

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 60

2nd September 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, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Iaprekorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

A. Andreyev: The Struggle of the British Miners and the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Politics.

Jar: The Imperialist Policy of Primo de Rivera.

A. F. Neumann: The Fight for Abyssinia and Abyssinia's Protest to the League of Nations.

Paul Marison: The Role of the Poincaré Government.

John Pepper: Imperialist War Manoeuvres and Opportunist Peace Manoeuvres.

P. Stary: The Political Situation in Czechoslovakia and the Gajda Affair.

Union of Soviet Republics.

The Successes and Defects of the Economy Campaign in the Soviet Union. Proclamation by Comrades A. Rykov, I. Stalin and V. Kuybyshev.

Decree of the Soviet Government concerning Wage Increases in the Soviet Union.

The Labour Movement.

Giovanni Germanetto: Conference of the Italian Trade Union League and the Position of the Trade Unions in Italy.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

A. Nin: Creation of Unity in the Trade Unions of Bulgaria.

The Miners' Struggle in England.

The Session of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris. Report of Comrade Andreyev in the Extraordinary Plenary Session of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, August 12, 1926 (Conclusion).

Resolution of the Plenum of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union on the Paris Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

In the International.

Resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia upon the Events in the Russian and German Brother Parties. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.

In the Colonies.

A. F.: The Revolutionary Movement in Indo-China.

Agitprop.

A. G. Bosse: The American Party School.

The Struggle of the British Miners and the Anglo-Russian Committee.

By A. Andreyev.

Comrade Andreyev was the Chairman of the delegation of the Trade Unions of the U. S. S. R. to the conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee which has just concluded its sessions in Berlin. Ed.

We have expressed our opinion repeatedly and with exhaustive clearness in the decisions of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union concerning the estimation of the events in England. The latest happenings in connection with the miners' struggle have completely proved the correctness of our estimation.

The struggle of the miners has become a lengthy business and has already lasted four months. We can only wonder at the persistence and heroism with which the miners are carrying on their fight. The miners are prepared to be victorious even at the price of tremendous privation and sacrifice. Their struggle is all the greater, because all forces are mobilised against them.

The unhindered transport of strike breaking coal from

abroad to England and the transport of this coal in England is a specially great danger for the strike. It gives the enemies of the miners — the employers and the government — a powerful weapon with which to throttle the strike.

It has already been proved with complete clarity that the Conservative government in Great Britain is directly supporting the employers. The latest news concerning the mobilisation of the police to protect strike breakers provides a special verification of this fact. Some English trade union leaders do not yet or will not grasp this fact, but every honest proletarian understands perfectly that the Conservative government is determined to defeat the miners at all costs.

The situation of the miners which is in any case difficult enough, is made more difficult by the insufficient material support from the international proletariat and by the lack of necessary support on the part of the trade union leaders in England. This lack of support means starvation and inhuman privation for the miners and their families.

I believe that an estimation of the situation shows that the miners are now as before literally isolated in their struggle, although the leaders of the British trade union movement declare in words that they support the miners.

Taken together, all this must cause honest anxiety concerning the outcome of the struggle in the hearts of all those who feel themselves interested in the heroic struggle of the miners, in the hearts of all those who feel themselves joined with fraternal bonds to the fighting miners, and in the hearts of all those who wish them victory. The Trade Unions and the whole working class of the Soviet Union are doing everything in their power to assist our brothers, the fighting miners. Up to the present over 5 million roubles (approximately 500,000 pounds) collected in coppers from the proletarians of the Soviet Union, have been handed over to the Miners' Federation of Great Britain. We do not regard this as anything especially praiseworthy on our part, we have done only our simple class duty to our brothers in their struggle. We will continue to do our duty in the future, but with still greater persistence and energy, despite all the calumnies of the English bourgeoisie, concerning our honest and fraternally expressed solidarity which shows itself in our material support of the miners.

We are, however, of the opinion, that our assistance alone is very little to ensure victory for the miners. For this reason we requested the calling together of the Anglo-Russian Committee in order to discuss at its conference the extension and strengthening of all possible ways and means for supporting the British miners, materially, morally and otherwise, both in England and the Soviet Union and upon an international scale. We did this with the one honest wish, to give the campaign of support a broader basis.

Unfortunately, as has already been reported in the press, we were not successful in getting this question placed upon the agenda of the last conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee which took place about a month ago in Paris.

We have raised this question, however, exhaustively in the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee which has just ended in Berlin. If this conference does not result in immediate support for the striking miners, then we hope that every worker will clearly understand that the fault is not ours.

I can give no details concerning the conference until the delegation has presented its report to the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union. I say and wish to stress with all clearness that the contention that the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union wished to lead and to dictate to the British trade union movement is a malicious calumny. The English bourgeois press is doing all in its power to spread this calumny, in order to break the fraternal bonds between the British and Russian workers. This is also being done by those representatives of the reformist camp who are unsatisfied with the friendly relations between the British and Russian trade union movements.

We have often declared and declare again now that the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union have no other idea than to proffer fraternal assistance and to help in a joint struggle against the offensive of capital. We have no other motive than a wholehearted desire for joint work in the establishment of the real unity of the trade union movement.

We consider it to be our proletarian duty to the workers of the Soviet Union and also to the workers of the whole world to express our opinion on the leadership of the General Strike, but we are convinced that the tactics of the leaders can at present only be influenced by the British working class itself and by no one else. For this reason it is a base calumny to speak of an interference of the Russian trade unions in the affairs of the British trade union movement.

We are firmly convinced that this calumny and misrepresentation by our class enemies and by the opponents of international trade union unity will not succeed in breaking the fraternal bonds which exist between the English and Russian trade union movements.

POLITICS

The Imperialist Policy of Primo de Rivera.

By Jar (Madrid).

Notwithstanding the negotiations and conferences held in Paris between the French and Spanish delegates to discuss the future policy as regards the Morocco question, this problem is once more vivid and acute on account of the Spanish-Italian treaty being actually signed by the Dictators of Italy and Spain and because of the recent declarations of Primo de Rivera on Tangiers published by "A. B. C." on August the 14th. There is no question, the old rivalries between France and Spain in Morocco persist in spite of all the communiqués of friendship between the two countries.

The "Treaty of Madrid", signed by Primo de Rivera and Mussolini, is the realisation of the policy initiated in 1923 by Mr. Santiago Alba, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. In those days relations to France were very strained, this was why Mr. Alba created a new policy for a friendlier attitude towards Italy and planned the visit of the Spanish King to Italy.

The designs of France for the Tangiers Statute ought to be frustrated; this was Mr. Alba's plan.

But this policy had to be interrupted in April 1924 on account of the sharpness of the Rifian assaults. Primo de Rivera's Government was forced into a war alliance with France, in those days impotent to stop the attacks with its own means of defence. But this alliance did not mean a general policy of relationship with France. As the Spanish army's feelings were against it, the Military Directory was not able to develop a real friendship with France.

At present the Statute of Tangiers means for Primo de Rivera and Mussolini a fine pretext for their imperialist aims. The signification of the Treaty of Madrid, of which the declarations of the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs to the correspondents of "The Times" and "Le Temps" seemed so satisfactory, is entirely that of the acute imperialist policy. There is no mystery in its significance as "The Times" declared lately in one of its editorials. And coinciding with the signature of the Treaty of Madrid, between Italy and Spain, Primo de Rivera has made to one of the editors of "A. B. C." affirmations of violent imperialism on the problem of Tangiers. Very crudely speaking, feeling himself as a great conqueror, he menaces both France and England, and especially the latter.

Primo de Rivera declares that "Europe and the whole world will not see the end of the Tangiers problem, nor will the deep clouds, more dangerous than ever which menace European peace disappear, until the European nations recognise the Spanish right to Tangiers and give Spain the government and administration of the International Zone of Tangiers."

The Spanish nationalists and their official organisation, the "African League" (Liga Africanista) take the following view: Spain who has to endure an English Gibraltar, ought not to permit, through weakness in its relations with other nations, another Gibraltar, a French Gibraltar, to be formed behind its protectorate zone in the Riff, and another English "Gibraltar in Tangiers". The problem of national supremacy is traced in this way. When the requirements of war forced the Spanish and French armies to work together and develop a common campaign, the nationalist question was incidentally forgotten, but the compensation of Tangiers and Gibraltar was kept in mind. At present, the war problem seems abruptly ended; therefore, the imperialist aims appear once more. Some weeks ago the "Correspondencia Militar" stated: The African problem will be solved favorably for Spain, and in the near future, with Gibraltar, that will at last belong again to Spain, a new Andalusian province should be formed on the African coast.

Primo de Rivera is carrying into practice a political program, that he himself designates "International policy". The three ambitions maintained during the last years of the past century and since the first years of the current one by the Spanish traditionalists: 1. The dominion of North Africa, 2. An alliance with Portugal and 3. a Spanish-South-American block, have been adopted by Primo de Rivera's Directory and constitute the three main points of their program, and, therefore,

the crossing of the Atlantic, the "Plus Ultra's" "raid", departing from the little port of Palos, from which Columbus sailed in 1492 for the New World, the Madrid-Manila air raid, carried out by "El Cano", must be understood as the first imperialist attempts to form the Spanish South-American-Block. The public speech pronounced by King Alfonso XIII. at Palos, to commemorate the triumphant end of the Palos-Buenos Aires raid, was of such an imperialist tone that the Censorship did not allow the press to publish the words of the King of Spain. And the hostility, each day more clearly manifested, of the South and Central American Republics against the United States supremacy, is being exploited by Primo de Rivera to favour his policy. All the tactics of the Spanish Monarchy are determined by this imperialist tendency; consequently its intolerant attitude at Geneva, on the question of the permanent place in the League of Nations: Spain is trying to break definitively with the League of Nations, because its aim is to initiate a Spanish-South-American block.

Abd-el-Krim's surrender and the French and Spanish troops' advance across the Riff, have determined the revival of the imperialist aims which were those of the Spanish Monarchy from the very first days of the current century. Actually Primo de Rivera considers the military dictatorship strong and sure enough, to carry out this policy with success: Primo de Rivera thinks himself the real successor of the glorious conquerors in the military history of Spain.

Spain is actually enduring one of the most acute nationalist phases ever known. After the colonial war of 1898, the independence of Cuba and Philippines and our defeat in the war with the United States, the Spanish Monarchy was not strong enough to carry out any imperialist aims; Morocco was considered the only possible direction for nationalist expansion. In the past years, the European war awakened the imperialist zeal: the Spanish nationalists were looking towards Germany for the realisation of their ideals. The German defeat stopped these impulses which now again find an opportunity to develop: the Military Dictatorship and the Morocco problem. Primo de Rivera's declarations to the editor of "A. B. C." reflect the acuteness and gravity of the moment. The possession of Tangiers makes it possible to qualify England's control of the Straits of Gibraltar: it also leads to weaken French influence in Morocco. This is the real meaning of the alliance between Primo de Rivera and Mussolini and the significance of the Treaty of Madrid. The problems of Morocco and the Mediterranean are entering upon an interesting phase.

The Fight for Abyssinia and Abyssinia's Protest to the League of Nations.

By A. F. Neumann.

Italy's endeavours to create a colonial empire at any price have led to Abyssinia's becoming within recent times the source of almost chronic conflicts between England, France and Italy, i. e., between the countries participating in the treaty of 1906. The significance, the eventual results of these conflicts will be in no way mitigated by the fact that Abyssinia, as far as England and France are concerned, is not only an object of their policy but also a trump of high value in their play for gains which have nothing in common with Abyssinia.

England has a very close interest in the Lake of Tana and in the Blue Nile, because these are very important for the watering of the cotton-plantations owned by the English in the Sudan and Egypt. It is naturally difficult to estimate whether England is really so very interested to procure immediately from the Abyssinian Government the permission to build sluices on the Nile and a highway from the frontier of the Sudan as far as the Lake of Tana. It is still remarkable that in December of 1925 the English quite unexpectedly supported those claims of Italy which in 1919 they regarded as incompatible with their own interests and that they believe it necessary to come to agreements with Italy without the knowledge of France, despite the circumstance that it would be much more favourable to them to work with France, because the clash of interests between Great Britain and France in connection with the basin of the Nile no longer exists.

The only possible explanation is that the agreements between Italy and England are on a broader basis and that Abyssinia is

the price which England is prepared to pay to gain the support of Italy in other questions. That the solution of the problem is to be found here is proved by the coincidence of the English note of December 14th, 1925, in which Italy is promised English support of her claims in Abyssinia, and the decision of the League of Nations on December 17th, 1925, in favour of England in the Mosul question. Naturally, the English Press makes no mention of the relation between Mosul and Abyssinia. On the other hand, the problem is discussed with all the more vehemence in the French Press.

France's interests in Abyssinia are chiefly centred about the railway which connects the French port of Dshibuti with the Abyssinian Capital, Adis Ababa. This line is of decisive importance to Abyssinia's export trade and affords France an especially advantageous position in Abyssinia, both economically and politically. A division of Abyssinia, which would reduce France's sphere of influence, and the construction of a new railway, such as Italy contemplates, would destroy the monopoly held by the French Dshibuti-Adis Ababa railway. At the same time, France interests in Abyssinia are not of decisive importance, inasmuch as the whole of Abyssinia's foreign trade (export and import) amounts to no more than £2,500,000 per year. In other words, France is desirous, no less than England, of using Abyssinia as a means to an end.

Even though the reasons which govern French conduct in the Abyssinian question, may not be clear, and even though the price which France requires for its support of the Italian claims may also be unknown to us, one thing is certain: Negotiations on this point are being held between Italy and France. The Italian Press protests more and more clamorously against the French attempts at extortion and against French efforts to make the Abyssinian question dependent upon the Italian claims in Tunis and Tangiers. This connection is confirmed by the communiqué of the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs of July 4th, in which the simultaneous discussion of the Abyssinian question and "a number of Mediterranean problems" is stressed, as also by the conference between Briand and the Italian ambassador in Paris, Baron Avezzano.

In bringing up the Abyssinian problem, France is not pursuing its aims in Abyssinia, but in Morocco and Tunis. France would probably be willing to pay a high price, even its consent to the Italian plans in Abyssinia, if Italy would refrain from objection to French expansion in North Africa. This in no way affects the application of the Regent of Abyssinia to the League of Nations, which application the Italian and English newspapers allege to have been instigated by France; for, as may be clearly seen from a notice which appeared in the "Temps" of July 31st, 1926, it is not in the interests of France to bring the subject to the forum of the League of Nations and to discuss it before the general public. The "Temps" writes;

"Nobody can gain by making the question complicated... it is possible that negotiations might lead to the clearing up of misunderstandings in regard to the sense and the purpose of the Anglo-Italian agreement."

In the "Temps" of August 3rd, it is stated that Chamberlain's explanations in the House of Commons regarding the agreement between England and Italy may be accepted as satisfactory, although these explanations did not alter the situation. The "Temps" must, therefore, be guided by some other motive. This is the desire to prevent the affair being settled by the League of Nations. France prefers negotiations behind the scenes to the negotiations in Geneva.

On the other hand; it is not impossible that Chamberlain's statement that England does not contemplate bring pressure to bear upon Abyssinia, was a frank one. England perhaps prefers, now that it has gained a favourable solution of the Mosul question, to leave itself a free hand in regard to Abyssinia and not to bind itself to Italy. It is within the bounds of possibility that England, in contrast to Italy, will try to find through negotiations at Geneva an expedient from the somewhat uncomfortable situation into which it has got through the intricate game it has played.

The case for Italy is a very different one. Italy's colonial policy is in a large measure decided by the question of prestige and not exclusively by the economic needs of Italian Imperialism. An important part in Italy's Abyssinian plans is played by the Italian desire to incorporate West Abyssinia in the Italian sphere of influence, in order to form a connection between Eritrea and Italian Somaliland and thus create out of Italy's colonial frag-

ments a real colony. This does not mean that Italy will be prepared to pay the price which France demands, and abandon Italian efforts at expansion in North Africa, but it means that Italy is as little inclined as France to submit the affair to the forum of the League of Nations and that it finds it preferable to carry on direct negotiations for a settlement.

Abyssinia cannot, therefore, count upon the support of any of the big powers in the League of Nations. The Abyssinian problem has also not yet been placed upon the agenda of the September Session of the League of Nations. But Abyssinia has made it clear that in case of failure it will appeal to the International Court of Arbitration at the Hague. But there again it will probably not find sanction for its claims. The League of Nations is neither able nor willing to help Abyssinia; it will only display once more its function as a tool of Imperialism.

The Role of the Poincaré Government.

By Paul Marion (Paris).

The latest measures of the Poincaré Cabinet (the foundation of a treasury for the administration of the floating debt, the formation of a fund to support the franc by the necessary manoeuvring) disclose the strategical plan and the tactics of the French by capitalists.

The Poincaré Cabinet is about to make a thorough attempt to rescue the French bourgeoisie from its present disastrous situation at the cost of the middle class, the peasants and the proletariat.

Poincaré is adopting not only the measures recommended in the Experts' Report as a way out of the crisis, but he has also taken into consideration those points from the project of Léon Blum, the leader of the French Socialist parliamentary fraction, which could be of use to the capitalists ("internal" efforts, deflation by raising the rate of interest). The help of certain private banks has enabled the Poincaré Government to make certain stock exchange manoeuvres to support the franc, and this has placed the first actions of this cabinet in a good light.

The Poincaré Cabinet represents the joint action of all capitalist groupings in France, but its plans show a pre-dominance on the part of exporting heavy industry.

A few months ago the "Journée industrielle", the organ of big industry, pointed out that one day the policy of inflation, which, as the German example shows, is dangerous, would have to end, and discussed the fiscal and social measures which would be necessary to stabilise French finances without threatening the interests of big exporters.

Its programme may be summed up as follows: When, after the inflation period, French industry can no longer profit from the export premium offered by a permanently depreciating currency, then it will be unavoidable to reduce the cost of production of French products by abolishing the taxes which "burden" heavy industry. War profits must be spared from the inroads of the state. The consumer masses must be compelled to economise by a rigid application of indirect taxes. Further measures would be: The abolition of the eight hour day; the sale of state monopolies; the abolition of social labour laws, which unnecessarily burdened the budget, and finally a strong government must be in power in order to overcome the social difficulties which would be unavoidable in the transition period.

That is the programme which the Cabinet of Poincaré is about to put into operation.

Poincaré can only be successful if he is able to overcome a whole series of financial, economic and class difficulties, in particular the difficulty of co-operation between the various capitalist groups which are supporting him and whose contradictory interests may clash again tomorrow. He must, above all, be able to outlive the anger of the middle classes and the proletariat who will be the victims of the unavoidable economic crisis.

* * *

Above all it is necessary to remember under what circumstances the National, that is to say the capitalist, Block took the place of the Left Block.

It must be remembered that after the demission of Pétet and of the ninth Cabinet of Briand on June 15th this year, for the first time the formation of a Ministry from the National Block was brutally demanded.

All bourgeois statesmen including the leaders of the Left Block were of one opinion upon the necessity of abolishing everything in the national finances which had a democratic appearance.

The abolition of the control forms for income from securities, the abrogation of the law prohibiting the export of capital, the reduction of taxes upon personal as distinct from real property and upon income, all this was already decided upon by the penultimate Briand Cabinet. But the varied opinions of the finance and capitalist groups showed themselves with regard to the following question: How and at what time should the franc be stabilised?

The representatives of export industry and their direct representatives in parliament (Poncet, de Wendel, and Louis Marin) were interested in continuing a mild inflation as long as possible in order to permit them to compete easily with foreign industries.

The bear and bull speculators of the franc were similarly enemies of stabilisation.

But the deposit banks which exist from a systematic exploitation of the small depositors, and certain business banks which would receive advantages from measures of deflation, demanded stabilisation. The Experts' Report which attempted to reconcile all these interests and which was accepted by the representatives of the Comité des Forges out of fear for the coming crisis and consideration for the whole interests of the capitalist class, proposed the following four chief measures:

1. The balancing of the state budget by indirect taxation; the recovery of capital placed abroad by reducing direct taxation and abolishing all real fiscal control.

2. The relieving of the state treasury from the floating debt by the creation of a treasury for the administration of the National Defence and treasury bonds.

3. The obtaining of foreign loans in order to control the exchange market and to ensure the stabilisation; this assumes the ratification of the Washington Convention and the signature of the agreements with Great Britain.

4. The decreeing of legal stabilisation by converting the notes of the Banc of France to a definite value in gold, this value to be determined by experience during the course of the preparatory period.

Although French heavy industry has declared itself in agreement with the principle of stabilisation in the face of financial necessity, and in order to avoid a crisis the consequences of which would be incalculable, it nevertheless insisted that this far reaching operation should be carried out under its leadership and under its direct control.

This was the reason for the mistrust against Caillaux who did not seem to be sufficiently safe and who looked like a much too hasty stabiliser, therefore the campaign in favour of Poincaré, the confident of the French industrialists, the war Lord of 1914 and of the occupation of the Ruhr.

A stabilisation at the cost of the middle classes and the working class could not be carried out, so declared the Experts' Report cynically, without adopting certain political protective measures. Therefore the interest of the capitalists was as follows:

1. To make the cabinet a cabinet to defend the franc, even a cabinet to represent a holy unity in order to milden the protest of the democratic petty bourgeoisie — therefore the participation of Herriot and Painlevé in the Cabinet of Poincaré.

2. To preserve the appearance of democratic legality whilst at the same time treading upon parliamentary privileges.

In this way the six members of the Left Block in the cabinet and also the hundred socialist members of parliament whose opposition is as legal as it is useless, give the French big capitalists the possibility of lulling the fears of a section of the middle classes and of the working class and avoiding the immediate and wild revolt of those who reject stabilisation at the cost of the poor.

It is the task of the Communist Party to smash through this circle of violence and cunning by an energetic political campaign during the course of which the French big bourgeoisie and its direct agent Poincaré together with his assistants, the leaders of the Left Block, and the silent opposition, the Socialist leaders, must be untrashed and defeated.

The Communist Party must organise the struggle against stabilisation by the Poincaré methods all the more quickly because the progressive application of the bourgeoisie plans for stabilisation will bring with it a financial, economic and social

crisis which will be more difficult than any crisis through which capitalist France has ever passed.

The measures of Poincaré — 11,000 millions indirect taxes; the creation of a treasury for the administration of the floating debt which can demand advances in bank notes; the raising of the rate of interest from 6 to 7.5% and the purchase of pounds and dollars by means of newly issued bank notes, — all this will unavoidably result in:

1. A general increase in the cost of living (as a consequence of the indirect taxes).

2. A demand for the redemption of the bonds; the bankruptcy of middle and smaller undertakings as a consequence of the rise in the rate of interests and the limitation of credit.

3. A new wave of inflation which must result at the same time through the redemption of the bonds, in the increase of the cost of living and the purchase of foreign currency at the cost of the state.

Over and above that there is the ever increasing pressure of Anglo-Saxon finance capital upon French economy.

In this way the crisis in France is becoming ever more intense. The French proletariat will recognise, however, that the only solution which is calculated not only to stabilise the currency and to emerge from the post-war period without foreign loans, to bring about the emancipation from home and foreign capital and to bring the finances in order at the cost of the rich, is the solution which has been adopted in Russia.

Imperialist War Manoeuvres and Opportunist Peace Manoeuvres.

By John Pepper (Moscow).

The Independent Labour Party has addressed a memorandum on war danger and disarmament to the Executive of the II. International.

The memorandum demands complete and immediate disarmament in every country, criticises the "partial disarmament conferences" of the League of Nations, and unveils the militarist policy of British Imperialism. The I.L.P. declares that there is a danger that every agreement made by the governments on the subject of restricted armaments is likely to serve the sole purpose of generating a false feeling of safety among the workers, for it distracts their attention from the dangerous policy pursued by the government. The memorandum states it to be the duty of the socialist movement to prevent this by constantly exposing the Imperialist policy which is the cause of wars. As counteractive the I.L.P. then proposes the organisation of a world campaign of all socialists for a general disarmament and for the organisation of the resistance of the working class against the danger of war, this resistance to include the laying down of tools in the key industries, and the refusal to give war service or to make ammunition.

These are the fundamental outlines of the I.L.P. memorandum. This memorandum is a remarkable mixture of correct criticism of the Imperialist policy of Great Britain and of the League of Nations, mingled with pompous radical phraseology and tearful pacifism. One sentence of the memorandum kills another. It declares that as long as the governments pursue an Imperialist policy no disarmament is possible, and in the next sentence it proposes a lengthy and detailed programme for a partial disarmament within the limits prescribed by the disarmament conferences of the League of Nations. It admits that war and war danger are indivisibly bound up with the essential character of Imperialism. But it does not simultaneously propose that Imperialism be overcome by social revolution. It admits that no real disarmament is possible without the co-operation of the Soviet Republics, but it does not utter a single word of criticism or condemnation against the Imperialist powers who are making this co-operation impossible. It proposes that the workers in the key industries should go on strike, and that all workers should refuse military service, in the case of war, but it does not waste a word on the organisational preparations to be made for the proletarian struggle against Imperialist war, nor a word on the united front of the working class as prerequisite for preventing war, nor a word on the transformation of Imperialist war into civil war. The memorandum to the II. International is the I.L.P. to the life.

The I.L.P. recently issued the slogan of: "Realisation of Socialism in our time". But at the same time it declared itself against armed insurrection, against the dictatorship of the proletariat, that first fundamental prerequisite for the realisation of socialism. The I.L.P. recently issued the slogan of a "living wage". But in practice it has not raised a finger to aid the miners in their struggle against the reduction of wages, though this is a question involving the subsistence minimum. The I.L.P. announces the Utopian slogan of: "No more war", Utopian because the I.L.P. supplements this slogan by another on "no revolution on any account". A few months ago the I.L.P. proposed to the Executive of the II. International that it should take steps towards the amalgamation of the II. and III. Internationals. But at the same time it rejected the most moderate united front proposals made by the Communist Party of Great Britain in the defence of the imprisoned communists, and for the prevention of scab coal transport.

The I.L.P. applies to the Executive of the II. International in this pompous memorandum for aid against the war danger, but forgets that the whole II. International joins hands unreservedly in the fraudulent policy of the League of Nations. The I.L.P. finds the right words of censure for the disarmament swindles practised by the Imperialist governments, serving no other end than to awaken false feelings of security among the workers. It will not see that the II. International and all its parties have never done anything else, on any occasion, except awaken and intensify this false feeling of security among the workers. The I.L.P. memorandum characterises very rightly the militarist policy of the British government in Singapore, in India, in Egypt, in Iraq, in China, in the Sudan, in the Suez canal, and in all the oceans; but it shuts its eyes to the fact that the MacDonald government, which was almost identical with the I.L.P., pursued precisely the same policy, and that the parliamentary Labour Party, two thirds of which are members of the I.L.P., entirely approved of this imperialist policy.

The new memorandum of the I.L.P. is just the same as the whole policy of the I.L.P. It is a combination of a brilliant Utopia, intended to dazzle the workers, and of an opportunist and frequently dirty practical policy.

We know the I.L.P., it is an old acquaintance of ours. It has taken a "radical" fit for the second time.

As early as 1920 it wanted to "approach" the Communist International. At that time it was impelled forward by the pressure of the revolutionary committees of action which had formed in many places among the British proletariat, of the mighty protest movement of the English working class against the Polish war and for the Soviet Republic. At that time it even broke from the II. International, and began to "study" the programme and statutes of the III. International.

And now the I.L.P. begins once more to drivel about the amalgamation with the Communist International. It has discovered that there is a danger of war, it is anxious for the "rapid" realisation of Socialism, it promises to carry on a systematic "left" opposition within the II. International. This "radical" mood of the I.L.P. has once more its cause in the radicalisation of the British working masses.

The mighty economic crisis in England, the decay of the British Empire, the growing unemployment, the example given by the building up of Socialism in the Soviet Union, the disappointment with the Labour government, the increasing danger of war, the class struggle becoming more acute from day to day, all tend to turn the British working class more to the Left. All the appeals, memoranda, proposals, and Utopian advances of the I.L.P. are merely the weak reflection of this turn to the Left among the working masses. The more the offensive of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat makes itself felt, the greater will be the radicalisation offensive in the I.L.P. The offensive of British capital against the working class is anything but a manoeuvre, but the radicalisation offensives of the leaders of the I.L.P. are nothing but a manoeuvre.

But despite all this, it would be false were we not to discern, beneath all these petty tricks and windings and radicalisation offensives and small manoeuvres, the growing discontent, the real revolutionary bitterness arising in the masses of the I.L.P. What is merely a manoeuvre to the leaders of the I.L.P., is deadly earnest to the masses. The working classes of England are radicalising sincerely. They are truly anxious for an agreement with the trade unions of the Soviet

Union, they really want to co-operate with the Communist International, they are really prepared to join in the fight against Imperialist war danger. It would be wrong to see merely a petty manoeuvre in this memorandum of the I.L.P., we must see at the same time the significant symptoms of the beginning revolutionising of the British working class which it contains.

Our reply to the leaders of the I.L.P. must be to tear the veil from their opportunist intentions. The working masses in the I.L.P. must however receive a positive reply from us. We must state clearly: We Communists are ready at any time to lead the way in a common struggle for the realisation of Socialism in our time, or in a common struggle against war danger. The Communist International differs from the II. International in having realised Socialism by the dictatorship of the proletariat. The reason why the Communist International split away from the II. International was that the II. International identified itself with Imperialist war, and that the Social Democratic parties sank in the bog of "national defence". The Communist International was born of the struggle and in the struggle against Social Chauvinism. And even now the Communist Parties are the sole leaders in the struggle against Imperialist war. In France it was only the Communist Party which fought against the Morocco war. The socialists and adherents of the II. International supported the disgraceful Morocco adventure. The Soviet Union is the sole power pursuing a peace policy. But the II. International accuses it, the sole and proletarian peace power, of warlike intentions. The central organ of the I.L.P. itself stated, after the World Congress of the II. International in Marseilles, that what this Congress combatted was not French Militarism, nor British Imperialism, nor German Monarchism, but solely Russian Communism. We must say to the masses of the Independent Labour Party that they can only carry on the fight against French Militarism, against German Monarchism, and against British Imperialism, if they join forces with "Russian" Communism, or, rightly expressed, with the Communist International.

The Political Situation in Czechoslovakia and the Gajda Affair.

By P. Stary (Prague).

The so-called "Gajda affair" has been the centre of political interest in Czechoslovakia for the last few weeks. It is a question of no less importance than the conviction of the assistant chief of the General Staff — in reality the actual chief — of carrying on espionage in France for a foreign power, allegedly, the Soviet Union.

The great nervousness, through which this affair has come to be one of the greatest political sensations, is due to the fact that the rule of the Czech bourgeoisie has come to a critical turning point at which no slight danger is to be encountered. The turning point is formed by the circumstance that the "Pan-National Coalition" of the Czech bourgeoisie with the Social Patriotic Parties, which ruled the country for no less than seven years up to the last parliamentary elections on November 15th, 1925, is now broken.

The elections of November 15th showed that the continuation of stabilisation under the "Pan-National Coalition" is no longer possible: the masses had become radicalised, and the Social Patriotic Parties, on account of their collaboration with the bourgeoisie, emerged from the elections greatly weakened, while the C. P. increased their number of seats from 28 to 41 and became the second strongest party in Parliament.

The Czech bourgeoisie was suddenly disposed to forget the traditional enmity for the Germans, or, rather, for the German bourgeoisie. Direct Government on the part of the united Czech, Slovakian and German bourgeoisie would still be too sudden a transition; it would too conspicuously disclose to the broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie and to the backward portions of the proletariat the true nature of that bourgeois Nationalism with which the bourgeoisie has fed them for seven years. For this reason the "Super-Party" Officials' Government of Cerny came into being. Its task was to carry out with the support of the bourgeois parties of all nationalities the next requisite step towards the consolidation of the bourgeois class regime, and, among other measures, to introduce high import duties on the

most important agricultural products, and to perfect the development of the army by introducing the eighteen-month term of service and by withdrawing the soldiers' right to vote.

By means of a broad application of the united front tactics the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia drew a large body of the reformist masses into a bitter fight against the demands of the united bourgeoisie and thereby forced the reformist parties to depart for the time being from their habitual attitude of sham opposition. In connection with this united front the big and bloody street demonstrations took place in Prague about the middle of June and, in the following weeks, in the whole of the Republic.

The Social Patriots looked for a way out of their awkward position. The old coalition is dead and, for good reasons, a new one cannot be countenanced. They are, therefore, speculating upon a fusion of all the Socialist parties — the Czech and German Social Democrats and the Czech Socialists — and upon a collaboration of these parties with several Left wing bourgeois groups. But even in the camp of the bourgeoisie there are factions and tendencies towards co-operation with the reformists, and up to the present the Work Party, which has ceded from the National Democrats, and the Legionaries' group have expressed themselves more or less openly in favour of this direction. The point of concentration of the whole of these formations is the so-called Residence i. e. President Masaryk and Foreign Minister Benes with their entourage. This Right wing block of the united international bourgeoisie of this State is faced by a Leftwing block of the united Czech-German Social-Patriots with Left wing bourgeois groups in tow.

The second fresh phenomenon in the inner-political life of Czechoslovakia is Fascism. The representatives of the Czech big bourgeoisie, the National Democratic Party, is the one which is openly developing into a Fascist party. The chief cause of their commotion is not the "national traditional enemy", the Germans, but the "Residence" namely, Masaryk and Benes. The reason is that at the present moment the "Residence", by its efforts to form a Left wing block, threatens to frustrate the plan for a dictatorship of the united ultra-reactionary bourgeoisie.

It can be understood why Czech Fascism clung with hands and feet to a man of the type of "General" Gajda. Gajda is hailed by the ultra-reactionary Czech parties as the "Hero of Siberia", the ally of Koltshak and butcher of the Russian revolutionary workers and peasants. But Gajda, too, for his part is by reason of his qualities the proper man for Czech Fascism: lacking in character, unscrupulous, an adventurer of the worst order, he will stop at nothing.

When, in 1924, the Communists disclosed in Parliament and in the Press the whole despicable role played by Gajda in the Russian revolution and proved that, when the Soviet Army stood outside Warsaw in 1920, he had offered his services to the Soviets, though without success, the former Coalition with its Social Patriotic components tried to counter the attack by a conspiracy of silence, on the one hand, and, on the other, by ridicule of the Communist accusations. Even the Press of the parties closely related to Gajda admit that the Communists alone put up a consistent fight against Gajda from the very beginning.

Why was Gajda set upon by the "Residence" parties just at this particular time? There are two rather weighty reasons. First of all, Gajda, while still Chief of the General Staff, flirted quite openly with the Fascists; at all their public meetings and demonstrations he was treated as their hero and the "man of the future", without a single word of objection from him. He was elected "military expert" of the future regime of the Right block. Secondly, the "Residence" parties undertook an open attack upon the Right block because Gajda offered the necessary opportunity, for the big collection of damaging evidence which the Communists had compiled against him, was sufficient to compromise Gajda, at least, abroad. In this attack the "Residence" parties actually gained a victory. On August 13th Gajda was retired.

The Communist Party did not confine itself to the sharp fight against Gajda and his mentors and against the half-heartedness and cowardice of the "Residence" parties, but displayed the whole connection between this affair and the antagonisms in the camp of the bourgeoisie. Their standpoint is best illustrated by the following slogans: Down with Gajda, the slaughterer of Russian revolutionary workers and peasants! Bitter fight against the ultra-reactionary united bourgeoisie, who want to

have Gajda continue his Siberian role in Czechoslovakia! Equally bitter fight against the "Residence" parties, who by their "Left" phrases are trying to catch the exasperated masses without vigorous action against the ultra-reactionary united front of the bourgeoisie! Against the dictatorship plans of the Right and Left blocks of the bourgeoisie — the united front of the working class for the Workers' and Peasants' Government!

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

The Successes and Perfects of the Economy Campaign in the Soviet Union.

Proclamation by Comrades A. Rykov, I. Stalin and V. Kuybyshev.

To all Party and Soviet Organisations!

The slogan of economy issued by the Party and the government has aroused the deepest interest and approval among the broad masses of the workers and peasants. The economy campaign expresses the will and determination of the active elements of the working class to carry on every branch of economics and administration in the spirit of thrift, and thus to ensure the necessary speed of industrialisation for the country. The necessity of thrift, of economy, as one of the most imperative prerequisites of socialist accumulation, and as the first prerequisite ensuring the proper employment of the means accumulated for the purpose of industrialisation, is being realised by ever increasing masses of the working people. It is becoming clear to everyone today that the penetration of economics and administration with the spirit of thrift must not be merely a temporary campaign, called forth by the exigencies of the emergency, but must become the permanent slogan for a whole period of our economic development.

Thus the comparatively brief period which has elapsed since the proclamation of the economy slogan can only be regarded as a preliminary stage of the campaign, consisting of endeavours to enlighten the masses on the subject of the tasks involved by the slogan, and to lay down the main lines and methods to be employed. But brief as this period has been, we are nevertheless already able to sum up the first results of the campaign, and to draw such conclusions from the successes and defects so far observed as can be extremely useful for the further pursuance of the campaign.

The most important success recorded for the campaign is the change which has taken place, the transition from uneconomical and extravagant methods to sensible and economical ones, to frugality in the expenditure of the means of the state, and to such employment of these means as is best adapted to serve the end in view. This change has been accomplished by the economy campaign. Every expenditure made by our economic organs is now undertaken from the standpoint of economy, of careful and responsible consideration as to the advisability of expending public means, of the necessity of avoiding unnecessary expense. A point of special importance is the watchfulness exercised by the Soviets, and by the working class, in questions involving the economical expenditure of the wealth of the people. This watchfulness is redoubled and aided by the economy campaign. It must be admitted that up to the present results have been slight and inadequate. But it is incontestable that a change has set in, and this change is a pledge of further progress.

Another important success of the campaign is the distinct trend towards the improvement, simplification, reduction, and cheapening of the apparatus of production, transport, trade, co-operation, and administration, plainly observable of late. This new trend is expressed in the greater significance attached since the campaign to the necessity of rationalising every branch of economic and state life. It need not be said that here too the results so far attained are but slight and insufficient. There is still more talk than action with regard to the simplification, reduction, and rationalisation of the apparatus. But the first successes have been gained, the attention of the active elements of the working class has been directed to this question, a change is beginning, and this beginning must be the pledge of further progress.

One of the most important achievements of the campaign is the fact that it has finally drawn the enemies of thrift and economy into the light of day. These enemies are: a) the petrification and bureaucratism in many of our economic organs, which obstinately resist the execution of measures of economy; b) the limited viewpoint and red-tapeism existing in other of our economic organs, which seek to buy themselves off from the obligations of the economy campaign by means of bureaucratising this campaign, and gaining on inconsiderable trifles whilst leaving the main evil untouched; c) the criminally good natured conduct of a number of responsible functionaries with reference to these manoeuvres of bureaucracy and officialdom; the lack of determination to crush bureaucratism and red tape, and to raise the campaign to the level of a mass movement. The importance of exposing these enemies to economy is very great, for it preserves the campaign from a fruitless division of forces among a multitude of trifles, enables its fire to be concentrated on the most important centres, and thus ensures further success for the whole campaign.

These are the main successes to be recorded for the economy campaign.

But at the same time there are a number of serious defects to be recorded, distortions of both the idea and the actual practice of economy. These defects must be exposed at once, for their further development involves the danger that the campaign becomes isolated from the masses, and degenerates into bureaucratic enactments, which would lead to the shipwreck of the whole campaign.

These defects are:

In the first place the misrepresentation of the idea and the political import of the measures of economy. These are represented as merely being a temporary attempt to bridle excessive extravagance and unthriftiness. At best they are regarded as a secondary task, as an effort "to save something for industry", but are not connected in any way with the general political tasks of the Party.

It need not be said that this conception of our economical measures has nothing in common with real economy. The economy campaign is in reality one of the leading political tasks of the Party under the circumstances now given by the development towards industrialisation. The economy campaign is the realisation of the fact that our industry cannot develop with sufficient speed on its own resources only, that it needs additional means. The economy campaign is the realisation that these additional means have to be raised in our own country. The economy campaign signifies that we cannot raise these means if we continue our present methods of economics and administration, and continue to maintain our present expensive and bureaucratic apparatus. The economy campaign signifies that we must reduce, cheapen, and simplify our apparatus of production, transport, trade, co-operation, administration, etc. to the utmost extent possible, to the end that both now and in the future we may save hundreds of millions of roubles for the industrialisation of the country.

There are two ways of raising these hundreds of millions: One way is to take away as much from the peasant as possible, and to utilise the means thus exported for the requirements of industry. Some of our comrades urge us to take this way, but we cannot do so, for it would mean a rupture between the workers and the peasantry, the breakdown of the alliance between workers and peasants, an undermining of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the reduction to poverty of the peasantry, and with this the weakening of industry.

The other way is: The greatest possible reduction of our whole economic and administrative apparatus, from the top to the bottom; the cheapening and simplification of this apparatus, enabling hundreds of millions to be saved for the requirements of industry. Our economic and administrative apparatus swallows up about 2 milliard roubles yearly. There is no reason to doubt that this expenditure could be reduced by 300 to 400 million roubles, and additional means for our industry thus won. This is not only possible, but absolutely necessary, if the spirit of bureaucracy and petrification is to be banned from our apparatus, and its cheapening and simplification achieved.

These are the two ways possible. There is no third way. The economy campaign means that the second way, the sole way really adapted to its purpose, is to be chosen. This is the idea and the import of the economy campaign. The question of the economy campaign is thus the question of the maintenance of

the alliance between the workers and peasants, the question of the further development of our industry, the question of the struggle against the bureaucratism of our economic and administrative organs.

Only one of two things is possible: Either we carry out the measures of economy, reduce and cheapen the economic and administrative apparatus wherever possible, save the means needed for industrialisation, and thus preserve and strengthen the alliance between the workers and the peasantry; or we do not carry out the measures of economy, but throw the burden of supporting the unwieldy bureaucratic apparatus upon the peasantry, and thus destroy the alliance between workers and peasants and with this our hopes of industrialisation.

This is the question today. Lenin regarded it from the same aspect when he wrote:

"It must be our endeavour to build up a state in which the workers retain their leadership over the peasantry and preserve the confidence of the peasantry in the proletariat, at the same time removing even the slightest trace of extravagance from their social conditions by means of the strictest economy. We must adjust our state apparatus on lines of the utmost economy.... If we preserve the leadership of the proletariat over the peasantry, we shall have the possibility of utilising even the smallest amount saved by our strict state economy for the purpose of developing our great machine industry and the electrification of the country."

The second defect is the distortion of the practical application of the measures of economy. This distortion is expressed in the perfectly unallowable measures taken by certain economic organs, interfering seriously with the workers' standard of living, and worsening the material position of the workers. Many such forms of the wrongful interpretation of the idea of economy might be cited: the reduction of the compulsory care of juveniles, the worsened quality of working clothes, withdrawal of tea water, withdrawal of lighting for the worker's clubs, reduction of technical schools, mechanical interpretation of the question of reducing working staffs, attempts at altering works rules without the agreement of the trade unions, too hasty revision or even violation of the collective agreements, veiled reductions in wages, etc.

These evils are much aggravated by the fact that they exist at a juncture when we have still an excessive and bureaucratic staff of workers in our administrative organs, when we have still "high officials" (who are by no means to be confused with the honest specialists devoted to their work) in receipt of entirely unallowable advantages — the use of motor cars and other means of transport, the receipt of royalties, concealed increases of salary in the form of endless business travels or of cash advances which cannot be repaid.

Such evils become actual crimes when called into existence under the flag of economic measures, for they undermine the whole conception of economy, whether deliberately or unconsciously. The originators of these unallowable measures obviously do not grasp that the main goal of our measures of economy — the development of socialist industry — cannot be realised without improving the material position and raising the cultural level of the workers. The originators of these unallowable measures obviously do not grasp that the task of these economical measures is not to lower, but to raise the material and cultural level of the worker. Is it to be wondered at that this false interpretation of economy alienates the working class from the whole economy campaign, that they blame the campaign for the evils existing in its name, and the main demand of the campaign — increased labour productivity — is not realised?

The Party and the government demand that these evils should be energetically and finally liquidated.

The Party and the government declare that if the above evils recur, the guilty will be severely punished.

The Party declares that it will expel in disgrace from its ranks all communists who fail in the future to combat these evils with adequate energy.

The third defect is: The broad masses of the workers and peasants have not been induced to participate sufficiently in the economy campaign, the production conferences of the workers are insufficiently utilised, the trade unions are not sufficiently active in leading the campaign. The circular issued by the C.C.

and the C.C. on 25. April 1926, on the economy campaign, states that

"the campaign can only be successful if participated in by the broadest masses of the workers and peasants", and that for this reason it is necessary

"to arouse the attention of the masses of workers and peasants, and to obtain the active participation of the masses of workers and peasants for this work."

It must be recorded that up to now this task has been accomplished in a very slight degree, if at all, by the economy campaign. We have not yet succeeded, or not to a sufficient extent, in mobilising broad masses for the tasks of the campaign. The production conferences held by the workers, these mass organisations of leading importance, still stand aside from the campaign for the most part.

In view of these facts, the first task before the campaign is to develop the activities of the production conferences, to actuate their participation in the conferences of the engineers and technicians, to accord increased attention to those suggestions of the workers which are submitted through the conferences, to exercise systematic control over the execution of the decisions accepted, to grant premiums for separate achievements tending towards perfecting the process of production, and to provide for a greater degree of guidance and instruction to be given by the trade unions to the production conferences.

The form of organisation mostly employed for carrying out the campaign is the commissions formed administratively in the undertakings, and in the Soviet and co-operative organs. The activity of these commissions is for the most part extremely limited and internal in character, and fails to touch the masses of the workers. The production conferences, the economic commissions, and the economic councils, are called upon to participate in the campaign in a sense, but the chief drawback is that the essential organisatory form leading the campaign still consists of the commissions of the economic organs. Serious faults must be found everywhere in the work of these commissions. Here the resistance of the bureaucratic group of our Soviet economic apparatus is felt most strongly. Many of these commissions work slackly, remain passive, restrict themselves to removing trifles, or to pointing out abnormal conditions, but without adopting any energetic measures for removing the abnormality; they work along the line of least resistance. The commissions though in reality simply the auxiliary organs of the works managers, take over from these the responsibility for the success of the campaign.

It is thus the task of the campaign to combine the activities of the best adapted commissions with those of the forms of mass work (production conferences, workers' conferences, economic commissions sections, commissions of the municipal Soviets, etc.), and to liquidate those commissions whose existence is superfluous, and whose activities remove from the corresponding production and administrative organs the responsibility for the carrying out of the campaign.

These are chief defects of the economy campaign.

The Party and the government, in thus drawing attention to the successes of the economy campaign and appealing for the further development of these successes, point out at the same time to the Party and Soviet organisations the faults detrimental to the campaign. The Party and the government demand that all needful measures be taken to remove these defects. The masses are to be enlightened on the real idea and the political import of the economy campaign, the present manner of campaign is to be altered into a campaign carried on by the broad masses of workers and peasants for the simplification, improvement, and cheapening, of our economic and administrative apparatus, and all misrepresentations of the economy campaign are to be combated — these are the first tasks of the present economy campaign.

The whole of the work of our Soviet and Party organisations, and of our agitators and propagandists, must be permeated through and through by a spirit of determined fight for economy. The activity and the initiative of the broad masses must be gained for the actual work of carrying out methods of saving and thrift. The present defects of the campaign must be swept away, and with them the bureaucratic distortions of our mechanism of production, transport, trade, co-operation, and administration.

In this work of accomplishing an efficient campaign of economy, the chief task falls to the organs of the Control Commissions, headed by the united Central Control Commission of the C. P. S. U., and by the People's Commissariat for Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. These must exercise an unwearied control over the actual execution of the measures of economy. They must ensure that the measures are so carried out that means necessary for the industrialisation of our country are saved.

Moscow, 16. August 1926.

A. I. Rykov,

Chairman of the Council of People's Commissaries.

I. V. Stalin,

Secretary of the C. C. of the C. P. of the Soviet Union.

V. V. Kuybyshev,

Chairman of the C. C. C. of the C. P. S. U.

Decree of the Soviet Government concerning Wage Increases in the Soviet Union.

After hearing the proposal of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union which stressed the necessity of raising wages upon the occasion of the renewal of the collective agreements and upon the basis of the successes in the economic situation of the country, the Council of People's Commissars of the U. S. S. R. decides:

1) In order to protect the interests of those groups of workers whose wages have remained behind the general level of wages and in the interests of the greatest possible systematisation in the raising of wages, a special commission under the control of the People's Commissariat for Labour of the U. S. S. R. will be formed with the following composition:

Chairman: The People's Commissar for Labour of the U. S. S. R., Comrade Schmidt.

Ordinary members: From the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union: Comrade Dogadov (substitute: Comrade Vladimirov); from the Economic Commission of the U. S. S. R.: Comrade Strumilin; from the People's Commissariat for Workers' and Peasants' Inspection of the U. S. S. R.: Comrade Janson; from the Supreme Economic Council of the U. S. S. R.: Comrade Quiring (substitute: Comrade Kraval); from the People's Commissariat for Traffic: Comrade Khalatov (substitute: Comrade Rudi); from the People's Commissariat for Finance of the U. S. S. R.: Comrade Kusnetsov (substitute: Comrade Polyudov).

2) The Commission is instructed to determine the extent and the time of the possible wage increases according to the resources of the state industry and the traffic system inside two weeks and at the same time to work out measures to ensure an increase of the productivity of labour and a reduction of unjustifiable absences from work.

3) All state institutions and undertakings are instructed to regard the decisions of the commission as a guiding line in renewing the collective agreements.

Moscow, Kremlin, August 17th, 1926.

The Chairman of the Council of People's
Commissars of the U. S. S. R.
A. Rykov.

The Substitute Business Manager of the Council
of People's Commissars of the U. S. S. R.:
I. Miroshnikov.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Conference of the Italian Trade Union League and the Position of the Trade Unions in Italy.

By Giovanni Germanetto (Milan).

After so much work and talk for and about the Trade Union Law, the monopoly unions and the Ministry for Trade Unions, we have finally arrived at the application of the law. The police demand the lists of members, and, as even this decree does not do away with the class-warfare nor prevent the outbreak of strikes here and there, we have the first sentences on workers on account of striking and they are numerous and severe as those for insulting the Prime Minister.

The section of the law which governs the relations between employer and employed, is of special interest. The settlement of all disputes and judgement concerning all breaches of contracts between the official associations (the other trade unions cannot conclude contracts) and the industrialists come within the jurisdiction of the Appeal Courts, which function as labour authorities. Non-compliance with judgements of the Courts of Appeal are punishable: with imprisonment from one month to one year and with fines ranging from 100 to 5000 lire. Functionaries of official associations may be punished with imprisonment from six months to two years and fines from 2000 to 10,000 lire. Functionaries of associations, who instigate lock-outs or strikes, are sentenced under the criminal law.

The law, it will be seen, is directed against the workers. They may be fined from 100 to 1000 lire, while strike leaders may be given sentences ranging from six months' to two years' imprisonment, and their right to hold public office may be suspended for three years. Still heavier sentences (3 to 7 years' imprisonment) threaten organisers, instigators and leaders of strikes or passive resistance directed against the dispositions or measures of State institutes. In this manner the class trade unions are completely incapacitated.

The leaders of the C. G. L. (Confederazione Generale del Lavoro — General Trade Union League) are at present doing as little as they ever did in recent times to steady the wavers, to collect stragglers or even to help those in prison.

What attitude have the Maximalists (Socialist Party) taken in regard to these affairs? For a long time the Party Executive has been resorting to all kinds of evasions while nominally holding with the Anglo-Russian Committee. The Socialist Party leaders acknowledged the Anglo-Russian Committee merely because they were forced in this direction by pressure exercised by the workers, who, under the influence of slogans of the Communist Party, long ago decided in favour of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the defence of trade union unity. Our comrades of the Trade Union Committee of the Communist Party proposed a manifesto to the Maximalists, as well as circulars and common announcements. This proposition was rejected. The Maximalists forbade their members to attend shop meetings of the Committees for the Unity of the Trade Union Movement and to participate in the Committees for the Despatch of a Delegation to Russia, while even the left wing of the Christian Socialists took part.

Under these circumstances, the Executive of the C. G. L. convoked a congress, or, to be more exact, a national conference. In this connection the Trade Union Committee of the Maximalists published a communication in which they promised to participate, "in special cases", in the opposition against the class collaboration policy of the leading reformist of the C. G. L.

The following organisations and categories took part in the Conference: Building-Trade Workers' Union, Hatters' Union, Foodstuff Workers' Union, Metal Workers' Union, Polygraphic Union, Tramway Workers' Union, Farm Labourers' Union, Textile Workers' Union, Electricians' Union, municipal workers, private employees, wood workers, transport labourers. The first invitation to the Conference was addressed to the representatives of the local organisations. Consequently participation was limited to the organisation functionaries. The report to the C. G. L. Executive was nothing more than a report concerning the retreat of the executive. There was not a single sentence about the prospective fight of the proletariat, though much mention was made of the growing

necessity for centralisation. A number of resolutions were passed, including a memorandum addressed to the Government and concerning the liberty of the trade union organisation and the Trade Union Law, the London World Migration Congress, the Eighth International Labour Conference, etc. A comprehensive resolution was accepted in regard to questions of organisation.

The Communist delegates, representatives of the wood workers and private employes, issued a declaration of their own in this regard. The Communists also proposed a political resolution in which it was stressed that the class trade union can neither be suppressed nor functionally supplanted, and that its activity cannot be interrupted or modified even for a moment. Since December, 1924, the C. G. L. has not been carrying out a trade union policy of any kind; its sole activity has consisted of measures against the Communist workers, in throttling the metal workers' strike of March, 1925, and in the decree which abolished Democracy in the trade unions. The economic and trade union position of the workers demands from the C. G. L. an active intervention. The pessimism of the leaders and their inclination to defeatism increases the depression, which Fascism consistently strives by every means in its power to spread among the masses. The interests of the working class demand a strong and determined trade union leadership, which will observe a programme showing how the Italian working class can once more retrieve completely their former liberty.

The Communists, who included these ideas in their resolutions, condemned the bureaucratic regime of the C. G. L. and proposed a number of measures of organisation calculated to reanimate the trade unions. The six Maximalists who were present, held aloof from these burning questions; among themselves they were completely at variance. In reply to a direct question put by the Communists, the General Secretary of the C. G. L., Buozzi, declared that the matter would be studied carefully. The resolutions and the accepted agenda reflected exactly the reformist spirit of the present leadership of the C. G. L.

Such is our present trade union position. In truth, the Communists are the only ones who are working for trade union unity. The Maximalists belong to the Paris Bureau and work there together with the allies of Archduke Nicolaus. The Reformists occupy a place on the right wing of the Amsterdam International.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

Creation of Unity in the Trade Unions of Bulgaria.

By A. Nin (Moscow).

In Bulgaria unity has been established in the trade unions. This is an important step forward, which will be greeted by the workers of all countries with great satisfaction. For the first time for many years the Bulgarian working class has succeeded in concentrating its strength in a single trade union organisation. The Bulgarian workers received the news with enthusiasm and thousands of them struck up the "International", even though this song, as an expression of the unshakable faith in liberation, which the most cruel oppression can never stamp out, is prohibited by the Bulgarian executioner Government.

The Amsterdam International hastened to claim the realisation of unity in the Bulgarian trade unions as their victory. They should refrain from adorning themselves with laurels which they have not really won. For it was this body which carried on throughout the Balkans an extensive policy of disruption which reached its climax at the conference of Sofia in April of this year. It is well known that at this conference the Amsterdam people refused to negotiate with the Independent Trade Unions, which embrace the majority of the organised proletariat, and they declared that unity on a national scale was possible only within the bounds of the reformist organisation and, on an international scale, only within the pale of the Amsterdam International. These disruptive tactics were completely wrecked.

Unity was established by the fusion of all organisations in a new central organisation; this organisation is managed by a committee set up on a parity basis. If it is true that the new centre has resolved to establish "intelligence relations"

with the Amsterdam International — in view of the brutal regime of oppression in Bulgaria, it is not possible to establish such relations with the Red International of Labour Unions — it is no less certain that it has manifested its leaning towards international unity of the trade union movement in that it has joined the Anglo-Russian Committee and declared itself decidedly in favour of the creation of a united trade union international. Lastly, the new Centre has resolved to leave the final solution of the question of international relations until the Fusion Congress in Bulgaria, which is to take place in six months' time.

The establishing of unity in the Bulgarian trade unions must, therefore, be regarded as a victory for the Independent Trade Unions and by no means as a victory for the Amsterdam adherents. The Fusion Congress will have to decide upon the principle and the policy of the new central organisation.

The Independent Trade Unions should exploit the six months which they have before them, to intensify their agitation against reformist ideology and tactics, against affiliation to Amsterdam and in favour of consolidation of unity on the basis of unwavering class-warfare. The Independent Trade Unions will, of course, submit to the resolutions passed by the majority of the Congress. Even in the unlikely case that they find themselves in the minority, they will continue their work within the confines of the united central organisation. But we have no fear concerning the decision of the working class. We are quite convinced that, in case the Bulgarian proletariat is allowed the opportunity of giving expression to its will in the matter, the decision of the Fusion Congress will not be in favour of the reformist attitude.

THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

The Session of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris.

Report of Comrade Andreyev in the Extraordinary Plenary Session of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, August 12, 1926.

(Conclusion.)

This was the declaration they gave us. We promised to publish it in the report of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union. But even if it is true that Hicks and Purcell did not say that of which they are accused, we had nevertheless sufficient grounds to believe such accusations. Our workers had sufficient ground to believe it after Hicks and Purcell had voted to reject the Russian money. There was then sufficient ground to believe that Hicks had spoken of the "damned Russian money" and one must remark, by the way, that Hicks remained silent upon the question for almost two months; even after the publication of the declaration of our Central Council he did not make any denial. The Russian workers and we also although some of us know Hicks personally, had grounds to believe that through the British strike some of the British leaders had gone so far to the Right that one could not any longer tell who were actually the Lefts and who the Rights. We were able to convince ourselves of this fact at the last conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

It was said that we had received incorrect information. I believe, however, that now after a considerable period for the examination of this information, correct or incorrect, has passed, we are all convinced that our information upon the events in Great Britain and our attitude which expressed itself in our estimation of the British events, have been corroborated by the subsequent events and information. There is no need to correct our verdict upon the attitude of the General Council. The question of information does not come into consideration, because all the subsequent events and in particular the last session of the Anglo-Russian Committee in which the British delegates refused to discuss the question of support for the miners, have been examined, and this examination has completely verified the correctness of our verdict upon the standpoint of the General Council during the last strike. (Interruption: Correct!)

Our Attitude at the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

What attitude did we take up at the session of the Anglo-Russian Committee? Our attitude was, that from the beginning we answered the attempt to criticise our Central Council by declaring that its verdict upon the events in Great Britain and its declaration concerning them was correct. With regard to the formal side of the question, we declared that the declaration of our Central Council could not be examined at the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee without a previous examination of the activity and the attitude of the General Council in all its details during the general strike. Should it be proved that the General Council was right, then we are wrong, but for the moment we hold the opposite opinion: the General Council did not employ a correct tactic. Citrine declared that the British delegates were not empowered to discuss the activities of the General Council before the Anglo-Russian Committee. To this we replied that as things stood we also were not empowered to discuss the declaration of our Central Council, or to come to any decision in this connection. We had no such powers. (Interruption: Correct!)

Our attitude at the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee was that we repeated the criticism which was expressed in the attitude of the Central Council of Trade Unions of the Soviet Union and in the declaration issued by our Plenum. We pointed out, however, that it was not the most important task of the Russian delegates to the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee to criticise the General Council. There had been differences of opinion between us previously, we had, however, been able to find a common language in the interests of a common cause, the international unity of the trade union movement. We expressed the opinion that it was possible, if the representatives of the Council only wished it, to find a common language also at this conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee, in order to discuss the most important task, that of elaborating ways and means to strengthen the support for the miners. That is the chief task. That was the first point which our delegation placed before the Anglo-Russian Committee for discussion.

We raised also various other questions in connection with an estimation of the international situation and the conclusions therefrom for the further struggle to create international unity. We proved that the international situation is characterised in general not only by the continuation, but also by the strengthening of the offensive of capital against the working class. The lock-out of the miners in Great Britain is an expression of this offensive of capital against the working class, as also is the introduction of the nine hour day in Italy, and a number of lock-outs in various other countries, which, although they are not so wide-spread as the lock-out in Great Britain, are nevertheless all links in the chain of the strengthened offensive of capitalism upon a world scale.

Capitalism is attempting to recover its economic balance by worsening the working conditions of the proletariat. The capitalists are trying to force the better paid workers down to the level of their worst paid comrades. That is the most important characteristic of the international situation. Further, it is necessary to regard it as proved by experience that the general strike is a powerful weapon in the hands of the fighting working class when it is correctly applied. The British strike proved that this weapon is the strongest in the armoury of the working class, this was proved not by the end of the strike, but by the carrying out of the strike. The participation of the broad masses proved that the strike is a powerful weapon, but that, however, this weapon must not be used as it was used by the General Council.

And thirdly, an estimation of the situation proves with absolute clearness that now every economic conflict, every more or less great conflict between labour and capital inevitably develops from an economic collision to a general political class struggle. This was proved excellently by the British strike, when the whole state system, parliament, the judiciary, the police, the army, the Church, etc., were mobilised against it. Everything was done in order to break the General Strike. This strike proved that at the present moment a more or less great economic conflict cannot be regarded by the working class as a purely economic and industrial conflict, and carried out as such. The British bourgeoisie and the British Conservatives realised that from the first day of the general strike, they declared that it was a political strike, a strike against the foundations of the constitution. This connection between economics

and politics is understood by every simple worker in the Soviet Union. The leaders of the General Council have not grasped it, however. They swore again and again that the strike was a purely economic industrial strike, and that it could by no means be regarded as a blow against the British Constitution. They appealed to the workers to indulge in sports.

Fourthly one can regard it as absolutely proved that in an international offensive of capital against the working class, there is not sufficient unity in the ranks of the latter to secure it a victory. This unity does not exist. There is no fighting international which could be a real leader of the international struggle of the working class against capital. That is true. The lack of unity is making itself very painfully felt at the moment and has delivered the struggle of the miners in Great Britain over to the direct blows of the enemy. The events in Great Britain have corroborated with particular clarity and persistence the necessity for the real creation of international trade union unity and for the formation of an International which is really capable of leading and supporting the class struggle of the workers against the offensive of capital. This is excellently proved by the actions of the present International to which the British unions are affiliated, the actions of the Amsterdam International which, instead of helping, is sabotaging the help of others.

This conclusion upon the necessity of a still more intensive struggle for unity corroborated the correctness of the attitude of the Anglo-Russian Committee in its previous decisions which were, however, not carried out, as for instance the decisions of the Berlin Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee. That was not our fault. They were not carried out because the other party undertook to carry them out. We did everything which depended upon us. We negotiated and corresponded with Amsterdam, which, however, rejected the calling of an unconditional conference. We were therefore of the opinion that in accordance with the estimation of the international situation, the second question with which the Paris Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee would have to deal, was the question of unity in the light of the latest happenings and that the Anglo-Russian Committee should adopt some decision in this matter which would without a doubt have been of tremendous significance for the further struggle for unity.

We also declared that it would be good if the Anglo-Russian Committee would adopt a decision concerning the danger of war, for the estimation of the whole situation proves that the danger of war is growing every day. The present state of peace is resting upon a tremendous growth of militarism, upon armaments in every individual capitalist country, and for this reason a spark will be enough to commence a new and great imperialist war. In various countries, for instance in China, in the Balkans, in Morocco, etc. one can already clearly hear the sabre rattling. All this together is a proof of the hopelessness and the complete bankruptcy of bourgeois pacifism, that bourgeois pacifism which expressed itself in the formation of the all-forgiving League of Nations and the disarmament conferences which actually are nothing but a cover for a tremendous growth of militarism.

In particular we pointed out that recently an attempt is being made in Poland, not without support of the British Conservatives, to prepare an armed intervention against the Soviet Union as a reprisal for the support which the Russian workers have given to their British comrades. For this reason we considered it necessary to raise the question in the Anglo-Russian Committee of adopting a decision warning the world proletariat of this threatening danger.

And finally, we proposed that a declaration signed by both parties should be issued stressing the necessity for the continued existence of the Anglo-Russian Committee, in order in this way to destroy the hopes of our class enemies for a speedy end of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The Anglo-Russian Committee in which both parties are represented, in which the representatives of the trade union movements of both countries sit, must make such a public declaration in order to assure the working class of both countries that no break is intended, that both parties stand for the maintenance of the Anglo-Russian Committee. The proposal to publish such a declaration was laid before the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee by us as an addition to the other questions.

The Attitude of the British Delegates at the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The British delegates rejected all our attempts to raise these practical questions at the conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee and refused to discuss them. They declared that the activity of the Anglo-Russian Committee could only be taken up after the General Council had been informed of the discussions at the Conference of the Committee and after the decisions of our Central Council had been disavowed by the latter. This was declared by the English delegates in their speeches. We tried in particular to get a practical answer from the British delegates in the question of the miners: "What do you say to our proposal concerning the miners?" I must now report that the chief argument which the British delegates used in their answer to our proposal to discuss the miners' question at the conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee was that "the discussion of the miners' question at the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee can do more harm than good". This was literally the same argument which they used when they refused the money of the Russian workers.

Without beating about the bush we told them that they were repeating the tactics they had used in rejecting the money of the Russian workers. They replied that the discussion of such questions did not belong to the competency of the Anglo-Russian Committee. We contended, however, in my opinion, in all the previous meetings of the Anglo-Russian Committee that we were leading a struggle against capitalism together. Now it seems to me that the organisation of assistance for the miners belongs to this struggle. The British delegates now declared upon the instructions of the General Council, that the discussion of this question does not lie within the competency of the Anglo-Russian Committee. What is, then the competency of the Anglo-Russian Committee? (Interruption: "Drinking tee!" Amusement.)

We Russian delegates were of the opinion that considering the passivity and sabotage of the Amsterdam International and the individual Trade Secretariats and also of the General Council towards the struggle of the British miners, a decision of the Anglo-Russian Committee for the organisation of assistance for the miners would have had a tremendous significance. We had the opportunity of listening to the declarations of the British representatives. The following is an extract from the protocol of the speech of Pugh:

"Comrade Pugh declares further that the question of supporting the miners was discussed in the session of the Commission for Foreign Relations and that it was pointed out in this commission that the raising of the question on an international scale by the Anglo-Russian Committee would do much more harm than good.

The discussion of the question of supporting the miners here can, as has already been said by the Commission for Foreign Relations, only do more harm than good. For this reason Comrade Pugh sees no necessity to do this."

In the first place the British delegates refused to discuss any practical questions and to make any decisions and declared that the meeting must limit itself to an exchange of opinions and a discussion, and that the General Council had to be informed, secondly the British delegates were in a great hurry. When we requested an interruption of the Conference in order that we could at least set ourselves in telegraphic connection with our Central Council, because a situation had arisen of decisive importance for the future fate of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the British delegates refused our request, they had apparently made a firm decision upon this point before their journey to Paris; they declared that they could not agree to an interruption of the meeting because they had no time. Purcell was journeying to America, the tickets were already bought, the rest of the delegates had to return to London. They were therefore not able to agree to an interruption of the meeting.

That was their attitude to a discussion of the question of supporting the miners, whilst three million people are suffering. After a short interruption of the session of one hour, we agreed amongst ourselves in our delegation to present the Committee with a declaration of the happenings.

Our Declaration and their Declaration.

They read us their proposal upon the assurance that it would be acceptable to us. Their proposal was as follows:

"A long discussion took place upon the declaration of the Russian Trade Unions concerning the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress and its attitude during the recent national strike.

The British representatives stress that the General Council could not permit an interference in the internal affairs of the British Trade Union movement and demanded the withdrawal of the above mentioned declaration. The Russian representatives pointed out the impossibility of fulfilling this demand. As no definite decision was adopted, the conference was then indefinitely postponed. Both parties will report back to their Central bodies."

We declared that this resolution was completely unacceptable for us and read our own declaration:

"Having regard to the fact that the British delegation refuses to discuss the questions placed before the Anglo-Russian Committee by the Russian delegation and that it declares that its General Council must first be informed concerning the results of the exchange of opinions at the present Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the Russian delegation will report this to the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union:

1. We express our deepest regret that the British Comrades hasten their departure although a number of most important practical tasks lie before the Anglo-Russian Committee for discussion.

2. We stand for the maintenance of the Anglo-Russian Committee, particularly in the present moment, when the offensive of capital against the working class is intensifying and the danger of new wars is becoming ever more real, we hold that the existence and activity of the Anglo-Russian Committee in such a situation will be of the greatest advantage to the working class.

3. We consider, however, the refusal of the British delegation to discuss the extremely important practical questions concerning the organisation of support for the British miners, which have been placed before the Anglo-Russian Committee by us, to be incorrect.

4. We declare at the same time in the name of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union that the Russian Unions, despite all this, will continue to support the fighting porkers in Great Britain."

The Further Course of the Negotiations.

I must say that our declaration confused the British delegation to a certain extent. Our open declaration that they had refused to discuss the question of supporting the miners and the expression of our regret that they were in such a hurry, made a very unpleasant impression upon them. As I have said, the British delegation was confused and a further exchange of opinion took place whereupon the British delegation declared upon its part that it considered it necessary to postpone the conference until the following day. That was on July 30th. After the declaration that the conference was postponed, our comrades in private discussions put the question: "What do you actually want?" We were told that it was naturally possible that much of that which we proposed would be acceptable. Try to work out a resolution, they told us, which we can discuss tomorrow morning with clear heads (Laughter). There was nothing left for our delegation to do but to accept this proposal.

Our delegation prepared a resolution for the morning session which was approximately as follows: It raised the question of organising assistance for the British miners upon an international scale; it raised the question of the possibility of preventing the transport of coal. It discussed the attitude of Amsterdam and the Trade Secretariats towards the support of the miners. The resolution contained a number of proposals upon unity, and upon the danger of war, proposals based upon an estimation of the international situation. It also contained a declaration concerning the necessity for the continued existence of the Anglo-Russian Committee. That was, in short, the contents of the resolution which was worked out by us and presented to the British delegation for their approval. When, however, the conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee met again after the interruption, the British delegates declared that they considered it impossible to adopt any practical decisions, etc. and that it was their duty to report first to the General Council. All this

only convinced us that the whole tactics of the delegation were decided upon beforehand and worked out by the leaders of the General Council before the Conference.

After they had refused to discuss our resolution, they presented a new declaration as follows:

"The British delegates raised the question of the declaration issued by the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union concerning the policy of the British General Council during the recent national strike.

The British delegates stressed categorically that the General Council would not grant anyone the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the British trade union movement, and demanded that the above mentioned declaration be withdrawn and that for the future an agreement be made concerning this question.

This question was debated at great length without, however, arriving at any definite decision. The British delegates therefore pointed out that they were not in a situation to examine the other questions before they had reported upon the discussion to the General Council.

The question of the conflict in the British mining industry was raised. The British delegates explained the steps taken by the General Council to organise international assistance for the miners. They expressed also their deepest satisfaction with the noble financial support of the miners on the part of the Russian trade union movement and undertook to present the General Council with any practical proposal that the Russian delegates might make with regard to further support.

With regard to the general international situation the Committee was unanimously of the opinion that the creation of international unity in the trade union movement was urgently necessary and that the British and Russian movements are determined to continue their work to obtain this end."

Thereupon we added the following text to our declaration of the previous evening:

"Further, the declaration of the Russian delegation was heard that in their opinion the declaration of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union could not be regarded as an interference on the part of the Russian Unions in the affairs of the British trade union movement and that they, the Russian delegates, did not consider it possible to discuss the declaration of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union at the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee without receiving permission of the Central Council to do so. The main instructions which the Russian delegates received from their Central Council were to raise the question of the support for the British miners in the Anglo-Russian Committee. This, however, could unfortunately not be done, because, according to the declaration of the British delegation, the latter was not empowered to do so by its General Council."

We then proposed to enter our draft resolution into the protocol. Thus ended the conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee. The British delegates proposed to regard the session as postponed and to continue it in two or three weeks time. We declared that the question of a future meeting could be arranged by negotiations between the Central Council and the General Council. Thus ended, as we have said, the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Conference.

Conclusions.

In our opinion the conclusions to be drawn from the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee can only be the following: The Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union must clearly place on record that the British delegation and the General Council definitely refused to examine the question of support for the miners and that upon our part we did everything possible to raise this question both in our own country and upon an international scale.

The strike has now entered a phase of severe struggle and if a defeat is possible, if, as Purcell himself declared, three million people are starving and suffering all possible privations, then it is the General Council which is responsible for this (Interruption: Correct!). There can be no other conclusion from the tactics of the representatives of the General Council at the

Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee. They knew weeks ago that it was our intention to raise the question of support to the miners at the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee. They declared nevertheless that they had no power to discuss this question. That is the first thing which the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union must place with all clarity upon record.

A second thing which it must place on record is the fact that the attempt to put the question of the declaration of the Central Council, our criticism of the General Council, under discussion was nothing but an attempt to avoid discussing the question which we had put forward, i. e. the question of supporting the miners. The tactic of the delegation of the General Council to the Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee cannot be described in any other way. With regard to the declaration, in our opinion the Central Council has absolutely no reason to alter the declaration adopted by the Plenum of the Central Council in any way whatever.

All subsequent events and the subsequent tactic of the General Council, particularly the tactic of its delegation to the last Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee corroborate perfectly the correctness of our attitude. I believe that we should declare in our decision that we stand for the maintenance of the Anglo-Russian Committee, that this Committee has become an important factor in the struggle for the unity of the international working class movement and that its liquidation or undermining would only be of advantage, to the class enemies of the proletariat and assist them to a triumph.

We must declare that the attitude of the General Council and its delegation to the Anglo-Russian Committee can be regarded as nothing else but as the first step to a breaking up of the Anglo-Russian Committee. The attitude of the General Council and its delegation when it refused to discuss the tremendously important question of supporting the miners, a question which was well within the competency of the Anglo-Russian Committee, can be judged in no other way. We must therefore declare that we stand for the maintenance of the Anglo-Russian Committee, an Anglo-Russian Committee which is not merely a sign-board, not merely a fiction, but a real organ of the struggle for the international unity of the trade union movement and the struggle against the offensive of capital. The British trade union leaders represented by the General Council and its delegation took the first great step at the Paris conference to break up the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Another main conclusion is that our trade union movement, despite the policy of the General Council, must declare, that we shall not in the least weaken our moral and material assistance for the striking miners of Great Britain. We will do whatever depends upon us, because this will consolidate the fraternal and friendly relations between us and the British workers, quite independent of the will of the trade union leaders. (Applause.)

Resolution of the Plenum of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union upon the Paris Conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

(Unanimously adopted on August 12th 1926 after the speech of Comrade A n d r e y e v, chairman of the U. S. S. R. Trade Unions Delegation to the Paris Conference.)

After hearing the report upon the conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris and upon the work of the delegation of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, the Plenum of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union ratifies the actions of the delegation during the conference.

The Plenum points out that the British delegation to the Paris conference took up an attitude contrary to the interests of the broad masses of the British miners.

The chief question is that of supporting the heroic struggle of the British miners. The striking miners, their wives and children, are suffering the greatest need and privations. All the forces of the bourgeoisie — the government, the mine owners, the police, strikebreakers, and espionage organisations — are directed against the miners. The hypocritical "friends" are at-

tempting to cripple the will to struggle of the miners and to spread defeatism in their ranks in order to force them to surrender. The miners are in great need; and it is the duty of every honest supporter of the workers cause to regard the support of the miners as the chief task.

It is for this reason that the Central Council took the initiative in calling together the Anglo-Russian Committee and proposed the question of support for the British miners as the one and only point on the agenda, a support which would oppose the insolent attack of capitalism not only in words but also in deeds. The U. S. S. R. Trade Unions have done everything within their power to this end. They considered it necessary to increase the amount of support, and to enlarge the campaign to include the whole international proletariat. "A friend in need is a friend indeed". But although the privations of the miners have become very great, and the attacks of the bourgeoisie have become particularly sharp, the British delegation refused to discuss the question of supporting the miners.

The Central Council regards this attitude as wrong both in substance and in form.

Formally this attitude is wrong because the answering telegram of the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress accepting the offer of a conference made no protest against the agenda proposed by the U. S. S. R. Trade Unions which contained only one point, the question of supporting the miners.

In substance this attitude of the British delegation is the continuation of that policy of capitulation and sabotage pursued by the leaders of the General Council during the general strike which damaged the working class movement and above all the interests of the miners severely.

The Plenum of the Central Council wishes to place the fact on record that through this attitude the British delegation must take the responsibility for any lack of sufficient support for the miners.

The Plenum is of the opinion that the demand which the British delegates placed before the U. S. S. R. delegates calling for the withdrawal of the declaration of the Central Council of the U. S. S. R. Trade Unions in connection with the British General Strike is more than unfounded. The Central Council sees no reason to alter its analysis of the British events and the role played by the General Council and its present leaders in it. Particularly as not only the history of the strike, but also the attitude of the British delegation at the Paris conference fully corroborates the basic contentions of this declaration.

The Plenum wishes to place the fact on record that the refusal of the British delegation to discuss the question of support for the British miners and its covering of this refusal by the demand for the withdrawal of the declaration of the Central Council of the U. S. S. R. Trade Unions are in fact a step towards the breaking up of the Anglo-Russian Committee and an attempt to make the international campaign of assistance for the British miners impossible. Although the working masses of Great Britain and other countries are closing in more and more round the banner of unity, although the possibilities of activity for the Anglo-Russian Committee are becoming ever greater and although the working masses are regarding the Anglo-Russian Committee with ever more sympathy, nevertheless the leaders of the British trade unions have taken the responsibility for the first step towards breaking up the Committee.

The Plenum declares that the responsibility for this step rests absolutely and completely on the shoulders of the British delegation in the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The Plenum is of the opinion that it is the duty of the Trades Unions of the Soviet Union despite the attitude of the British delegation to prosecute the idea of the unity of the trade union movement with all the means at its disposal. For the U. S. S. R. Trade Unions the Anglo-Russian Committee is not a block of leaders, but the embodiment of the friendship and solidarity between the working masses of Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

Therefore the Central Council of the U. S. S. R. Trade Unions in the conviction that the maintenance of the Anglo-Russian Committee is necessary in the interests of the international proletariat, will continue to demand from the Anglo-Russian Committee an active support of the workers against the capitalists, a support not in words but in deeds. This is the only honest working class policy. The Plenum is of the

opinion that it is the duty of the Anglo-Russian Committee to use all the means of its power to support the miners. The Plenum considers a refusal of this support to be tantamount to an indirect support of the capitalists and all class enemies of the proletariat.

The Plenum stresses the necessity for a complete freedom of mutual criticism inside the Anglo-Russian Committee. The Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union as an organisation of the victorious proletariat of the Soviet Union has had immense experience of the class struggle, and its trade unions have conducted victorious general strikes against the enemy more than once. It will not keep silent when the incorrect policy of the leaders of the General Council damages the cause of the working class struggle. The Central Council makes not the least demand to be allowed to "interfere in internal matters". It wishes to assist the British proletariat both materially and ideologically.

The Central Council observes with indignation the strike breaking attitude of the Amsterdam International and the leaders of the International Miners' Federation and the other international organisations who for the sake of the bourgeoisie have refused deplorably to support the heroic British workers.

The Plenum of the Central Council considers it necessary to continue the energetic campaign of assistance for the British miners.

The Plenum of the Central Council of the Trade Union of the Soviet Union instructs the Presidium to publish the complete text of the report and the discussions and also the present resolution, in the press.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia upon the Events in the Russian and German Brother Parties.

The Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia adopted the following resolution upon August 21st:

1) The Central Committee of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia endorses the full text of the resolution of the Political Bureau of the Party of July 30, 1926 in the Russian question approving of all the measures adopted by the leadership of the Russian Party against the attacks of the opposition upon the unity of the C. P. of the Soviet Union, and it declares its complete agreement with this resolution. With this decision the Central Committee regards the question as settled and does not consider it necessary to open up a discussion in the Party upon it.

2) At the same time the Central Committee follows carefully the struggle of the Communist brother Party in Germany to clean itself from the disruptors who are attempting to injure the unity and discipline of the party. The Central Committee hopes that the expulsion of Ruth Fischer, Maslov and others will be a warning for all who may feel inclined to attack the unity of the Communist Party of Germany.

The Central Committee believes that all members of the Communist Party of Germany and all its organisations and nuclei will place themselves behind the leadership of the party and defend with it the Leninist and Bolshevist line in the C. P. of Germany against all fractional attacks whether from the Right or the Left.

The Central Committee of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia expresses its sympathy with the German brother Party and its leadership and hopes that the fractional attacks of Ruth Fischer, Maslov and others will in a short time be just such a completely overcome and insignificant episode for the C. P. of Germany as today the secession of Bubnik and his followers is for the C. P. of Czechoslovakia.

Long live the fighting determination and Bolshevist discipline of the Communist Party!

Long live the Communist International!

Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.

A Party Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been arranged for the 15th October in Moscow. The agenda is the following: 1) Report of Comrade Bukharin upon questions of international policy. 2) Report of Comrade Rykov upon the economic situation. 3) Report of Comrade Tomski upon the results of the work of the trade unions of the Soviet Union and their future tasks.

IN THE COLONIES

The Revolutionary Movement in Indo-China

By A. F.

Economically, Indo-China is ruled by the **Bank of Indo-China**, which in the year 1924 possessed a capital of 64,400,000 francs, and the transactions of which during the same year amounted to 4.5 milliards. It has in its hands the „Credit Industriel et Commercial”, the French Coal Company of Tonkin (which exports 1,400,000 tons of coal in the year) and the Railway Company of Yunam.

The total trade of the colony amounts to more than 4 milliard francs. The sale of opium and alcohol bring in more than one milliard, of which sum the administration costs 200 millions. The rest is pocketed by the monopolists. In this manner French Imperialism earns 415 millions a year just for poisoning the natives. The budget of the colony totals 1,327,000,000 francs. Exports of rice figure at 15,000,000 centners, exports of rubber at 80,000 centners.

The wealth of Indo-China accrues to the exclusive advantage of the French. A miner earns 32 centimes a day, a female worker 28 centimes and a juvenile 16 centimes. Furthermore, they are not paid regularly and, even so, not always in money. The coal company erects shops at which the workers are obliged to buy their requirements at prices about 10% higher than those ruling on the market. Wages are often paid in kind, and the worker gets his money in many cases a fortnight or even a month later. By these methods the company prevents the workers from deserting. Of the 15,907 miners counted in 1916, not one reached the age of sixty. And out of this consideration workers' pensions for the natives have been refused as being superfluous.

The life of the peasant is no better. The soil is lean, the methods of working it belong to the Middle Ages, and the crop is consequently slight. While in Europe a hectare yields 4,67 kilogrammes of grain, the same measure of ground produces only 1,21 kilogrammes in Indo-China. The Government levies upon the peasants a revenue tax of 10% in gold. Furthermore, the peasant must pay so much for irrigation, manure, seed, hire of draught cattle, labourers, etc., that he works with a deficit of 3,75 Dollar per „Mau” (ground measure). How is it possible for the peasant to live and pay his taxes? The answer is very simple: It does not matter. The principal thing is: He pays and lives.

An Annamitic proverb says: „If a man works, he dies of hunger; if he does not work, then hunger kills him.” Through thousands of years of tradition and through force of circumstances they are tied to the land. They would gladly escape from the ungrateful land, if they could; but where can they go to? The majority of them eat nothing but potatoes and vegetables the whole year round. Only on great holidays do they eat the precious rice.

It is not only under taxation that the natives groan, though this has increased by 550% in the course of ten years. The following is taken from a native paper „Khaihoa du Tonkin”:

„People are often arrested illegally. They are kept in prison for months... the soldiers compel them to pay this and that and also brutalise them... One was so seriously maltreated that he had to be taken to hospital. When a very poor man has the misfortune to be arrested, there is nothing for him to do but sell his wife and child in order to pay the fine, even though his conviction be unjust.”

But there are even more serious cases. The Governor of Cambodia built a summer palace for 57 millions, which the natives had to raise, and on the road which he had laid from his residence to the palace, 1900 natives met their deaths.

In November of last year the natives handed to the newly arrived Governor, the „Socialist” Varenne, the „Claims of the Annamites”. They related to rights in connection with the free-

dom of the Press, freedom of speech, meetings and coalition, etc. Varenne promised everything and gave nothing, just as his predecessors had done. At the same time, the French police in Shanghai arrested the old Nationalist, **Phan-Boi-Chow**, who had been living abroad for twenty years. He was brought to Tonkin for trial. Although the matter was kept quiet, the rumour of the arrest spread about and, after the arrival of Varenne in Indo-China, the students held demonstrations which were directed particularly against the colonial rule. This was the first time that anything of the kind had occurred in Indo-China. Varenne was obliged to release the old Nationalist and content himself with having him watched secretly. Since that time the students' movement has continued and since March of this year it has become much more animated.

In connection with the return of the Nationalist **Bui Queng-Chieu** from France, where he had been carrying on propaganda against the corruption in the colonial administration, there was another demonstration in which thousands took part. The French Fascists organised a counter-demonstration, and soldiery, police and gendarmerie were mobilised. Despite all the provocations, the Fascists did not succeed in causing any bloodshed, much as they wished to do so. About this time another Nationalist, **Fan Chau-Trink**, an old political prisoner, died, and 30,000 Annamites of Indo-China accompanied his corpse to the grave. Throughout the country national mourning celebrations were held. Collections were made and 100,000 dollars were raised within a few days. All the students went into mourning.

The French were startled by this national movement and took measures against it. They forbade the students to wear mourning and to make collections. They prohibited the mourning celebrations. The students answered with a strike, which was carried out in all the big towns. Even the little school girls joined in. A slight incident illustrated the national spirit of the students: In a school in Saigon somebody wrote on the blackboard: „Abf.” This means „A bas les Français”. („Down with the French”). The French teachers demanded that the students should clean it off. All the students refused to do so. The „Socialist” Varenne gave instructions that severe measures should be taken against the students. There were arrests and expulsions, and in Saigon alone more than 500 students were removed from the schools.

In Tonkin there is a secret organisation known as „Fuc-Viet” (Liberation of Annam). It recently published its programme. The following is an extract from it:

„France keeps Annam under. It has oppressed our people for years . . . our population of 25 million must form a solid block in order to end the tyranny . . . which is already perishing. All the nations are answering to the signal of the Russian revolution. India and Egypt are awakening and will recover their freedom. Is it possible that the people of Annam will sleep for centuries? If the ordinary methods will not suffice to liberate us, then we must have recourse to extreme violence in order . . . to capture our place. People of Annam, awake!”

In Cochinchina there is a group known as the „Constitutional Party” and consisting of intellectuals who have been brought up according to French ideas. It is thoroughly moderate and preaches „co-operation of the French and Annamites upon the basis of equality”. In reality they have no organisations. But as it often attacks the French administration — in all loyalty, of course — it enjoys a certain amount of influence with the natives.

Another group is called „Young Annam”. This is more advanced and very active. Its official organ — managed by a young Annamite — often publishes articles taken from „L'Humanité”. It published the Communist Manifesto in the form of feuilletons. The French administration naturally tried to destroy the organisation. In March the „Young Annam” arranged a meeting of protest against the exiling of Tonkinese; more than 3000 people attended it and a sharp resolution was adopted. Among other things it demanded freedom for the native press, abolition of corporal punishment, freedom of education, freedom of movement etc. In the proclamation of the demonstration the phrase occurred: „. . . we swear to work for the liberation of the Annamite people”. On account of this phrase which was copied in the „Tribune of Young Annam”, two writers of the proclamation, the organisers of the meeting and the director as well as the manager of the paper were sentenced to two years'

imprisonment. The judgement gave rise to a renewal of the strike in the schools.

The political situation in the colony is best of all illustrated by a plaint in one of the French journals of Tonkin: "This agitation is transforming our country, which has previously been so quiet, into a seat of commotion and disorder."

AGITPROP.

The American Party School.

By A. G. Bosse (Moscow).

For three or four years educational work in the New York District was not taken seriously, the policy was one of drift, and the situation was complicated by the year and a half factional struggle, the absorption of the leading comrades in other Party work and the general lack of interest on the part of the membership. In November of last year with the re-organisation of the Party, with the organisation of the Agitprop Department under Comrade Wolfe, the educational work of the district was transformed.

The slogan of the school is: "Training for the class struggle", and its success both as a Party training school and as a Left Wing school with a mass following, has been great.

The Party training course consists of classes in Marxism, Leninism, the Party's history, structure and problems, and Communist work in the trade unions. About 150 students applied and half were selected. The students were sent by the street and shop nuclei and were admitted on the basis of Party activity, trade union activity, and theoretical preparation. Most of those taking the course were Party functionaries, active trade unionists, and leading Party workers. The teachers were the Agitprop director of the district (Wolfe), and his assistant (Benjamin), the General Secretary of the district (Weinstein), and the industrial organiser (Miller, later Zack). In the trade union course other comrades who are specialists in their particular field of work, were drawn in for special sessions of the class.

The other Party training course, "Fundamentals of Leninism", was for members of the shop nuclei only. When the course began, the Party was in the process of reorganisation, and most of the comrades were still in territorial branches. The nucleus selected the comrade, usually the organiser, paid his fee and exacted regular attendance from him. The class met every other week and in alternate weeks, the comrade led the political discussion in the nucleus on the matters discussed in class. The course dealt with "the theory and practice of Leninism in their concrete application to the American Party in general, and the needs and problems of the shop nuclei in particular." The instructor was the organisation secretary of the district (Stachel).

The other courses were open to all workers who wished to attend. The English courses were graded from elementary courses for those unable to speak English, to advanced English, advanced public speaking, workers correspondents, and modern literature from the point of view of historic materialism. In economics there were elementary and advanced courses.

Financially, the school was faced with great difficulties at the beginning. The director was paid now and then, the secretary served voluntarily, and the only one paid regularly was the clerical secretary. The rent was paid tardily, the chairs broken, and other facilities lacking. The classes were held in the district headquarters and despite constant noise of Party and faction meetings in adjacent rooms, the classes carried on with great regularity. To put the school on its feet financially, the Agitprop Committee decided upon a drive for funds.

An application to the Garland Fund (a million-dollar fund whose interest was used for labour, education, the labour press, labour publication, and the like) was refused on the ground that the school taught sectarian doctrines and was not a real workers' school. The Agitprop Committee decided to go ahead with its drive, and began with a banquet to which as many workers' organisations as could be reached were invited. At this

banquet a couple of thousand dollars was pledged. A concert and mass meeting brought another 2500 dollars and a six-week's intensive drive in the Party, the trade unions, fraternal and other workers' organisations, brought the total to 8,000 dollars. The Garland Fund which had granted the library 1,000 dollars was asked to send a representative to investigate the school, and the favourable report made resulted in a grant of 5,000 dollars. With the fees which students paid the school was put up on its feet financially, and the director was able to eat and breathe freely again.

All the students paid fees (unless on strike or unemployed) of 2.50 for a 1-hour a week three-months term, and 4.00 for the 3-hour a week Party training course. The fees helped to pay a large part of the school expenses for rent, light, telephone, printing, etc. The teachers were paid, but all turned their wages back to the school. (They are all Party members).

Next year the school is to be broadened out into a Left Wing school, by the addition of some sympathetic non-Party instructors. The Agitprop Committee of the district runs the school, and has approved of this extension of activities. An attempt was made this year to supply teachers to the unions, but due to a shortage of teachers and to mass strikes in which many of the Left Wing unions were engaged, little was done along this line. A new building, probably together with the district office, will be the object of another drive this coming school year. The school attempted by the reactionary A. F. of L. Central Labour Council of New York, (with 800,000 members affiliated) has been a failure, and the Socialist Party Rand School is practically dead. The Workers' School has the field to itself, and is successfully burying its roots in the local mass organisations of workers.

The mass character of the school is indicated by the 800 students registered last year (November 1925 to June 1926). Of these more than half remained in regular attendance through June. How good a record this is can be seen if we contrast it with the work in the public evening schools where only 200 students out of a registration of 800 remain after six months. Half the students were Party members and half non-Party workers, mostly of Left Wing organisations. Most of them were members of unions. The content of the courses was such as to constantly link up the class-room work with the mass struggles of the workers. The basic course, which was given at the central school and at all the section branches in New York and in nearby cities, was the Fundamentals of Leninism. The text used was the "ABC of Communism" by Bukharin and Preobrazhensky, but at teachers' conferences, stress was laid upon the adaptation of this text to American conditions.

The slogan "Discover America" indicates the attempt to concretise and "Americanise" all the teaching. When the Passaic textile strike broke out, all the energies of the school were directed toward aiding twin the strike. Teachers spoke in the strike area (Comrade Weisbord, the leader of the strike, had been a teacher of one of the branch classes); the English classes used the strike in their reading and composition work and in their workers correspondents' class; the class in economics studied the centralisation of industry and the concentration of capital of the textile industry; the research class turned its efforts toward conditions in the industry, profits, interlocking directorates, and foreign connections; the trade union class took up the question of organisation of the unorganised and similar questions in the light of the Passaic strike.

In the Furrier's strike a delegation of the administration, teachers and students appeared before the strike committee, and offered to put the school at the disposal of the strikers. The hall committee of the strikers asked the school administration to help out with speakers, musical talent and entertainment of other sorts, and the school got in touch with some of the people it had listed for such work.

The most interesting feature of the work of the past year has been the success with which the school has combined the functions of a truly Communist training school with those of a Left Wing mass school. The prospects of the coming year are very favourable for a still further broadening out of its work. An intensive training course for selected Party functionaries from all over the country combined with an institute for teachers for the next year is the chief work of the summer.