

V. b. b.

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 50

1st July 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

All Forces to the Support of the British Miners!

The Miners Struggle in England.

All-Russian Council of Trade Unions Calls for Convocation of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The Miners of the Soviet Union for the Convocation of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The Relief Action in the Soviet Union for the British Miners.
The International Conference of the Revolutionary Miners in Essen.

G. Zinoviev: The General Council's "4th of August".

J. Stalin: The General Strike in Great Britain.

Solidarity with the British Fighters.

N. Lentsner: The British Strike and the Workers in the U. S. S. R.

How the Toilers of the U. S. S. R. Sprang to the Aid of the British Strikers.

Politics.

Paul Marion: The Cabinet of Briand-Caillaux.

P. R. Dietrich: The Political Situation in Germany after the Referendum.

L. Ungar: A "Friendly Approach" between Hungary and Roumania by Order of England.

In the International.

The Party Conference of the C. P. of France.

The White Terror.

Only the World Proletariat can Rescue Sacco and Vanzetti!

Eight Finnish Revolutionaries Rescued from Prison.

To the Victims of Bourgeois Class Justice in all Countries!

Book Reviews.

Erich Gentsch: John W. Brown: "The Migration Problem and the Working Class".

W. Ensee: "The Nine Days".

All Forces to the Support of the British Miners!

Appeal of the E. C. C. I.

The E. C. C. I. has sent the following appeal to the workers of England and of all countries:

Some new circumstances convince the Communist International that the miners' strike is in the greatest danger. The leaders of the miners have entered into an agreement with the General Council to postpone the Conference of Trade Union Executives convened for the 25th of June. Not only that, the miners' leaders have agreed to cease criticising the actions of the General Council who betrayed the general strike. This fact is of the greatest importance. The miners' leaders, in entering into this agreement, have exposed the miners' strike to exceedingly great dangers. The General Council have postponed the calling of the Conference of the Executives in order not to be compelled to answer publicly for their treacherous behaviour on the occasion of the general strike, and in order to gain time so as to strengthen to some extent their authority which has been considerably shaken among the working class. The miners' leaders are now, either consciously or mistakenly, helping the General Council to gain time in order that the latter can better deceive

the workers, and that everything shall continue to remain as it was before with regard to the leaders of English trade unionism. The agreement of the General Council with the miners' leaders, which is ostensibly for the purpose of supporting the strike of the miners, cannot be characterised as anything else than a new attempt at deception. This deception is, among other things, exposed by the fact that, simultaneously with the announcement of this agreement, press reports appeared, emanating from the leaders of the transport workers and railway workers, according to which, as regards affording real aid to the miners, these trade unions are bound by the treaties concluded with the employers after the general strike.

The declarations of Herbert Smith have recently borne an ambiguous character. The recent declarations of Cook, in which he characterises the Conference of the miners' leaders with the General Council as "a meeting of the very greatest importance", are also incorrect. Such declarations cannot produce anything else than dangerous illusions. We are faced with a direct sabotage of the miners' strike by a section of the present leaders

of the General Council, and the connivance of this sabotage by the other section. In the last few days the members of the General Council, upon whom rests the blame for the betrayal of the General strike, have been making half-hearted declarations against the Right wing of the Conservatives who are striving to bring about a breaking off of relations with the Soviet Union. The empty officious phrases of Citrine are of no more worth than the diplomatic speeches of MacDonald in Parliament. There exists not the least doubt that the masses of English workers are indignant at the provocation of the Conservatives against the Soviet Union, and that their protests will increase. The campaign against Birkenhead, Churchill and Co. who are striving for a breaking off of relations with the Soviet Union, must not be led as it is being "led" by the leaders of the General Council. They are converting this campaign into a manoeuvre to disguise the capitulation of the miners strike which they are preparing. This question must be put openly, directly, honestly, in a proletarian manner and not in the way MacDonald and Citrine are putting it. Cook recently declared that the postponement of the Conference of the Executives is owing to the efforts to form a united front of the English trade union movement to repel the attack on the Soviet Union. The leaders of the General Council have apparently succeeded in convincing some of the miners' leaders of their readiness to initiate a real fight against the Conservatives and for the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, this is only a political masquerade. The Right leaders who play the leading role in the General Council, are consciously striving to sidetrack the whole affair, and are seeking for a silk thread in order to strangle the miners' strike. They obviously regard the alleged campaign on behalf of the Soviet Union as such a silk thread. The so-called Left leaders on the General Council are still allowing themselves to be dragged at the heels of these conscious strike-betrayers.

Whoever really wishes to fight seriously against the Birkenheads and against the Churchills must before all give active support to the striking miners. Otherwise, all the talk of a fight against the Conservatives is mere deceit and hypocrisy. It is quite possible that between the Conservatives on the one hand and Thomas and MacDonald on the other hand, there will again be arranged a simple division of labour; it is quite possible that everything is being conducted according to a definite plan approved by Baldwin. Churchill and Birkenhead conduct a campaign against the Soviet Union, Thomas, MacDonald and Citrine come forward ostensibly to protect the Soviet Union; the miners are called upon to join in the united front, and in such manner the question of effective support for the miners will be happily buried. As a result of the agreement of the miners' leaders with the betrayers and capitulators in the General Council, the intentions of the General Council leaders, who are consciously preparing a united front of the leaders against the interests of the workers, are being realised.

The course and the result of the General Strike show that the united front of the present leaders of the English trade union movement only means that the workers are betrayed to the bourgeoisie. The united front of the traitors, of the capitulators and of the vacillating leaders must be opposed by the genuine, proletarian front of the working masses.

The miners' strike is in danger! The chief slogan is: Do not permit the miners' strike to be sabotaged. The miners' strike is not a "normal, usual", economic strike. Its specific peculiarity consists in the fact that, in May 1926, the miners drew four million other workers with them into the fight. The fight of the miners has already led to a general strike which immediately threatened the English bourgeoisie. The economic importance of the coal dispute is at present enormously great. This strike is a trial of strength between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It is of tremendous political importance for the working class of the whole world.

Those who wish to help the miners' strike must not condone the crime of the leaders of the General Council, but must appeal to the broad working masses and prepare for an extension of the miners' strike by drawing fresh working class troops into immediate participation in the strike.

We say to the English workers: a fresh betrayal is being prepared. The miners' strike is in danger! Repudiate the hesitating leaders, organise a real genuine fight of the working masses against the Conservatives who are preparing to break off relations with the Soviet Union. We say to the workers of the whole world: Up to now your strike aid was insufficient.

The Comintern expressly demands from all sections, all forces, their whole energy for the active support of the miners. It is absolutely necessary to obtain regular, even if minimum contributions on behalf of the miners from all workers. The cessation of export of coal to England must be enforced at any price. The British miners must be surrounded by an atmosphere of universal, proletarian sympathy and support. Before all, however, the workers of England and of other countries must learn the real truth regarding the state of affairs in the British miners' strike.

Act, without losing a minute!

Let us organise real support for the great fight of the British miners!

The Executive Committee of the Communist International.

THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

All-Russian Council of Trade Unions Calls for Convocation of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Moscow, June 29th 1926.

The All-Russian Council of Trade Unions has today sent the following telegram to Walter Citrine, the Secretary of the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress:

"In connection with the General Council's decision we once more put the question of assisting the miners.

The Central Council of the Labour Unions of the U.S.S.R. proposes to convoke as soon as possible the Anglo-Russian Committee in order to help the British Miners. The bitter struggle of all the bourgeois forces makes the convocation particularly imperative. The representatives of the miners of the U.S.S.R. now in Berlin have requested some leaders of the British miners to consider together with the Russian miners the convocation of the Anglo-Russian Committee."

The Miners of the Soviet Union for the Convocation of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Moscow, 25th June 1926.

In an interview with press representatives Comrade Chatchaturianz, the secretary of the Miners Federation of the Soviet Union, made the following declaration:

The Central Committee of the Miners Union decided in the middle of June, in the interest of increasing the aid for the striking miners in England, to take the initiative, first, through the medium of the International Action and Propaganda Committees of the Miners, to convene the International Miners Conference at Essen, and secondly, to propose to the British Miners Federation the convocation of an Anglo-Soviet Miners Conference to discuss the best means for giving support to the striking miners.

The miners of the Soviet Union hope that the decision adopted in Essen will result in an energetic relief action. As the Berlin Conference has not yet been held owing to the non-arrival of the English delegates who have only just left England, the C.C. of the Miners Union of the Soviet Union decided to propose to the English miners Federation through its delegate, Comrade Schwarz, to approach the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress and the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union, jointly in the names of the miners of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union, with the request that the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee be immediately convened for the purpose of organising energetic strike relief for the British miners. The Berlin Conference will immediately discuss this proposal.

Comrade Chatschaturianz expressed the hope that this Conference will strengthen the connections between the miners of the Soviet Union and of Great Britain, whatever may be the immediate result of the struggle.

The latest news regarding an agreement between the Miners Federation and the General Council has caused great concern among the miners of the Soviet Union, as the General Council which has already betrayed the miners once, can only repeat the treachery which led to "Black Wednesday". This agreement, the news regarding which arrived at the same time as the report that the railway workers and transport workers will not do anything, is directed not against the bourgeoisie, but against the working class and can, therefore, only lead to the defeat of the miners. I am deeply convinced — said Comrade Chatschaturianz — that the brave fighting British miners will reject the attempts to arrive at an agreement behind their backs, and will carry out their will in spite of all hindrances. The miners of the Soviet Union are determined to give energetic aid. Between the miners of the two countries a united front has actually been set up, for it is clear that while the Miners International has only talked and afforded no real help, the miners of the Soviet Union, supported by the entire working class of the Soviet Republics, have already sent 4 million roubles to their English brothers. The results of the Berlin Conference are not yet known, but we are thoroughly convinced that it will warn our English brothers against every compromise with the betrayers and the capitulators in the General Council, and afford real help to the strikers.

The Relief Action in the Soviet Union for the British Miners.

Moscow, June 26, 1926.

Demonstrations and meetings against the attempts of the English government to prevent the relief action introduced for the miners are reported from numerous towns in the Soviet Union. In Baku there took place a monster demonstration of the workers in the naphtha wells organised by the Miners Union. The demonstration sent to the C. C. of the Miners Union of the Soviet Union the following telegram:

"Inform the Miners Federation of Great Britain that on the 25th June 50,000 naphtha workers from all districts of Baku demonstrated under the slogans:

We will double our aid for the English workers!

Hands off the Soviet trade unions!

We have vanquished our bourgeoisie and nationalised the mining industry of Baku, and desire the British miners to do the same. We are sending 67,000 roubles collected by the naphtha workers. The collections are being continued with the greatest enthusiasm. Long live proletarian solidarity!"

The International Conference of the Revolutionary Miners in Essen.

On the 16th and 17th of June there was held in Essen a Conference of the revolutionary miners. The Conference was participated in by representatives from eight countries; two representatives from the Miners' Union of the Soviet Union, two from the Unitarian Miners' Federation of France, two from the revolutionary miners of Germany, one from the miners' section of the International All Trade Union Federation of Czechoslovakia, one from the Federation of the Knights of Labour in Belgium, one from the Federative League of Miners of Holland, one from the Minority Movement of Great Britain and one from the revolutionary miners of Poland. In addition, representatives were present from the R. I. L. U. and the C. P. of Germany.

The main question with which the Conference dealt was that of increasing the aid which the revolutionary miners are giving to the striking miners in Great Britain. The reports of a member of the International Propaganda Committee and the representative of the revolutionary miners of Great Britain gave a picture of the firm and unshakeable determination of the British miners, who will not enter into any compromise and who are determined to fight to the end. Hodges, the secretary of the Miners' Inter-

national and Varley, member of the Executive Committee of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, do not enjoy any popularity and influence among the masses. The miners are threatened with two dangers: a collapse of the strike as a result of the import of strike breaking coal, and the insufficient help which is being given from abroad.

The representatives of the revolutionary miners of the various countries reported on the relief campaign which had been conducted by them. The efforts of the revolutionary miners to take advantage of the favourable situation which has arisen as a result of the cessation of output of British coal, by organising strikes for the purpose of supporting the English miners and improving their own economic position, are meeting the obstinate resistance of the reformists. The latter are concluding agreements with the coal owners who willingly grant the miners small bonuses in order that they shall not down tools during the British strike. As regards the prevention of the export of coal, the cynical representatives of the reformists in Germany and Poland declare that the export must be still further increased in order to promote their own mines and, in addition, to exert pressure on the British employers who will be more inclined to give way if they are threatened with the loss of markets. The reformists are, in fact, doing nothing to prevent the export of coal and to support the strike.

The Conference sharply condemned the inactivity and the treachery of the Miners' International and the leading organisations of the Miners. It called upon all miners to increase the relief campaign and to organise the industrial struggle in their own countries for the support of the British miners and for the improvement of their own position. The Conference called upon the organisations of the revolutionary miners to increase the collections and regularly every month to deduct a quarter of a day's wages for the support of the strikers. It appealed to the various organisations to help the British miners and not to permit the loading up for coal destined for Great Britain.

In order to increase the campaign and to prepare an international strike, the Conference decided to organise in the various countries a weak of international demonstrations to be participated in by foreign revolutionary miners.

The report given by a representative of the International Propaganda Committee on the work done by this Committee gave rise to a lively debate. The speakers called attention to desirable improvements in the work of the Propaganda Committee. The resolution which was adopted gives directions to the Propaganda Committee for further activity in the direction of strengthening the connection and propaganda, for a greater collectivity in the work and a greater participation of all sections in the work of the Propaganda Committee.

Thereupon followed the election of the new International Propaganda Committee.

The General Council's "4th of August".

By G. Zinoviev.

The more clearly we see the picture of the English strike and the part played in it by the General Council, the more clearly we realise that this was the General Council's "4th of August".

What was the significance of August 4th 1914 to the majority of the leaders of the 2nd International?

At the critical, decisive moment, when so much depended on the general staff of the Labour movement, the general staff of the 2nd International, almost in its totality, went over to the camp of the enemy, to the camp of the bourgeoisie. The alliance of the leaders of the working class with the bourgeoisie against the main mass of the working class, — that was what the 4th of August meant. The great crisis which had arisen dissipated all illusions, phrases, idle talk, show, everything superficial and revealed facts as they are; the leaders of the 2nd International proved to be agents of the bourgeoisie within the Labour movement. Secret things were brought to light. When the imperialist war broke out, the leaders of the Social Democratic parties and the Reformist trade unions revealed themselves as public purveyors of workers as cannon fodder to both groups of imperialists. It is just at such moments that the leaders of the masses of workers ought to have done their duty by them. But they "did their duty" by the imperialists and the Kings, their real masters.

Have the Reformist leaders changed since then? How would they behave if a fresh imperialist war were to break out? Would they now do their duty towards the workers?

Of course not!

We have had some experiences, and they were not without importance: the attitude of the Social Democratic leaders to the Russian October revolution, the part played by such shining lights of Social Democracy as Scheidemann, Ebert and Noske in the all-decisive days of the revolution in Germany (end of 1918, beginning of 1919), the treacherous behaviour of the Social Democratic leaders during the occupation of the Ruhr, the attitude of the Social Democratic leaders to the events in China, to the wars in Syria and Morocco etc.

The newest and most important example is the behaviour of the English General Council in the days of the great general strike in May 1926. This was not a foreign war. It was "only" a war within the country, class against class. The working class had every prospect of victory, the objective situation was entirely in their favour. The army of the workers flung themselves into the fight. But the staff! It waited a few days, chose the most opportune moment (for the bourgeoisie) and . . . despicably betrayed the cause.

If a new imperialist war were to break out to-morrow (or let us say a war on the part of England against the Soviet Union), the present General Council under Thomas would undoubtedly fly to the bourgeoisie and serve the capitalists of their "own" country with loyalty and devotion. If they played their "own" working class false in a fight such as that in May 1926, they would be all the more likely to play the workers of the Soviet Union and of other countries false, all the more likely to betray the English workers in the complicated situation of the beginning of a new imperialist war.

The treachery of the General Council in May 1926 can (and should) only be compared with the treachery of August 4th 1914. It was all the more infamous firstly because it was not the first but the second time that it was guilty of betrayal, and secondly because it was done in "peaceful" circumstances, when the guns were not yet firing, when there was nothing of the chauvinist frenzy which always accompanies the beginning of a war with a "foreign" power.

Let us examine more closely into the part played by the General Council in the days of May 1926.

* * *

The first aim of the Conservative Government was to challenge the miners alone, to isolate them and to vanquish them completely. The second task which the Conservative Government set itself was, as far as possible, to hit the trade union movement and the growing revolutionary spirit with which it was pervaded, with the object of bringing confusion into the movement which was becoming more radical, of disintegrating it, provoking some, encouraging others with words; in short, to demoralise the rising Labour movement.

Both these aims were more or less common to the Government and to the bourgeois leaders of the Labour movement. Thomas, Clynes, MacDonald, Henderson & Co. There can now no longer be any doubt that this group of leaders was, from beginning to end, in the hands of the Government, was a partner in its game, some simply as venal agents of the bourgeoisie, the others because of a certain political trend which pursued its own aims.

"The General Council", writes Brailsford, the English Reformist "did not want the general strike. The absence of any preparations proves this. It hoped and even believed to the last minute that the Government would ultimately come to terms... The General Council glided automatically into the strike."

"Up to the very last moment, none of the leaders actually believed in the possibility of a strike. Thomas and his comrades believed that it would somehow or other be possible to come to an understanding with the Government", writes the "Manchester Guardian".

The movement of the masses grew beyond the strength of the leaders.

The fighting spirit of the masses of English workers was underestimated both by the Government and by the trade union leaders mentioned. They were playing with fire. Forces came into play which could no longer be restrained by them.

The general strike began and demonstrated the enormous, incalculable forces of the English working class. Thomas, Mac Donald, Clynes, Henderson & Co. placed themselves at its head, apparently to the satisfaction of Baldwin. To place oneself at the head in order to behead, is a "method" which has already been tested out more than once.

From the first moment it was evident that the chief danger to the strike lay in the leaders of the General Council — Right as well as Left. The first word of the Comintern was: "The leaders of the General Council are the chief danger."

The organisation shown by the masses was marvellous. In the course of the first week the strike developed continuously on an ascending line. The masses started committees of action which actually developed into something resembling district soviets of deputies of workers. Under the influence of the masses, the trade unions began to assume responsibilities, such as the control of the "free" bourgeois Press, the formation of a sub-commission for electricity whose task it was to distribute electric power throughout the country, the appointment of commissariats etc.

These were highly important beginnings of something new. These were already elements of a certain dual power, promising phenomena of revolutionary constructive work of the masses. The workers began to fraternise with the troops. The workers began to drag the genteel bourgeois out of their motor cars. The workers began to put out of gear the strike-breaking motor-buses which made their appearance in the London streets. The attitude of the working class was such that there seemed every reason to hope that events would develop entirely in favour of the proletariat.

The proletarian army however had no staff, or rather it had a staff which harboured treachery in its very heart. Although the victory of an army need not be exclusively due to its staff, it is at any rate difficult for it to be victorious in opposition to its staff, and in the case in question it could only have carried off victory by opposing its own staff.

The staff, i.e. the General Council, had waited for the "opportune" moment (opportune for the bourgeoisie) and capitulated in the most infamous manner, thus carrying confusion in the ranks of the army from which, at that stage, it was unable to recover.

MacDonald could "testify as a witness", that in the course "of all the negotiations and discussions during the meetings of the General Council not a single reference was made by anyone to political questions, regardless of whether this member or that of the General Council belonged to what is known as the Right or the Left wing...")

The "Left" thoroughly deserve this fawning of Mac Donald's.

The "Labour" correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" writes:

"From the very beginning, the General Council made every effort to persuade the workers to accept a temporary reduction of the wages of the best-paid workers... After the strike had begun, the General Council lost no time in bringing the conflict to an end as soon as possible... It accepted the suggestion of the Archbishop and carried on assiduous negotiations with Samuel..."

The General Council felt that a further spread of the strike would have had extremely serious consequences... Revolutionary forces would have been let loose even contrary to the wish of the General Council, the centre would have been proved to be cut off from the masses, and every local strike committee would have become a Soviet... The General Council proved to be the exact opposite of a revolutionary committee. It consisted of weary trade union officials who lived in the unhealthy atmosphere of stuffy rooms, tortured by sleeplessness and in constant conflict with the miners (!), with the members of the Cabinet, with delegations of strikers; the General Council consisted of persons who were constantly obsessed by a fear of disturbances (!)... The General Council resolved to act quickly. It was evidently prepared to bring the situation, which had arisen, to an end, at any price (!) "Manchester Guardian" of May 16th 1926.)

*) Retranslated from the Russian.

The Reformist Brailsford testifies:

"On Sunday May 2nd, the friction between the General Council and the miners almost led to a breach... From what I heard on that evening, I had the impression that we were on the eve of a new breach and a new "Black Friday" ("New Leader" of May 21st, 1926).

The Reformist Wheatley states:

"The General Council gave Baldwin more than he demanded." ("Forward" of May 22nd, 1926.)

From his point of view as a social traitor, MacDonald was quite right when he wrote that the strike was in the hands of "firm leaders". ("Forward" of May 22nd, 1926.)

* * *

After the General Council had been beaten, the leaders of the 2nd International began to shift the blame on to the workers, as might have been expected, just as, after August 4th 1914, the leaders of the 2nd International tried to justify their own vile social patriotic treachery by pointing to what they described as the "patriotic" mood of the mass of workers. In this respect an article by Otto Bauer, the "Left" leader of the 2nd International, is extremely instructive, in that he "proves", without the slightest foundation of fact, that the general strike in England came to grief in consequence of the wholesale blacklegging of the workers. Otto Bauer goes so far as to maintain as follows:

"The experience of 1921 was decisive. At that time the miners also demanded a general strike; the leaders of the railwaymen and transport workers however refused it. After that they were for years contemptuously called "traitors". It is not everyone who can bear such insults. This time they were afraid of being again represented as traitors. For this reason they voted, obviously against their conviction, for the proclamation of a general strike." (Vienna "Arbeiter Zeitung" of May 16th 1926.)

Is it possible to imagine a meaner sophism? So the heroes of "Black Friday" 1921 were unjustly described as traitors! And now, poor Thomas & Co., in order to avoid new insulting accusations of treachery, voted "against their conviction" for the proclamation of a general strike, whilst the "backward" masses of workers were guilty of blacklegging, thus shattering the general strike. But there still remains to be explained for what purpose Thomas & Co. organised the capitulation of the General Council on May 12th 1926. Was this treachery also committed only that they might not be called traitors?

The only thing that is true in all this is that the leaders of the General Council "voted for the proclamation of the general strike against their conviction". This recognition must be registered as a fact by which the further behaviour of these leaders can best be explained.

Large numbers of the English workers have only developed far enough to understand solidarity among workers in one trade, but not to understand class solidarity — this is the gist of Otto Bauer's remarks. The workers are still far behind Mr Thomas, the "defender of class interests" (perhaps the interests of the bourgeoisie?). This is how Otto Bauer who became the "Left" theorist of the 2nd International sums up the position. It never occurs to Otto Bauer that if some strata of the English workers are still up to the neck in craft prejudices, the duty of real Labour leaders should be to train them up to an understanding of class duties. Otto Bauer is not in the least aware that, during the strike, the leaders of the General Council did exactly the opposite.

Even the Reformist Brailsford is obliged to admit:

"For nine days the masses of workers gave evidence of a solidarity such as has never been seen before in the industrial history of our country. From beginning to end it was a soldiers battle. But no single leader was equal to the task of giving expression to the unanimous will of the masses of workers... The most remarkable fact of this general strike was the unbounded devotion to the common cause... The masses of workers flocked up in such numbers that the difficulty was, not how to mobilise the workers who came into consideration for the strike, but how to hold back from striking those workers whom the General had not called out."

All voices of the Press are unanimous in stating that there was no slackening in the strike, but that on the contrary an excellent spirit prevailed among the masses and that the "second line" of workers was clamouring to be allowed to enter the struggle.

Otto Bauer's words are flatly contrary to the truth.

This is how the leaders of the 2nd International twist the facts. After that it is easy to imagine what an ocean of lies the traitors of the General Council have set in motion in order to drown the truth.

* * *

At the decisive moment, Thomas & Co. were masters of the situation in the General Council. Like every great crisis, the British general strike has dissipated a number of illusions and revealed the true relation of forces. The General Council proved to be under the thumb of Thomas, although officially the Right was in the minority in it.

A number of reliable reports speak for the fact that almost all the members of the General Council voluntarily submitted to the leadership of Judas Thomas from the very beginning of the general strike. Many equally reliable communications point to the fact that a "Left Winger" such as Purcell, looked at the general strike, even before it began, through Thomas' eyes. When it was a question of accepting the help of the international trade unions, especially the help of the trade unions of the Soviet Union, Hicks, a member of the "Left", took up an equally treacherous standpoint as that of Judas Thomas (Hicks' speech on the "Damned Russian money"). The fate of the strike was actually sealed at the moment when the General Council refused the help of the international trade unions.

All the "Left" members of the General Council, together with Thomas & Co. exercised continuous pressure on the miners and demanded that they should capitulate. All the "Left" leaders of the General Council with one doubtful exception, voted for the capitulation and took part in the shameful pilgrimage to Baldwin in order to offer him the head of the general strike on a charger.

Some directly sold themselves to the bourgeoisie, others clung to the bourgeoisie out of Reformist short-sightedness and lack of character, others again were in a blue funk, which increased with the growth of the movement, whilst still another group vacillated to the last moment. Objectively the so-called "Left" members of the General Council played a much more treacherous part than Thomas himself, for, in view of Thomas' sadly treacherous past, the masses would not have entrusted so much actual power to Thomas, had he not been backed by all the other members of the General Council.

The general strike had no clear aim, no clear programme. Whereas in reality it had, and had of necessity, a political character from the very beginning, the General Council persisted in asseverating at every street corner that the strike was only an economic one, that it was not directed against the Constitution and so on. In the meantime the Government assiduously organised its strike-breakers. The General Council called upon the striking masses to spend its leisure time in games, dancing and sport. The General Council, in which the masses had at first placed unbounded confidence, and to whom it had with enthusiasm entrusted the fate of this great movement, was capable of vacillating, even in view of the Government's threat to declare the strike illegal, a threat which was coupled with the "promise" to confiscate the personal property of the official trade union leaders.

The Magdeburg trial recently proved with absolute certainty that in 1918, when the great strike began in Germany, the leaders of the Social Democrats, Ebert, Scheidemann and Noske, deliberately joined in the organisation of the strike in order to wreck the strike of the workers. They openly admitted before the Court that, whilst they were members of the strike committees of the workers, they were at the same time in touch with the staffs of Hindenburg and the Crown Prince. Something of the same sort has now been done by the Right leaders of the General Council. Just as in 1913 the independent Social Democrats Haase, Dittmann & Co. in the Government of "People's Commissaries" acted in the same way as Ebert and Scheidemann, so Purcell and Pugh have now acted in the same way as Thomas and Macdonald.

* * *

The 12th of May 1926 (the day of the capitulation of the General Council), is for the General Council what the 4th of August 1914 was for the majority of the leaders of the 2nd International. The behaviour of the leaders of the General Council after the capitulation completely confirms this. The majority of the leaders of the General Council not only took up a neutral standpoint (a la Pontius Pilate) towards the continuation of the miners' strike, but even directly opposed the miners.

Hicks, the leader of the "Left", stated in a public speech that it was "disloyal" of the miners to fight for the maintenance of their wages, whilst in other trade unions there were categories of workers who are worse paid than the miners. What is that but the language of a strike-breaker?

The upper stratum of the Executive of the Railwaymen's Union refuses even to answer the miners' request for help and declares that it has no reason to discuss anything with the miners. That is quite in Baldwin's style who also refuses to negotiate with the miners before they have capitulated. Cramp, the "leader" of the railwaymen, now calls the general strike a "soap-bubble".

At the National Conference of the Shoemakers' Union in Blackpool, Joseph Simon and Smith have already made actually Fascist speeches against the "Reds":

"The Reds have the habit of agitating for the proclamation of the general strike, and when the strike is proclaimed, they act as strike-breakers and take possession of the most advantageous functions",

declared Smith. Is not that the language of a Fascist?

Swales of the "Left", the only one of the members of the General Council, who put up a weak "opposition" to the capitulation, is now finding no better occupation than trying, in common with Hicks and Ben Tillet to gloss over the attitude of the General Council and to represent the majority of the members of the General Council as having been led astray by Baldwin and Samuel. With regard to the causes of the defeat of the strike, this same Swales declares:

"The chief cause of the defeat of the strike is to be laid at the door of the miners. Baldwin felt himself justified in not carrying through the Samuel' memorandum since the miners had also declined to accept it and to submit to the General Council. The disorganised behaviour of the miners...." etc.

If Swales is not a deceiver but "only" deceived, he is in reality more dangerous than any deceiver.

Frank Varley, a member of the Executive of the Miners' Federation (to say nothing of Hodges), openly suggests a project of reducing wages and of compulsory arbitration for the miners.

Finally, Purcell of the "Left" publishes, in the Danish "Social Democrat" an interview in which he states:

"The great strike was called off as soon as it had accomplished its task, that of ensuring negotiations in the coal industry on the condition that the mineowners, who had dictated terms to the workers implying the cutting down of wages, should withdraw their demands. It is only in this field that the great strike had aimed at obtaining results."

This is a treacherous declaration.

* * *

It is now a perfectly established fact that, if during the last year or two the General Council has professed in words to be "Left", it was only a reflection of the trend to the Left of the masses. The masses are liberating themselves from traditional trade unionism which is saturated with conservative ideology. The masses demand above all an approach to the working class of the Soviet Union. The fighting spirit of the masses is growing. The "Left" leaders adapted themselves to this attitude of mind of the masses so as not to lose their influence. They have now dropped their "Left" mask. This is what should be explained above all to the broad masses of the English workers. The broad stratum of the "leaders" of the English trade union movement, from the local and district officials of trade unionism to the upper stratum of the General Council represent a uniform reactionary caste. It is sufficient to remind

ourselves that even the cause of the fusion of the small trade unions, of overcoming craft unionism, of amalgamating the trade unions and reorganising them into industrial federations is everywhere obstructed by the egotistical interests of the trade union officials, who openly sabotage this work. The matter went so far that it became necessary to guarantee the trade union officials their salaries for ten years so as to stop them hindering the fusion of the small trade unions into large ones.

In these circumstances the English trade union movement cannot make a serious step forward, if the proletarian vanguard does not unmask the treacherous part played by the bourgeois and petty bourgeois trade union leaders, the climax of which was the treacherous behaviour of the General Council in the recent general strike.

The bankruptcy of the General Council means a new bankruptcy of Reformism both of the Right and of the "Left" wing.

The Communists must of course understand how to make a distinction between the Right and the "Left" Reformists. In the present period the situation in England is such that the so-called "Left" are causing a particularly great amount of harm. Just as in 1914/1918, the so-called "Kautskyans" were the arch-enemy, so at present the "Centre party", who call themselves "Left", are the chief obstacle in the way of the further development of revolution in the English Labour movement.

The fight against Reformist illusions will now become the chief task in England. The strike has prepared the soil for this fight. It is not out of the question that the Labour party, even in its present form, will again have great success at the elections; this however will soon result in the Labour party turning against the predominance of the Right. The by-elections since the strike have shown this. The task to be performed is to show up to the masses of workers just the "Left" Reformists, who in reality side with Thomas.

In the summer of 1920 a delegation of English workers visited Soviet Russia for the first time. At that time, Soviet Russia was particularly in need of support from the English trade unions. Nevertheless Lenin in an open letter to the English workers (of May 3rd 1920), says straight out:

"I am not surprised that a number of members of your delegation do not take the standpoint of the working class but that of the bourgeoisie, the class of the exploiters, for the imperialist war has revealed a festering sore in all capitalist countries, i. e. that the parliamentary and trade union leaders of the workers are going over to the side of the bourgeoisie..."

* * *

Rosa Luxemburg, after the 4th of August 1914, called German Social Democracy a "stinking corpse". Lenin entirely agreed with this description.

Since the 12th of May 1926, the General Council in its present composition, is also a stinking corpse.

This does not mean that it no longer represents a force. The stinking corpse of German Social Democracy has continued to poison the atmosphere for more than 10 years since the 4th of August. This may also, for a few years, be the case with the General Council. As leader of the fighting masses of the workers, the General Council is anyhow a corpse. The English workers will understand how to clear it out of the way and to elect their own leaders into the General Council; they will understand how to build up the General Council out of real, fighting Labour leaders.

Let us avoid any misunderstanding. After August 4th 1914, Lenin issued the slogan of a direct split in the Social Democratic parties and the creation of independent Communist parties, of a split in the 2nd International and the formation of the Third International.

Are we now to issue the slogan of a split in the English trade unions, of secession from the unions? Of course not! In no circumstances! Where we do this, it would mean forgetting the difference between party and trade union, it would mean forgetting everything that Lenin taught us as to the necessity of work in the reactionary trade unions.

Let us multiply our efforts to win over the trade unions from within and at the same time proclaim the whole truth regarding the General Council's "4th of August"! They do not contradict each other; on the contrary, they support each other.

The General Strike in Great Britain.

By J. Stalin.

The Causes of the Strike in England.

The first question is, what were the causes of the strike in England, and how could it happen that England, this land of capitalist power and unexampled compromise, should within recent times have become the scene of great social conflicts. How has it happened that, "great England", the mistress of the seas has become transformed into a country of "Bolshevistic General Strike"?

Firstly: England formerly occupied a monopolist position in the circle of capitalist States. As ruler over a whole number of large colonies, as the possessor of a model industry, England was in a position to play the role of "workshop of the world" and to rake in enormous super-profits. That was the period of "peace and prosperity" for England. Capital pocketed surplus profits. The crumbs of this surplus profit fell to the upper section of the English Labour Movement. The leaders of the English Labour Movement were gradually rendered docile by Capital, and the conflicts between Labour and Capital were usually settled by compromises.

The further development of international Capitalism, particularly the development of Germany, America and partly also Japan, who made their appearance on the world market as competitors against England, undermined the former monopolist position of England. The war and the post-war crises delivered a further decisive blow to the monopolist position of England. The surplus profits became smaller, the crumbs falling to the labour leaders began to disappear. The voices in England demanding the lowering of the standard of living of the working class became more and more insistent. The period of "peace and prosperity" gave place to a period of conflicts, lock-outs and strikes. The English workers began to turn to the Left and resorted more and more to the Bolshevik method of direct struggle against Capital.

It is easy to realise that, under such conditions, the brutal threat of the mineowners to lock out the miners could not remain unanswered.

Secondly: The second fact consists in the restoration of the international market connections, which resulted in the intensification of the struggle of the capitalist groups for the market. It is characteristic of the post-war crisis that it destroyed almost all the connections of the international market and replaced these by a chaos. At present, in view of the temporary stabilisation of Capital, this chaos has receded somewhat into the background, and the old connections of the international market are being gradually set up again. If a few years ago it was a question of restoring the factories and getting the workers to work for Capital, the question now is that of securing raw material and markets for the restoration of the factories. In this connection the struggle for the market has arisen again with fresh force, while the victory in this struggle will go to that group of capitalists and to that capitalist State whose goods are cheaper and whose technic is more advanced.

But new forces are appearing on the market: America, France, Japan, Germany and the Dominions and colonies of England, who have succeeded in developing their industry during the war and who are now taking part in the struggle for the market. After all, the easy extraction of profit from the foreign markets, as was practised by England, has of course now become impossible. The old colonial method of monopolistic plundering of the markets and the sources of raw material has had to give place to the new method of dominating the market by means of cheap goods. From this there arises the effort of English capital to restrict production, or, at least, not to extend it beyond certain limits. From this there arises the enormous army of unemployed in England which has become a permanent feature in the last few years. From this there arises the danger of becoming unemployed, which keeps the workers in a constant state of uneasiness and increases their fighting mood. Hence, the lightning-like effect which the threat of the lock-out had on the workers generally and on the miners in particular.

Thirdly: The third fact consists in the endeavours of English Capital to reduce the cost of production of English industrial products and to cheapen commodities at the expense of the British working-class. It is not a mere chance that the main blow in the

present case has been directed against the miners. English capital has attacked the miners not only because the mining industry is badly equipped from a technical standpoint and requires "rationalising", but before all because the miners have always fought in the foremost ranks of the English proletariat and are fighting there to-day. To check this advance-guard, to reduce their wages and to prolong the working day, in order afterwards to deal in the same manner with the other groups of the working class — that was the strategy of the English capitalists. This is the reason for that heroism with which the English miners are conducting their strike. This is the reason for that unexampled readiness to help which the English workers displayed in supporting the miners by the general strike.

Fourthly: The fourth fact is the rule of the Conservative Party in England, a party of the most bitter enemies of the working-class. Of course, any other bourgeois government would have adopted practically the same measures for the suppression of the working class as those employed by the Conservative government. But there is not the least doubt that only such sworn enemies of the working class as the Conservatives could have so easily and so cynically carried out such a monstrous provocation of the whole of the working class as did the Conservatives by their threats of lock-out. To-day it can be regarded as proved beyond doubt that the English Conservative Party not only wanted the lock-out and the strike, but that they had been making preparations for them for nearly a year. They postponed the attack on the miners in July last year, because they considered that the moment was not "suitable". But they used the whole of the intervening period in equipping themselves for the struggle, in piling up stores of coal, organising blacklegs and in working up public opinion in order to deliver the blow against the miners in April of this year. Only the Conservative Party could have acted in such a "statesmanlike" manner.

The Conservative Party slipped into power by means of forged documents and provocations. On the very day they came into power they made an attack upon Egypt, using ever means of provocation; they have already been conducting for a year a concealed war, with the tried and approved colonial methods of plundering and suppression, against the Chinese people. They are sparing no pains in order to render impossible the rapprochement between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the peoples of Great Britain, and are gradually preparing a possible intervention. To-day they are attacking the working-class of their own country, which attack, with an eagerness worthy of a better cause, they have been preparing for a whole year. The Conservative Party cannot live without a conflict even in England itself. After this, can one be surprised that the English workers are replying with blow for blow? These are the essential facts which rendered the strike in England unavoidable.

The Causes of the Defeat of the Strike in England.

The defeat of the strike in England was due to a whole number of causes, of which one must at least mention the following:

Firstly: The English capitalists and the Conservatives, as the course of the strike has shown, have, in general, proved themselves to be more experienced, better organised, more determined and, therefore, stronger than the English workers and their leaders in the shape of the General Council and the so-called Labour Party.

Secondly: The English capitalists and the Conservative Party went into this tremendous social conflict fully equipped and prepared, while the leaders of the English Labour Movement were completely surprised by the lock-out of the miners by the mineowners; they had done nothing, or next to nothing, in the way of preparatory work, and only a week before the conflict expressed the conviction that it would not come to a conflict.

Thirdly: The staff of the capitalists, the Conservative Party, conducted the fight in a determined and organised manner, delivered their blows at the decisive points of the fight, while the staff of the Labour Movement, the General Council and their "Political Commission", were inwardly demoralised and disintegrated, as the chief leaders of this staff proved themselves to be either direct betrayers of the miners and of the whole of the English working-class (Thomas, MacDonald, Henderson & Co.) or as characterless supporters of these betrayers who were afraid of the fight and still more afraid of the victory of the working-class (Purcell, Hicks etc.).

It may be asked, how could it happen that the powerful proletariat of England, which has conducted the fight with unparalleled heroism, was under the leadership of bribable, cowardly or simply characterless leaders? This is a question of great importance. Such leaders have not risen all of a sudden. They have grown up from below; they have passed through a certain process of education as labour leaders in England, through the school of that period when English Capital was drawing surplus profits, when it could be gracious to the labour leaders and make use of them in order to make compromises with the working class; while at the same time, these leaders, by approaching nearer to the bourgeoisie in their habits of life and in their position, estranged themselves from the working masses, turned their backs on them and ceased to understand them. These are the leaders who have been dazzled by the brilliance of capitalism, who have been awed by the power of capital and who dream of "becoming somebody" and of hob-nobbing with "people with money".

Fourthly: The staff of English Capitalism — the **Conservative Party** — realised that the tremendous strike of the English workers is a fact of enormous importance; that against such a strike it is only possible to conduct a serious struggle by resorting to political measures; that in order to suppress the strike the authority of the king as well as the authority of the House of Commons and of the Constitution must be invoked, that the strike cannot be ended without the mobilisation of the army and the proclamation of a State of Emergency. On the other hand, the general staff of the English Labour Movement — the **General Council** — did not or would not understand this simple fact, or were afraid to admit it, as they kept on insisting that the general strike was a purely industrial affair, that they had no intention of leading the struggle on to political lines and that they did not dream of attacking the General Staff of English capital, the Conservative Party, and that they did not wish to raise the question of power.

By this attitude the **General Council** condemned the strike to inevitable defeat. For, as history shows, a general strike, if it is not to be handed over to inevitable defeat, must be conducted on political lines.

Fifthly: The staff of the English capitalists perceived that the international aid for the English strike constituted a deadly danger to the bourgeoisie, while the **General Council** did not realise, or acted as if they did not realise, that the strike of the English workers could only be won with the aid of international proletarian solidarity. Hence, the refusal of the **General Council** to accept the financial help of the workers of the Soviet Union and of other States.

Such a powerful strike as the **General Strike** in England could only yield tangible results under two fundamental pre-conditions: if the strike had been conducted along political lines, and had been converted into an act of struggle of the proletarians of all the advanced capitalist countries against Capital. But the English **General Council** shrank from these two pre-requisites and thereby condemned the general strike to failure.

Sixthly: There exists no doubt that a not inconsiderable role was played by the more than ambiguous attitude of the **Second International** and of the **Amsterdam Trade Union International** in regard to supporting the English strikers. The platonic decisions of these organisations of the Social Democrats as regards giving support to the strike amounted to an actual refusal of any financial help, for one cannot otherwise explain the fact that the trade unions of Europe and America together did not contribute more than one eighth of the financial help which the trade unions of the **Soviet Union** found it possible to afford their English brothers, than as being due to the ambiguous attitude of the social democratic Internationals. I do not speak of help of another sort, of help in the shape of stopping the import of coal, in which respect the **Amsterdam Trade Union International** is actually acting as a strike breaker.

Seventhly: There is likewise no doubt that the weakness of the English **Communist Party** played a not unimportant role in the failure of the general strike. It must be said that the **Communist Party** of Great Britain is one of the best sections of the **Communist International**. It must be observed that its attitude during the whole period of the strike in England was perfectly correct. It must, however, also be admitted that its authority among the English workers is nevertheless still weak. And this circumstance must have played a fatal role in the course of the general strike.

The Lessons of the General Strike.

What are the lessons of the general strike in England, at least the most important of them? These lessons can be enumerated as follows:

Firstly: The crisis in the mining industry in England and the general strike arising from it, raise in the most acute form the question of socialising the means of production in the mining industry under workers' control. This is a question of achieving Socialism. It is hardly necessary to prove that there is not and cannot be any other way to the fundamental solution of the crisis in the mining industry than the way proposed by the **Communist Party of England**. The crisis in the mining industry and the general strike are bringing the English working class face to face with the question of the practical realisation of Socialism.

Secondly: The English working class had to learn from their own experience that the chief hindrance in the way to this aim is the political power of the capitalists: in the present case the Conservatives and their government. If the **General Council** were afraid, as of the plague, of admitting the immediate connection between the economic struggle and the political struggle, the English workers must now understand that, in their severe fight against organised capital, the question of power is now the main question, and that it is impossible to solve the crisis in the mining industry or the crisis in English industry as a whole, without solving the question of power.

Thirdly: The course and the outcome of the general strike must convince the working class of England that Parliament, the Constitution, the king and other attributes of bourgeois power are nothing else than a protective shield of the capitalist class set up against the proletariat. The strike has torn away the mantle of the fetish and the sacredness both of Parliament and of the Constitution. The workers are realising that the present constitution is a weapon of the bourgeoisie against the working class. The workers must realise that they, likewise, require their workers' constitution as a weapon against the bourgeoisie. I believe that the acceptance of this truth is one of the most important achievements of the English working class.

Fourthly: The course and the results of the strike must convince the working masses of England of the unfitness of the old leaders who have grown up in the old school of compromise policy. They must realise that the old leaders must be replaced by new, revolutionary leaders.

Fifthly: The English workers must now realise that the miners of England are an advanced division of the English working class, that the support of the miners' strike and the securing of their victory is, therefore, the concern of the entire working class of England.

Sixthly: The English workers, in the difficult moment of the general strike, when the platforms and the programme of the various parties were being tested by deeds, became convinced that the only party which can boldly and resolutely guard the interests of the working class right up to the last, is the **Communist Party**.

A Few Conclusions.

I now proceed to a few conclusions which are of practical importance.

The first question is the question of the stabilisation of capital. The strike in England has shown that the thesis of the **Communist International** regarding the passing and temporary character of the stabilisation is perfectly correct. The attack of English capital upon the English miners is an attempt to convert this passing, temporary stabilisation into a durable and permanent stabilisation. This attempt was not and could not be crowned with success. The English workers who replied to this attempt with a powerful strike, have shown the whole capitalist world that a permanent stabilisation of capital under the conditions of the of the post-war period is impossible, that experiments of such a nature as that carried out by the English capitalists bear within them the germs of the destruction of the foundations of Capitalism.

If, however, the assumption of the firmness of capitalist stabilisation is false, the opposite assumption that the stabilisation is past and done with, and that we are now in a period of great revolutionary upheavals is equally false. The stabilisation of Capitalism still continues; it is a passing, temporary stabilisation, but nevertheless a stabilisation.

Further, precisely because the present passing, temporary stabilisation still exists, precisely, therefore, will Capital endeavour to attack the working class. Of course, the lessons of the English strike must demonstrate to the whole capitalist world how very dangerous to the life of Capital is such an experiment as that carried out by the Conservative Party in England. That the experiment has not been without effect upon the Conservative Party there cannot be the least doubt. There is also not the least doubt that these lessons will be taken note of by the capitalists of all countries. In spite of this however, Capital will endeavour to undertake a fresh attack upon the working class, for it feels its position to be insecure and desires to consolidate itself.

It is the task of the working class and of the Communist Parties to continue in the future to organise the united front of the workers, and at the same time to exert all their forces in order to convert the attack of the capitalists into a counter-attack of the working class, into a revolutionary attack of the working class, into a fight of the working class for the setting up of the dictatorship of the proletariat and for the abolition of capitalism.

Finally, the working class of England, in order to be able to fulfil these urgent tasks, must be freed from their present leaders. It is impossible to enter into a war against the capitalists when one has such leaders as Thomas and MacDonald. It is impossible to hope for victory when there are such traitors in the rear as Henderson and Clynes. The working class of England must clear out such leaders or they will never be victorious.

These, comrades, are the conclusions to be drawn from the English strike.

SOLIDARITY WITH THE BRITISH FIGHTERS

The British Strike and the Workers in the U. S. S. R.

By N. Lentsner.

During the past few months, international Menshevism has made a lot of noise about the "national narrowness" of the workers of the U. S. S. R. and its Communist vanguard. Some of the eccentric "Left" Communists, such as Korsch and Co., have also created a legend about the "kulakisation" of the Soviet Republic, the collapse of internationalism in the U. S. S. R. If a real circumstantial denial of all these Menshevik-anarchist ravings be required, ample proof was furnished by the workers of the U. S. S. R. themselves during the days of the British strike. One may say without the slightest exaggeration that the British strike did not arouse such enthusiasm, such an outburst of fraternal solidarity in any other country or in any other Section of the international army of labour as that which took place in the U. S. S. R.

On May 1st the radio and telegraph transmitted the news of the miners' strike, and on May 4th of the general strike to all corners of the U. S. S. R. We can see what a repercussion was given to this news from the Tass telegrams sent to Moscow during those very days. Here are some of these telegrams taken at random:

OMSK (large town in Siberia) 1.3.5. "The Tass telegram confirming the strike of the British miners was received during the 1st of May evening meetings in the clubs and caused great enthusiasm."

TOMSK (large cultural centre in Siberia) 2. 5. "The news of the miners' strike in England was enthusiastically welcomed by the workers. Resolutions of support for the strikers were passed at meetings of the clubs. The railwaymen decided to contribute one day's wages in aid of the strikers."

Baku 3. 5. "The news of the strike in England was greeted with enthusiasm by the Baku proletariat."

MINSK (capital of White Russian republic) 4. 5. "A crowded meeting of Minsk workers, who had assembled for the opening of the White Russian Museum of the Revolution, welcomed the news of the British strikers with enthusiasm. A telegram was sent to the Executive of the British Miners' Federation to the effect: "The workers of Minsk send their warm

fraternal greetings to the miners of England. Fight to the finish against your capitalists and government."

Odessa 5. 5. "The news of the British miners' strike evoked unprecedented enthusiasm amongst the workers of Odessa. There was a regular scramble for the special editions of papers devoted to the events in England. In the evening thousands of meetings of working men and women took place at which resolutions for rendering material aid were passed. The Odessa Department of the Miners' Union is starting a campaign of support for the British miners at the demand of the wide mass of the workers."

KHARKOV (Capital of the Ukrainian Republic) 5. 5. "During the day a tremendous spontaneous demonstration of solidarity with the striking workers of Great Britain took place in Kharkov. At the conclusion of work, in all institutions, and factories, columns of thousands of demonstrators with bands, banners and slogans marched to the building of the All-Ukrainian Council of Trade Unions. The tremendous square could not hold one-fifth of the demonstration. One after the other, new columns of thousands of demonstrators kept passing through the square. Outstanding slogans were: 'Expect from us not only greetings, but material aid also.' At the most modest estimation more than 100,000 people took part in the demonstrations."

The solidarity of the toilers of the U. S. S. R. at once assumed palpable forms. The A. U. C. T. U. (All Union Council of Trade Unions) made a decision for the contribution of one-quarter of a day's pay on May 6th, while on May 4th, the first day of work after the May Day holidays, contributions began to be made in all corners of the U. S. S. R. in thousands of factories, works, depots and institutions. In hundreds of them both before and after May 6, on the insistent initiative of the workers and employers themselves not one-quarter of a day's but a half day's or a whole day's pay was contributed. Working class students receiving an allowance of only 20 roubles per month, and living from hand to mouth, contributed one rouble or more. Therefore the secretary of the A. U. C. T. U., Dogadov, could rightly inform representatives of the press that the trade unions merely had to endorse the action of their members. If it be taken into consideration, that in the U. S. S. R. there are no less than 8 million trade union members, that hundreds of Soviet newspapers opened individual funds, and that the peasants conducted collections in aid of the British workers in thousands of villages, then the absurdity of the British bosses and their lackeys about the "interference of the Soviet Government" becomes quite clear. There certainly was "interference" but only on the part of tens of millions of toilers of the U. S. S. R. Let Chamberlain send his protests and notes to them!

The enthusiasm evoked by the strike of May 1st and May 3rd, did not wane for a number of weeks. The wave of solidarity was carried from Moscow and the surrounding area from province to uyezd, from uyezd to village and from village to hamlet. Telegrams and resolutions of solidarity were sent by the miners of Sutchan on the border of China, by the population of the Siberian town of Obdersk situated a thousand versts from the railway line, by the lumber-jacks of Archangel located on the coast of the White Sea, by the metal workers of the Urals, the textile workers of Vladimir and Ivanovo-Voznesensk, the sugar workers of Western Ukraine, the oil miners of Baku and Grozny and the coal miners of Don Bas. From Leningrad to Vladivostok, from Murmansk to Batum, throughout the whole extent of the vast Soviet Union, tens of millions of toilers of the U. S. S. R. expressed their warm fraternal sentiment of solidarity in demonstrations, meetings, and assemblies.

Not only the workers, but also the peasants and intellectuals extended a helping hand.

The Soviet peasants who have fought in the ranks of the Red Army against the White Guards, against the interventionist troops of British, French and Japanese imperialism have realised the international nature of the struggle opened up by October. The toilers of the U. S. S. R. at the same time understood the struggle which the British workers conducted in 1919-20 against the interventionist plans of Curzon and Lloyd George. The leit-motiv of hundreds of resolutions passed and numerous speeches of workers and peasants was the thought that: "we are paying back the British workers for their struggle against intervention."

The Soviet intellectuals during the 8 years of proletarian dictatorship have been so steeped in the atmosphere of proletarian dictatorship that the international solidarity of the toilers has not only become comprehensible to them, but even obvious.

Engineers, doctors, scientific workers in general, journalists, artists — all sections of the Soviet intelligentsia warmly greeted the struggle of the British workers. The small Academic Theatre organised a special performance in aid of the strike. Soviet writers issued a paper the title of which was the slogan of the British Y. C. L. "Fight Like the Devil".

The country of Soviets has not witnessed for a long time such enthusiasm as took place in May 1926. In looking through the thousands of resolutions passed by the workers and peasants at general meetings, one may observe the following main thoughts running through these resolutions like a red thread:

Firstly — we, workers of the U.S.S.R. who have gone through two great revolutions, who have fought against capitalism in the severe conditions of the czarist regime, understand how important working class aid is in other countries. The first duty of every worker is to help his working class brother on strike;

Secondly — we must render wholehearted support to the British miners, for the cause for which they are struggling is our cause, their victory is our victory, their defeat is our defeat. Why? Because both the Soviet workers and the British workers are only sections of the world army of Labour, because the British workers by their struggle — though perhaps not fully realising it — are bringing nearer the victory of the world proletarian revolution, the commencement of which was our October;

Thirdly, the general strike is the commencement of a tremendous struggle of the British workers who are feeling for the right paths for this struggle. Nearly every resolution called upon the British workers to abandon the reformist prejudice; "The general strike is an economic struggle, this struggle must not be linked up with a political struggle." Thousands of resolutions call upon the British comrades to extend the bounds of their struggle, to follow the Russian example and to join the strike up with an armed struggle.

Fourthly, on reading the resolutions, on observing the workers' meetings, one cannot help thinking that the struggle of the British Strike perhaps excited the workers of the U.S.S.R. no less than the British workers themselves. The Soviet workers were most of all worried at the fact that the General Council was directed by Thomas & Co. Literally every resolution called upon the British workers to remove Thomas & Co. from their posts and to be vigilant in respect of this treacherous fraternity. The workers' resolutions recall the Russian experience, compare Thomas with the well-known czarist gendarme Zubatov, who tried to play the role of a friend of the workers and sowed mistrust and provocation in the ranks of the labour movement.

In warning the British proletariat of the inevitable treachery of the Thomases, the resolutions of the Soviet workers at the same time emphasised the correctness of the British Communist Party's policy. Particular admiration was aroused by the slogan of the British YCLers: "Fight like the devil". Saklatvala, who courageously called for an alliance of soldiers and workers was sent fraternal greetings from scores of meetings. The workers of the U.S.S.R. understood that the Communist Party cannot immediately carry the majority of the proletariat with it, but they knew one thing: the Party's policy of linking up the economic struggle with the political, the slogan for a Workers' Government and nationalisation expressed the real Bolshevik tactic which in their day led to the October Revolution. It is just because the Communist Party came forward courageously with its programme, not heeding the prejudices of the masses, that the Soviet workers expressed their feeling of admiration: the workers of the U.S.S.R. are used to appreciating leaders just because of their capability of going against the stream when necessary.

During the nine-days of the general strike the British events were the current topic of the day. The more hot-headed elements were even dreaming of the strike turning into a revolution. The more cautious people, of course, understood that in the given state of affairs in the British Labour Movement, a revolution was very improbable. But everyone was certain that the British workers would be able to defend their interests. The messages describing the moods of the masses strengthened this belief amongst the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. Therefore the news of the strike being called off came as an absolute thunderbolt for the entire toiling masses of the Union. At first many did not believe it, then this feeling was replaced by contempt and hatred for the betrayers of the strike. The resolutions do not transmit one-hundredth part of the mood of the Soviet working masses.

They themselves felt the defeat; they experienced unprecedented sorrow, but one thing they did not understand: how could the field of battle be abandoned when the army was in a fighting spirit. The news that the General Council had formerly made the decision to refuse the aid of the Russian workers was like the lash of a whip to the masses. Whilst MacDonald & Co. could believe the impudent falsehood about the money being sent by the "Soviet Government" and not by the toilers of the U.S.S.R., the workers of the Soviet Union who had collected their kopeks by the million were insulted to the very depths of their hearts by this "patriotic" gesture of the General Council. The Russian workers, who had seen how the British imperialists helped the Russian White Guards, could not understand at all why the Russian workers were not to help their British brothers. And if Hicks, Purcell and other "Left Wingers" discredited themselves more than anyone else in the eyes of the workers of the U.S.S.R., this was especially because of their refusal of aid from the Russian workers. These people formed the Anglo-Russian Committee, avowed their Internationalist sentiment and then, when it came to realising this internationalism — they rattled.

The resolutions passed after May 30th, i. e. after the general strike had been called off contain three characteristic themes:

The resolutions firstly observed with bitterness that their foreboding of treachery had been fully confirmed. There is not a single resolution which does not condemn the treachery of the Thomases, the shameful capitulation of the General Council;

Secondly, the resolutions call upon the British workers to draw the full lesson of the general strike, call upon them to understand clearly that only the Communist Party can be their firm and true leader;

Thirdly, the resolutions call upon the miners to continue their struggle steadfastly and promise to continue material aid with unslackening energy. At the same time the partial strike in ports which was combined with the demonstrations of international solidarity on the part of Soviet and foreign seamen, was continued.

This happened whilst the Amsterdamites and the Social Democrats with lightning rapidity, so unusual for them in ordinary times, stopped their aid which in any case was so meagre that it was hardly palpable. At the conference of the Miners International, Hodges was compelled to acknowledge that out of the £400,000 received by the British miners, £350,000 had been given by the Soviet trade unions. If we recall that the wages in the U.S.S.R. are lower than in many other countries, and that the Soviet trade unions have 2 million less members than in the Amsterdam International, then we realise how real and palpable was the aid of the workers of the U.S.S.R.

The Social Democrats who shout about "the national narrowness" of the U.S.S.R. workers, refused to hinder the transport of coal in Poland. A Social Democratic director of Prussian mines stated that "charity begins at home", while the German reformist unions helped the bosses to ship coal to different countries, thereby partially undermining the solidarity strike. The British strike has exposed the pantomime internationalism of the reformists. Only the Soviet Section of the world army of labour has been worthy of its international obligations in the days of the great general strike.

How the Toilers of the U. S. S. R. Sprang to the Aid of the British Strikers.

The resolutions, appeals, telegrams and sketches given below only give a poor idea of the tremendous wave of moral and material support which swept throughout the U.S.S.R. Owing to lack of space we can only cite the most characteristic material illustrating the campaign of aid in the U.S.S.R. We think that even in this abridged form this material is of tremendous interest (Editor).

First Repercussions amongst the Masses.

OMSK, 1. 5., The Tass telegram confirming the strike of the British miners was received during the 1st of May evening meetings in the clubs and aroused great enthusiasm.

BAKU, 3. 5., The news of the strike in England was received with enthusiasm by the Baku proletariat.

TOMSK, 2. 5. The news of the miners strike in England was enthusiastically welcomed by the workers. Resolutions of support for the strikers were passed at the club meetings. The railwaymen decided to contribute one day's wages in aid of the strikers.

MINSK, 4. 5. A crowded meeting of Minsk workers, who had assembled for the opening of the White Russian Museum of the Revolution, welcomed the news of the British strike with enthusiasm. The Executive of the British Miners' Federation was sent a telegram to the effect: "The workers of Minsk send their warm fraternal greetings to the miners of England. Fight to the finish against your capitalists and government."

ODESSA, 5. 5. The news of the British miners' strike evoked unprecedented enthusiasm amongst the workers of Odessa. Yesterday thousands of meetings of working men and women took place at which resolutions for rendering material aid were passed. At all enterprises the workers are demanding extensive reports on the economic and political situation in England. The Odessa branch of the miners union is starting a campaign in support of the British miners, at the demand of the masses of the workers. Today a city conference of miners is taking place devoted to the events in Great Britain ("Trud", 6. 5. 26, p. 2).

II. THE FIRST APPEALS OF THE TRADE UNIONS AND SOVIETS.

Appeal of the A. U. C. T. U. to all Members of the Trade Unions of the U. S. S. R.

To All Trade Union Members in the U. S. S. R.!

The British proletariat has unanimously come out in defence of its economic and political conquests. Five million workers are already on strike in England. The British workers, united in their trade unions, are confronted with the union of the capitalists and bankers. The wage-workers of Great Britain stand face to face with a capitalist class upheld by all the power of the State apparatus, police and army. The workers of Great Britain can only be supported by their class brothers the workers of other countries. Every worker understands only too well the tremendous historical significance of the events taking place in England. The moment has now come to prove in deeds that proletarian solidarity is not a hollow phrase and that the cause of the British proletariat is the cause of our own proletarian kith and kin.

The Presidium of the A. U. C. T. U. and Central Committees of all Soviet Trade Unions call upon the workers and employees of the entire Soviet Union, all toilers of our great Workers' Republic to come to the aid of the toiling proletariat of Great Britain by raising a levy of a quarter of one day's wages. That is what the organised trade union workers of U. S. S. R. can and should do immediately, in order to support the British strikers, their brothers both in class and in struggle.

The Presidium of the A. U. C. T. U. and the C. Cs. of all trade unions express the conviction that the workers and employees organised in Soviet trade unions will render fraternal aid to the British workers in their struggle against the capitalist class.

Long live the struggling proletariat of Great Britain!

Long live the struggle and support to the finish.

Chairman of the A. U. C. T. U. M. Tomsky.

Secretary of the A. U. C. T. U.: A. Dogadov
and Chairmen of the various unions.

(Here follow signatures of chairmen or secretaries of 23 different national trade unions Ed.)

To the Seamen and Dockers of Soviet Ports.

Comrades:

The British working class, to ward off the attack of their bourgeoisie and Conservative Government, has declared a general strike.

In Great Britain the mines have been abandoned, the railways have come to a standstill as also the factories, printing works and mercantile marine — about 5 million British workers are on strike.

The British Conservative Government has declared a state of emergency dividing the country up into 10 military districts at the head of which members of the Conservative Government have been placed. It has mobilised the entire police, military forces, asphyxiating gas units, aviation and fleet.

You will ask why is this?

It is in order to wrest from the British miners by violence a part of their wages for the benefit of the bourgeoisie, in order to compel the British workers to work an extra hour per day.

The sympathy of the International bourgeoisie is on the side of British capitalists and the British Conservative Government.

The struggle of the British working class with the entire bourgeoisie has assumed dimensions unknown in the labour movement since the inauguration of the capitalist order. The struggle has already emerged far beyond the confines of purely economic demands and has assumed a clearly expressed class political nature.

The entire capitalist world is shaking from the blows of the British working class.

The victory of the British workers is only possible with the wide solidarity of the working class of all countries and in the first place of the transport workers and seamen!

The Central Committees of the Water Transport and Local Transport Workers have appealed to Soviet ports to stop loading cargoes and fuel bound for England, and to stop the shipment both of these cargoes and also of any that might be sent through other countries, to declare a partial strike in the ports so that not a pound of cargo destined for England be loaded in Soviet ports without the agreement of the British trade unions leading the strike of British workers.

The unions of water and local transport workers in the localities should take steps to ensure the complete success of the strike.

Long live the victorious struggle of the British workers.

Long live International Proletarian Solidarity.

Long live the united International Working Class front.

Central Committee of the Water Transport
Workers Union of the U. S. S. R. A. Isichenko.

Central Committee of the Local Transport
Workers of the U. S. S. R. V. Rudakov.

(„Trud“, May 7. p. 3.)

To Working Men and Women and Toilers of Moscow.

Millions of British workers defending themselves from capitalist onslaught have declared a general strike.

The working class of the Soviet Union cannot be indifferent to this struggle. We are merely a separate section of the world proletarian army. This army is fighting for the emancipation of the working class, for the liberation of the toilers and oppressed of the whole world. The workers of Great Britain are faced by the forces of British capitalists who, though decaying are not yet broken. They are being helped by the compact capitalist front of the whole world. World capitalism is exerting all forces in order to smash the working class army in order to strangle the proletarian revolution at its birth. The British workers are defending their vital interests, but the strikers have decided to defend their class rights to the end.

The workers of the whole world should support the struggle commenced by the British workers. We, workers of the Red capital, of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, must take the front place in this assistance. We know better than all others the meaning of the deprivations connected with a long proletarian struggle. We ourselves on more than one occasion have experienced how difficult it is to fight against the organised power of capitalism.

III. HOW THE FUNDS WERE RAISED.

In the Donetz Basin (Donbass).

Stalino (Donbass) 11. V. The struggle of the British workers is meeting with the most lively response amongst the mine and metal workers of the Stalin district. The workers are contributing one day's or two day's wages on their own initiative. The Trade Union organs have to restrain the workers from increasing their contribution in aid of the British workers.

The District Trade Union Council has organised a commission for granting aid to the participators in the British strike.

A campaign has been opened in the local paper for individual contributions which is meeting with enthusiastic response.

At a meeting of miners of the Gorlovsky mines 3,000 workers were present. The theatre was filled to overflowing. The

proposals of the speakers for contributing a day's wages for the strikers were greeted with vociferous applause.

In the shops of the Lugansk Enamel Factory the workers are eagerly discussing the events in England. The workers and employees of the enamel factory are contributing a half day's wages to the strikers.

The workers of the textile factory in Lugansk have also decided to contribute a half day's wages.

Messages from the localities and the pages of local Donbass papers illustrate the tremendous enthusiasm of the workers of Donbass and other places. Besides individual contributions a campaign is being conducted calling upon various people to make contributions for the British strikers.

In Archangel.

Souvenirs of the British Interventionists.

The news of the general strike spread as fast as electric sparks; the telephones rang in the distant factories.

Factory whistles summoned the workers to special meetings. The assembled workers greedily caught at every word, because the bloody story of 1918 still lives in every memory here. The earth is still fresh on the graves of the workers who lie buried in the Square — workers who were shot by the British hirelings. It is not easy to forget the unrestrained debauch of those British whippets and Lewis guns. And the news that 5,000,000 British workers had stopped working for these hangmen, flew around the factories, arousing tremendous enthusiasm.

Before there was even time to write out the appeal of the District Trade Union Council for aid, funds began to be showered down on the local newspaper office.

The young workers of the Levacheff Works decided to contribute half a day's wages in aid of the British comrades.

The workers of the Lenin and Bukharin works — a quarter of a day's wages.

The woodworkers contributed 1,000 roubles.

It would be difficult to find a factory or institution which did not hasten to give substantial aid to the British workers.

Even the students, the pioneers, collect kopeks, gather roubles — roubles which afterwards have mounted up into thousands.

The workers say in their resolutions that this is only the commencement. That if necessary they will double, even triple this aid. That this is only part of the debt which the British workers at one time gave to the workers of Archangel.

It was the British workers after all who made their imperialists leave the North of Soviet Russia and now a good opportunity has come to repay the debt.

The workers heard with great misgivings the news that the Trade Union General had refused their aid.

"They have no right to, they must make good their error", they say, and began collecting money with still greater energy. Subscription lists were circulated round the workers.

But this news sowed the first alarm, and some works decided:

"To have detailed reports on the events in Great Britain once a week."

In the resolutions the British comrades are warned:

"Have no trust, comrades, in the heroes of Black Friday."

"Beware of new betrayals by the compromisers."

"Stand firm, the hour of liberation is near."

The last telegram that the compromisers had issued the order to call off the general strike came like the lash of a whip. No resolutions could show how many thousand workers' fists were clenched with rage at this news, how thousands of people burned with the desire to roll these Thomases, MacDonaldis and Hendersons in the gutter.

G. Pritchkin.

("Pravda", May 18, 1926.)

Moscow Textile Workers to the British Miners.

In the various textile factories of the Moscow Province, meetings devoted to the British events are still being held. Contributions are also still coming in.

In 36 enterprises and institutions contributions of a quarter day's pay have been made, in 10 enterprises half a day's wages, while in 2 factories a full day's wages have been subscribed. Two factories instead of making contributions worked 10 hours.

In the resolutions of the various meetings concerning the struggle of the British miners, the textile workers emphasised that their success in the struggle largely depends upon material aid and call upon the International proletariat to render this assistance. ("Trud", 27. V. 26, p. 2.)

A Three-Day Campaign in Novgorod.

In Novgorod a Three-Day Campaign has been conducted. Meetings have been held where explanations were given and statements made as to the progress of the strike. Collections were made in aid of the strikers. An extensive campaign has also been conducted by the trade union organisations in the rural districts. ("Trud", 28. V. 26, p. 2.)

Friendly Organisation of Help (Baku).

The workers of Baku eagerly answered the call of the events in Great Britain.

Hardly had the telegram bearing the news of the miners strike reached Baku when an emergency session of the Miners Union of the U. S. S. R. was convened for the same day. It was decided to give every manner of support to the miners on strike. Already the next day help began to pour in from all sides. In its recent manifesto to the workers of the U. S. S. R. the A. U. C. T. U. proposed deducting for the benefit of the British workers, one quarter of the day's earnings. Before our workers knew of this decision, they began already to deduct from their earnings considerably more than proposed by the A. U. C. T. U. Very many meetings are held. In Binigardi alone, 13 emergency meetings were held on May 6th, all of them devoted to British events. There is not an industry and hardly any enterprise where meetings have not either been held or are in the course of preparation. The same can be said of the office workers of the various institutions and of the higher technical and administrative staffs.

The Belogorod workers gave one day's earnings at the factory meetings wherever it was possible to hold them. In factory No. 6 it was decided with the sanction of the management, to add to this also the work of one Friday, sacrificing thus the day of rest. Motor transport workers give one day's earnings. In the Stenka Razin settlement card collections are made, the engineering-technical section giving one day's earnings there and then. The same was done by the workers of the Baku Soviet. The food workers and many others deducted half a day's earnings.

IV. GREETINGS FROM ALL CORNERS OF THE U. S. S. R.

From Far-off Siberia.

After listening to a radio message concerning the strike of the British workers and their stubborn struggle against capitalists, the citizens of the Obdorsk village (Siberia) expressed their solidarity with the cause of the liberation of the workers from the capitalists yoke, declaring: "We pledge ourselves to help the revolutionary workers of Great Britain with all the means at our disposal, and we begin by giving financial help to the strikers."

The Miners of the Far East Swear to Support the British Miners.

"The Suchan and Artemovsk miners send their fervent greetings to the great army of British miners who, step by step are destroying the might of British imperialism. Warm greetings to the British Communist Party — true leader of the working class struggle.

We, workers vow to render every possible aid to our brothers in their difficult struggle.

Long live the British miners.

Long live the Communist Party of Great Britain.

Curses on the betrayers of the miners' struggle."

We are ready at any moment to give you a Proletarian Helping Hand.

"We 4,000 working men and women and employees of the motovilikhi works (Perm District, Urals) assembled at our general factory meeting, send hearty greetings to the British workers engaged in a life and death struggle against capitalism. We most emphatically declare that we Motovilikhi workers, follow with breathless attention every detail of your struggle for

the liberation of the Working Class and are ready at any moment to give you both our proletarian moral and material help. We call upon the workers of the world to give energetic support to the struggling proletariat of Great Britain."

Railwaymen.

"We railwaymen of the Chuzovsky branch line, express our warm sympathy for the struggle declared by the British workers against their avowed enemy, the bourgeoisie.

Having ourselves experienced the whole weight of the struggle against the bourgeoisie, particularly during the time of intervention, we remember what aid the workers of the West rendered us.

And now, when a section of the Western workers has actively entered the struggle against the enemy, we declare that we will not only warmly sympathise with them in this struggle, but also render them wholehearted aid.

Fraternal aid of Leningrad and Moscow Metal Workers.

"Red Putilov-ites."

The General Meeting of 12,000 metal workers of the "Red Putilov" Works (Leningrad) send you their profound expression of fraternal solidarity.

We call upon you, workers of Great Britain, to rally your ranks still closer under the banner of a united front against capitalism.

The workers of "Red Putilov" are always ready to come out in defence of the fighting British proletariat at the first call of the Communist International.

The Putilov workers are already commencing practical aid on the spot and have decided as a first contribution to give a quarter of a day's wages in aid of the strikers. ("Pravda", 13. 5. 26, p. 3.)

Dynamo Workers.

The General Meeting of workers and employees of the "Dynamo" Factory, Moscow, comprising 1,500 workers, sends fraternal greetings to the British workers.

The Dynamo workers who have struck on more than one occasion under Tsarism finished by taking arms against the Tsar and capitalism. We have seen by our own experience that the economic struggle changes directly into a struggle for power.

Determination in the struggle and the firm leadership of the Communist Party ensured us victory. Now we have power in our hands.

While following the progress of your struggle we hope that your country in the near future will have a similar experience.

The working class of the whole world and in the first place the workers of the U. S. S. R. are watching your heroic struggle.

Remember that you are not alone in your fight. We workers of "Dynamo" declare that we will render you aid at any moment, not only in a monetary form, but also in other ways, if necessary.

In order to support the British strikers, the meeting contributes a quarter of its day's wages and calls upon other Moscow factories to do the same.

The General City Meetings of the Workers and Employees of the First Ship Repairing Works Dedicated to Andre Marty in Odessa sends hearty proletarian greetings to the British strikers. The meeting expresses its conviction that the strike will be victorious, given the general support of the entire British proletariat and the workers of all countries.

The workers of the U. S. S. R. for their part, will help on this victory for the righteous cause of the working class not only morally but also materially.

Long live the solidarity of the working class of the whole world.

Long live the British workers on strike.

Long live the Communist International.

* * *

Sweep the Yellow Leaders right out of the Way.

We, 1,000 workers of the "Krasnoe Sormovo" works here assembled, greet with enthusiasm our British working class com-

rades who have entered the struggle against the capitalists. We hope that the British comrades will not falter in their struggle and will sweep the Yellow leaders and criminal capitalist hounds right out of the way.

We are appealing to all works in the Sormovo district to render substantial aid to the struggling British workers.

The Working Men and Women of the "Vesuvius" Factory (Gomel Province) greet the British working class who have come out against the capitalists.

We "Vesuvians" promise you wholehearted support.

The brazen British bourgeoisie have turned from defence to an attack on the British working class, which must resist them with clenched fists.

Miners of Great Britain, be firm and staunch until the very end. No concessions to the capitalists.

Long live the British working class.

Long live the class solidarity of the workers of the world.

Long live the approaching revolution.

("Pravda", 13. 5. 26., p. 3.)

Do not Believe in the Heroes of "Black Friday".

We, Workers and Employees of the "Lenin" Factory (Archangel) send our fraternal greetings to the British proletariat. We note the increased revolutionary movement and call upon the workers of the whole world to rally in a united front against capital, for we can only shake the foundations of capitalism if we are rallied in compact ranks.

We declare on our part that the workers of the U. S. S. R. are always ready to aid their fighting brothers abroad.

Let our first contribution — a quarter of a day's wages — serve as the commencement of such aid.

Less vacillations, comrades, and the hour of victory is near. Put less trust in the words of the traitor-heroes of "Black Friday". Long live the British proletariat and the Communist Party of Great Britain.

The Workers and Employees of the Sorofsky Saw Mills in the Karelian Republic, promise the British workers all round support in their struggle. We note that the strike which you have declared is one of the greatest encounters of the proletariat with world capitalism. We are certain that this encounter will help to bring nearer the final day of working class victory over capitalism.

The workers in our saw mills, to the number of 2,000, call upon you to stand unwaveringly at your revolutionary posts, and to struggle to cast off the influence of the compromisers and traitors of the working class cause. ("Pravda", 20. V., p. 3.)

POLITICS

The Cabinet of Briand—Caillaux.

By Paul Marion (Paris).

On the 23rd of June, Briand, after numerous futile attempts and combinations — the most remarkable of which was the proposed inclusion of Poincaré in the government — formed his tenth Cabinet. The fact that this Cabinet contains some moderate radicals and socialist renegades should not mislead anybody. The true head of the new Cabinet is M. Caillaux. He is Minister for Finance with special powers. In the speech he delivered on June 20th he characterised the true character of the new government: it is necessary to restore order in the finances, in the factories and in the streets. And he has already announced through his newspapers that he will resort to dictatorial measures.

No one who has followed the political and economic events in France in recent times will be surprised at the fact that such words were spoken by a Minister who has the support of the Bloc of the Left. During the last year the Bloc of the Left has been continually decaying. This applies especially to the time since Briand, in November of last year, took over the government after Painlevé.

The National Bloc was always, in fact, the special political instrument of French heavy industry and its banks. Against it there was set up, with the support of the democratic petty bour-

geoisie and under the leadership of certain commercial banks, as well as of certain heads of manufacturing industry, the famous Bloc of the Left, which gained the victory in May 1924. It was the object of this Left Bloc to make use of the working masses who are not revolutionarily inclined, and the hesitating middle classes for a policy which permitted French imperialism, in foreign politics to adopt the Dawes Plan, and in domestic policy to grant certain concessions in order to ward off the threatening attack of the wage and salary earners and of the small business people who were being robbed of all their savings.

These concessions consisted chiefly of a few social reforms, as well as the democratising of the fiscal system by, on the one hand, raising somewhat the direct taxes and, on the other hand, by reducing the indirect taxes paid by the masses of consumers. At first these masses were deceived by the hypocritical promises of Herriot and his people, but under the Painlevé Ministry they slowly began to realise the true state of affairs. We are witnessing today in France a regrouping of the classes, particularly since the Morocco war and the commencement of the serious intensification of the valuta problem, which is connected with the problem of exports and of the whole production in France.

The various fractions of big capital have drawn closer together. The necessity of a common defence of the general interests of capital against the efforts of the workers to obtain wage increases to meet the increasing prices, against the civil servants who have even come out in demonstrations in the streets, against the economic competition and the financial pressure of the rival imperialisms of England and America, whose action is expressed in the accelerated fall of the Franc — all this has expedited the rapprochement in the capitalist camp. It was Briand's function to bring about the necessary new parliamentary grouping in order that the French bourgeoisie could at least maintain the outer appearance of a democratic regime.

During the months of December, January, February and March, Briand did everything possible in order to destroy, piece by piece, the financial election programme of the Bloc of the Left, as well as the Bloc itself. Inflation, indirect taxes, rejection of every effective financial control — these were the points on which the radicals and the socialists constantly capitulated in the most shameful manner; and in the eyes of the workers they bear the responsibility for the success of this capitalist manoeuvre. Thus the budget of 1926 was finally adopted, which greatly resembled the old budget of the National Bloc.

The month of May — during which parliament was not sitting — brought with it a sharpening of the financial situation. Hence the bourgeoisie deemed it necessary to bring about the corresponding changes in the government, in order to maintain the privileges of the French capitalists.

The deficit in our trade balance, the mass-sales of Francs in the foreign money markets and in Paris, as well as the question of the debts payable to America, resulted in a sudden rise of the Pound and of the Dollar, which the Ministry were only able to stop for a few days by means of financial manoeuvres.

On the other hand there rose throughout the country, a wave of partial strikes for higher wages. A strong swing to the Left is to be seen in the Socialist Party. The Communist influence grew and is growing, the united front actions and the workers' demonstrations are becoming more numerous, our Party press, and in particular the "Humanité" is increasing its circulation.

The bourgeoisie is conscious of the full extent of the danger. As a result of this not only the press of the Right, but also the more or less neutral information press energetically demanded a government of the strong hand.

The long Ministerial crisis of recent times has now found its solution: the Bloc of the Left, whose responsibility for the whole development cannot be emphasised too much, has given place to the "fighting" Cabinet of Caillaux-Briand. This Ministry will endeavour with all means — and if necessary even with illegal means — to carry out successfully the common defence of capitalist interests: that is to say, abolition of financial control, reduction of direct taxes, free export of capital, and increase in the burdens which the working class has to bear. The Communist Party, on the basis of its concrete programme for the immediate future, — restoration of finances at the cost of the possessing class —, will know how to carry on the fight against the Briand-Caillaux government.

The Political Situation in Germany After the Referendum.

By P. R. Dietrich.

Despite the strenuous endeavours of the Communist Party and of the other organisations which gave their aid in the struggle for the complete confiscation of the properties of the quondam royal families, the 20 million votes required by the law have not been registered at the referendum. But, even though the necessary million of votes could not be raised, the big fight has in every respect been thoroughly worth while.

The fact that, in addition to the class-conscious masses of workers under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Social-Democratic workers — under pressure from whom the Social-Democratic executives were first of all compelled to take their place in the fighting-line —, as well as a large percentage of the Christian-Socialist workers under the leadership of the Centre and millions of the one-time Rightward voters of the middle-classes, of the peasantry and of the brain-workers, took an active part on the side of the working-classes in this fight, is convincing evidence of the steady Leftward development of the German workers, who are now beginning to attract to their camp considerable numbers of the lower middle-class.

The referendum has convinced many workers who formerly believed they could gain their ends in a Democratic Republic by Democratic means, that the methods of bourgeois Democracy are futile even for the carrying through of relatively small partial demands. Under the rule of Capitalism, millions of Social-Democratic workers have come to feel unmistakably the "formal equality of Democracy", so lauded by the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party, that their eyes have been opened. They have at last recognised that the Communist Party was right in declaring at the commencement of the campaign that Democratic methods of defending the interests of the working-classes are neither practical nor efficacious.

II.

In spite of the negative result of the referendum, the bourgeoisie, who strained every nerve to defeat the referendum, did not think fit to proclaim the defeat with great jubilation. The bourgeoisie perceives even more clearly than the Social-Democratic Party-executives how much power lies behind the 14½ million votes cast in favour of expropriation. At the same time, the bourgeoisie is aware that the Social-Democratic leaders were reluctant to take up a position against the nobility and the Monarchist reactionaries and that they are prepared, for the sake of the big coalition, to betray and sell the 14½ millions votes cast in favour of expropriation without compensation.

Confident of the support of the Social-Democratic leaders, the bourgeoisie, who even prior to June 20th, had held up the bogey of Bolshevism, have set out to flout the millions of voters. The Marx-Stresemann Government demanded the prompt acceptance en bloc of the Government compromise, which practically meant the complete acknowledgement of the exorbitant claims of the nobility. The Government parties used every means at their disposal to get the Bill accepted and thereby get rid of this dangerous question.

The leaders of the German Socialist Party immediately resolved to work for the passing of the Marx-Government Bill in favour of the nobility. The amendments proposed by the representatives of the German Socialist Party in the parliamentary Legislative Committee were mere manoeuvres to divert the recalcitrant masses of Social-Democratic workers from further participation in the fight for the complete confiscation of the royal properties. Despite the scornful rejection of all previous proposals on the part of Social-Democracy, the representatives of the German Socialist Party did not reject the individual paragraphs of the Government Bill, but withheld their votes as a preparatory measure for their final assent.

At the same time, the Government continued behind the scenes to negotiate with the Social-Democrats and the German Nationalists in order to procure a majority in favour of the Bill and thus frustrate the demand of the overwhelming majority of the working masses for the dissolution of Parliament. If the Government and the Government Parties, with the aid of Social-

Democracy, are successful in passing the Compromise Bill, the whole responsibility, will rest with the Social-Democratic Party.

The Social-Democratic Party must, furthermore, accept full responsibility for future measures adopted by the Marx-Stresemann Government and a Parliament which is definitely opposed to the workers.

What are the measures being prepared by the Government and the Reichstag?

1. The Government is using the trade-treaties as a means to change low protective customs tariffs into high ones. The pending increase of the agrarian duties will inevitably result in a great advance in the prices of cereals and, consequently, in those of bread, provender and butcher's meat.

2. Parliament and employers are systematically preparing a fresh attack upon the unemployment dole. The right to unemployment benefit is to be replaced by unemployment insurance. The Government is also trying to do away with uniform allowances and to introduce in their place a cunning system of scales.

By means of the withdrawal of unemployment benefit the Government is preparing a campaign of the employers for a cut in wages accompanied by an extension of working hours.

3. The Democratic Minister of Finance, Dr. Reinhold, is making up a new taxation schedule for the Government whereby taxes on capital will be further reduced while fresh burdens will be loaded on to the backs of the working people.

4. With the support of the Government the employers are carrying on their systematic offensive against the whole length of the working-class front. Within the last three weeks the ranks of the unemployed in Berlin have swollen by 14,000. Krupp-Essen have already announced the dismissal, as from November 1st of this year, of another 30% of their hands, which means 3000 to 4000 workers.

In view of these facts it should be the task of the Social-Democratic Party and the A. D. G. B. (German General, Federation of Trade Unions), in common with the Communist Party, to force the pace of the popular movement which arose out of the campaign for the confiscation of royal properties and to create out of the voting front of nearly 15 millions a firmly welded battle front. The attitude of the Social-Democratic Party and that of the A. D. G. B. shows that the working masses who are determined to put up a fight against the predatory plans of the bourgeoisie, must organise a defensive out of their own forces in conjunction with the Communist Party.

III.

The Communist Party promptly stigmatised the co-operation of the Social-Democratic Party in the Marx-Stresemann Government Bill as rank treachery in respect of the millions of people who voted in favour of the expropriation of the former royal families and declared that it would carry on the fight for the confiscation of the royal properties and the struggle against social and Monarchist reaction.

As a step towards the continuation of the mobilisation of the masses and the strengthening of the striking force, the Party has issued the slogan for the organisation of a Congress of Workers. This Congress should not only bring together the whole of the working population, the petty bourgeois sections in town and country, as well as the brain-workers, for another blow against the predatory claims of the former ruling houses, against Parliament, Government and President, who are prepared, even in face of the plight of millions of unemployed and workers on short time, to grant the huge claims of the former royal families, but at the same time organise on the widest possible basis the fight against the new customs and taxation exploitation, against the proposed abolition of the unemployment benefit and against further "rationalisation" at the cost of the German workers.

One phase of the battle was concluded by the imposing mobilisation of the decisive political classes in Germany. A new, greater and more difficult phase is imminent. The Communist Party, fully conscious of its historical task, will take its place in the forefront of the big battle which is rapidly approaching.

A "Friendly Approach" between Hungary and Roumania by Order of England.

By L. Ungar (Moscow).

Since the coming into office of the Avarescu Government, the foreign policy of Roumania has been more than ever subject to English influence. The continuous contest between England and France for influence in Bucharest has for the time being turned in favour of England. Altogether France's influence in the Balkans and in the countries of the Little Entente is considerably weaker since she has been experiencing economic difficulties and a financial crisis of her own.

A new factor in the foreign policy of Roumania has appeared on the scenes in the form of Italy, and Avarescu's policy is distinguished from that of Bratianu just by the emphasis it lays on its friendship for Italy. There can be no doubt that the Avarescu Cabinet is hoping to obtain from Italy not only the granting of credits but also the ratification of the Bessarabian protocol. On the whole, however, English influence remains paramount in Avarescu's policy.

English influence has also triumphed in the trend of Hungary's foreign policy. Had it not been for the demonstrative support of England, the Bethlen Government would long ago have fallen in consequence of the franc forgery affair. At the last meeting of the League of Nations, Chamberlain shook hands demonstratively with the Hungarian Prime Minister when he entered the room, whereas Bethlen met with an extremely cool reception from the representatives of the Little Entente on the occasion of his visit to France. It is true that, as regards the French Government, Bethlen has partly made good his share in the responsibility for the franc forgeries by concluding the commercial treaty which is extremely disadvantageous for Hungary while being extremely advantageous for France, but the economic and financial penetration of English capital into Hungary and the hope of obtaining English support in the sense of a revision of the Treaty of Trianon, are driving Hungary by dire necessity to steer its course in the direction of England.

In order still further to consolidate its position in that part of Europe, English diplomacy made it its object to bring about a mutual approach between Hungary and Roumania and to create a Conservative Block between the two countries which, together with Pilsudski in Poland and Liapcheff in Bulgaria, would carry out the English policy, — both against the Soviet Union and against French influence in the Balkans and in Southern Europe. The solution of this task is by no means easy in view of the bitter dissensions which exist between Hungary and Roumania. The Treaty of Trianon annexed not only Transylvania but even purely Hungarian territory to Roumania. Nearly a million and a half Hungarians are living under the power of the Roumanian Government. Roumania is a member of the Little Entente and has pledged herself to support Jugoslavia and Czecho-Slovakia against the attempts of the Hungarian Government which is working to bring about an alteration of the Treaty of Trianon and the restoration of the Habsburg Monarchy. Agrarian reform in Transylvania has been effected chiefly at the cost of the Hungarian landowners; in the districts populated by Hungarians, the Roumanian Government is carrying on a violent policy of Roumanianisation, even disregarding the scanty rights which the Treaty of Trianon guarantees to the Hungarian national minority. On the other hand the policy of Roumania was directed against Roumania.

English diplomacy, however, has very skillfully made use of all the factors which make an approach between the Hungarian and Roumanian Governments possible. In Bucharest the Roumanian Boyars and in Hungary the landed proprietors are those who actually have the power. Opposition to all the symptoms of the worker and peasant movement is encouraging friendly class relations between the landowners of Roumania and Hungary. Among the countries of the Little Entente, Roumania is the one which offers comparatively the least resistance to the restoration of the Habsburg monarchy. The Roumanian landowners are hostile to any agrarian reform, even were it, as was the case in Transylvania, carried through at Hungary's expense. The Roumanian landowners realise that agrarian reform only begins with the estates of the Hungarian landowners but must logically end with the estates of the Roumanian Boyars.

Hungarian foreign policy is also directed against Jugoslavia and Czecho-Slovakia, and in this respect has much in common with Roumanian foreign policy. Even in the past, English diplo-

macy regarded Hungary and Roumania as a barrier against the Slav danger and continues to do so; Roumania and Hungary are quite willing to be used for this purpose. English diplomacy took all these factors into consideration when it inaugurated the policy of an approach between Hungary and Roumania.

In order to create a more friendly atmosphere between the two countries, the Avarescu Government, under England's influence, formed an election Block with the party of the Hungarian national minority promising the latter a few insignificant concessions in the field of popular education, the Church and administration. The leaders of the Hungarian party in Transylvania are reactionary Hungarian landed proprietors who have formed an election alliance with Avarescu, the most blatant representative of Roumanian chauvinism in agreement with Horthy, the most blatant representative of Hungarian chauvinism. The leaders of the Hungarian party in Transylvania have betrayed the real interests of the Hungarian minority but have obviously found means to ensure that the interests of the Hungarian landed proprietors should be considered in carrying through the agrarian reform and that no further breaking up of their estates should take place in the interest of the Roumanian peasants.

This agreement was partly responsible for Avarescu's victory at the elections, for it secured 13 seats in the Roumanian Parliament for Hungarian landed proprietors and paved the way for an approach between Budapest and Bucharest. Now it is possible for the Bethlen Government to point out that the Roumanian Government is treating its "oppressed Hungarian brothers" better than before and that it is therefore possible to carry out a common policy of the Hungarian and Roumanian landowners.

In order to ensure this policy being "skilfully" carried out, the former Hungarian Foreign Minister, Count Banffy has already gone to live in Roumania, has adopted Roumanian nationality and is the leader of the Hungarian party in Roumania. This "patriotic" action ensures to Count Banffy the possession of his estates in Transylvania and to the Hungarian Government the certainty that the policy of the secret agreement between Bucharest and Budapest will not be endangered by irresponsible acts on the part of the Hungarian national minority in Transylvania. At the same time the large banks of Hungary and Roumania are entering into business relations and exploiting in common the Roumanian and Hungarian population of Transylvania.

In the Little Entente, Roumania is advocating the policy of "consideration" for Hungary and sabotaging the action of Jugoslavia and Czecho-Slovakia against Hungary on account of the forgery of French, Czech and Jugoslavian banknotes; England on the other hand, in the League of Nations, is quite openly defending Hungary and its banknotes forgers in high places.

These are the main factors in the friendly relations between Hungary and Roumania and these are the first steps taken by Hungary towards creating a reactionary Block in South East Europe against the Soviet Union and against French influence.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Party Conference of the C. P. of France.

Special detailed report to the Inprecorr.

FIRST TO FIFTH SESSION.

First Session.

Lille, June 20, 1926.

The Party conference was opened this morning at 10 o'clock. There are approximately 200 delegates present. After the election of the Presidium, the Chairman, Comrade Devernay, greeted the Conference and briefly outlined the tasks with which it is faced.

Telegrams of greeting were read, including one from Tunis and one from the members of the C. P. of China in Europe.

Report of the Executive.

Comrade Semard delivered the report upon the first item of the Agenda, the Report of the Executive. He declared that since the last conference of the Party in Clichy the world had

been the scene of events of enormous political and economic importance, such as the revolts in the East, the general strike in England etc. In France itself great events had occurred. There have been two wars — Morocco and Syria —, and a great intensification of the class contradictions. In addition there was the fall in the value of the Franc, constant changes of government and growing discontent of the masses, penetrating deep into the middle classes.

Our Party which is still young, was confronted with this serious and ever sharpening situation. It can be said that in general and in spite of many failings, the Party had followed a correct policy, as in the case of the Moroccan war etc.

Without concealing any mistakes or trying to make the organisational situation of the Party appear better than it is, it can be said that our Party has made great progress and gained considerable influence in all spheres. The causes for the decrease in the Party membership were: the mechanical carrying out of the reorganisation, the panic of the frightened elements through the Morocco campaign, the lack of political life in the nuclei and the resistance shown to the reorganisation of the Party upon the basis of the nuclei. The loss of membership concerned the petty bourgeois. The Party has not sufficiently taken advantage of the general trend towards the Left. Here was an important task of the united front tactic in the future.

The speaker analysed the mistakes of the Party, particularly in the application of the united front tactics. Referring to our campaign against the Moroccan war, he declared that we had quite rightly issued defeatist slogans; the slogan of fraternisation and of the military evacuation of Morocco. But in our enthusiasm we made these slogans as conditions for the united front with the socialists, as pre-conditions for participation in the Committees of action. This was a mistake, for these conditions wrecked the united front and were incapable of attracting the non-communist masses.

But while correcting our errors, our Left deviations, we must not go to the other extreme and fall into opportunism, that is to say we must issue the correct revolutionary slogans but must not immediately enforce their acceptance by the non-communist masses.

Since then some organisations had been guilty of Right deviations. A pre-requisite for the correct application of our united front tactics is the correct estimation of our opponents. We must not under-estimate the strength of the Socialist Party; we must not close our eyes to the fact that in certain districts it possesses a proletarian basis, that is has great municipalities in its hands and that its apparatus is connected with the C. G. I. We have not understood how to develop sufficient activity in the most important sphere, the trade union sphere.

The Centrist tendency in our Party which made its appearance after the Conference of 1. and 2. December (article by Humbertot, letter at the time of the Enlarged Executive etc.), is demanding a democratic centralism, by which they mean that there should be set up an organ of constant discussion. This would mean converting the Party into a debating society, discrediting it in the eyes of the masses and destroying it. The "Humanité" which has recently made great progress, would at once lose its circulation were it to become a discussion organ. The proletariat needs a correct line and concrete slogans.

We have the proper organs for discussion: the nuclei, which have to discuss the slogans and the tactics of the Party.

One of the most important tasks of the Party, continued the speaker, is the unification of the young and the older generation of the Party.

As regards the Right, they have for some time past maintained complete silence. But in the districts they are still conducting a systematic campaign of opposition against the Party leadership. One must sharply combat those Right tendencies in the Party which support the trade union policy of the "Revolutions Proletarienne" of Monatte and Co. The Party Conference must oppose in the sharpest manner the Monatte, Rosmer, Souvarine group which is actually carrying on a counter-revolutionary activity.

But this does not mean that the discontented working class elements should be expelled. The Party Executive is perfectly willing to allot to the Right working class elements, that share in the leadership which is due to them, if they openly and without reservation declare their complete agreement with the resolutions of the C. I.

Our present task is to consolidate the Party, to follow a clear political line and to apply correctly the united front tactics.

The bourgeoisie is openly preparing for a broad fascist offensive, headed by the French employers organisations. It is all the more necessary, therefore, that the C. P., by its correct and concrete slogans, by the right application of the united front tactics, attracts to itself the majority of the working class, makes its influence felt in the trade unions and leads the masses towards a revolutionary workers' and peasants' government.

Second Session.

Lille, 20th June 1926.

The second session of the Conference was opened with the discussion on the Report of the Executive.

Comrade Mathieu (Limoges) declared that the Party must in the future learn from the failures of the past. The speaker cited examples from his own district showing the bad work of certain instructors, as the latter carried out the directions of the C. C. without understanding and without adapting them to the political level of the masses.

Comrade Simon (Bordeaux) spoke to the same effect. The C. C. must take into consideration the situation in the various organisations and build up its work accordingly.

Comrade Morin (Paris district), one of the leaders of the opposition against the C. C., pointed to the negative character of the report and criticised the political and organisatory measures of the C. C. The reorganisation is not completed, the fractions are not functioning, the influence of the Party has declined. (cries of No!) It is therefore necessary to control the policy and the activity of the Party Central. The Central has for too long prevented any discussion. The Right have been opposed by purely mechanical, authoritative means. We ask why the Left do not come forward here and state their political opinion.

We had hoped that as a result of this Party Conference there would be another leadership. The International has declared that the essential core of the leadership shall remain. We submit but we shall take care that the past is not repeated.

Comrade Humberdot, also a leader of the Centrist opposition to the C. C., criticised the slogans issued by the E. C. and complained of the lack of democratic centralism. The self-criticism on the part of the leaders contained in the report of the Executive is to be welcomed, but it must be the starting point of a broad discussion in order that we shall learn from the failures of the past. The Party leadership has erred in the political perspectives which it laid down as a basis for its activity, and also in regard to the social composition of the Party: as a result it was the prisoner of the ultra-Left elements.

We shall vote for the acceptance of the report of the Executive, but this does not mean that we vote for the Party Central, but for their admission of their failures.

Comrade Costes (secretary of the Paris district) briefly replied to the insincere criticism of Morin and Humberdot. He declared that they were opportunists and that they had come to the end of their tether in the Paris district.

Third Session.

Lille, June 20, 1926.

Continuation of the Discussion on the Report of the Executive.

After short speeches by Comrades Rey (Auvergne) and Monméa (Alpes) Comrade Renaud Jean in a speech lasting an hour, examined the causes of the declining curve in the development of the Party and the somewhat sceptical mood which he had experienced here and there in the provinces. Such a mood, he declared, is by no means justified by the objective development in France, for events are working for us. Wherein lie the causes? Firstly, in the lack of a uniform conception of the role of our Party, and secondly in the organisatory errors committed up to the Conference of 1st and 2nd December, that is up to the time of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.

If we wish to win the masses we must conduct a policy which will inspire them with confidence. For this purpose it is not sufficient to defend their every day demands, but we must at the same time direct our attention to the political struggle for power, to the fight against the whole economic and political system of the bourgeois State.

As regards the organisatory weaknesses, it is wrong to say that the transference of the Party to nuclei was incorrect. But the Party, with its complicated structure, with its district organisations etc. does not correspond to the structure of France,

and will not be capable, in revolutionary times, of conducting the fight against the firmly centralised bourgeois State. That the Party organisation is not a good one is shown by the simple curve of the development of the membership: after the Party Conference of Tours we numbered 10,000 members, today we have only 50,000. The reason is to be found in the lack of proper connection between the C. C. and the basis of the Party. The speaker stated he would not submit any theses or resolutions of his own; he would vote for the Executive's Report.

Fourth Session.

Lille, 21st June 1926.

The discussion upon the report of the executive committee was continued.

Comrades Oudin (Troyes) and Barette (North West District) spoke of the application of the united Front tactic and Barette in particular warned of the dangers of a united front at any price.

Comrade Pichon (Bordeaux) demanded a more active participation of the provinces in the leadership of the Party.

Comrade Nicod pointed out that the situation outside Paris demanded different methods of work and he sharply criticised the Morin group.

Comrade André Marty although he is himself a member of the E. C. criticised it and its methods of work, the weakening of the Morocco campaign and the insufficient activity during the British general strike. The campaign against Fascism must be better led was his opinion. The political line of "l'Humanité" was not sufficiently sharp. Marty further dealt in detail with the attitude of the communist parliamentary fraction which did not carry out its purpose well enough. The tasks of the E. C. and those of the Political Bureau must in the future be more clearly defined.

Comrade Beers (Bretagne) spoke upon the necessity of a good information organ.

A long speech on the part of Doriot then followed. He declared that the Right wing was in retreat. It was hiding itself under the tendency of Humberdot and Morin. It was urgently necessary to liquidate the Right wing and their protectors Humberdot-Morin. The methods of the Right were not suited to the after-war period and the present development. In the present tense situation it is the duty of the C. C. to mobilise the masses against the bourgeoisie through the medium of the united front. In this connection however, opportunist dangers would have to be avoided. The speaker declared himself to be in agreement with Jean Renaud in the following points: 1) The E. C. must not be eliminated by the Polbureau; 2) the E. C. must have firm connections with the masses of the Party membership; 3) partial actions for the immediate demands of the workers, peasants and middle classes must not cause the revolutionary orientation to be forgotten. The attitude of Jean Renaud with regard to the organisation of the Party however was false because it was necessary to build up the Party organisations in the districts according to the most important centres of production. The opinion of Renaud upon the loss of members was also incorrect. The speaker in answer to Marty declared that upon the whole the communist parliamentary fraction has fulfilled its duties. In conclusion Doriot declared that the attitude of the Communist Party to the Morocco war had proved that the Party was the only revolutionary Party in France.

Fifth Session.

The discussion upon the E. C. report was continued. Many speakers took part in the discussion including comrades Nerac and Choime.

The elections of the various commissions then followed and the speech of greetings of the Czechoslovakian fraternal delegate Haken who was received with stormy applause.

In the continuation of the discussion Dorel spoke and Laporte on behalf of the parliamentary fraction. Laporte described the difficulties with which the fraction had to contend and its activities and spoke against the feelings within the Party against the fraction which was only the executive organ of the Party.

Comrades Vuillemin and Fugerolle (Italian Group) described the tasks of the Party amongst the 3 million foreign workers who are at present in France.

Comrade Tacco (Nice) described the anti-fascist actions in the South of France.

Sixth Session.

Lille, 22nd June 1926.

The session continued the discussion upon the report of the E. C.

The communist member of parliament **Gauthier** defended in a detailed speech the point of view of the Right wing. He supported the letter of the 250 to the E. C. C. I. and declared under general protest that the policy of the Comintern was dominated by the interests of Russian foreign policy. He demanded a free Party discussion upon international policy.

The declarations of **Gauthier** were rejected by the whole congress. **Villatte** (Paris) pointed to the relationship between the Right wing and the centre.

The Centrist **Morin** made a declaration against the Right wing and against **Gauthier**.

Schiavro then spoke upon the activity of the Party in **Algeria**.

Erneste Gireault (Paris) criticised the sharp struggle conducted against the Right.

The closing speech of **Semard** then followed. He declared amidst applause that the E. C. was prepared to draw all forces into the work and he spoke against the unjust criticism which had been made against the E. C. He explained the tasks of the united front committees and spoke in detail of the attitude of the parliamentary fraction. The social democratic tendency in the parliamentary fraction had shown itself in the letter of the 250. **Semard** declared that in the Russian question the **French Rights** were working parallel with the **Ruth Fischer** group in Germany. He then discussed the organisation form of the Party which must be based upon the factory nuclei. The Party Congress he declared must finally create ideological clarity.

After the closing speech of **Semard** the report of the E. C. was adopted with all votes against two and with one abstention.

Seventh Session.

Lille, 23rd June 1926.

The Party Conference for the fighting English Workers.

Comrade **Campbell**

of the Communist Party of Great Britain greeted the Congress of the French Communist Party in a short night session. He described the situation in Great Britain before, during and after the general strike and then proceeded to discuss the common tasks of the British, German and French proletariat. His remarks were received with great applause. Thereupon a political address of the Party Congress to the Communist Party of Great Britain and an appeal to the workers of France to support the workers of Great Britain were decided upon. The session was then closed.

Eighth Session.

Report on the International and National Situation.

Comrade **Renaud Jean** made a declaration to the effect that he was in agreement with the leadership in the question of the nuclei.

Comrade **Semard** delivered a speech upon the international and national situation and the tasks of the Party which lasted for three hours. Comrade **Semard** characterised the relativity of the stabilisation by the crises and the revolutionary process in Europe and in the Orient. The British Empire was in decay, a permanent economic crisis prevailed in Great Britain itself and the class-struggle there was intensifying. In Germany declared the speaker the class antagonisms are growing as a result of the effects of the Dawes plan and the campaign for the expropriation of the princes had resulted in a political crisis. **Semard** then described the development of Fascism in Italy, the Coup d'Etat of Pilsudski in Poland and the financial crisis in Belgium. The dominating opponent poles of the world said the speaker were the United States and the U.S.S.R. The speaker then went on to describe the contradictions of imperialism, the danger of war, the League of Nations as a tool of the imperialists and the role of the social democracy as the assistants in the work of bourgeois stabilisation. A solution to this situation he said was only to be found in the social revolution and in the creation of the united states of socialist Europe.

After a short pause comrade **Semard** described the economic and political situation in France. The growing concentration of capital was causing a famine amongst the impoverished

middle-classes, the peasants and the workers and caused an intensification of the class antagonisms. The parties were decaying at a great speed. One government crisis followed the other. The bourgeoisie was organising fascist leagues and the masses were streaming to the Left, whilst strikes were becoming ever more frequent. The present governmental crisis would bring no solution with it. Anglo-Saxon capital wanted a stabilisation, but an economic crisis, unemployment and class-struggle were attached to it.

The tasks of the Party declared the speaker were the following: 1) the creation of a trade union mass movement; 2) the creation of a mass Party of workers and peasants, and 3) the winning of allies. The most important means to these ends was the united front tactic. The struggle for immediate demands should be connected with a revolutionary orientation. The speaker concluded by declaring that the leadership of the Party would have to be firm and united.

Lille, 23rd June 1926.

In the afternoon of the 23rd of June, the discussion upon the speech of comrade **Semard** upon "The national and international situation and the tasks of the Party" was opened.

The first speaker was comrade **Berron** (Alsace-Lorraine) who expressed the views of the comrades in Alsace-Lorraine upon the general situation in France. He then sketched in detail the situation in Alsace-Lorraine, the autonomist movement there and the tasks of the Communist Party.

Thereupon the continuation of the discussion was postponed and the session was closed.

THE WHITE TERROR

Only the World Proletariat can Rescue Sacco and Vanzetti!

American capitalist justice is still firmly retaining in its clutches the two victims, **Sacco** and **Vanzetti** who have been condemned to death. Although the innocence of the two revolutionaries has been formally proved by the confession of **Celestino Madeiros**, although the workers of the various countries have by a powerful protest movement expressed their indignation against the planned judicial murder, the American plutocracy has not yet finally abandoned its intention to murder **Sacco** and **Vanzetti**.

Thanks to the protest movement of the American and the international proletariat, the American authorities have already three times been compelled to postpone the execution of **Sacco** and **Vanzetti**. The final decision regarding a new trial demanded by the defence will be given in July.

Many official statements, however, indicate that the American bourgeoisie will again do everything possible in order to find any pretext, no matter how ridiculous, for upholding the death sentence.

The Italian Ambassador to the United States is already washing the hands of the American central government. Compelled by the mass protest of the Italian workers, by the hundreds of protest telegrams which he has received, to make a statement, he declares that the condemnation and murder of **Sacco** and **Vanzetti** is, "according to the American Constitution", an inner affair of the Court of the State of Massachusetts (!), that the Central government and the President of the United States cannot exercise any influence in the matter.

"Should the sentence be confirmed — concludes the Ambassador in the declaration — then the right to pardon rests solely with the governor of the State of Massachusetts, over whose actions the President of the United States has no right of control".

This statement, along with the statement of judge **Thayer**, according to which **Sacco** and **Vanzetti**, even if they have not committed the actual deed with which they are charged, are nevertheless morally guilty as they are anarchists who preach the overthrow of social institutions, shows how great the danger is. This attitude of the American bourgeoisie is a further proof that **Sacco** and **Vanzetti** can only be saved by increasing the protest movements of the international working class more than ever.

Sacco and **Vanzetti** themselves place their entire hopes in the active solidarity of their class comrades. **Vanzetti** writes in a letter:

"The echo of your campaign in our behalf has reached my heart. I repeat, I will repeat to my last, only the people, our comrades, our friends, the world proletariat can save us from the powers of the capitalist, reactionary hyenas or vindicate our names and our blood before history".

Sacco writes:

"We will stand like good communard soldiers to the end of the battle, and looking into the eyes of our enemy, face to face, to tell them with our last breath that we have faith that you, the comrades and all the workers of the world's solidarity, would free Sacco and Vanzetti to-morrow. Meanwhile, best wishes to all from my comrade Vanzetti who joins with my most fraternal greeting."

This confidence must be replied to by continuing and increasing the protest movement of the workers of all countries, regardless of Party, until Sacco and Vanzetti are rescued.

Eight Finnish Revolutionaries Rescued From Prison.

Moscow, June 27th 1926.

Today, on the Soviet Finnish frontier, the first exchange of prisoners between the Soviet Union and Finland was carried out by a representative of the International Red Aid. Eight Finnish White Guardist spies were exchanged for eight Finnish revolutionaries. Among the latter there were the railway worker Lachtosari who had been twice condemned to life-long imprisonment, the agricultural worker Leppolo who has been in prison for four years, and also five revolutionary workers and one peasant. The exchanged prisoners gave details regarding the unbearable prison regime which has completely shattered their health. One of the exchanged comrades had been kept for three and a half years in prison awaiting trial.

To the Victims of Bourgeois Class Justice in all Countries!

Greetings sent from the Opening Session of the 4th International Women's Conference on May 30, 1926.

The 4th International Women's Conference, together with the vanguard of the working women of Moscow send hearty greetings to all prisoners lingering in jails in the capitalist West and of the oppressed countries of the East.

Today when the representatives of the working women of all countries meet under the banner of Communism, our thoughts are with you men and women prisoners of capitalism.

Even if today your jailers can do their worst, if thousands of revolutionary fighters are still in chains, and if prison bars are still strong, the brutality of your executioners is of no avail. The atrocities they perpetrate cannot break our iron proletarian will and will not instil fear into the hearts of the fighters in the ranks of the proletarian army of Communism.

The united front of the working men and women of all countries will deal a deadly blow to the stronghold of capitalism.

Imbued with faith in the cause championed by Lenin, the cause of the proletarian revolution, we from the country of Soviets stretch out our hands to you through the prison bars and say: "The day is not far distant when the bourgeoisie will pay the penalty for all its crimes."

Down with the Fascist hangmen!

Long live the world proletarian revolution!

BOOK REVIEWS

John W. Brown: "The Migration Problem and the Working Class".*)

By Erich Gentsch (Berlin).

The Secretary of the I.F.T.U., John W. Brown, has issued a detailed report for the so-called World Migration Congress

*) John W. Brown: "Das Wanderungsproblem und die Arbeiterklasse", I.F.T.U. Amsterdam, 1926.

held from the 22nd to the 25th June in London, the first volume of which lies before us.

The World Migration Congress was convened and held by the International Federation of Trade Unions (Amsterdam) and the Labour and Socialist (Second) International. It was attended by delegates from twenty two countries, among them being Australia, British India, Japan, Canada, Mexico, New Zealand and South Africa. The most important countries for emigrants, the United States of America, Brazil and Argentina, were not represented. Nearly all the representatives had been sent by the international trade union organisations affiliated to Amsterdam.

The holding of this conference jointly by the Amsterdam and the Second Internationals sufficiently characterises the "political neutrality" of the Amsterdam trade union bureaucracy. The Soviet Union, a country comprising one sixth of the surface of the globe and therefore constituting a complex which is of extraordinary, in fact of overwhelming importance for migration questions, was not invited. The reformists rightly feared the criticism — delivered solely from the standpoint of the proletarian class struggle — of the Russians. They had had enough of the annihilating criticism of the Russians at the Hague "Peace Conference".

The spirit of the World Migration Congress will only be characterised here by a few words regarding the speech of Alex. Knoll, Secretary of the A. D. G. B. (German General Federation of Trade Unions). Knoll said: "The position of the labour market in Germany has been still further worsened, because Germany has been deprived of her colonies. As a result there exists in Germany an eager desire to obtain colonies" (?) That it is impossible to conduct an emigration policy from this standpoint is clear to every class conscious worker. This cry for colonies from the camp of the free trade unions, however, is not the result of mere chance. Already some months ago, a member of the Socialist Party of Germany, Dr. Valentin Müller-Gera, in the "Gewerkschaftsarchiv" (Trade Union Record), sang a beautiful (probably well paid) song on the colonisation by the German unemployed of countries abroad — if possible of German capitalist colonies.

J. W. Brown, in the first volume of his report, deals at great length with the world migration problem, but without adopting any attitude to the national and international tasks of the trade unions regarding the migration question. After referring to the racial antagonisms and to capitalist colonisation in the various parts of the world, he only recommends the nations to strive for an understanding on a peaceable basis, so long as this is possible. In his opinion, it is the task of the international labour movement to throw the whole weight of its influence into the scale in favour of a just and peaceable settlement.

The report most carefully avoids going into the problem of the right of self-determination of the peoples, including also that of the colonial peoples. The winning of this right of self-determination, with the aid of the class conscious workers of the world, would at least reduce a great danger, i. e. the danger of the undercutting of wages by the Chinese, Indian and African workers.

In their mania for co-operating in all places and circumstances with the capitalists, the Amsterdamites always forget the fact that this co-operation leads, even in the very best cases, to a few petty reforms, but never brings a solution. A solution of the migration problem will only be brought about by the destruction of capitalism, for which it is necessary to fight in the first place also in this connection.

J. W. Brown next deals in his report with the various forms of migration: permanent migration, where the emigrant intends to settle down in a country for good; temporary migration, where the emigrant hopes after some time to return with his savings to his native country; and seasonal migration, as in the case of the Italian building workers, the Polish agricultural workers etc., where the emigrant goes to another country for the summer months, returning in the winter months.

While in the first form of migration there exists the desire on the part of the emigrant to adapt himself to his new surroundings, to join up with the trade union movement and to help in improving the position of the workers, with the temporary emigrant this desire is lacking in the majority of cases. The temporary emigrant or the season workers rarely takes any interest in the labour movement.

Organised mass emigration (collective, under the supervision of an organisation, or in families or other groups) is now be-

coming quite a feature in Europe, particularly in **France** and **Germany**. The migration of **Polish**, or **Slovak** seasonal workers to **Germany** and that of **Italian** workers to **France** is controlled and regulated by national treaties.

This migration movement, particularly of a few workers desirous of better conditions, to countries with somewhat higher standards of culture, cannot be combated with the argument: "They depress our wages." These immigrant workers must, on the contrary, be won for the trade union movement; they must be raised up to the level of the workers of the new country and be made class fighters.

Of course, it is necessary and desirable that the unions should have an important word to say in the conclusion of collective and individual agreements between the employers and the immigrants. This likewise, however, depends solely upon the activity developed by these trade unions themselves.

A model example of how the trade unions should not deal with immigrants is offered by America. In the majority of cases the **American trade unions** do not admit immigrants to membership. The consequence is, that the latter have to work under considerably worse conditions than the small proportion of **American trade union** organised workers (2,8 million).

These tactics however, lead to the outspoken policy of a **labour aristocracy**, which, no longer regarding itself as belonging to the proletariat, looks upon the immigrants with contempt. We find similar tendencies, for example, in **Germany** in regard to the **Polish immigrant worker**.

J. W. Brown gives in his report a great quantity of statistical details. Thus, from 1909 to 1914, 17 million people from 15 European countries emigrated to **America**, **Canada**, **Argentina**, **Brazil** and **New Zealand**.

The war and the post-war period with their vast transformations, also brought about a decisive change in this respect. During the war emigration was almost completely held up. But in the years 1920-24 emigration from **Europe** to the **overseas countries of North and South America**, **Africa**, **Australia** and **New Zealand** amounted in all to only 3,499,086 persons, in spite of the tremendous crisis in the European countries. The countries chiefly contributing to this total were **Great Britain** with 1,070,000, **Italy** with 835,000, **Spain** with 457,000, **Poland** with 278,000, **Germany** with 242,000, **Portugal** with 146,000, **Czechoslovakia** with 79,000, **Yugoslavia** with 52,000, **Sweden** with 48,000, **Roumania** with 44,000, **Norway** with 43,000, **Finland** with 40,000, **Austria** with 39,000, **Switzerland** with 34,000 and **Belgium** with 17,000.

How great, however, was the migration on the **Continent of Europe** itself is shown by the fact that **Italy** had a total of 1,5 million emigrants, **Poland** 447,000, **Czechoslovakia** 189,000, **Belgium** 108,000 and **Roumania** 91,000.

Most of the overseas countries have protected themselves against uncontrolled immigration by means of definite legislation. The **United States of America**, in particular, have definitely fixed the quota of immigrants permitted to enter the country from the various countries. While in 1913, 1,200,000 persons emigrated to the **United States**, in 1924 only 706,898 and in 1925 only 294,314 persons were admitted.

After a historical survey of the migration problem, in which the influence of **famine and food shortage** (after the Napoleonic wars), **political reaction** (1848) and **economic crisis** (1881) on emigration is proved by figures, the author gives a further survey of migration and vocation. In the year 1923, the record year for European emigration, of the total of 422,071 emigrants, 111,785, that is 26.5%, belonged to the (skilled) **industrial and mining proletariat**, 14.4% belonged to **agriculture**, 19.1% to **transport and commerce**, 16.1% were **household employees and unskilled workers**, 3.6% belonged to the **free professions**, including officials, and 29.3% either had no occupation or the occupation was not given.

The Nine Days.*)

By W. Ensee.

In order that the workers of all countries should be able to form a correct estimate of the **English General Strike** and draw the appropriate lessons from it, it is necessary that, apart from the official accounts, they have information regarding what actually took place behind the scenes immediately before and during those eventful nine days. The little pamphlet which has just been published in England by **A. J. Cook** entitled the "Nine Days" will do much to enlighten **English workers** as to the course of events which led to the calling off of the **General Strike** and the betrayal of the miners.

A perusal of its contents leaves no doubt in the reader's mind that, the immediate cause of the failure of the **English General Strike** was — peace to **Otto Bauer** — that the **leaders betrayed the movement**. On the one hand we have the picture of the eager fighting enthusiasm and solidarity of the simple rank and file workers, on the other hand the picture of the **General Council**, forced by the government's obduracy and the pressure of the workers into a fight for which they had no heart, without any preparations having been made, vacillating and searching eagerly for any excuse to call off the strike, regardless of the interests of the miners and the workers who had responded so loyally to the call. "It is evident", says **Cook** in conclusion, "that some of the **T. U. C.** were afraid of the power they had created; were anxious to keep friends with the Government, and not to harm the employing class... and there were others who were determined to sabotage the **General Strike** to justify their repeated declarations 'That it would not succeed'."

Two little incidents are worth recording: On the very eve of the strike we have **Ramsay MacDonald** declaring in the **House of Commons**: "With the discussion of general strikes and Bolshevism and all that kind of thing I have nothing to do at all. I respect the Constitution as much as **Sir Robert Horne**." And, later, when the **General Council**, without consulting the miners' leaders, had accepted the Memorandum of **Sir Herbert Samuel** and were trying to force the miners to accept it as a basis of negotiations, **Cook** states: "Mr **Pugh** was continually pressed and questioned by **Mr Herbert Smith**, myself, and my colleagues as to what the guarantees were, and who had given them. We got no answer. But **Mr J. H. Thomas** said to me personally, when I asked him whether the Government would accept the **Samuel proposals** and what were his guarantees: 'You may not trust my word, but will you not accept the word of a **British gentleman who has been the Governor of Palestine**?'". It does not need a profound Marxist to see that under such "leadership", the **General Strike** of the **English workers**, no matter what class solidarity they may have displayed, could hardly end otherwise than in disaster.

Whilst **Cook** in this pamphlet gives in a very brief compass a plain narrative of the events that led to the calling off of the general strike, it is to be regretted that he does not point out to his readers the obvious lessons to be drawn from the experiences of the historical nine days. The shameful betrayal on the part of the **General Council** with its disastrous results to the workers only confirms that which **Comrade Trotzky** has urged in his recent book, "Where is Britain Going?", i. e. that the urgent task confronting the **English Labour Movement** is that of replacing the old leaders who have arisen during the period of capitalist prosperity in England, and creating that firm revolutionary leadership which alone will be capable of leading the workers in the stormy period lying ahead and which must inevitably culminate in the direct struggle for power. This is the lesson of the **Nine Days**, and it is this lesson that the **English Communist Party**, the real disciples of **Lenin** in **Great Britain**, have been consistently driving home to the workers.

*) "The Nine Days" by **A. J. Cook**. The Labour Research Department, London.