Germany, which resulted in 2 million unemployed, a tremendous financial crisis in France, which is becoming more and more acute, a general strike in England, and the most recent events in Poland. This is the balance of a single year of "stabilisation". We might really say to the gentlemen of the bourgeoisie: "If you 'stabilise' yourselves in this way for another three or four years, nothing but fragments will be left of you". We wish them every success and a "comfortable journey" in this direction.

Otto Bauer, the theorist of the 2nd International, the most "Left" amongst them, who considers himself a scientific politician and endeavours to weigh everything "objectively", devoted an article to Chinese events after the defeat of the people's army in China. This article is entitled "China's 1849". As is well-known, 1849 was the year of the defeat of the bourgeois democratic revolution in Europe, and the year 1848 was the year of its rise. The defeat of 1849 arrested further revolutionary development for many decades for, after 1849, it did not raise its head again until 1871 in the Paris Commune and then stood still again until our revolution in 1905. Otto Bauer maintains that the year 1849 has now begun for China, that the Chinese revolution is a corpse and that the task of the European proletariat is to prevent the desecration of the said corpse. Otto Bauer is prepared to render this service to the Chinese revolution; the corpse must be buried with due honours. Otto Bauer does not see that, although the Chinese revolution is in difficult situation, he, Otto Bauer, and his Second International much more closely resemble a corpse than does the Chinese revolution.

I daresay that some Marxist theorist will be found who will say the same about the English general strike. The railway men have signed conditions according to which they will not strike again and, since they have signed, the matter is "final", which means that the stabilisation of capitalism has resulted from the English strike.

In my opinion, the result of the strike is not stabilisation but a new disorganisation of capitalism. The capitalist ship is tossed by the storm, it inclines first to the right and then to the left. When the ship rolls to the right, it crushes the workers for a moment, but the ship itself groans as well. Stabilisation is a condition of stability, but what can be said for the stability of a ship which heaves over first to the right and then to the left? The ship of capitalism is groaning not only in Germany and in Poland, but also in England. England is the chief seat of capitalism in Europe; next to America, it is the richest country in the world. Anyone who does not regard the matter superficially but resolves the skeleton of capitalistic economics into its component factors by means of class analysis, will say that the events of the past year disprove the existence of capitalist stabilisation.

Let us look at events as they are developing in Poland. At the first glance, affairs there seem to have ended in a farce. Pilsudski organised a "peaceful" demonstration, after which, it is true, thousands of dead had to be buried and a large number of wounded cared for. Everything was done "on the basis of the Constitution". Pilsudski seized the President by the throat, ordered him to resign and declared that he would put new ministers in power. Pilsudski is now trying to create a Government which is not much better than the old one.

And the people? Have the events left it untouched? Have they left no imprint on the army which had to storm the "Belvedere", the "holy place" of the Government? The army had to choose: Pilsudski or the old Government. Has this lesson made no impression on the workers and peasants? From the point of view of a quasi-Marxist analysis, it can be said that, thanks to Pilsudski "stabilisation" has been achieved in Poland. In reality however, Poland is shaken to its foundations. What the Poland of to-day has experienced, is of course not the last blow; there are still many blows to come.

Neither has England experienced her last blow; she will receive dozens more. Nevertheless, what has happened, both in England and in Poland, represents, independently of the events of to-day, a great advance in the relation of forces between the classes.

A mass of people, such as has never been seen hitherto, was stirred up, and this mass acted in a Bolshevik manner. Did not the committees of action in England begin to assume, according to type a resemblance to our district Soviets? Must not great significance be attached to the unusual, not quite respectful behaviour of the workers to the ladies and gentlemen driving in motors? Overturning motor-buses and setting them on fire in the streets of London as did the English workers, is a far less innocent past-time than the cricket and dancing which Thomas and Pugh suggested to them. The hundreds of thousands of pickets, the fraternization of the soldiers, the calling out to the soldiers that if they must shoot, they should fire on their masters! All these facts were really seen in fossilised old England!

The English working class has not yet gained the victory, but a new England has been born. At the present time, a great differentiation is taking place in the Labour movement in England. The General Council at its head is veering to the right. The process of decay in the upper stratum will still go on. These people will still have to prove that they were right when they put themselves completely at Baldwin's mercy. A new movement however is growing up from below. A light will flare up in every trade union; it is already smouldering.

During the strike, there were elements of double government in England. The General Council crept under the table from fear, but the workers created committees of action, organised the distribution of food and formed a sub-commission for electricity. The latter had a modest name, but its significance was very great, for it controlled the distribution of electrical energy through the whole of England.

And what about the question of the "freedom" of the bourgeois Press? The English type-setters began to answer this question during the days of the strike. The Printers' Union was always the most backward, the most reactionary of the trade unions in England. And this trade union censored fashionable bourgeois papers and declared: "We will let no newspaper appear which calumniate the workers". Thomas was horrified at all this, but the workers resolutely continued.

The workers were compelled to sign humiliating conditions. But this only intensified their rage and their class-hatred of all oppressors. The English working class is a whole head taller

than it was. The "leaders" however have lost their heads, if indeed they ever had any. They are done with, they are dead persons, even though they can walk, breathe, draw salaries and enjoy the "respect" of the high lords and masters. The English working class has created its own power; it, the giant, sees its hands and feet being tied with cords by the dwarfs who call themselves its leaders. The English working class will shake off these gentlemen with a single shrug of its shoulders. These people have sung their last song. If the revolutionary impetus of the English working class increased after 1921, it will grow more than ever after this strike.

The English strike has meant an enormous concussion for the whole of capitalism, for the whole international Labour movement. An understanding observer must attribute vast importance to all that has happened in England. The immediate issue was indeed bad, but we must picture to ourselves the course of the fight. The beginning and the course of the fight were magnificent and showed the power of the English working class, the growth of its revolutionary consciousness. The atmosphere of stagnation of the last few years is beginning to disperse. The immediate issue of the strike in England was, as we have said, bad; but there are strikes which are more important than victories, and the defeat in England was one of these.

The problem of the general strike was once more brought to the fore by the vast and mighty movement at the most important point in Europe. The general strike is not a hopeless idea. Of course, if we regard the general line of development, it will proceed as Lenin taught; the general strike must be combined with much more violent forms of class war. This does not mean that the very first general strike must develop into an insurrection; but the general line of revolutionary development has been completely confirmed.

The English strike confirms the analysis of the Communists both in the questions of the stabilisation of capitalism and of the general strike, and in the characterisation of the Right and "Left" leaders. These leaders are rotten to the core. With regard to them, there can be no illusions. Like every great concussion, this crisis has thrown to the winds the illusions concerning Hicks, Pugh and their like. History strides past these puppets and proceeds with the order of the day.

History fills up the breach, it produces new leaders. As long as England was in possession of the industrial monopoly in the world market, the Marxists could find no key to the Labour movement in England at that time, which would have revolutionised the whole movement at a blow. This key has now been found, it is in the hands of the Communist Party and in the hands of the Left Minority Movement of the English trade unions, which will gain in strength.

However the fight in England may end, it opens up a new era for England and for the whole of Europe, it shows that the tactics laid down by the Communist International which have seemed to many of our enemies to be something fantastic, something wrong, are the only right, reasonable and true way to victory for the international proletariat.

Support the British Miners!

Appeal of the R.I.L.U. to the Workers of All Countries.

Moscow, June 19th, 1926.

For nearly two months the English miners, numbering over a million, have steadfastly and calmly withstood the attack of the English bourgeoisie, of its government and the leaders of the English political and trade union movement. The miners are continuing the struggle, because all the proposals which have been made by the "neutral" government and by many, not only right but also by so-called "left" leaders, only amount to a repetition of that which was proposed by the mineowners two months ago, namely, the reduction of wages and the lengthening of the working day.

Nevertheless, the more steadfastness and self-sacrifice the British miners display, the more the British bourgeoisie and their lackeys the English government, are beginning to grow uneasy. The attempt made by the British government to induce the government of the Soviet Union to sabotage the English strike, for the note of the British government has no other meaning than this, can only be regarded as a result of this nervousness.

The trade unions and the proletariat of the Soviet Union have already given a dignified answer to this challenge of the British government. The Soviet government has given an answer such as any worker might have expected: The spirit and nature of the Soviet power is diametrically opposed to that which the British government wishes to obtain from it.

The answer of the trade unions of the Soviet Union will meet with a profound response among the broad masses of the international proletariat. To allow the British government to interfere in the mutual relations of the working class of the Soviet Union and of the working class of England, of the trade unions of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet government, would amount to handing over the fate of the international labour movement to Chamberlain, Birkenhead, Joynson-Hicks and other agents of the English mineowners. The workers of the Soviet Union replied to the note of the British government with the slogan: "Doubled relief for the English miners!" The workers of all countries must reply in loud and decisive tones: "Hands off the trade unions of the Soviet Union!" Doubled Relief for the English Miners!"

Long live the fight and the victory of the English miners!

The Executive Bureau of the
Red International of Labour Unions.

Appeal of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union to the Working Class of the Soviet Union and of all Countries.

Moscow, 17th June 1926.

The Conservative English government has dispatched a note to the Soviet government regarding the aid given by the trade unions of the Soviet Union to the striking English workers. This interference on the part of the English government in the relations of the working-class of the Soviet Union and of Britain, is an attack upon the free right of the working class of our country to give brotherly aid to the workers of other countries in the manner and to the extent which they consider necessary.

The Central Council of the trade unions of the Soviet Union raises the most energetic protest against the interference of the English government in the affairs of the workers of the Soviet Union, and declares that the organised workers of our Workers' Republic will not allow anybody to dictate to them how they shall act. To demand from the Soviet government the prohibition of the help of the trade unions of the Soviet Union for their class brothers, means to misunderstand the spirit and nature of the Soviet power. The trade unions of the Soviet Union declare that they have helped, are helping and will continue to help the striking English workers; for the cause of the English workers is our cause, no matter what the government, which is protecting the interests of the miners, may think about the matter.

Down with interference in our relations with the English workers!

Hands off the trade unions of the Soviet Union!

Increase of the Relief Action for the British Miners by the Workers in the Soviet Union.

Moscow, June 17th 1926.

Protest meetings took place today in the Moscow factories against the attempts of the British government to interfere with the solidarity action of the workers of the Soviet Union for the miners on strike in Great Britain, and in the relations between the Soviet government and the trade unions of the Soviet Union. Sharp protest resolutions were adopted, calling upon the Soviet government energetically to repel all such attempts.

After the meetings, the workers, employees and students marched in procession with bands and banners to the centre of the town, where several trade union leaders delivered speeches before the trade union headquarters. About 350,000 people

part in the demonstrations which lasted until late in the evening. The banners of the demonstrators bore inscriptions such as: "We shall continue the work of solidarity!" "Miners, stand firm!" "Down with intervention in the inner affairs of the Soviet Republic!" "Hands off the trade unions of the Soviet Union!" etc.

Protest meetings and protest demonstrations against the note of the British government are reported from many other towns in the Soviet Union. The Leningrad Trades Council issued an appeal declaring that the working class of the Soviet Union replies to the provocative action of the British Conservative government by increasing tenfold the support of the strike and of the work of international proletarian solidarity.

The collections of money for the British miners are being continued with the greatest success throughout the whole of the Soviet Union, which success was increased still more by the events of the last few days in connection with the note of the British government and the campaign against the Russian trade unions being conducted in Great Britain, as well as the steadfastness of the British miners.

The miners of the Donez Basin decided to devote one half per cent of their wages to the strikers during the continuation of the strike. The members of the trade unions of Moscow have up to now collected 356,000 roubles for the strike funds. The Young Communists have arranged for the 21st and 22nd of June in Moscow a mass sale of badges, in the shape of a miner's pick, for the benefit of the strike funds.

At the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Land Workers Union of the Soviet Union which was opened today, a letter of thanks from the British Agricultural Workers Union, signed by the General Secretary, R. B. Walker, for the financial support given by the Soviet trade unions during the general strike was read. Walker writes that the British working masses know how to appreciate this support and requests that everything possible be done in order to make permanent the financial support of the miners' struggle. The Plenum decided to continue the financial support for the miners and to send similar appeals to the brother organisations in Czechoslovakia, France, Sweden etc.

THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

The Young Workers in the General Strike.

By R. Schüller (Moscow).

It is exceedingly interesting to learn in what way the working youth and the young Communist League in Great Britain took part in the recent general strike. And it is very satisfactory to find that the favourable picture which one derived during the general strike regarding the active and enthusiastic participation of the Youth and of the Young Communist League in the struggle, is being confirmed by exact reports and material. In fact the young workers and apprentices, both organised and unorganised, eagerly took part in the struggle in great masses, and the young and small Young Communist League has given a good account of itself. This fact is all the more important and welcome as the trade unions, in general, did not wish the apprentices to take part in the strike, and likewise made very little effort to fetch the unorganised young workers out of the factories.

As regards the extent of the organisation of the young workers, it is a generally well-known fact that in Great Britain (as in many other countries) the young workers organised in trade unions constitute a very small minority.

Neither the apprentices nor the unorganised young workers could expect any strike pay, and the prospect of victimisation was very great, while those workers under 16 of age had not even the prospect of receiving unemployment benefit. The strike of the apprentices and unorganised young workers, in spite of their neglect by the trade unions, was therefore an heroic action which shows how greatly the British working class youth, along with the entire working class, have been roused by the recent events.

The youthful elements everywhere distinguished themselves by special enthusiasm, fighting spirit and activity. This is con-

firmed from all sources. The Young Communist League displayed the greatest activity and thereby reflected the mood and activity of the working class youth during the strike. Right at the beginning of the fight the League issued the following slogans for the youth:

All young workers into the strike. Most energetic participation of the youth in all strike activity. Representation of the youth on the strike committees and councils of action.

Fraternisation between soldiers and strikers!

United front of the working youth!

Members of the Central were sent to all the important districts. "The Young Worker", the organ of the League, which on the 1st of May was converted from a fortnightly paper into a weekly paper, was issued daily under the title of "The Young Striker". Leaflets were distributed wholesale. In addition to this, most of the district executives issued their own strike bulletins for the youth.

The Youth organisation of the Independent Labour Party disappeared during the strike, if possible even more completely than the Party itself. So far as members or local groups of these organisations were desirous of fighting, and this was so in the majority of cases, they had to look to the Young Communist League for leadership. Thus the Y. C. L. reports:

"In Tottenham a 14 years old member of our League issued a strike bulletin quite alone and delivered a speech at a factory meeting. He thereby brought 500 young women workers into the strike and caused them to join the trade union."

The "Young Striker" states:

"50 young transport workers in Bethnal Green joined in the strike and the Y. C. L. succeeded in getting them to join the trade union."

Of great importance was the slogan of the League: "Election of representatives of the youth to the strike committees and councils of action. In many cases the League succeeded in this. In many cases it also succeeded in bringing about the formation of special committees of the councils of action for work among the youth.

The intensive agitation of the League for the fraternisation of troops and workers deserves special attention. "The Young Striker" is full of reports of the movements and the mood of the troops, and contains appeals for fraternisation between soldiers and workers. Leaflets were also distributed among the soldiers.

The work of the League was carried on under very difficult circumstances. The Central in London was practically illegal. The Police carried out several raids on the offices of the League. The whole Executive in Manchester was arrested, but afterwards released. The secretary of the League, comrade Springhall, was sentenced to two months hard labour. Many other members of the League were sentenced to fines and imprisonment. The possession of a copy of the "Young Striker" was sufficient during the strike in order to be sentenced to several weeks or months hard labour.

The "Young Comrades League" (the children's organisation) likewise showed very great activity. Its main endeavours were directed towards enforcing from the authorities support for the children of the strikers in the shape of free meals in the schools, in many cases with success.

The calling off of the General strike has not ended the activity of the League. The League is now concentrating its forces in the fight of the young miners and in defending the unorganised youth and apprentices against wholesale victimisation.

The influence of the Young Communist League has greatly increased. It is also gaining in numbers. The League is now conducting a recruiting campaign in order to increase its membership still further, with the aim of creating a Mass Young Communist League.

CHINA

Whose Interests does Sun Chuan Fang Represent?

By Tang Shin She.

By the murder of the President of the Shanghai Trades Council, by the murder of a peasant leader in Kiangsu who agitated for the liberation movement, and by the recent nomination of a Chinese member of the English Boxer Compensation Committee, i. e. an English employee, as Mayor of Greater Shanghai, Sun Chuan Fang has won the favour of the imperialists and the latter are therefore spreading through their press the best possible reports regarding the power of Sun Chuan Fang, the greatness of the territory under his control, the riches of his provinces etc. This shows that the imperialists are very pleased to have found a new and capable lackey to fight against the liberation movement in China.

As a matter of fact Sun Chuan Fang, in October last year, united the Governors and Generals of the five Yangtse provinces: Kiangsu, Che-kiang, Nganhui, Kiangsi and Fokien, in the fight against Chang Tso Lin and drove him out of the Yangtse district. But all these allies did not fight for him, but were partly in a position of being compelled to defend themselves against Chang Tso Lin who was threatening their existence, while they also believed that, after the victory, they would be able to obtain fresh offices. By means of a trick, however, Sun Chuan Fang, before the war against Chang Tso Lin was ended, brought the provinces of Kiangsu and Che-kiang completely under his rule. He sent the provincial troops of Che-kiang and Kiangsu to other provinces, in order they should not be a hindrance to him. This immediately gave rise to great discontent with him. The Kiangsu troops in Nganhui are already making preparations to reinforce themselves in order, in the near future, to march on Nanking and win back their own capital town. The population of Che-kiang are energetically demanding the immediate return of their provincial troops.

The situation for Sun Chuan Fang is somewhat critical, even if he should not immediately lose these provinces. He is therefore again beginning to set to work to realise an old plan, i. e. to capture his native province of Shantung. Last year he abandoned this plan because he saw that he could not accomplish anything there and because he perceived that he could operate better in the Yangtse district. He is now organising the "Black Lancers" — robber hands — with whose aid he hopes to win back his native province, in order that he shall there have a secure place in the event of his ever losing the Yangtse provinces. In the provinces of Fokien and Kiangsi, Sun Chuan Fang's influence is practically nil. On the other hand the Canton government enjoys great sympathy in these provinces.

It is true, that the provinces of Kiangsu, Che-kiang and Nganhui, where Sun Chuan Fang still has the power, are very rich in rice, silk and tea. But the financial situation there is shaken to such an extent that the debts are several times greater than the annual revenue. In order to pay for the upkeep of his army Sun Chuan Fang was compelled to sell to the bourgeoisie the state property in his provinces and officially to permit the opium trade which brings in an enormous revenue — in Kiangsu 40,000 boxes annually = 40 million Chinese dollars, that is one thousand Chinese dollars per box.

That the business people, as the European newspapers report, are satisfied with Sun Chuan Fang is a fact. When he is in need of money he does not, as did the former military ruler of Kiangsu, call upon the Shanghai Chamber of Commerce, that is the bourgeoisie, to pay, but he squeezes the last coin out of the petty bourgeoisie. When at the beginning of the year he had to pay his soldiers, he demanded from the butchers of all the towns under his rule a special tax (Shanghai alone, without the foreign quarter, had to yield 80,000 Chinese dollars). The peasants of Kiangsu were compelled to pay a year's land taxes in advance.

In the three provinces of Kiangsu, Che-kiang and Nganhui, there is a strong movement for autonomy, that is every province is demanding self-government. Last year, at the commencement of the fight against Chang Tso Lin, Sun Chuan Fang had to promise the population of Che-kiang to hand over to them after the end of the war the administration of the province.

(He was at that time the governor of Che-kiang.) He promised faithfully to return to his native place of Shantung. The people of Che-kiang immediately set about with all eagerness to draw up a constitution for the province, which was published on the 1st of January last amidst the jubilation of the population. Sun Chuan Fang, however, did not pay attention to this, but again nominated one of his creatures as governor. The population of Kiangsu likewise wanted in January last to set up a provincial constitution and to convene their provincial parliament, which had not met since 1924. But Sun Chuan Fang did not let it come to this. To-day the Kiangsu newspapers dare not even mention the matter. The hope of the population of the Yangtse provinces for a democratic government must be abandoned under Sun Chuan Fang's rule. With him there can only be a military dictatorship.

Sun Chuan Fang, who last year proceeded against Chang Tso Lin on the ground that the latter suppressed the liberation movement of the Chinese people, is today behaving much worse than Chang Tso Lin. Not only must the Communists within his territory work illegally, but also the labour movement and the Kuomintang can only carry on their activity in a semi-legal fashion. The "Anti-Red Movement" which is maintained by imperialist money, has its headquarters in Sun Chuan Fang's district. Sun Chuan Fang is striving to carry out a so-called "people's diplomacy", that is to say, co-operation of the Chinese bourgeoisie with the imperialists, particularly with the English, Japanese and Americans, against the dangerous ideas of the people.

As is to be seen, Sun Chuan Fang, who is held up by the imperialists as being the second model Chinese governor (the first is the governor of Shansi), only represents his own interests and those of the Chinese bourgeoisie. He squeezes the Chinese population and suppresses them with the most brutal means. The discontent against him is continually growing. The millions of so-called robbers, i. e. landless peasants in his district are growing daily. The petty bourgeoisie are growing visibly poorer. As soon as these two factors are combined with the provincial troops who have for long been discontented, it will come to a general revolt in Sun Chuan Fang's territory.

IN THE COLONIES

Two Mohammedan Congresses.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The wars in Morocco and Syria, the strained situation in Egypt, the revolt in Tripoli and the victory of Ibn Saoud in Arabia have set the Mohammedan world in a ferment. In the face of the common enemy with which the peoples of North Africa and Near Asia are confronted — the imperialism of the three European great Powers: Great Britain, France and Italy, the antagonisms existing between the various religious sects and between the various local leaders are more and more disappearing. A united national movement is beginning to arise, the aim of which is: to bring about by all means, and in the first place by revolutionary means, the emancipation of the Arabian countries. The imperialists, the chief of them being Great Britain which has special interests at stake, have made it their task to destroy this dangerous national revolutionary united front. To achieve this purpose no manoeuvre, no bluff, no taking advantage of personal ambitions is too mean and contemptible for Great Britain.

Such an attempt to bring a part of the national movement under the influence of Great Britain, was the "Caliphate Congress" in Cairo. The plan of the English was to bring together the greatest possible number — even if only fictitious — of representatives of Mohammedan districts, and to get them to proclaim king Fuad of Egypt, who is a tool in the hands of Great Britain, as Caliph.

This plan failed. The Congress in Cairo was a complete fiasco. The most important circles of Egypt, even the Mohammedan delegates from Palestine, from Iraq and other countries saw through the British manoeuvre and sabotaged the Congress from within. Already at the beginning of the session it was proposed that the Congress should protest against the cruelties of the French in Syria. When the leaders of the Congress raised objection to this political demonstration, which of

course would have set the key-note to the whole Congress, and when in spite of this the proposal was enthusiastically adopted by the majority of delegates at the Congress, it was obvious that the fate of the Caliphate Congress was sealed. The delegates returned home from the Congress without anything having been achieved.

Much more serious, in regard to its content and character, is the Mohammedan Congress which was convened for the first half of June in Mecca. This Congress was called by Ibn Saoud who at present dominates in Arabia. It is being attended not by a few bogus delegations, but by representatives of the most important Mohammedan centres of the world: representatives from Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan, the Soviet Union, the various Arabian countries and India have come to the Congress, the official agenda of which includes two items: the settlement of the question of pilgrims and the determination of the future regime in Hejaz.

There is no doubt that there will be discussed in Mecca those questions which are today engaging the attention of the world of Islam: before all the defensive measures against European imperialism, Mecca, the centre of independent Arabia, which even if hard pressed by the imperialists has not been subjugated, is undoubtedly the most favourable place for such discussions. And precisely the fact that, at the Congress of Mecca there will meet two, formerly, such hostile Mohammedan groups as the Arabs and the Turks, renders the importance of the Congress for the entire Near East doubly great.

How even the religious questions of Islam are bound up with the fight against imperialism is shown, for example, by the question of Akaba and Maan, which will undoubtedly be raised during the discussion of the future regime in Hejaz. These two towns which always belonged to Hejaz, were annexed by the English on the occasion of the flight of king Hussein in the year 1925. Not only the Bedouins living in the neighbourhood, but also all circles of Islam in various countries protested against this act of robbery, which only opened the door to Arabia and at the same time constituted an offence against the Mohammedan religion, which declares the soil of Hejaz to be "holy".

There are many similar points of conflict, and no matter whether the Congress openly comes forward against the imperialists or whether the delegations from the various countries confine themselves to confidential discussions, it marks a step forwards in the setting up of the anti-imperialist front in Near Asia and fully justifies the mistrust with which it is regarded by official British circles.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The Western Marine Workers' Conference at Montevideo.

By Harrison George (Chicago).

In approaching the labour movement of Latin America we must constantly bear in mind the colonial character and semi-feudal status of all territory south of the United States-Mexican border. The "independence" of the many republics is and has been a wholly formal affair. Spain, England and Portugal all had thieving fingers at the throat of Latin America since its discovery and settlement, and the wars for independence of a hundred years ago changed nothing essential so far as the reality of foreign rule was concerned.

Together with the lack of industrial development, the heritage of anarchism with its disintegrating decentralisation, and continuous savage repression by the ruling class, has left the trade union movement in its present pitiable state. Labour unions, where they exist at all, are practically local organisations, sometimes with friendly relations toward a formal central body whose power is jealously restrained and which has one and sometimes two rival centres to contend against within the nation. It is an astounding fact that in the great nation of Brazil there has not yet been organised a trade union central.

With this situation confronting it, the young proletarian movement finds itself faced by the added necessity of struggling

against the most brutal and artful of exploiters — the imperialism of the United States.

How United States imperialism has extended its influence may be seen by the fact that its investments in Latin America increased from \$ 290,000,000 in 1930 to \$ 4,040,000,000 at the end of 1924. It is still growing rapidly with no sign of halt in the future. It is artfully forcing out imperialist rivals in Chile by proposing a "consolidation loan" of \$ 250,000,000 and restricting Chilean credit to compel the acceptance of this and to force agreement to Washington's desires on Tacna-Arica.

What labour may expect from United States imperialism is already proven by its brutal and bloody rule in Central America and the Antilles. The need of unity in organisation and purpose against it has not yet penetrated the labour movement sufficiently to result in action. The first promise of action came with the holding in March of this year of the Continental Conference of Marine Workers at Montevideo, Uruguay.

This conference originated with a call put forth by the Marine Transport Workers Industrial Union No. 510 of the Industrial Workers of the World (I. W. W.), which felt the need of unity in action against the powerful international shipping combine. It awoke a sympathetic feeling among the marine transport workers' organisations of Latin America (mostly port workers), whose miserable lives and fear of the "colossus of the north" has made them very receptive to the movement for trade union unity that is sweeping the world. Despite the tremendous obstacles the conference was a success insofar as it began the process of unity and struggle.

I have already spoken of the extreme disorganisation of the trade union movement generally and its background. The marine workers organisations share in this lamentable situation. Even the union which convoked the conference is but a shadow of its former self due largely to anarchist administration. The Mexican Federation del Mar y la Tierra elected delegates but was too poor to send them to the conference.

The Cuban unions were suffering destructive repression at the hands of President Machado, who openly guarantees United States capitalists, who have some \$ 1,250,000,000 invested in the island that supplies 28 per cent of the world's sugar, that all strikes will be broken by force of arms. Many trade union leaders have been assassinated, others are imprisoned, and it was not to be expected that the Cuban port workers, though they wished to attend, could get to Montevideo. The conference itself had to be changed from Havana, its originally proposed location, to avoid the Cuban terror.

In Peru, also, American imperialism rules quite openly through its murderous tool, President Leguia, whose campaign of destruction against the labour unions, deportations of revolutionary students and workers and savage brutality against all who protest labour conditions in a "free colony" of Uncle Sam, have shocked even those accustomed to sanguinary dictators on the frontiers of imperialist conquest. Without a shadow of doubt the Peruvian marine workers will join and support the movement which came out of the conference, but they could send no delegate so far upon such short notice as was given.

Among the chief obstacles to the conference was the lack of preparatory propaganda and organisational work, of which the I. W. W., though the initiators of the conference, were wholly incapable. Even the adherents of the Profintern were remiss in their duty of furthering trade union unity by urging their unions to send delegates.

It was a success, therefore, to overcome the disorganisation and poverty existing, the tremendous distances of thousands of miles and weeks of travel and the lack of preparation, to have represented at Montevideo, the Brazilian seamen and port workers, the Marine Section of the I. W. W. of the United States, the Maritime Workers' Federation of Uruguay and the seamen of Chile, besides the Water Transport Union of Soviet Russia and the Transport Workers' Section of the Profintern. The Argentine Maritime Federation, by some mischance, acted too late to get delegates to the conference but indicated afterward that it agrees with its decisions and will join the movement which resulted.

It was a success for the Montevideo Conference to establish a Unity Committee to begin the profoundly necessary work of gathering all seafaring and port workers of the continent

around a programme of militant struggle in the interests of the working class which is in harmony with the programme of the Profintern. This unity committee, known as the "Comite Continental de Obreros Maritimos y Portuarios", with headquarters at Montevideo, Uruguay, is to meet at intervals of three months, publish an organ devoted to its programme and summon another congress after from 15 to 18 months of preparation. Concurrent and new affiliates are to support the work of unity by contributions according to membership.

All of the resolutions of the Montevideo Conference reflect a policy of proletarian struggle. Confronting imperialism it resolved:

"To recommend to all the organisations that they devote a part of their activity to combatting Yankee imperialism and all imperialism. To recommend to the organisations that they lend aid to all movements against imperialism in general, trying always to turn it in favour of the proletarian revolution."

The marine workers of the western hemisphere made clear that they do not regard their own unity as a separation from the workers' organisations of other lands, and stated their intention to work for World Trade Union Unity.

Distrusting the hypocritical peace and disarmament diplomacy of the capitalist nations as being merely part of their preparations for new wars, the conference made concrete its opposition to capitalist wars by the following decisions:

"All organisations that are in accord with the Continental Congress of Maritime Workers, agree to propagate among the workers that are found within the armed forces of capitalism, that they have an identity of interests with the workers in the industries and on the farms."

"To advocate and as much as possible to create in the ports and transport centers, Control Committees to watch all shipments of arms."

Against the menace of Fascism, which in South America conceals neither its name nor its counter-revolutionary purpose, the conference resolved:

"Each organisation represented and those that desire to affiliate, agree to dedicate a part of their propaganda against Italian fascism and that of their own country."

"Each organisation agrees to propagate, and when possible to create defense groups against Fascist attacks, in whatever form these appear."

The opposition of class conscious proletarians to United States imperialism in Latin America would not have been complete without opposition to its control within the labour movement through its pliant tool, the labour bureaucracy which created and maintains the Pan American Federation of Labour, which, as its own leaders paint it, is "the Monroe Doctrine for the working class", and which is trying to corrupt with class collaboration the militant unions of Latin America.

The Montevideo Conference resolved:

"Now and in the future to defend and propagate the slogan: 'Against class collaboration, for the class struggle, in favour of the proletarian revolution.'"

"As against the Pan American Federation of Labour, we propose the unity, nationally and internationally, of all unions based on the class struggle."

The conference expressed its solidarity with the Chinese proletariat in its struggle against domestic exploitation and imperialist oppression in a cable to the Chinese Seamen's Union, pledging concurrent organisations to prevent their own capitalists from crushing the Chinese revolution. The final clause of this resolution should be flaunted in the face of the reformist trade union leaders of the "more advanced" Amsterdamers:

"We call upon the marine workers of all the world to boycott the transportation of arms to the reactionary Chinese generals."

The conference, although handicapped by lack of definite information, which is later to be gathered by the Continental Committee, concerning the economic conditions of various countries, especially among port workers, formulated a pro-

gramme of concrete demands around which all workers in the industry may be rallied in united struggle. These include:

- 1) The eight hour day for seamen and the six hour day for firemen and coal passers.
- 2) The forty-four hour week for all marine and port workers that have the eight-hour day.
- 3) Holiday work at double time and overtime double the present rate.
- 4) Uniform scale of wages for seafarers of all countries on equal ships and equal lines.
- 5) Uniform number of personnel in crews.
- 6) Vacation with pay after six months service, two weeks for deckhands, one month by firemen.
- 7) Full wages and passage home for workers discharged or left in foreign ports.
- 8) Right to leave ship at will in any port, without punishment or loss of pay.
- 9) Dining rooms for crews with all comforts.
- 10) Tub and shower baths for crews.
- 11) Establishment of the cabin system for crews, with all sanitary conditions.
- 12) Unions to be consulted when new ships are planned, to assure good conditions for the workers.
- 13) The recognition of ship committees, composed of representatives from all departments of the same ship.

The reformists of Amsterdam, not being interested in uniting the workers of Europe, let alone those of colonial lands, ignored the conference.

Whatever may be the intentions of the enemies of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie and its labour lackeys, Latin American workers have begun the process of unity around the programme of the Profintern with the Montevideo Conference of marine workers. Again it is proven that only "Moscow" is interested in the unity of the workers and their struggle for emancipation.

THE WHITE TERROR

The Protest Movement for Sacco and Vanzetti must be Increased.

The new evidence brought by the defenders of Sacco and Vanzetti proving the complete innocence of the two revolutionary fighters:

- 1) that a certain Celestino Madeiros has confessed to the murder with which Sacco and Vanzetti are charged, and
- 2) that the chief witness, Goldrige, brought forward by the Court an ex-convict who had been condemned on charges of stealing, swindling and bigamy — has confessed that judge Thayer induced him to give false evidence by promising him his liberty in return,

will demonstrate to the whole world the monstrous and unexampled character of this political trial. Never before have the judges of a bourgeois State so shamelessly exposed their role as blind executioners of the commands of their bourgeoisie and their complete corruption, as the "free" judges of "democratic" Massachusetts.

This does not mean that Sacco and Vanzetti can now be regarded as rescued. On the contrary! The judicial authorities of America and the men standing behind them will, after this general exposure, endeavour all the more strenuously to save their "reputation" and to get rid of Sacco and Vanzetti.

The American workers have realised this and are extending and increasing their protest movement. On receipt of the news that the defence, on the basis of fresh evidence, had made application to the appeal court for a revision of the trial and that the carrying out of the death sentence had been postponed, there took place in New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Boston and in other towns, and also in the mining districts, further mass demonstrations in which the workers demanded the immediate release of Sacco and Vanzetti. Several speakers bitterly attacked the reformist labour leaders who are sabotaging the protest campaign.

The Communist Party of Mexico issued an appeal protesting in the name of the workers of Mexico against the contemplated "legal" murder of Sacco and Vanzetti and demanding a new trial.

The International Labour Defence are receiving numerous resolutions from meetings of members of labour organisations

condemning in the sharpest manner the decision of the class court and promising the fullest support.

The Workers Party of America and the International Labour Defence are endeavouring, by the formation of a "Sacco-Vanzetti Defence Committee", to co-ordinate the protest movement in the whole of America and to attract all labour organisations into it. The Communist and other Left wing labour papers are supporting the movement by an energetic daily press campaign.

In Italy, where the communist, socialist and anarchist organisations are working hand in hand, the protest movement is likewise growing. Further protest telegrams have been sent to the American Ambassador in Rome from the staffs of factories in Milan, Novara and Monza.

It is the task of the working class in all countries, by increasing the protest movement, to exercise the necessary pressure on the American judicial authorities, so that they will not be able to reject the new application for revision.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

One of the Most Important Achievements of the Russian Revolution.

By E. Deutschmann (Moscow).

The statistics of the population of the Soviet Union may be regarded as one of the most important evidences of how the working masses who have come into power, are beginning to save themselves and their children from being killed by social conditions.

Let us begin with the general mortality of the population of the Soviet Union in 1923, the first year of which we have comparatively complete statistical data and in which we succeeded to some extent in overcoming the consequences of war and famine.

According to the records of 49 governmental districts, 7 autonomous provinces and 4 autonomous republics of the R. S. F. S. R. with a population of 77,272,000 and of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic with a population of 26,279,000, the mortality in 1923 was 21.6 per thousand. In contrast to this the mortality in European Russia in the last year before the war was 27.4 per thousand. Let it be noted that in the pre-war statistics the Western border districts, which separated themselves from Russia after the revolution and had a comparatively low mortality, were included and the statistics of Siberia and the Far-Eastern districts with a mortality above the average were excluded, whilst in our statistics exactly the opposite is the case. If we compare the mortality in the years 1913 and 1923 with regard to the same areas, the respective figures amount to 28.3 and 21 per thousand. Thus the mortality has fallen by 7.3 per thousand in comparison with 1913, which means nothing more nor less than that in one year 975,000 more persons are kept alive in the Soviet Union.

In order to represent the results achieved in a more telling way, we will compare the decrease of mortality during the period 1913—1923 with that in other countries. Assuming the mortality in 1913 in the country in question to be equal to 100, the mortality in comparison in 1923 equals:

1. R. S. F. S. R. and Ukrainian S. S. R.	74.2
2. Ireland	80.1
3. Holland	80.5
4. Hungary	81.7
5. Austria	84.5
6. Finland	85.1
7. England	85.5
8. Roumania	86.2
9. Norway	86.3
10. Italy	88.3
11. Belgium	88.4
12. Denmark	90.4

13. Australia	92.5
14. Germany	93.9
15. New Zealand	94.7
16. Spain	96.0
17. France	96.4

This table shows that we take the first place in the relative decrease of mortality. This never occurred in the whole of the pre-revolutionary history of Russia.

We can now show those who dread the sacrifices of a civil war and terrify the masses of workers with them, that in the very first year after the stabilisation of the Soviet Power, we almost completely replaced the losses suffered by the Red Army in the civil war. (The number of the soldiers who fell or died of illness during the civil war, amounts altogether to 1,212,824.) The old Russia committed bloodless social murder of a million human beings every year. The proletarian revolution alone could bring about a revolution even in mortality.

These figures can be supplemented by the following data:

The increase of population in 1913 amounted to 15.7 per thousand; in 1923 we had an increase of population of 19.1 per thousand. This brought us into the first rank in international population statistics (Czechoslovakia 12.2, United States 9.9, England 8.1, France 2.4 per thousand etc.).

The decrease in infant mortality deserves special attention. In this respect, conditions in the period 1910—14 were not only the worst in the whole of Europe, but the figures of infant mortality, which, in European Russia, amounted to 25.6%, exceeded by fully 30% the countries which ranked lowest in the statistics (Roumania and Hungary each with 19.8%). In contrast to this, the mortality of infants, i. e. of children under a year, amounted in 1924 to only 19.4%, so that the Soviet Union has already out-distanced the two countries which were so far ahead of it in the pre-war period.

Whilst the general infant mortality, between 1867 and 1914, i. e. in half a century, decreased from 27.1% to 25.6%, i. e. by only 1.5%, the infant mortality in the Soviet Union during quite a short period decreased to 6.2 deaths to 100 births, i. e. by more than 29%. This means that more than 300,000 children are kept alive every year.

The above quoted figures justify us in concluding that the revolution has put an end to the "historical traditions" of old Russia, according to which the general and the infant mortality were always the highest in Europe. On the most important front, on the front against death, the revolution is beginning to show its advantages in a striking manner. In the first year of its firm establishment, it has already saved a million human lives.

What were the factors which had such an influence on the state of the population of the Soviet Union? They were:

1. A better distribution of the national income, even though it has not yet reached the pre-war level in absolute figures. This led: a) to an improvement of the situation of the masses of peasants at the cost of the expropriation of landowners, and b) to an improvement of the situation of the working masses (8 hours day, social insurance on a large scale etc.).

2. The obvious cultural development of the workers and peasants.

3. The reorganisation of public health work with extensive development of preventive measures (maternity and child welfare, instruction in hygiene, more healthy working and living conditions), and the attraction of the broad working masses themselves into the work of safeguarding health. (In the Moscow governmental district alone there are 11,000 active health nuclei.)

These are, of course, only the first results. We must by no means rest on our laurels. We still have an enormous task before us if we wish not only to overcome the murderous health traditions of Tsarist Russia, but also to catch up to the countries which stand highest in the cultivation of health, not only relatively but absolutely. These first, comparatively very significant results, are a guarantee that the correct and successful development of the Soviet system and of socialist construction will lead us to victory in this domain.