

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 63

23rd 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: Inprekorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

Arthur Rosenberg: The New German Imperialism and Germany's Entry into the League of Nations.

Hands off China.

Hands off China! Hands off the Soviet Union!

The R.I.L.U. to the Workers of all Countries.

Tang Shin She: The Advance of the Revolutionary Troops and the Next Tasks of the Kuomintang.

Politics.

Giuglio Aquila: The Attempt on the Life of Mussolini.

Acosta Duarte: The Comedy of the "Referendum" in Spain.

J. Taigrin: The Soviet Government and the Tangier Question.

B. Ferdi: The Political Struggles in Turkey.

The Labour Movement.

R. Palme Dutt: The Bournemouth Trades Union Congress.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

The Berlin Meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee. Report given by Comrade Andreyev at the Extraordinary Session of the Presidium of the Enlarged Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union. II.

The A. U. C. T. U. on the Results of the Berlin Meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

A. Lozovsky: The Question of Unity at the British Trades Union Congress.

The White Terror.

A New Manoeuvre of American Justice against Sacco and Vanzetti.

Concerning Ourselves.

Five Years of the Inprekorr.

The New German Imperialism and Germany's Entry into the League of Nations.

By Arthur Rosenberg (Berlin).

The organs of the German bourgeoisie are triumphantly pointing to the enormous difference that exists between the situation of Germany in Versailles 1919 and in Geneva 1926. In 1919 Germany was excluded from the community of "cultured nations"; today she is recognised with enthusiasm as a great Power with equal rights. Without joining in the ridiculous paens of enthusiasm at the success of the Stresemann policy, one must still admit that the present world-political position of Germany is quite different from that of 1919. What is the essential difference? The idea of the Versailles Treaty was that Germany was removed from the ranks of the imperialist great Powers. Germany had lost all her colonies, her foreign investments were confiscated, the occupation troops were on the Rhine; the reparation obligations were so enormous that they seemed to render impossible any recovery of German economy, the disarmament provisions of the Peace Treaty meant the annihilation of German militarism, the iron clads of the German navy lay somewhere at the bottom of the sea. The new militarist States, Poland and Czechoslovakia, stood ready at any moment, along with Belgium and France, to crush any sign of German resistance.

The German bourgeoisie have now succeeded, precisely in the most dangerous moment, after the collapse of the resistance in the Ruhr, in winning the help of American capital.

America took in hand the settlement of the reparations question. The loans from America rendered possible the stabilisation of the German valuta. The German bourgeoisie, who in 1923 were trembling before the workers' revolution, drove back the working class along the whole front and consolidated their political and financial position. The relative stabilisation of European conditions in 1924 and 1925, shaky and uncertain as it is, nevertheless revived all the hopes of the German ruling class. When the most pressing danger appeared to have been overcome, the German bourgeoisie immediately proceeded to lay the foundations for a new imperialism.

Several important pre-conditions for modern imperialism exist in present-day Germany. Germany has a considerable share in the world monopoly of the most important branches of production: iron and coal, dyes and chemicals, potash production, the optical and electrical industry. The German dye trust with its enormous capital represent a great international power. The German steel trust, which is backed by American capital, is now endeavouring to consolidate its world position in the negotiations for an iron cartel with France and Belgium. The lack of capital which arose as a result of the inflation period in Germany, no longer exists to the same extent as in 1924 and 1925. Since the commencement of this year there has again arisen a considerable inner-German capital market. Why, therefore, should Germany be incapable of exporting capital?

It is true that considerable obstacles stand in the way of the rebuilding of a new German imperialism. German imperialism is to reappear at a time which is proving to be the period of decline of world capitalism, as the period of world revolution. Since 1924 the oversea-countries have become industrialised; Asia has awakened to passionate resistance against the foreign exploiters; almost all countries are shutting out foreign competition by means of tariff walls; Soviet Russia has arisen, whereby imperialism has been deprived of one sixth of the surface of the globe. Under these conditions German imperialism can hardly find its field of activity.

In addition to this there must be mentioned the special hindrances resulting from the peculiar situation of present-day Germany. As a result of the Dawes plan German economy continues to remain under foreign supervision. The German Reichsbank and the German railways are in the hands of foreign capital. The German capitalists of today must not only tolerate the French occupation in Mainz, they dare not, without the permission of foreign powers, even reduce the tax on beer. In spite of the development of an inner-German capital market, German economy is still, to a very great extent, dependent upon foreign investors. The reparation liabilities compel Germany to make annual payments which already mean to German economy a net loss of 1.5 milliard gold marks a year, a sum which in the next few years will increase to far beyond two and a half milliard gold marks. In addition to this there is to be reckoned Germany's military impotence. The German chemical industry, it is true, bears within it undreamed-of possibilities with regard to warfare, nevertheless if Germany had to carry on a war alone she would be absolutely helpless in the face of the hostile aircraft, tanks and heavy guns.

Under these quite peculiar circumstances any revival of Germany imperialism is dependent upon two pre-conditions. In the first place Germany needs allies, and in the second place she requires a special sphere for the development of her capital exports. The German bourgeoisie wish to attain both these ends with the aid of the League of Nations. Germany wishes to obtain her world political security, in the first place by an alliance with England and secondly by an alliance with France and, in the framework of the anti-bolshevik policy of the League of Nations, she wishes to obtain access to Russia as a field for the export of capital.

The Anglophile foreign policy of Germany found its clearest expression in October 1925 at Locarno. Under the Locarno treaties England is recognised as the arbitrator in all future disputes on the part of Germany with France and Belgium. At the same time England succeeded in bringing about that the Locarno treaties should first come into force with Germany's entry into the League of Nations. Germany's acceptance into the League of Nations and her entry into the Council of the League was to have been carried out already in March of this year. But in March the hindrances were still too great. Concurrently with the German claim to a permanent seat in the Council of the League, there arose the claims of Brazil, Spain and Poland. The apparent cause of the break-up of the meeting of the League in March last was the opposition of Brazil, but at that time the most important political problem still remaining unsolved was the German-Polish antagonism.

In May of this year, however, there took place in Poland the coup d'état of Pilsudski. Whilst the old Polish right government had been a tool of France in regard to its foreign policy, the victory of Pilsudski meant the complete going over of Poland into the English camp. Pilsudski's free corps, and behind them the Polish regular army, are to be available at any time as the mercenaries of the English Conservatives against Soviet Russia. The Pilsudski government, acting on English advice, was prepared to come to an agreement with the German bourgeoisie. In the Commission of the League of Nations which was engaged at Geneva with the question of reforming the Council of the League, the compromise draft put forward by Lord Robert Cecil gained acceptance. The German as well as the Polish delegation accepted the English formula. Germany voted for Poland having a seat on the Council, and Poland for Germany. The English Conservative government can be satisfied, if Pilsudski should seek adventures in the East he will, thanks to his German friend in the League of Nations, be free from any danger from the West. The German bourgeoisie, however, in all

international disputes relies upon the support of England. Along with this efforts are being made to improve Franco-German relations. Briand is aiming at a Franco-German entente. The German bourgeoisie are not so stupid as to cease all connection with Paris for the sake of England. In spite of this however, the main idea of the foreign policy of the new German imperialism is an understanding with England against Soviet Russia.

The superficial observer will object that German exports to Russia have considerably increased in the last few years, that German credits for Russian business are being employed on an increasing scale, that therefore the most influential German economic circles are apparently aiming at peaceful trade relations with Soviet Russia. But the question of the existence of German imperialism is not so much one of exporting goods but much rather of exporting capital. Soviet Russia is disposed, in the sphere of its economic plans, to buy foreign goods. Soviet Russia, however, will never permit an unrestricted import of capital, for that would mean the Dawesation of Russia. Already in 1922, at the time of the Genoa Conference, the project was raised whereby German capitalists should act as agents of the Anglo-Saxons in the capitalistic rebuilding of Russia. Lloyd George was the sponsor of these plans and found eager supporters in Stinnes and Rathenau. Soviet Russia, of course, emphatically rejected these projects. But today the most influential men in German economy desire in the first place to break through the foreign trade monopoly of Soviet Russia. They desire free play for capital in Russia, unhampered by the Soviet laws. As capitalist Germany is not able with her own forces to undertake such a violation of Soviet Russia, she desires the help of the apparatus of the League of Nations. It is thus that by means of the League of Nations, the world-embracing plans of British anti-bolshevism are connected with the peculiar necessities of German imperialism.

Thus Germany's entry into the League of Nations confronts the working class with serious problems. The bourgeoisie desire, by means of the great coalition, to secure the support of the social democratic leaders. In spite of this all class-conscious workers will stand firmly together in order to thwart the plans of the new German imperialism against Soviet Russia.

HANDS OFF CHINA

Hands off China! Hands off the Soviet Union!

Appeal of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

To the Workers of all Countries!

The development of the struggle of the Chinese people against their imperialist oppressors and their Chinese satrap federates is proceeding at a tremendous pace. The advance of the army of the Canton government, which represents the democratic anti-imperialist interests of the peasants, workers, intellectuals and traders of the Southern provinces, has delivered a severe blow to the militarists and their supporters, the imperialist great Powers. The enemies of the liberty of the Chinese people realise the full extent of the defeat which is threatening them and are therefore preparing a large-scale counter-action.

The danger of a new armed intervention on the part of the imperialist big Powers in China has become exceedingly great. The English press is already conducting a wide campaign in favour of such an intervention. In Tokio negotiations are already taking place between the representatives of the English and Japanese governments regarding united intervention on the other big Powers will also endeavour in good time to secure their share of the plunder. The English forces on the Yangtze and in Canton have already come into action. Further military reinforcements are on their way. Full and open intervention is perhaps only a question of a few days.

The military ruler of the Northern provinces, Chang Tso Lin, whose military power has not yet been weakened, has a violation of all treaties, already undertaken a no title act against

the Soviet Union by seizing a part of the property of the Eastern-Chinese Railway which, in accordance with agreements under which the Soviet Union renounces all special privileges, belongs jointly to the Soviet Union and the Chinese government. This action is a direct provocation, the only purpose of which can be to involve the Soviet Union in military complications. But there is not the least doubt that behind this action of **Chang Tso Lin** there stands **British Imperialism**. The wide-scale plan of intervention, which was obviously worked out under the leadership of England, is therefore directed not only against the Chinese people, but also against the Soviet Union. The intrigues of England in the Far East are added to those measures for encircling Soviet Russia from the West and from the South.

The Communist International calls the attention of the revolutionary Workers and Peasants of all countries to the great danger with which the cause of the emancipation of the world from the yoke of capitalism is threatened by the new machinations of the great Powers. An armed intervention against the Chinese people and a new war against the Soviet Union would bring immeasurable harm to the whole world. The working and peasant masses of the capitalist countries have already on more than one occasion shown that they are not willing to allow the imperialist great Powers again to proceed against the Chinese people who are fighting for their emancipation, or even against the Union of the first Workers' and Peasants' Republics. The Communist International calls upon the workers and Peasants, and on all circles in every section of the population in the capitalist countries who are in sympathy with the fight for freedom of the Chinese people, as well as with the work of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, to stay the arm of the imperialist robbers and to prevent with all means the fresh intervention.

Long live the Fight for Freedom of the Chinese People!

Long live the free and peaceful Socialist Construction in the land of the Workers' and Peasants' Soviets!

Hands off China!

Hands off the Soviet Union!

**The Executive Committee
of the Communist International.**

The R. I. L. U. to the Workers of all Countries.

Comrades,

The Chinese revolution is threatened by an intervention. There is little doubt that the leading role in this attack against the masses of the Chinese people is being played by the English government. Whilst in many provinces the counter-revolution is throttling millions, these "benefactors" of the Chinese people calmly look on. When, however, the bought counter-revolutionary Generals are attacked, then these "defenders of civilization" are moved to action and stab the revolution in the back. The advance of the revolutionary Canton army to the North, and a number of defeats of the counter-revolutionary mercenaries is evoking the diplomatic and military activity of the imperialists, in the first place of the English bandits. The Conference of the English trade unions at Bournemouth has passed a protest resolution against the policy of England in the Far-East. But words and resolutions do not now suffice. The intervention must be fought with deeds and not with words.

Working men and women of all countries! Remember that the cause of the Chinese people is your own cause. The workers of the "Great Powers" will not be able to shake off their fetters until they have broken the backbone of their own imperialism. From country to country, from town to town, let the voice of the working masses resound throughout the whole world:

Clear the imperialists out of China!

Hands off the Chinese Revolution!

**The Executive Bureau of the
Red International of Labour Unions.**

The Advance of the Revolutionary Troops and the Next Tasks of the Kuomin Tang.

By Tang Shin She.

After the capture and occupation of the three sister towns of Hankow, Hanjiang and Wu-Chang the Kuomin armies immediately continued their advance, both in a Northerly direction along the Hankow-Peking railway line in order to reach the province of Honan, and in an Easterly direction along the Yang-tse river, thus commencing the attack on the province of Kiangsi; finally, starting from Hunan, proceeding along the Chuchow-Pingsiang railway line to Central Kiangsi. Their plan in the first place aims at capturing the whole province of Hupe, in order not to expose again the three most important towns to an attack by Wu-Pei-Fu and Sun Chuan Fang. That means that in the North, on the Honan frontier, they wish to occupy at least the fortress of Wuchingwan, and on the Yang-tse, on the North Kiangsi side, the fortress of Wushuech. Finally, with regard to the attack from Hunan on Kiangsi, it is exceedingly important that the revolutionary troops have this province in their hands, because it borders on three provinces in the Canton sphere of government: on Kwangtung, Hunan and now Hupe, and because Sun Chuan Fang could very easily undertake attacks from there as he has already done. A further reason for the advance lies in the fact that in Kiangsi and Honan there already exist armed forces which are on the revolutionary side. In Honan there are the rest of the troops of the Kuomin army, who have already undertaken attacks against Wu-Pei-Fu, while in Kiangsi the greater portion of the Generals, apart from the governor there, sympathise with the Canton government. According to the latest reports the Kuomin armies in North China which have retreated from the Nanko pass, are marching from Chuyuan to Honan. This permits of a speedy junction between the revolutionary armed forces of the North and of the South.

Of the three sister towns Hankow is the most famous trading town of Central China, Wu-chang the political capital of Hupe, and Hanjiang an industrial town possessing great military importance and containing the greatest stores of weapons in China and enormous iron and coal deposits. In Hanjiang there is a natural fortress, the mountain of Kuisan, from whence the towns of Hankow and Wu-Chang can easily be bombarded. If one once captures Hanjiang, then, regarded from the strategical standpoint, one can maintain that one also possesses Hankow and Wu-Chang. Hanjiang fell into the hands of the Canton army because an under-General of Wu-Pei-Fu, Liu Tso Lung, went over to them. The revolutionary troops have now taken Hanjiang and Hankow and have occupied the suburb of Wu-Chang. The town of Wu-Chang itself is not yet in their hands, because there are still 5000 soldiers of Wu-Pei-Fu within the town. The Canton army is refraining from firing on the town in order not to inflict any harm on the population. It has, however, surrounded and blocked the town.

The troops of Wu-Pei-Fu in the North are nominally under the leadership of Chi Shu Yuan, the former governor of Nanking. But they are actually led by Tien Wei Chin, who has for long been a vacillating supporter of Wu-Pei-Fu and is seeking to establish connection with the People's armies. Since the retreat of the Kuomin army from the Nankow pass the quarrel between Wu-Pei-Fu and Chang-Tso Lin for the booty has become more sharp. Chang-Tso Lin demands the province of Chili with Peking and its surroundings all for himself. This means the driving of Wu-Pei-Fu's troops from North China to Honan. When Wu-Pei-Fu, before the capture of Hanjiang-Hankow, went himself from Peking back to Hankow, it was a desperate attempt to retain Hankow in any event in order to possess a sure place somewhere. Owing to the death, alleged to be the result of sickness, of the governor of Honan, a direct supporter of Wu-Pei-Fu, Tien Wei-Chin went with troops to Northern Honan in

order to take over the post of governor; this means practically the retreat of Wu-Pei-Fu from Chili. It is very problematical whether the troops of Tien Wei-Chin, after he has taken the post of governor and after Wu-Pei-Fu has suffered a thorough defeat in Hankow, can still be regarded as supporters of Wu-Pei-Fu. Since the defeat of Wu-Pei-Fu the newspapers have not published anything regarding relief action by Tien-Wei-Chin for Wu-Pei-Fu.

Wu-Pei-Fu's supporters also include a number of Generals in Szechuan; but they are his followers only in name. Already before the capture of Hanjang-Hankow they announced that they wished to declare the province of Szechuan to be independent. This means in polite language a breaking away from Wu-Pei-Fu and a concealed going over to the Canton government; for the Generals have long since declared themselves to be sympathisers with the Canton government.

On their advance to the North the Canton troops were everywhere welcomed by the population who gave them refreshments. They are working together with the population and hold joint meetings. Peasants' and workers' organisations, the Communist Party and the Kuomin Tang are increasing at a rapid rate. The population in other parts of the country which are not yet occupied by the revolutionary troops are over-joyed at the news from the already occupied districts and eagerly desire the arrival of the Canton army. Wu-Pei-Fu's troops are everywhere regarded as enemies. The newspapers report that at the capture of Yochow the troops of Wu-Pei-Fu, either went over en bloc to the Canton army or fled as fast as their legs could carry them to Hankow. The leaders of the Canton troops constantly declare in their speeches at public meetings that their victory is not to be attributed solely to the weapons of the soldiers but mainly to the help of the population.

What does the Canton government wish to bring to the Chinese people? What does it regard as its next task? When it undertook the expedition to the North it declared it to be the continuation of the work of Sun-Yat-Sen. The latter already in 1924 had endeavoured to launch an attack against the North in order to annihilate militarism in China, to create a real democratic government which in the first place should represent the interests of the peasants and workers, to abolish the unequal slave treaties and to shake off the imperialist yoke. For the purpose of carrying out these tasks Sun-Yat-Sen, in a Manifesto proposed to convene a National Assembly and an international Conference. In the National Assembly there should meet together representatives of the following organisations: 1. Economic organisations, 2. Chambers of commerce, 3. Educational bodies, 4. Universities, 5. Students' unions of all provinces, 6. Workers organisations, 7. Peasants' organisations, 8. All leaders of troops who are opposed to Wu-Pei-Fu, 9. Political Parties. The National Assembly was to be preceded by a Preliminary Conference.

This plan, on its publication, received the approval of the entire population, and active steps were taken to carry it out. Everywhere "Societies for the National Assembly" were founded. Owing to suppression on the part of Chang-Tso-Lin and Tuan-She-Sui they had to disappear for a time, but have now resumed their activity. The Kuomin-Tang now, after the victory over Hankow, is already making preparations to carry out this plan.

At an international Conference the abolition of the unequal treaties is to be declared. With regard to the debts to the international Powers investigations will be made as to whether the loans were employed in the interests of the people. If yes, then they will be honoured, if no, then they will not be recognised.

In order to carry out these tasks the Kuomin-Tang has already placed on the agenda the question of transferring the seat of government from Canton to Hankow.

POLITICS

The Attempt on the Life of Mussolini.

By Giuglio Aquila.

The bomb which was thrown at Mussolini's carriage in Rome on September 11th, exploded at a moment of great political difficulties both external and internal for the Fascist government. This fact suggested and made plausible the original suspicion that once again, as with the previous "attempts at assassination" of the "Duce", it was a case of an "attempted assassination", carefully prepared by his own police. It seems however that this time it was a serious political attempt on his life. The would-be assassin who was arrested, claims to be an Italian anarchist. He declares that he acted on his own initiative and denies having accomplices or persons who knew of his intention, let alone having been "under instructions". As a matter of fact the Italian police has failed up to the present in discovering traces of any "conspiracy". Mussolini is so enraged by this that he has already dismissed the Chief of the National Police and the Chief of Police in Rome. Even this measure has not advanced the discovery of the "conspiracy" by a single step, although the number of arrests and of houses searched amounts in Rome alone to hundreds. The same applies to the provinces. It is chiefly communists and anarchists who have been arrested; there have, however, been numerous arrests also among the members of the petty bourgeois opposition parties and among the bourgeois opposition elements. The names are kept secret by the police "in the interest of the investigation". At the same time — in spite of Mussolini's "solemn prohibition" — "irresponsible" Fascist acts of terror are taking place. In the proletarian districts of Rome, numerous workers have been beaten by Fascists till blood was drawn. In the provinces also the Fascists are letting themselves go. In Trieste, where it got as far as guns being fired, a state of siege has been declared. The Fascists then took possession of the premises of a bourgeois liberal association.

The would-be assassin lived for a time as an emigrant in France. He lived in Marseilles and returned to Italy at the beginning of February. After the serious diplomatic defeats he recently suffered, Mussolini tried to turn this fact "to advantage" in his foreign policy.

Mussolini has described the year 1926 as "the Napoleonic year". This sounding phrase is the description of the "magnificent" and "heroic" foreign political plans of the Fascist Government which are dictated to it by two very prosaic factors: by the imperialist aspirations of the Italian bourgeoisie and by the insuperable difficulties with which the regime meets in the country itself, which were to be camouflaged by the brilliant success of the foreign policy of the Fascist Government.

The imperialist aspirations of the Italian bourgeoisie clash directly with the interests of French imperialism: the Balkan predominance in the Mediterranean, Tunis, Tangier, Abyssinia. In the last few months, Mussolini had suffered defeat after defeat right along the line in the plans of his foreign policy, and — with one exception (the Mosul Treaty between England and Turkey) — the defeat always came through France. France's intervention turned Mussolini's advances to Yugoslavia into an obvious fiasco. In Abyssinia, France, through the agreements it came to with England, put a decisive spoke into his wheel. Mussolini then concluded the Italo-Spanish treaty of friendship with Primo de Rivera. This treaty is a direct threat to French imperialism in the Mediterranean and particularly in Tunis. Furthermore Mussolini wanted to play off Spain against France in other fields. Primo de Rivera brought up the Tangier question and laid his claim to a permanent seat on the Council in Geneva. Mussolini had, however, again reckoned without his host and suffered two new defeats. He failed to recognise that by his policy he drove England into forming one front with France: in Geneva, England could not allow Germany's entry into the League of Nations, i. e. into the imperialist league against the Soviet Union, to be jeopardized; neither could she admit of the Tangier question, by the way an extremely ticklish one as regards England's position of power in Gibraltar, to be brought to the fore.

Mussolini imagined that this attempted assassination would give him the opportunity of "revenge himself" in a small way on France for the serious defeats suffered by his foreign policy.

which were all the more bitter because the victories he had hoped for were to have helped him out of the extremely serious difficulties with which he was faced in the country itself. By calling attention to the fact that the would-be assassin lived for a time in France and was probably in touch with the other Italian emigrants in that country, further that the French Government tolerates the presence of Italian emigrants in France, he now accuses the French Government of a share in the responsibility for the attempt on his life. A few hours after his escape from assassination, he made a speech to his Black Shirts from the balcony of the palazzo Chigi (the Foreign Office), saying among other things:

"From this balcony I wish to say a few words full of purport which should be well understood by those to whom they apply. If the friendship of the Italian people is really valued, a stop must be put to certain unprecedented and implicating toleration on the other side of the border."

The Fascist Press of course took up Mussolini's words and started a campaign of agitation against the Italian emigrants in France and against the French Government.

Mussolini's personal organ, the "Popolo d'Italia" was however incautious enough to admit the real reason of Mussolini's "action" against France in its issue of the next day, if such an admission were even necessary. The "Popolo d'Italia" wrote:

"We well understand that the new Fascist Italy is disturbing the old Powers who have arrived in their sleep and is arousing their jealousy . . . In the Fascist era, the Kingdom of Italy has at last embarked on a policy independent of the Great Powers. Italy is reorganising her army, her navy and her air-fleet and she will not suffer being excluded from colonial benefits."

Mussolini has even made the insane demand to the French Government that the Italian emigrants in France should be under the "supervision" of Italian Fascist police, who should be attached to the Italian Embassy in Paris, and he demands that the political emigrants should be handed over to him as common criminals!

This political move, however, proved to be a mistake. Mussolini has achieved exactly the opposite of what he had hoped to achieve.

The Poincaré-Herriot Government, which grants the right of asylum to the Italian communists in the form that it expels them by dozens without the least cause and merely because they are communists, this same Poincaré-Herriot Government and its whole Press, headed by the "Temps", in order to get in a blow at Italian imperialism, hypocritically rejects from the high horse of moral indignation the insinuation that the French Government should infringe on the "sacred" right of asylum of political emigrants. Thus Mussolini's endeavour to "make use of" the attempted assassination to the advantage of his foreign policy, has turned out a pitiful fiasco.

The Comedy of the „Referendum” in Spain.

By Acoste Duarte (Barcelona).

The three years of military dictatorship, which have deprived Spain of the most elementary political rights, have brought about a situation in trade, in industry and in finance which is disastrous and chaotic — a situation which induces Primo de Rivera to hand over power to the "Union Patriótica" Party which is formed from the scum of the reactionaries and clericals. The government of this Party will be a continuation of the military policy, the governing system of which has its best executive organs in terror, and in violence. With the exception of the clergy, of the army and of the most conservative fractions of the old political parties and the social democracy, the majority of the citizens enjoy no political freedom nor legal existence. Anybody who is suspected of holding advanced or radical views, no matter whether he belongs to a bourgeois or proletarian party, is subjected to the most severe persecution.

Our Communist Party is compelled to work illegally. Our best comrades are frequently thrown into prison. We have no rights to hold meetings, nor to combination nor any freedom whatever. The trade unions which incline to us are dissolved and

the oppositional minorities in the General Labour Federation, where they are strong, are kept down by imprisonment, banishment and police brutality. On the other hand the Socialist Party enjoys unrestricted freedom to carry on its activity and its most prominent members work according to the dictates of the dictator.

As Primo de Rivera has apparently succeeded in weakening the political parties hostile to him, he is now striving to create the appearance of a broad basis for his government activity and to reduce his responsibility. The "referendum" which has just been concluded is a clear demonstration that the dictator is in a blind alley. The cost of living has increased by 17%. The deficit in the budget exceeds 1250 million Pesetas; the military budget has been increased by more than 254 Pesetas, the budget for the clergy by more than 18 million Pesetas etc. The total of the State debt amounts to about 19,000 million Pesetas. The value of the Peseta continues to remain very low. The Morocco question, with its daily fresh battles, still remains. Unemployment is increasing enormously.

The position of the working class is terrible. It has no right to strike, that is if the strike is led by revolutionary elements. The workers are wretchedly paid and the length of the working day depends upon the will of the employer. Industrial and commercial bankruptcies are the order of the day. The burden of taxes is considerably hampering trade, and the life of the country is becoming paralysed. Only the acts of violence of the government and the terror of the dictator render it possible that the people bear in silence the loss of their political liberties, few as they were, and at the same time the loss of the elementary right to existence.

The movement of the artillery troops — a purely professional movement — has induced the dictator to expedite the drafting and publication of the future parliament, which is to be elected on the basis of representation according to professions by the various organisations and by the trade unions which are recognised by the government as legal, that is, by the federations and trade unions of a clerical and social democratic stamp. This parliament will be a sham parliament, a tool of the dictator, and the elements of which it is to consist will be the elements which enjoy confidence in the present political situation. In this artificially assembled parliament the true opinion of the people will remain unrepresented.

There is no doubt that the results of the "Referendum" constitute an open rejection, a categorical condemnation of the methods and the work of Primo de Rivera. Out of 14 million citizens who were entitled to take part in the referendum, only 2,400,000 cast their votes, among these being 2 million women, 155,000 officials of the State and municipalities and of the provincial administrations — compulsory votes — etc. When one takes into consideration the compulsory measures and the acts of violence of the military rulers, then one can maintain with certainty that the total number of the votes cast in favour of the ruling dictatorship do not amount to more than half a million. When it is also remembered that only members of the "Union Patriótica" Party were permitted to control the voting, one can arrive at the conclusion that the government sustained a shattering defeat.

The country which is suffering under the dictatorship, has not lost either its political feeling or instinct. The working class in particular, with a fine instinct and in spite of the indirect recommendations of the social democracy, have silently abstained from taking part in the referendum and thereby registered their protest. Such a decisive attitude of the proletariat with regard to the comedy of the "Referendum" constitutes at the same time a condemnation of the dictator and a condemnation of the social democracy, which has sold itself to the ruling militarism and which endeavoured to induce the working class to accept the proposed parliament.

To sum up, one can say that Primo de Rivera has been rejected by the enormous majority of the population. The Communist Party, in spite of all the difficulties created by the extraordinary situation, has an exceedingly favourable field of work before it which will allow it to penetrate into the working masses, by whom it is recognised as the advance guard of the proletariat. The position is now very favourable for such a development provided all the social democratic remnants in the C. P. are definitely liquidated.

The Soviet Government and the Tangier Question.

By I. Taigin, Moscow.

On September 9th, the representatives of the Soviet Union in Great Britain, Italy, France and Sweden presented the following note, in accordance with the instructions of their Government:

"The Soviet Government has learned that the Spanish Government has approached the States which signed the general treaty of the Algeciras Conference, with the proposal to convoke a fresh conference for the purpose of revising the principles laid down in the general treaty and in the subsequent international conventions.

In accordance with instructions from my Government I take the liberty of pointing out that the participation of my country in the Algeciras Conference gives it the right, as it does all the other member States of the Algeciras Conference, to take part in the said revision, according to the policy of my country.

In consonance with the above statements, I am authorised to declare in the name of my Government that it reserves the right not to acknowledge the resolutions which may be passed without its participation in relation to the above question. My Government would draw special attention to the necessity of consulting it as regards the place at which the prospective conference should be held."

What is the significance of this proclamation of the Soviet Union?

About the year 1900 France's efforts towards the economic and political conquest of Morocco became apparent. In 1904 France concluded a secret treaty with England and Spain, in which these two countries recognised France's protectorate mandate over Morocco on condition that the Spanish zone in Morocco should be excluded from the protectorate, that a special international zone should be founded in Tangier and that the economic interests of Great Britain in Morocco should be guaranteed (Morocco is a country rich in mineral wealth).

The result of the agreement was an energetic attempt on the part of France to subjugate the Sultan of Morocco. But the French successes brought Germany on the scene. On March 31st, 1905, the former Kaiser Wilhelm II landed unexpectedly in Tangier and held a jingo speech. This speech and the threatening attitude of Germany towards France led to the convocation of the International Algeciras Conference in January 1906, in which the representatives of England, France, Spain, Italy, the United States, Russia, Sweden and Morocco participated. The final result of the Algeciras Conference, which lasted four months, was the so-called "general treaty", which recognised formally the sovereignty of the Sultan of Morocco, the integrity of his possessions and the principle of the "open door" in respect of the economic interests of all foreign powers. At the same time, measures were taken for the creation of a number of "international institutions", such as a State Bank, a customs office, a police force, etc., which were to be under the supervision of the Foreign Imperialists.

But France was not disposed to content itself with the curtailment of its influence in Morocco. It used the murder of a few workmen in Casablanca as a pretext for occupying that town on July 30th, 1907. In the next few years France doggedly continued its offensive in Morocco and on May 21st, 1911, it occupied the town of Fez.

The French Government appeared to be on the very point of realising its secret dreams. But Germany again interfered. On July 1st 1911, the German cannonboat "Panther" entered the harbour of Agadir. The German demonstration was not without effect. On November 4th, 1911, Germany and France came to an agreement, which enabled France to proclaim its protectorate of Morocco after Germany had been satisfied with the transfer of a portion of the Congo territory and with the consolidation of its economic interests in Morocco. The protectorate was actually declared on March 30th, 1912. Several months later, on November 27th, 1912, a special convention was made between France and Spain to cover the division of "the spheres of interest" in Morocco. The elaboration of the status regulating the international position of Tangier was postponed to a more favourable occasion.

The Treaty of Versailles compelled Germany to give up all its rights and claims in Morocco. The French position in

Morocco was substantially strengthened. On December 17th, 1923, a treaty concerning Tangier was concluded between England, France and Spain, whereby all the States which had participated in the Algeciras Conference were invited to subscribe to this agreement. Only one exception was made, the Soviet Union received no invitation.

Recently the revision of the "general treaty" and all the conventions and agreements relating thereto has been demanded by Spain. As may be assumed from the Geneva journals, Spain has the intention of calling a new international conference. On this occasion, too, invitations are being sent to all the States whose representatives were present at the Algeciras Conference, but the Soviet Union is again left out.

The note which was published on September 9th, therefore, protests against this attitude on the part of the great powers. The Soviet Union demands that its proper right to participate in the conference which is being prepared by Spain should be respected. If the conference takes place and the Soviet Government gets the opportunity of taking part in it, it will not attend the conference in order to help the capitalist robbers to decide the fate of the Moroccan tribes; on the contrary, it will defend the interests of these tribes against the Imperialists. It is for this reason that the Soviet Government is categorically claiming the right to be represented at the conference.

Will this possibility be allowed to the Soviet Union? It is highly probable that the initiators of the conference, who are fully aware of the views of our Government in regard to colonial problems, will use every means in their power to keep the Soviet delegates away from the conference, if this really happens, the only expedient for the Soviet Union is one which it has used on several similar occasions (we refer to the resolutions of the international conference concerning Spitzbergen and the Aland Islands): To declare with the greatest publicity that it refuses to acknowledge the resolutions of the conference which was not attended by its representatives.

The Political Struggles in Turkey.

By B. Ferdi.

For some time now bitter political struggles have been developing in Turkey. The necessity for the war of independence did much to bridge the gap between the opposing groups. But immediately after the war grave conflicts arose between the chiefs of the Nationalist movement, between Mustapha Kemal and the best known of the men who had previously supported him in the fight, Certain elements which had direct relations with the profiteering bourgeoisie of the big commercial centres, founded together with a number of politicians, who have connections with feudal families, a kind of political Opposition party under the name "The Second Group of Defenders of Liberties". The remainder of the organisation "Union & Progress", also adopted an attitude of opposition to the revolutionary acts of the Kemalists. But as a result of the grave antagonisms which appeared in these various tendencies this group could not play an important role.

At that time the Imperialist danger still threatened the country. It was just before the conclusion of the Treaty of Lausanne. It was necessary to win the fight by diplomatic methods. Kemal exploited this circumstance as well as his great reputation, and he succeeded in frustrating the intrigues of his opponents. In this way the candidates of his party were able, almost without exception, to win through the constitutional election prescribed by him. But all this could not prevent the development of the opposition.

The Kemalists secured in all these fights to be invulnerable until the last twelve months or so. Since the insurrections of 1925, however, the situation has become more critical day by day. The Smyrna conspiracy, however, disclosed the awkwardness of their position. They govern the country in an atmosphere of hatred and discontent. These feelings are clearly expressed by every class of society. For this reason they were compelled to suspend Democratic freedom and to make a system of government out of the emergency laws and out of a regime of terror.

The explanation of this state of affairs is to be found in the peculiarity of the political organisation of the Kemalists, the People's Party.

This is the only powerful political party in Turkey which has a legitimate existence.

The People's Party is not a political party in the sense

which is understood in Europe. The classes, which it allegedly represents, are not organised in the party. In reality it is an administrative machine and a very small general staff. The members do not do any party work, they have only to make their regular contributions and to vote for the candidates of the party when the elections come around. There is never held a general meeting of the party. Everything is done by the parliamentary faction in Angora and communicated to the sections. In the beginning, at least, the People's Party was closely related to the masses of the middle classes, but in the course of time it has gradually severed this connection in order to be completely free.

No statistics are available concerning the strength and composition of the Party. We estimate that the number of its active members does not exceed 500, and the total number of its members will range between 2000 and 3000. According to the data which we have at hand, we can give the following sketch of their composition.

Functionaries or officers (active or in retirement)	35%
Landed proprietors and provincial magnates	25%
Large undertakers, industrialists and merchants	20%
Liberal professions: lawyers, doctors, etc.	10%
Well-to-do farmers	5%
Workers	5%
Total	100%

While the People's Party doubles its endeavours to deceive the middle class in order to keep it in tow and thereby rank as an organisation representing middle-class interests, it is, on account of its composition forced more and more to pursue the policy of the exploiter-class. This knowledge is common property. The decline of the People's Party has two important causes:

1. The encouragement which the Party itself gives to its most influential members to plunge into economic enterprises. In a relatively short time the most capable political leaders of Kemalism, supported morally and materially by the Government, have been able to secure for themselves the most prominent positions in the business world.

The big concerns need peace at home and the support of foreign capital in order to develop. Nothing damages their prosperity more than uncertainty brought about by diplomatic tension. The Government is, therefore, obliged to settle international differences amicably.

2. The second cause of the decline of the People's Party must be sought in the spirit and methods prevailing before its foundation and composition. Kemal won the gratitude of the people by successfully leading the armed fights for national independence. It was only after seizing power and disposing of his political opponents that Kemal occupied himself with the task of forming his party. All those who were entrusted with the organisation and leadership of the party sections and who were favoured with important posts in the machinery of state were selected from the very small circle of Kemal's intimates and were borne up by his tremendous prestige. There is practically nobody in Government circles who owes his position to election and to the confidence of any social group.

In their general policy the leaders of the People's Party are guided by a single thought: They want to have a free hand everywhere in order to be able to devote themselves to the realisation of their economic programme. In the same way they are unanimous in their desire to avoid any conflict, either internal or external, which might be long drawn out. The reign of terror which they have instituted in the country was designed to nip in the bud every attempt to resist their policy, so that no parliamentary or other fights of doubtful issue might ensue. The slightest suspicion is justification enough for them to suppress their supposed opponents with the greatest severity. They have abused their power so wilfully that the Democratic constitution of the Republic has become a scrap of paper. These practices alienate them from the masses of the people and deprive them of their prudence as leaders of the masses.

The Kemalists feel only too well that their policy must be ineffectual in view of the general discontent which must of necessity arise among the masses. Their policy throughout indicates their fear of the attitude of the masses of the people in case of armed conflict. If they were able to rely on the support of the masses they would have shown much more

radicalism in the various disputes which they have had with neighbouring countries and especially in the Mosul question. As they are afraid of the conflagration of civil war, they have hastened at great sacrifice to come to an understanding with the respective countries (Treaty of neutrality with France and Persia, treaty of friendship with Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, compromise with Greece in the question of the exchange of populations, etc.).

The situation is so strained, the discontent of the masses so great, that open fights of great dimensions may shortly be expected. The class which is destined to appear first upon the scene is that class of the bourgeoisie, which we are inclined to term the "great bourgeoisie of the old regime" and which is composed of representatives and allies of international finance. This is the class which is politically best organised. Famous politicians of the most various origin (Progressives, Unionists, "Second Group", Independents, etc.) have undertaken to defend the interests of these important classes. Three tendencies may be observed in this block, which would, of course, split up as soon as power was gained: Firstly, those who are dependent upon English capital and who advocate a policy of rapprochement in regard to Great Britain (the leading Progressives); secondly, those who advocate close collaboration with German capital (the "Unionists"); thirdly, those who have no particular point of view but who still cultivate friendly relations with the Soviet Union (certain Unionists, the remnants of the "Second Group").

The Government exploited the last unsuccessful conspiracy in order to seize upon several of the most prominent personalities of the Liberal Opposition and a few of them were hung. But this does not signify the definite elimination of this opposition.

This ideology is so deeply rooted in the country that it cannot be destroyed even though it be deprived of its most courageous and most capable fighters. The great majority of the intellectuals, all the officers on half pay and a portion of the civil servants display sympathy for this movement.

The true and real reaction, which is supported by the feudal and monarchist circles, is less to be feared at the moment. It is a fact that the clerical circles and the regents of the Ottoman Dynasty are carrying on a secret agitation among the ignorant population and especially among the poor peasants, and deliberately spreading confusion in their minds concerning the reform of the laity and the unfavourable economic position. The reactionary campaign will naturally continue until the time has arrived when feudalism will be destroyed and the question of land reform will be solved in a radical sense.

Finally, there is the question whether a revolutionary movement on the part of the discontented working masses and especially of the poor peasants is possible. In this direction one may anticipate any of a number of eventualities: firstly, a sudden swerving of the Kemalists, who find themselves threatened from every side and see that their salvation lies in the support of the oppressed classes and, therefore, would arrange their policy accordingly. There is no indication up to the present that a change of this nature will take place. But if the People's Party does not comprehend, before it is too late, the necessity of extending their social basis by attracting the most advanced elements, their position will be exposed to immediate danger, for the possibility of the formation against them of a coalition of all the malcontents under the leadership of the city bourgeoisie must be reckoned with. This is the second highly possible eventuality. The third possibility consists of a movement on the part of the working masses. It is the task of the Communists to prepare and promote such a movement.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Bournemouth Trades Union Congress.

By R. Palme Dutt (London).

The Bournemouth Trades Union Congress was a Congress held under a dictatorship — the dictatorship of the Conservative Government acting in alliance with the General Council of the Trade Unions. The Emergency Powers Act overshadowed the Congress; the principal leaders of the opposition, such as Comrades Pollitt and Gaullacher, were in prison with hundreds of the best of the workers. The fraternal delegate of the Soviet workers, Comrade Tomsky, who would have expressed criticism of the General Council, was prevented from attending by

the Government. The President ruled out of order any discussion of the two dominating issues — the General Strike and the Miners' Lock Out. The Miners, in the midst of struggle, were bound over by a "pact" between the leaders from expressing their views.

Under these circumstances the Congress registered superficially a gigantic sweep to the Right — "the most reactionary Congress ever held in the annals of the British Labour Movement" in the words of Cook. But its decisions bear no relation to what is happening in the working class.

The suppression of the Opposition, and the visible joint working of the Government and the General Council, is the most conspicuous feature of the Congress. For the past four years Comrade Pollitt has been the recognised leader of the Opposition at the Congress. He was due for release from his one year sentence on September 11; the Congress was on September 5. With the slightest pressure the General Council could have secured his release the necessary few days earlier. It was not done; under trade union demand a formal request was made to the Home Secretary, which was refused, and there the matter was left. In the same way, with regard to the exclusion of Comrade Tomsky, a formal protest was registered by the General Council; but the Times came nearer the truth of the position when it said:

"The action of the Home Office will relieve the General Council from a rather embarrassing position... There will be a secret sense of satisfaction that Tomsky will not be able to deliver the peculiar kind of fraternal speech which it is believed he had in contemplation for the occasion."

(Times 3/9/26.)

What the Government left undone in the way of smoothing the path for the General Council and silencing opposition, the General Council machine completed by censoring the agenda, ruling out debate on the principal issues, closing discussion against protest, and wiping out even a semblance of freedom of the Congress. The power of the machine may be judged from this fact: that the whole weight of the Miners' vote, the strongest Union and one fourth of the Congress, was directed against every sitting member of the General Council! and yet this 25% turnover of votes, which would swamp any ordinary parliamentary election, produced only one change in the thirty two members of the General Council, and that of a relatively unknown member.

Thus the decisions of Bournemouth are a reflection of the trade union machine and not of the working class. They represent the retreat of the trade union bureaucracy from Scarborough. At Scarborough the force of the rising Left Wing tide in the working class, in an atmosphere of victory from "Red Friday" and approaching greater struggle, compelled a show of concession from the machine: semi-revolutionary resolutions were passed, for international unity, for greater centralisation, for the overthrow of capitalism, for the formation of factory committees, for the break-up of the capitalist Empire; the so-called Left Wing leaders were at their highest point. These resolutions were never intended by the machine to be taken seriously, and immediately after the Congress were shelved and ignored. Once the Capitulation of May 12 had smashed the working class advance in battle by the coalition of the Government and the General Council, the reformist machine could openly abandon its shams and return to the normal policy of subservience and class collaboration. The so-called Left Wing leaders on the General Council were completely deflated, and played no role in the Congress; the dominating Right Wing leaders, such as Thomas and Henderson, did not trouble to attend. The Congress was left in the hands of such typical trade union bureaucrats as Pugh, Bevin and Cramp.

The Chairman's speech set the tone of the Congress. It was an expression of the extreme conservative view of the functions of trade unionism. "The Trade Unions to-day" he declared "are as much a part of the life of the community as the Law Courts or Parliament itself". The apparent conflict of Trade Unionism and the State in the General Strike (he called it the National Strike) was accidental; there was no political intention; "the supreme lesson of the national strike is the clear evidence it adduced as showing that the Trade Union Movement retained belief in the essential rightness of democratic methods". The Government attack on hours was mentioned; the remedy lay in the ballot box. The "tragic situation" in the mining industry

was mentioned; no steps were proposed. A "scientific wage policy" was the Chairman's proposal for the future of trade union policy. The speaker concluded with a warning against "mechanical unity" in the international field, and a plea for "toleration" at home. In this reactionary speech every living issue was evaded.

The principal issues facing the Congress were two; the General Strike and the Miners' Fight. With neither of these was the Congress allowed to deal.

The General Strike was ruled out from the agenda on two grounds; first, that the General Council was not responsible to report on this to Congress but only to the Special Conference of Trade Union Executives which had authorised it; and second, that by the terms of the June Pact of the General Council with the Miners' leaders no discussion was to take place and the Special Conference was not to be called until after the ending of the mining dispute.

The first of these grounds was a direct ruling out of the control of the General Council by the Congress which elects it. This was explicitly stated by the Chairman, who, in answer to the question whether "the Conference of Executives is more authoritative than this Congress" replied. "On this subject, undoubtedly". Thus in future the trade union bureaucracy desires to be responsible only to the trade union bureaucracy.

The second is even less valid. No private agreement of any two sets of officials has any claim to tie the hands of the Congress. The Miners' leaders were fooled into making the agreement, which Cook has since declared that he "personally regrets", and they were fooled again into maintaining it at the Congress, to that they alone defended the General Council from attack at the Congress.

When the small group of Communist delegates pressed forward the attack on the issue of the General Strike, taking as their opportunity the reference back of the section of the General Council's report mentioning it, and driving home a merciless criticism of the treachery and cowardice of the General Council, Cook intervened to save the General Council. "I appeal to Congress" he said "in the interests of the men for whom we are fighting, not to wash dirty linen". Immediately after his speech the debate was stopped, and the vote taken despite protests. The vote showed 775,000 for the reference back, and 3,098,000 against. Had the miners' vote been correctly cast, the vote should have shown 1.5 millions against the General Council to two millions for it; and the miners, had they put up a fight, could certainly have carried with them other sections.

Cook's action in saving the General Council at the Congress throws on him a responsibility parallel to theirs. He has subsequently stated that had he been free to speak, Tomsky's criticism of the General Council would have been mild in comparison to his. No subsequent criticism, when it is too late, can wipe out his action at the Congress.

The treatment of the Miners' Struggle was even more shameful. A resolution was put, not of practical assistance to the Miners, not even touching on the issues of the miners' fight, but of self-congratulation of the other Unions on their "generous financial assistance" to the miners ("high appreciation of the generous financial assistance, both national and international which has been afforded to the miners") and urging all to "subscribe to the utmost". This when, as Cook has stated, the Miners have not received as much as 1d per head a week from the British Trade Union Movement, and a one per cent levy would have in one week brought in more than all the voluntary collection in nineteen weeks; while the "international" assistance outside Soviet Russia has consisted, from the Amsterdam International, of 7.5 million tons of blackleg coal and a loan at interest. Practical aid, the levy, the embargo, was not allowed to be touched on.

One Union, the Woodworkers, put in a motion for a weekly levy for the Miners. The motion was not even allowed to be put to the Congress. No left wing speaker was allowed to speak.

In this shameful comedy the miners' officials again participated by supporting the insulting resolution of the General Council, and making no attempt to place the issue of the levy and the embargo before the Congress.

By these two issues the Congress stands judged. The treatment of other issues was corresponding. The placing of direct powers in the hands of the General Council was not only rejected, but even a resolution in favour of investigation and reform in a year's time was rejected, so great was the fear of a repetition of the situation of May. While a formal resolution

in favour of International Unity was carried, a proposal for a world conference of the Amsterdam and Red Internationals was opposed by Purcell and rejected by 2,416,030 to 1,237,000. On the other hand, an emergency resolution, proposed by a Communist for the Miners, for "Hands Off China" and "Hands Off Russia", was, despite the opposition of one of MacDonald's Ministers, carried by a large majority.

In the re-election of the General Council only two changes took place, and one of these was by previous arrangement. The one change by voting replaced a right winger by a Left Wing official, Hallsworth, who had done some good fighting at the Congress. Of the 32 seats 17 were "unopposed". This does not mean that there was no opposition to the holders, but simply that by the sectional system of nomination the majority of the seats are the unchallengeable preserves of the officials of the big Unions. In this way, Thomas, Bromley, Bevin, Turner, Poulton, Hicks and others were all "unopposed", while the majority of the remainder only had minor officials as opponents and not representatives of the Opposition. A democratic vote of the delegates would have certainly produced very different results.

The strength of the Opposition (which was almost solely maintained by the Communists and Minority Movement) on the voting on the main issues never fell below three quarters of a million. This is a very favourable result, in view of the workings of the block vote by which many minorities are swamped, and of the reactionary pressure of every kind, exercised by the Government and the General Council upon the Congress. Despite the official character of most of delegations, the reflection of leftward sentiment in the main body of the delegates was obvious in several incidents; and the extreme disciplining and nervousness of the ruling body was not without grounds. In fact, one member of the General Council, Conley, stated the position with blazing indiscretion, when he explained why the General Council was endeavouring to forbid the affiliation of Trades Councils to the Minority Movement:

"If the Minority Movement were allowed to affiliate Trades Councils and trade union branches, it would within a short time become the majority."

With this encouragement the Communists and Minority Movement can go forward with their work in the Trade Unions after the Bournemouth Congress, to wipe out its shameful record and replace the leadership responsible, more confident than ever in the favourable situation and the certainty of their advance.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The Berlin Meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Comrade Andreyev's Report at the Extraordinary Session of the Presidium of the Enlarged Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union.

(Continued.)

Our criticism of the standpoint of the English delegation.

We considered it absolutely necessary to reply to the declaration of the British delegation by expressing, with hundred per cent of downrightiness, our opinion of the attitude taken by the British delegation. This straight-forwardness considerably offended the delegates of the General Council, but it was simply impossible for us to coin pleasant phrases (A voice: hear, hear!) after we had heard that the British delegation was not prepared to discuss, at the meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee, practical measures for increasing the aid given to the miners. After they had declined to do this, we could not talk to one another in suavely diplomatic phrases, we could only say what we thought with complete proletarian frankness.

We declared to them that their reply entitled us to place clearly on record that they do not want the Anglo-Russian Committee to discuss or decide upon any measures in the question of increased aid for the miners. The last declaration of the British delegation, designating our proposals as obsolete, and as representing a stage long since passed, is to us a fresh manoeuvre, a fresh stratagem for removing the pressing important fighting question of aid to the miners from the agenda of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

In order to prove this, it is only necessary to recall briefly the facts: On 28. June the A. U. C. T. U. demanded the immediate convocation of the Anglo-Russian Committee, for the discussion of the question of aid to the miners. The Anglo-Russian Committee did not meet, however, until the 30th July, in Paris. This was not the fault of the A. U. C. T. U.; the meeting, was postponed by the General Council. At last the Anglo-Russian Committee met in Paris. We, the Russian delegation, were anxious to have the miners' question discussed, but were told that the most important question was that of the declaration of the A. U. C. T. U., and that the British delegation was not authorised to discuss any practical questions, such as the miners' question. This question was accordingly removed from the agenda. This was the second step taken by the General Council, the second attempt, to draw back from the question of aiding the miners.

And now the third factor: the disagreement with regard to the successive order of the points of the agenda at the Berlin meeting of the Committee, and the obstinacy with which the British delegation contended against the placing of the miners' question as first item on the agenda, were not accidental. The British delegation wanted to discuss the miners' question as something of secondary importance.

The fourth stage of their strategy was the declaration that our proposals are out of date.

To this last declaration we replied: Very well. Let us assume that our proposals possess no practical value. What do you propose? What practical improvement have you to suggest to our proposals? Were you willing, at the meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee, to examine our proposals point by point, and to make counter proposals, instead of contending for a day and a half against any discussion of the question whatever? Did you try anything of the sort? No, we observed nothing of the kind. The British delegation did not make the slightest attempt to examine our proposals point by point, they merely made a general declaration to the effect that they rejected them as a whole. This shows the nature of the "sincerity" with which they have been desirous of practically discussing the miners' question, and of increasing the necessary aid for the miners.

In reply to the objection that our proposals are out of date, and that they are already being carried out, we answered: Let us at least examine our most important proposals: Is the question of material aid then out of date? Is it unnecessary to increase the material aid being given? Have all necessary measures been taken? Is the international relief campaign adequate? Is the Amsterdam International doing anything remotely resembling an action of proletarian solidarity, or remotely reflecting even the idea that it is mobilising the international labour front in the aid of the miners?

With reference to Comrade Purcell's words, I must mention to you some of the figures referring to the material aid which has been sent from home and abroad. Up to the present the miners have received 740,000 pounds, of which about 500,000 have come from us, the rest having been collected in England and in other countries. When this sum is divided among the whole of the miners, we find that out of every eighteen pence received per miner per week, eleven pence has come from the workers of the Soviet Union. Does this show that the material aid has been adequate? Does it look as if the General Council had exerted every endeavour to induce the Amsterdam International and the Industrial Internationals to give all the aid in their power? No, nothing of the kind. Surely the want and privation suffered by the miners, and the length of the severe struggle, must give rise to anxiety as to the issue of the strike. But you assure us that everything has been done, everything carried out, all available possibilities utilised, etc.

With respect to material aid we proposed such measures as would have made it possible now to ensure for the miner a certain guaranteed and constant aid, not a haphazard and occasional aid on the principle of: If there are collections, it is a good thing; if there are none, the miners can receive nothing, etc. We proposed much more fundamental measures: We proposed, and undertook to carry out the measures in our own country, a one per cent levy on the wages of all members of trade unions for the duration of the strike. (Voices: Quite right.) This measure would have ensured essential success. Had this measure been carried out in England, in Russia, and in other countries, then it would have been a very real support, enabling the miners to continue their struggle. Was this measure carried out? Was it discussed even once by the General Council? No, not even once.

Has everything possible been done in the question of the embargo on coal and other fuel? Our English delegation declared that everything has been considered. In that case what is the meaning of Churchill's assertion that no less than one million tons of coal are being imported into England weekly? Is this scab coal not the most important weapon in the hands of the government and the coalowners, enabling them to starve out the miners? Here is the chief danger, and to this we have drawn attention. Has the General Council taken any steps in this direction? Has the General Council, on its own initiative, taken any steps towards proposing that the separate unions should carry out these measures in the interests of the miners? None whatever.

The General Council has not done this even once, although the representatives of the General Council assured us that they have examined into this question, discussed it with the separate unions, and had considered the embargo on coal and fuel transport as possible of accomplishment, etc. It is hypocrisy, after all this, to declare that our proposals are out of date. On no single occasion has the General Council, on its own initiative, proposed to any transport workers' union the actual carrying out of this measure. Not once has the General Council appealed to either the Amsterdam International or to the Transport Workers' Federation, with the request that the latter should provide for the carrying out of this measure outside of England, etc. And now we are told that our proposals are out of date, and this when in England a large number of trade councils — for instance in Liverpool, Glasgow, Manchester, Bristol, London —, and various sections of the Transport Workers' and Railwaymen's Unions have declared themselves in favour of an embargo on the transport of coal and other fuel, whilst the General Council has taken no steps in the matter.

We further proposed that the General Council should exercise determined pressure on the government through the Labour Party, in order to force the government to cease its direct support of the mineowners. The representatives of the General Council told us that they have done everything: The Labour Party is taking all necessary steps, etc. etc. But have we heard one single energetic declaration on the part of the Labour Party, calling upon the Conservative government to abandon its support of the mineowners? No, nothing of the kind. And yet the representatives of the General Council have declared that this is being done. Comrades, the Olympian tranquillity with which the English delegates dealt with this question literally disgusted us. The refusal to discuss the question of international aid for the miners signifies that the miners remain in their isolated position, that they must continue to fight alone, with the evident prospect of defeat. And if the question of the embargo is simply shelved, what does this mean? It means objective aid lent to the enemy, it means that the enemies of the miners are permitted to retain in their hands the weapon of scab coal, a weapon with which they can win the fight. The failure to force the Labour Party to exercise pressure on the government means, objectively regarded, that the Conservative government is to be given a free hand to smash the miners.

If it is still declared, after all this, and after no serious measures whatever have been taken in aid of the miners, that our proposals are out of date, then this is simply hypocrisy, if not more than that. It means that the proposals of the A. U. C. T. U. are being derided, though these proposals have been submitted in all seriousness — and with the sincere wish that they might be put into practice — to the mutual examination of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

We cannot judge the attitude of the English delegation otherwise than this.

A further objection: The Anglo-Russian Committee is not competent to examine into this question.

The constitution of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and the purposes for which it was founded, are in themselves sufficient evidence that the Committee cannot pass over the question of the miners' strike. If it undertakes nothing in this question, it will greatly detract from its authority in the eyes of the broad masses of the workers, for the immediate duty of the Committee is the joint struggle against the capitalist offensive, and mutual aid. This is stated in so many words in the former decisions and resolutions of the Anglo-Russian Committee. We declared that, i.e. the representatives of the A. U. C. T. U., regard the struggle for unity as a question of action and not of talk, and that, if the Anglo-Russian Committee were to further the cause of increased aid for the miners, this would be a great factor

towards the establishment of real unity, of a real trade union international. We declared further that we stand for the Anglo-Russian Committee, but are decidedly opposed to its being converted into a debating society, and will energetically combat any policy tending to transform the Anglo-Russian Committee into an institution for general discussions on unity. The Anglo-Russian Committee must be a real organ for the struggle for unity, and its basis must be the struggle against the capitalist offensive. That is how we understand the tasks and functions of the Anglo-Russian Committee, but you, the English delegation, speak of the incompetence and lack of authority of the Committee.

We declared to the English delegation that after all they have done, after dealing the first blow at the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris, they now deal the second in refusing to discuss the question of aid to the miners. The workers can form no other opinion of your attitude, for the working masses are waiting impatiently to know what the Committee says about aid for the miners. You will not discuss this question, and thereby you endanger the whole existence of the Committee.

The threat to dissolve the Committee.

The representatives of the General Council declared that, after the reply made by the Russian delegation to their declaration on the question of aid for the miners, it was possible that the General Council, after taking cognisance of the report of its delegation, would raise the question of the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee. This was said by various members of the British delegation.

Why should the General Council raise the question of the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee? What cause has arisen? You are anxious for dissolution because we, the Russian delegation, have told you the truth to your faces, and because you do not want to discuss the practical side of the question of aid to the miners. Dissolve the Committee if you want to. But take the initiative of dissolving it upon yourselves, for we shall not do it; we shall endeavour to make the Anglo-Russian Committee what it was intended to be in reality, and not only in name. If you will, take this initiative and dissolve the Committee, after first dealing it a further blow. Do this, and then see what the masses of the English workers will say to you, and to what extent they will support your action.

We have told you that our indignation is roused at the tranquillity with which the British delegation deals with a question of such extreme importance as that of the mining conflict. The struggle has been dragging on for four months. The present stage is one which may end in defeat, and yet you decline our proposals at such a moment with perfectly Olympian calm. This is beyond our comprehension. We, the representatives of the A. U. C. T. U., cannot adopt such a calm attitude with regard to this question. Our experiences have taught us what class warfare means. We have suffered more than one defeat in this warfare, and we have learnt how we should organise, and what we must do during the struggle, if we are to gain the victory. Such Olympian tranquillity is beyond us in face of such a struggle as the mining conflict.

I now come to the last objection raised, that of "interference" and "dictation". We have held this to be a very serious accusation, and have considered it necessary to protest against the assertion that the Russian Unions are anxious to exploit the Anglo-Russian Committee for the purpose of getting into their hands a dictatorship over the English trade union movement. We have been told in so many words that we were trying to write textbooks for the English trade union movement. This is perfectly ridiculous. Who wants to do any such thing?

All we want is to offer our sincere help. The assertion that we want to take over the immediate leadership of the English trade union movement is a lie and a slander. We are aware that the English bourgeois press is now spreading abroad reports that Moscow is trying to seize the leadership over England over the English labour movement, and that we are attempting to make the Anglo-Russian Committee a tool by which we gain the leadership of the British trade union movement. The motive of the bourgeoisie in spreading these reports are clear enough for their first desire is the most rapid possible rupture between the working class of England and the Soviet Union. But it is perfectly incomprehensible to us that this assertion is found in the responsible declarations made by representatives of the

British trade unions, the representatives of the British working class. It is perfectly incomprehensible to us that such a slander can be taken over by the members of the British delegation. We raise the most energetic protest against this. We have declared that we have not submitted our proposals with the purpose of forcing our will upon anybody, but for the purpose of having our proposals accorded careful consideration, point by point. If we have formulated our propositions incorrectly, we shall be pleased to have them corrected. All this is a necessary stage of joint discussion, in order that the decisions of the Anglo-Russian Committee may be laid before the General Council and the A. U. C. T. U. for confirmation. Is there any single element of dictatorship in this? Nothing of the kind. We are anxious for a joint discussion of questions, such discussion as formerly took place at the meetings of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and it is untruthful and slanderous to maintain that we want to influence the English trade union movement through the medium of the Anglo-Russian Committee. We know perfectly well that the British working class, and the British working class alone, can lead the British trade union movement and correct its faults. We, of course, reserve the right of free criticism, like any other organisation. This is an inviolable right possessed by every division of the international labour movement. But the immediate leadership, and the correction of the faults of this leadership, are the task of the British working class itself, and of the British working class alone.

We do not disguise the fact that the General Council pursued a wrong policy in the general strike, that it has rendered the struggle of the miners extremely difficult, and has struck the miners a severe blow. We are, however, of the opinion that only the British working class, and no one else, can correct these errors. We can criticise, we can impart our experiences, we can give our advice. But this cannot in the least be regarded as an attempt at dictatorship etc. It is the task of the English working class to make good the mistakes, and we hope that it will show itself capable of doing this.

I should like to draw attention to a very characteristic factor in the attitude of the British delegation. At the meeting the chairmen of the delegations spoke most frequently. Thus I in my capacity as chairman of our delegation spoke oftener than the others of our delegation, and the main attack of the British delegation was directed against me. The British delegation said in so many words that Andreyev's speeches followed a certain line, that he was steering for a rupture in the Anglo-Russian Committee, and that the speeches of some of the other Soviet delegates took a different line to Andreyev's.

This attitude on the part of the British delegation is an extremely characteristic attempt to make out that there are differences in our ranks, whilst in reality there are no such differences. Our delegation has maintained perfect unanimity. But the English delegation found it necessary to discover some deviating lines.

This is highly important, for in this manner an entirely wrong impression of the state of affairs might be given after the return of the British delegation. We were obliged to take this argument out of their hands beforehand. Our delegation brought forward the following declaration, with four signatures:

"Attempts have been made, in the speeches of Comrades Citrine and Swales, to make a difference between the line represented by comrade Andreyev and that of other members of the Russian delegation who have spoken.

To this the delegation declares that Comrade Andreyev -- the chairman of our delegation -- defends entirely and completely that line and standpoint corresponding to the instructions given to the delegation by the A. U. C. T. U.

The delegation declares that it is in entire and perfect agreement with the speeches and declarations made by Comrade Andreyev at the present meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee."

Ugarov. Lepse. Schwarz. Melnitschansky.

The declaration of the British delegation on the miners' question.

I have described the whole course of the discussion on the question of aid for the miners. At the close of the debates we received a written declaration from the English delegation. I must read this declaration:

"The British representatives in the Anglo-Russian Committee, having become acquainted with the resolution of the

Russian representatives, desire to state their general conclusions in respect to the said resolution.

The British delegates must consider the resolution in the light of the practical results which could be obtained by such a declaration.

Taking into consideration the insistence with which the Russian representatives demanded the examination of the question of the British mining conflict in the first order, the British representatives supposed that the Russian representatives would have proposals indicating lines of activity and sources of aid to the British miners which have not up to now been investigated or utilised.

The British representatives have already frequently stated they are ready to examine and report to their own trade union centre any practical proposal coming from the Russian representatives and which could extend the steps already taken and the efforts made by those charged with conducting the same.

The resolution does not do this, and its proposals in respect to the various organisations mentioned in it, if they were to be accepted by the Anglo-Russian Committee, would not give any additional practical effect whatsoever, and would also not give the desired aid to the British miners, but on the contrary, at the present would be harmful for the cause of the miners as the result of international complications which might thereby be evoked.

In respect to the proposed condemnation of the I. F. T. U. (Amsterdam) for its supposed inactivity, the British delegates are of the opinion that this item is outside the jurisdiction of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and also that they cannot give their signature to such decisions.

The question of an embargo on coal imported to England has been thoroughly examined both from the national and international aspect by the competent organs, and the Anglo-Russian Committee has not means at its disposal for putting into force such a policy, while the proposed manifesto to the organs indicated would be correctly estimated as an absolutely unjustified interference.

Sources of possible financial aid have already been thoroughly investigated, and all steps have been taken for fully utilising the national and international apparatus for this object. The resolution does not envisage anything at all that is new or that is capable of giving greater results.

The British Labour Party during the entire mining conflict has shown its readiness in all possible cases to utilise the moment for a struggle against the position of the British Government. It has all the time been in close contact with the Miners' Federation for this purpose.

The British delegates have already expressed their appreciation of the support and material aid of the Russian trade unions to the British miners, and are sure that the resolution is evoked by the sincere desire to ensure full possible support from all possible sources, but this support would not be attained with acceptance of the resolution.

If the Anglo-Russian Committee were to take upon itself powers which do not belong to it, this, as has already been indicated, would be looked upon as interference, and would neither bring practical aid to the miners, nor aid to the cause of International Unity.

Therefore the British representatives cannot agree to a joint acceptance of the resolution, but at the same time will report to their General Council about it."

This was the English declaration, to which we replied with the following declaration:

Declaration of the Delegation of the A. U. C. T. U.

"The delegation of the A. U. C. T. U. submitted to the meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee a draft of proposals referring to practical measures for helping the locked out miners in England, to the end that the 14 points comprising this draft should be examined by both sides of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and the measures agreed upon then laid before the General Council and the A. U. C. T. U. for final examination and confirmation.

After the declaration of the delegation of the General Council, to the effect that the delegation is not in agreement with the proposals of our delegation with regard to aid for the miners, the delegation of the A. U. C. T. U. places on

record that the British delegation does not wish any decisions to be come to on the part of the Anglo-Russian Committee on behalf of increased aid for the miners.

The main object of our proposals was to aid the struggle of the miners in every possible way, and aimed at making every possible effort, under the present difficult conditions, to aid the struggle of the miners to victory.

The object of our proposal for carrying out the coal embargo was to deprive the English mineowners and government of their main weapon for crushing the strike by scab coal. This proposal aimed at a united action in support of the fighting miners on the part of the transport workers of England and other countries. The English delegation, however, rejected this proposal. This attitude of the British delegation implies a continuation of that inactivity on the part of the General Council which has led to the actual isolation of the miners in their struggle.

A number of our proposals on the increase of material aid for the miners contained on the one hand a criticism of the impermissible passivity of the leaders of the Amsterdam International and the Industrial Internationals in the question of aid, and on the other hand suggestions of various measures the acceptance of which would have undoubtedly caused the Anglo-Russian Committee to increase the material aid given the miners. The British delegation refused to accept these proposals. We can form no other estimate of this attitude of the British delegation than to designate it as an attempt to veil the criminal inactivity of the leaders of the Amsterdam International and the Industrial Internationals, an inactivity frequently changing over into active resistance against help for the miners, and on the other hand as a sign of a lack of desire to support the miners in their struggle by means of strengthening the organisation of material aid, both in England itself and internationally. Our draft contained the proposal that the General Council should appeal to the Labour Party to demand from the Conservative government that the latter cease its policy of supporting the mineowners against the miners. But the British delegation did not agree even with this proposal. Such an attitude on the part of the delegation of the General Council gives a free hand to the Conservative government and to the mineowners to continue to exert their whole forces against the miners as before.

The arguments brought forward against our draft by the General Council, as if our proposals had no practical import, and as if the General Council was already in the act of carrying them out, merely mean an attempt on the part of the British delegation to avoid any practical discussion of the question of aid for the miners by the Anglo-Russian Committee, for the General Council has not once expressed itself in favour of the embargo, nor once recommended that these measures be carried out by the transport workers' unions of England, and by the International Transport Workers' Federation, as a means by which help is to be given to the miners. The General Council has made no use of its influence and its authority, either in England by the organisation of a regular material support for the miners, or internationally by promoting the organisation of an international relief through the Amsterdam International. Not once has the General Council demanded expressly from the Labour Party that the latter should require the Conservative government to abandon its support of the mineowners. To declare, under such circumstances, that our proposals are out of date, means in reality a frustration of the proposals made by the A. U. C. T. U. in aid of the miners.

It need not be said that the delegation of the A. U. C. T. U., when bringing forward these proposals in aid of the miners, did not in the least expect that this draft would not be supplemented, during the course of the joint discussion, by a number of corrections and alterations. We should have been prepared to examine with the greatest attention any proposal from the British delegation with respect to increased aid for the miners. But the British delegation expressed no desire whatever for the joint examination of our proposals. And the British delegation, whilst raising objections to our whole draft, did not bring forward one single proposal for the joint examination of the agenda question of aid for the miners. All this is a fresh proof that the delegation of the General Council has no wish that the Anglo-Russian Committee should elaborate any measures for increasing the aid given to the miners.

Such an attitude as this on the part of the delegation of the General Council at a moment when the miners' struggle assumes so acute a form, we consider to be entirely impermissible. We are confident that this attitude is opposed to the feeling of the broad masses of the fighting miners.

The attempt made by the British delegation to relegate the discussion and determination of measures in aid of the miners to a sphere outside of the jurisdiction of the Anglo-Russian Committee is merely another attempt to bring about a rupture in the Committee, and another blow against the friendship and unity of the Anglo-Russian trade union movement.

The whole aim and character of the Anglo-Russian Committee means that the Anglo-Russian Committee represents an organ in the trade union movement of both countries for the struggle for international trade union unity, and for the struggle against the capitalist offensive. It is clear that the Anglo-Russian Committee cannot simply pass over such an important event as the lockout of the miners in England, and that it must hasten to adopt measures in relief of the fighting miners.

We declare once more that the trade unions of the Soviet Union consider the continued existence of the Anglo-Russian Committee to be necessary. We shall however continue to make it our endeavour that the Anglo-Russian Committee shall actually realise the hopes and wishes placed in it by the working masses of England and of the Soviet Union, that is, we shall endeavour to increase the activity of the Committee in its work for trade union unity and against the capitalist offensive.

We protest energetically against the declarations contained in the speech of Comrade Pugh, in which he tried to make out that the trade unions of the Soviet Union were anxious to seize upon the leadership of the English trade union movement. We are fully aware that only the English working class can lead the English trade union movement, and we are convinced that if the leaders of the English trade union movement commit what are in our opinion errors, adopt a wrong attitude towards the miners' struggle, and lead the movement wrongly, then the English working class will correct this leadership out of its own resources."

I must say that our declaration was received with great annoyance by the British delegation. They declared that we, the Russian unions, were taking the initiative of causing a rupture in the Anglo-Russian Committee. We refuted this argument decisively in our subsequent speeches, and declared the argument to be a shifting of responsibility. After discussion the British delegation made the following brief declaration in reply to ours:

"The British delegation express disagreement with the attacks on their motives and sincerity contained in the Russian statement, and categorically refute the accusations contained in this statement.

They assert their amazement that their well thought out arguments and explanations evoked such a reply, and regret the present act of the Russian delegates, which is without precedent.

Finally, we desire to draw attention to the considerable difference between accepting the declaration and putting such a declaration into effect."

We felt ourselves justified in not replying again with a written declaration, as so many declarations had already been made. We restricted ourselves to once more confirming the importance of our declaration.

This ended the discussion on the miners' question. (Voices: "It is very little!") I must make mention of the fact that this discussion occupied one and a half days.

Trade Union unity.

We now came to the second point on the agenda, to the discussion on the unity question. This took much less time. We first heard a number of formal statements by Comrade Citrine upon the decisions passed, etc. The British delegation made no proposals of their own on the question of unity.

What standpoint was adopted by our delegation? We criticised the impermissible delay with which the decisions of the Anglo-Russian Committee made last December were being put into effect. We declared that this delay was especially impermissible, at the present time when the capitalist offensive

was increasing, when the war danger was becoming greater every day, and when the struggle for the unity of the working class should therefore become more and more active. We declared further that we for our part were doing everything that had been demanded by the decisions of the Anglo-Russian Committee. We carried on a fairly lengthy correspondence with Amsterdam on the question of the convocation of a conference between the A. U. C. T. U. and Amsterdam, without preliminary conditions, in order to discuss the unity question. Amsterdam declined to call such a conference, and thus the carrying out of the December resolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee was frustrated by the Amsterdam International.

Although the Plenum of the A. U. C. T. U. had not passed any decision on the subject, the fact, that our trade union functionaries are occupying themselves more and more with the idea of undertaking fresh steps in the unity question, induced us to feel it our duty to bring a new proposal at this meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee. This proposal was to the effect that the Committee should now get a joint conference of Amsterdam and the R. I. L. U., participated in by those national organisations which belong to neither International. We substantiated this motion by stating that this corresponds better with the correct standpoint in the unity question than do the decisions of last year's Berlin meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and that on the other hand this idea has much support, both within the trade union movement of the Soviet Union and in the British trade unions. We know that the Engineers' Union — and this is a very large organisation in England — and the Garment Workers' Union will submit resolutions to the coming Bournemouth conference, demanding the convocation of a conference between Amsterdam and the R. I. L. U. The English delegates energetically objected to this proposal. They said that this question was absolutely new to them, they had not discussed it and were thus not authorised to deal with it, and that they could not by any means declare themselves in agreement with our proposal. In this respect all we could do was to yield to the British delegation on this matter, but we told them that we are prepared to withdraw our proposal for the present, but only on condition that the Anglo-Russian Committee categorically confirms its last year's decisions, according to which the General Council undertakes to call a conference between Amsterdam and the Russian trade unions, without preliminary conditions, and that for the convocation of this conference the earliest date possible be fixed. The British delegation accepted this proposal, as a result of which the following resolution on the question of unity was passed:

1. The Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee, at its Fourth Session, held in Berlin on August 23, 24, 25, 1920, having considered the International situation and the task of the working class arising from this situation, unanimously confirms the necessity of more decisive steps for the international unity of the International Trade Union Movement and the creation of a single International of Trade Unions.

The present meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee observes with regret that the attempt to reach unity by means of summoning a conference of the I. F. T. U. with the A. U. C. T. U., made at the Berlin meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee in December, 1925, did not meet with success in view of the disinclination of the I. F. T. U. to agree to the summoning of such a conference with Russian unions without preliminary conditions.

2. Despite this the Anglo-Russian Committee will continue with still greater energy to insist on the establishment of real unity of the International Trade Union Movement.

3. As a first and substantial step in this direction the Anglo-Russian Committee confirms its decision taken at the Berlin Conference, according to which the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress should immediately fulfil the obligation undertaken by the Anglo-Russian Conference, and afterwards ratified by the General Council and the British Trade Union Congress, namely, the obligation to call, upon its own initiative and under its observation, a preliminary conference without any restrictive conditions, between the I. F. T. U. and the Russian unions.

The Anglo-Russian Committee recommends the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress to summon this conference not later than the end of October.

This is all that I have to report on the work of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Our most important conclusions.

I believe the first conclusion which we have to draw from this report is that, unfortunately, our worst anticipations have been realised with regard to the attitude taken by the British delegation in the question of aid for the miners: The British delegation has shown through and through that it does not want to increase the aid given to the fighting miners, nor to utilise the whole authority of the Anglo-Russian Committee for this purpose. This attitude on the part of the British delegation, and in consequence of the General Council, cannot be regarded as anything else than a continuation of that line of policy leading objectively to inaction, and to the complete isolation of one of the most decisively important groups of the English proletariat. We for our part have done our utmost. The Russian trade unions and the Russian workers are doing everything possible with respect to material aid. We repeat that we do not think of taking credit to ourselves for this. We are merely fulfilling our most elementary proletarian class duty. And at the same time we have done all in our power, in our capacity as one of the parties forming the Anglo-Russian Committee, to bring forward the question of increased international aid. May every Russian worker, every miners' delegate here present, and every British worker, know that the Russian trade unions have done all that is in their power. The General Council is to blame that the sincere wishes and sincere proposals of the Russian trade unions as to increased aid for the fighting miners have not been met. The whole responsibility for the possible defeat of the strike thus rests solely with the General Council.

The attitude adopted by the British delegation at this meeting has completely confirmed the correctness of our criticism of the General Council, contained in our declaration in our resolution on our report on the Paris meeting of the Committee. This is the first conclusion which we are inevitably obliged to draw from the results of the Berlin meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

With respect to the fate of the Anglo-Russian Committee, in my opinion we may draw the following conclusion. We stand for the Anglo-Russian Committee, and we stand by our former standpoint of maintaining the Anglo-Russian Committee — both the Russian and the British workers should hear this. But we are opposed to the Anglo-Russian Committee's remaining an Anglo-Russian Committee in name only, whilst in reality it turns aside from everything expected from it by the working masses of England and the Soviet Union. We stand for the Anglo-Russian Committee, but we are opposed to the representatives of the General Council transforming the Anglo-Russian Committee into a diplomatic debating society for the English and Russian trade union leaders. We are opposed to this, for it would be a highly unprofitable business. (Lauter Voices: Hear, hear.)

We, the leaders of our trade union movement, have had to leave all the urgent business of our own unions, and — although each one of us has dozens of duties of his own — run round abroad for a month and a half, in order to take part in the session of the Anglo-Russian Committee, without having achieved any result in the main question, in that main question in which the workers of the Soviet Union and of England expected positive results. This is exceedingly unprofitable.

I repeat once more that we stand for the Anglo-Russian Committee, and we shall not depart from this principle, but we shall exert our utmost efforts to make the Anglo-Russian Committee a real organ of the struggle for unity, of the struggle against the capitalist offensive, for it is only if this is accomplished that the Committee will be able to fulfil its aims, and maintain its authority among the broad masses of the Russian and British proletariats. We must however place on record that the attitude taken by the British delegation has dealt a severe blow at the authority of the Anglo-Russian Committee. This is the second conclusion which we draw from our estimate of the last session of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The third conclusion is a very obvious one: that the miners' struggle is the common struggle of the whole proletarian class, the common struggle of not only the English proletariat, but of the international proletariat, and that this fight of the miners has become the focus around which the first decisive battle is being fought in the conflict between international capital and the international working class, this struggle between the English

working class and English capital. The capitalists are awaiting the issue of the miners' struggle in order to extend their attack to other branches of industry. This applies to other countries as well. All this characterises the nature of the miners' struggle as an essentially class struggle, and therefore it must be given the united aid of the whole international labour movement.

The fourth conclusion which we may draw is that the possibility of the miners' being victorious is now completely bound up with political fighting questions. The present Conservative government has already taken sides, with perfect frankness and 100 per cent definiteness, with the coalowners. The Conservative power, the ruling party in England, has taken definite sides with the mineowners, and is fighting hand in hand with these against the miners. The miners have now to fight, not only against the coalowners, but against the bourgeois state opposing them. And more than this, the miners have now to fight in a direct struggle against the present Parliament, for this Parliament has lent direct support to the colliery owners by passing the eight hour law. This means that the miners have to combat not only the mineowners, but cannot hope to gain the victory without successfully combating the Conservative government and the Parliament at the same time. The completely class character of the English constitution is now being made plain to the workers of England, for this constitution is being utilised against the miners.

The miners are extremely inclined to give way with respect to negotiations, but their yielding attitude has simply been derided by the government. Thus the struggle so successfully commenced by the British workers can only be brought to a victorious end as a struggle against the employers and against the Conservative government.

The English miners cannot win the victory alone. This is the conclusion which must be drawn from events by the English miners and the English working class.

The fifth conclusion is that reformism has exposed itself in all its nakedness in the English strike. Reformism does not recognise class warfare, and fears it. The attitude adopted by the reformist leaders, especially the leaders of the Amsterdam International, in the question of the aid to be given to the miners, is an attitude which not only objectively fails to help the miners, but actually lends support to their enemies. Not a penny has been received from Amsterdam for the miners. Amsterdam has given money at the rate of 4 1/2% interest, but this looks such more like usury than the exercise of international solidarity. This is no weapon from the proletarian class arsenal, it is an attitude entirely alien to the proletarian movement. Reformism has completely unmasked itself with the adoption of this attitude.

In conclusion, we must state with all definiteness: In spite of the above described results of our negotiations with the representatives of the General Council, we declare that the Russian unions not only maintain their standpoint with regard to material aid, but will strive with even greater energy for an increase of this relief action, to the end that the miners may carry off the victory.

The A. U. C. T. U. on the Results of the Berlin Meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Moscow, 1st September 1926.

Comrade Andreiev the chairman of the Russian delegation to the Berlin meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee reported upon the proceedings of this meeting to the Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions in the presence of the miners' delegation. Andreiev stressed the fact that the Russian delegation had proposed concrete measures for the support of the British miners to be carried out on the part of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the General Council, with regard to a coal embargo etc.

The Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions unanimously ratified the attitude of its delegation. The resolution which was adopted reads:

"The Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions declares in the name of 8 millions of organised workers in the Soviet Union

that it honestly wishes to preserve, to consolidate and to strengthen the Anglo-Russian Committee as the organ of the fraternal alliance of the proletariats of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union in their struggle against the offensive of capitalism, for the international unity of the trade union movement and against the preparations for imperialist war. The Central Council will instruct its delegation to the forthcoming congress of the British trade unions to declare very definitely that it is the intention of the Soviet Labour Unions to continue to support the heroic struggle of the British miners against the offensive of capitalism. The Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions calls upon all members of its affiliated unions to contribute a percentage of their wages to support the British miners and calls upon the Red International of Labour Unions to commence a campaign for similar collections in its affiliated organisations."

The Central Council of Soviet Labour Unions, on the basis of the report of comrade Andreiev, ratified the unity declaration which was unanimously adopted at the Berlin Meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee (printed above).

The Question of Unity at the British Trades Union Congress.

By A. Lozovsky.

The General Council of the British Trade Unions set everything in motion in order to deprive the Trade Union Congress at Bournemouth of all political colour and to get it to pass such decisions as would admit of any "interpretation" according to circumstances. After some talk over the general strike and the miners' strike, the question of unity had still to be settled. Then the Congress would have fulfilled the task submitted to it by the General Council of turning back the wheel of the English trade union movement. The General Council did everything in order to obscure the problem of unity. It was, however, prevented from doing this by the opposition. The General Council, it is true, gave a detailed report on the meetings of the Amsterdam International and of the Anglo-Russian Committee before the general strike, but said nothing regarding the last two meetings of the Anglo-Russian Committee in Paris and Berlin and nothing as to what has been done and what has still to be done in order to fulfil the pledges undertaken by the General Council.

Against the vague standpoint of the General Council there was placed the resolution of the Tailors' Union, which repeated the decisions of the Congress at Scarborough, and the clear, emphatic resolution of the Engineers' Union. The latter resolution marks a considerable step forward. It states:

The Congress declares that in view of the international position of the trade union movement it is necessary to set up a United International of the Trade Unions of the whole world.

The Congress notes with regret the attitude of some sections of the Amsterdam International.

In view of this the Congress instructs the General Council to urge on the I. F. T. U. that a Conference, without preconditions, be convened between the R. I. L. U. and the I. F. T. U. as the representatives of two great world unions, in order to lay the foundation of the international unity of the trade union movement.

The proposal of the engineering Union is of particular interest, as by it the question of a Conference between Amsterdam and the R. I. L. U. is raised for the first time by a big organisation. The most far-reaching resolution to which the Left wing in the General Council was hitherto capable was the demand for the acceptance of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union into the Amsterdam International. The "entry" of the Soviet trade union into the I. F. T. U. was the official article of belief of the "left" with whom they gained a name for themselves in Amsterdam, although this only proves that those who held this belief had no understanding for the actual position in the international trade union movement. This standpoint received its first blow at Scarborough. Nevertheless the resolution adopted there did not quite openly express what was actually meant.

The reactionary trade union bureaucracy painted the R. I. L. U. in the blackest colours. It is therefore not surprising that

the resolution of the engineers stirred up the reformist swamp. The question became particularly acute in connection with the attitude of the General Council at the three last meetings of the Anglo-Russian Committee. The representatives of the Minority Movement criticised in the sharpest manner the inactivity of the General Council in the sphere of unity, and emphasised that it is not a question of the entry of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union into the Amsterdam International, but of the amalgamation of Amsterdam with the R.I.L.U. To the question of the representative of the engineers' Union as to whether it is true that the English delegation in Paris refused to discuss the question of supporting the miners, the inimitable Arthur Pugh replied that such a way of putting the question was incorrect! This shameful lie characterised not only Pugh, but also the General Council in whose name and on whose behalf he conducted the Congress.

The "clarification" took place, as was to be expected, by the Chairman of the Amsterdam International, Purcell, who is muddle-headed on principle. According to his opinion, an international Congress participated in by all the organisations affiliated to the R.I.L.U. and to Amsterdam would not only "not promote the cause of international unity but throw it back for many years (!)". The speaker of course, forgot to add why the Congress would throw back the cause of unity. Purcell further declared that the General Council will attempt to reorganise the apparatus of the Amsterdam International with the help of the Russians. He then declared that it would be important to accept the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union into the Amsterdam International as the revolutionary trade unions and the R.I.L.U. would thereby be liquidated. Purcell, who helped to found the R.I.L.U. along with us, has for long been endeavouring to liquidate it. Even the "left" Judas Bromley attacked the R.I.L.U. He accused the R.I.L.U. of splitting and endeavoured to discredit the Minority Movement. But Comrades Tanner and Elsbury dealt with Bromley and the other members of the General Council.

The Right wing did not bring in any resolution of their own; they clung to the vague, indefinite resolution of the Tailors Union, which only repeats the decision of the Scarborough Congress, in order to prevent a victory of the engineers' Union, whose resolution raised the question of actual unity by the amalgamation of the R.I.L.U. and Amsterdam. Two left resolutions were voted upon. The resolution of the engineers' Union received 1,237,000 votes and the resolution moved by Elsbury 2,416,000 votes. It is remarkable that the Miners' Federation voted unanimously for the Engineers' Union. The whole reactionary bureaucracy however voted for Elsbury's resolution as the lesser evil, in order by this means at any rate not to go beyond the level of Scarborough.

The discussions and the voting on the resolutions are in many respects instructive: in the first place because the reactionaries did not venture to put forward their own resolution. The demand of the broad masses for unity is too strong! The same bureaucracy did not venture to come forward openly at the Congress against the Central Council of the trade unions of the Soviet Union and to defend their attitude in the Anglo-Russian Committee. On the other hand the votes of the Left wing at the Congress were divided, which gave the reactionaries the possibility to save their position. Nevertheless the results of the voting are of the greatest interest. In spite of the fact that the votes were split, 1,237,000 were cast for actual unity. What would have happened if this question had not been submitted to trade union officials for decision but to the masses?

Our expectations which we had before the Congress, that the opposition would make a firm stand and that they would destroy the petty bourgeois idyll of the reformists, have been confirmed. All that is required is a closer co-ordination, a greater tenacity and unity of action and the Minority Movement will then be able to cleanse the English Labour Movement from the bourgeois reformist elements.

THE WHITE TERROR

A New Manoeuvre of American Justice against Sacco and Vanzetti.

The pressure of the international working class has finally succeeded in enforcing from the "free" judges of "democratic Massachusetts" a fresh trial in the case of the radical workers Sacco and Vanzetti who were condemned to death in 1921 for alleged murder. The fresh proceedings commenced on the 15th of September before the court of Dedham and are still going on.

It must be admitted that the American bourgeoisie and their judges who framed up the whole affair in order to get rid of the two revolutionaries who have a big following among the working class of Massachusetts, were very reluctant in their decision to grant a new trial. They did everything possible and made use of their whole arsenal of legal trickery in order to prevent a new trial.

The capitalists of Massachusetts and their confederates in the police and the court fully realise that the reopening of the case will necessarily expose all their methods of "objective bourgeois class justice", and that they will have to stand naked with all their miserable machinations, with all their stinking corruption not only before the workers, but before all honest people of the world. Their last manoeuvre was the attempt to have executed the chief witness in the trial, Madeiros, who himself committed the murder of which Sacco and Vanzetti have been charged and has confessed to the same, and who has been condemned to death on account of a robbery with murder. The object of this attempt is obvious: if the chief witness is got out of the way, then his confession can be distorted at will and even the protocol containing his confession can be caused to disappear. The American workers however have immediately perceived the object of the manoeuvre, and their protest has succeeded in postponing the execution of Madeiros until the new trial has been concluded.

In spite of this fresh defeat the authorities of Massachusetts will certainly have fresh surprises in store. Sacco and Vanzetti are not yet rescued! American class justice will only release them from its clutches if the protest movement of the workers, and particularly of the workers of America, is still further increased and if there is heard the continued cry of the workers of all countries: "Release our brothers Sacco and Vanzetti!"

Five Years of the Inprecorr.

1. Five Years of the Inprecorr.

Five years ago, on the 24th September 1921, there appeared the first number of the "International Press Correspondence", at first in German, French and English, and since the last 18 months also in Czechish. It set forth its programme in the following lines which were printed above the first article:

The "International Press Correspondence" will afford a true picture of all the political and economic conditions of every country, describe the most important events in the proletarian class struggle, report on the condition and the progress of our movement, and further, will publish the communications of the Executive Committee of the Communist International which are intended for the public. The contributions to the Correspondence are to be supplied by the leading writers among our comrades in all countries, who will carry out their work in close collaboration with their parties. By conveying an exact knowledge as possible of the conditions in the various countries, as well as by international collaboration in this work, the bond between the various Parties will be drawn more closely and co-operation facilitated.

We do not need to spend many words in order to show how far we have succeeded in realising our programme. Our readers can judge for themselves. On the 31st December 1921 there appeared the first Table of Contents of the "Inprecorr". Three months after our first appearance we were able to record that

we already had 188 contributors in 31 countries which constituted the most important political fields. We have at present 1000 contributors in 52 countries! The "Inprecorr." has found a wide field of circulation; it is carefully perused by friend and opponent. The bourgeois and social democratic press in London, Paris, Vienna and Budapest, as well as in Buenos Aires, Sydney and Calcutta are constantly polemising against us. On the other hand we receive letters full of joyful approval from the battlefields in China, Syria and Morocco, from the political prisoners of all the bourgeois States, and before all, however, from the factories and workshops of all parts of the world.

2. Five Years ago and Now.

Five years are a long period. Great events have occurred, great changes have taken place. Must we, under these circumstances, lay down an entirely new programme of work?

When we glance through the first numbers of the "Inprecorr." we are really surprised to see how topical most of the articles still are to-day. In the Autumn of 1921, on the occasion of the terrible famine disaster, the danger of an intervention in Russia became very threatening. The leading article of the first number accordingly bore the heading: "Hands off Russia!" The author was Comrade Ernst Meyer. The economic article, "The Crisis of Capitalist World Economy" was written by Comrade Varga; in this article there was set forth the same fundamental view of the situation which he has since maintained in our columns. The article under the heading "Relief for Russia" bore the title: "Relief for Russia, a true sign of the proletarian united front!" The section: "Our Problems" contained an article by Comrade Bela Kun: "To the Masses!" which, among other things, emphasised:

"The Communist Party only forms an advance troop in the fight when it has behind it a main troop. These main troops who will decide the revolutionary fight, are the masses, the majority of the working class".

The same number also contains an article by Comrade Zinoviev, entitled: "The Character of our Newspapers", the criticisms in which, unfortunately, still apply to-day. In the later numbers we find articles which are still topical on almost every page.

Enormous changes have certainly taken place in the last five years. But, fundamentally regarded, we have not yet emerged from that particular period which Comrade Lenin characterised at the III. World Congress of the Communist International as a "relative, uncertain balance of forces, a balance that can only be said to exist in a limited sense of the word, but which nevertheless exists" a balance of the forces of the international bourgeoisie on the one hand, and of Russian along with the revolutionary labour movement and the revolutionary movement of the suppressed peoples on the other hand. The situation of the international bourgeoisie in the year 1921 was not the same as it is today; but neither are Soviet Russia, the Communist Parties nor the so-called colonial peoples in the same position as they were at that time.

Five years ago the antagonisms between the various Powers were very acute, the Damocles sword of the reparations question hung over their heads. Timid preparations were being made for the first Conference at Wiesbaden between Loucheur and Rathenau, the Washington Conference stood before the door. Today we have the Dawes Plan as well as the Geneva agreements.

The Second International, which at that time only existed as a number of scattered fragments, has in the meantime been galvanised afresh. Poincaré's man, Boncour, and Vandervelde, the successors of Branting, are carrying out, not only in Geneva but also in Zürich, with the co-operation of Fritz Adler and Longuet, the foreign policy of the bourgeoisie. These are considerable, even if very temporary successes of the international bourgeoisie.

But we have on the other hand, in comparison with five years ago, a greatly strengthened Soviet Union and the rest of the forces of the revolution, all of which have grown in the meantime. In the year 1921 the C. P. of Germany was severely shaken. It had to fight with the K. A. G. (Communist Working Union) people and with the Ruth Fischer Maslow Opposition — these opposite poles of the one and the same petty-bourgeois-social democratic ideology of lack of faith in the revolution. In the Party Centre of the C. P. G. there were leading comrades who were not quite clear as to the importance of the daily struggles of the Communist theory of the State. In France we had a Party just beginning to develop, but which, under the leadership of Frossard, was still a semi-social democratic Party. The C. P. of Czechoslovakia was not yet born. In Italy there was a small sectarian Party. In America and England we had the first faint beginnings of the Communist Party. Today we have nearly everywhere good Communist Parties whose influence on the masses is increasing. As regards the movement for liberty on the part of the colonial peoples, it suffices to point to China.

We still have today the state of balance which Lenin recognised and analysed five years ago, even if the forces opposing each other today appear to be stronger, so that this balance is being reproduced, to some extent, on a much higher scale.

3. A Word as to the Shortcomings of the "Inprecorr."

The political world-situation, therefore, has not undergone in five years such essential alterations as would confront us today with completely new tasks. The next thing we have to do is: to remedy as quickly as possible the main faults of the "Inprecorr" and to make it better.

We are not in a position to maintain permanent, paid correspondents who have no other task than to serve the "Inprecorr". Our contributors in all countries are comrades who are overwhelmed with Party work. It therefore costs much time and pains before we receive from them the necessary contributions. As a result of this our articles sometimes appear rather late. The absorption of our contributors in practical work has for us the advantage that their articles are immediately derived from life. On the other hand, there is often the disadvantage that the author believes that he is writing for his own countrymen and engages in arguments with his opponents on detailed questions and scarcely heeds our reminders that we have, before all, to inform an international public, which has in the first place to be furnished with the knowledge of the position in the various countries.

Further: The "Inprecorr" should be a Press Correspondence which has to serve the newspapers. It does, in fact, render valuable service to the editors by supplying them with articles, but before all provides them richly with material which they can work up. But there still remains much important material which the editors are not able fully to make use of. We have therefore from the beginning made the "Inprecorr" accessible to a greater circle, and already in the second year of existence brought it out in the form of a review. At that time we were very hopeful that we should find not only a broad but also a large circulation. The circulation of the "Inprecorr" still leaves much to be desired.

Our next tasks are, therefore, to improve the information service of the "Inprecorr.", both as regards its promptness as well as its contents, but before all to aim at a larger circulation.

If ever a public journal bore the character of collective work it is the "Inprecorr". That is to be seen from the great number of contributors. The work of the small editorial staff would have been without success if they had not experienced a wide-scale support in all countries, but before all from our Russian friends. We take the opportunity on the occasion of our five years' existence to express to all these supporters and to all contributors our best thanks.

The Redaction.