

M. Tomsky: The British Strike and the Tasks of the International Trade Union Movement.

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 6 No. 64

PRESS

30th September 1926

CORRESPONDENCE

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

CONTENTS

R. Palme Dutt: Workers! Shall the British Miners Be Smashed?

Politics.

Arthur Rosenberg: Pilsudski's Plan of Attack against Lithuania.

Stewart Smith: The Significance of the Results of the Elections in Canada.

Jar: The Military Revolts against Primo de Rivera.

Hands off China.

The Capture of the Headquarters of Wu-Pei-Fu.

H. Eidus: Against Intervention in China!

Appeal of the E.C. of the Young Communist International.

The Balkans.

D. Fabian: The Murder of Tkatchenko and the Roumanian Democracy.

Economics.

Tang Shin She: The Economic Position in the Yang-tse Valley.

The Miners' Struggle in England.

M. Tomsky: The British Strike and the Tasks of the International Trade Union Movement. I.

J. Taigin: Economic Consequences of the British Miners' Struggle.

Giovanni Germanetto: The Sabotage of Relief for the British Miners in Italy.

Appeal of the Centrosoyus for International Co-operative Relief for the British Miners.

The Labour Movement.

Fritz Heckert: Twenty Five Years of the International Trade Union Movement.

B. Ferdi: The Labour Movement in Turkey.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

Josef Kovatch: The Workers of Yugoslavia take the Question of Trade Union Unity into their own Hands.

The White Terror.

Fisa: The New Wave of Terror in Italy.

P. Z.: The New General Attack of the White Terror in Bulgaria.

For the Unity of the C.P.S.U.

The Enlarged Executive of the C.P. of Switzerland on the Russian Question.

The Youth Movement.

Decision of the E. C. of the Y. C. I. regarding Comrade Vuyovitch.

Workers! Shall the British Miners Be Smashed?

By R. Palme Dutt (London).

The Government declaration of September 17 to the British Miners (reinforced by their letter of September 24) is the declaration of the policy of the **Knock Out Blow**. All the efforts of the miners' leaders to reach a peace of compromise have failed. The concessions offered by the miners' leaders, concessions of a reduction in the already lowered wages of the miners and acceptance of the hypocritical Samuel Coal Report, concessions never sanctioned by the rank and file and made amid general protests, have yielded no result and have only hardened the demands of the enemy. The last hope of the miners' leaders, their hope expressed in the Government as a neutral "third party" above the classes to save them from the coalowners, has been proved false and illusory. The Govern-

ment declaration of September 17 affirms the absolute unity of the Government with the Coalowners in rejecting the miners' concessions and demanding a total surrender on every point: Lower Wages, Longer Hours, District Settlements and Compulsory Arbitration. The subsequent negotiations with the Government have ended in deadlock, and been broken off by the Government itself; and the Prime Minister's secretary's letter of September 24 to the Miners' Federation has reaffirmed the Knock Out Declaration of September 17. Thus the situation is that the **fight confronting the Miners is more bitter and desperate than ever before**; the miners are fighting for their barest existence and rights of organisation; and after all the attempts at negotiation and compromise, Cook has had to declare that,

"save in point of time, we are no nearer a settlement than we were on the first day".

What does the Government's policy mean? On August 26 the Miners' leaders first approached the Government, represented by Churchill. Having been completely rebuffed by the coal-owners, who refused to negotiate with the Federation, they appealed to the Government to intervene and open negotiations. Churchill received them with studied brutality and indifference; he professed to make light of the losses of the dispute, informed them that, so long as foreign coal came in freely, the Government and coalowners could prolong the dispute indefinitely ("we have no difficulty in carrying on the life of the country"), and that it was for the Miners' Federation to produce a written formula of definite concessions — "something that alters the situation" — before the Government would stir. There followed a week of behind-the-scenes negotiations, during which the figure of MacDonald appeared as pulling the strings and acting as go-between for Churchill; he was publicly thanked by Cook for his "good offices as mediator", and himself declared complacently to the business men of the Bournemouth Rotary Club that "he had lived over again a few days of as difficult work as he had when in office in 1924". The end of this intervention was the formula of surrender on wages. After prolonged controversy on the Executive, and intense division at the Delegate Conference of September 2nd, the Conference eventually authorised the Executive by 557,000 to 225,000 votes to present "proposals for a national agreement". On September 3rd the formula of surrender was presented in a letter to the Government:

"We are prepared to enter into negotiations for a new national agreement with a view to reduction of labour costs to meet the immediate necessities of the industry."

This formula had been prepared in agreement with the Government as an acceptable basis. It was subsequently amplified in the proposals published by the miners on September 23rd, which put forward

- 1) an immediate 10% reduction in wages,
- 2) a national wages agreement by an independent tribunal on the basis of the Coal Commission Report.

Has this surrender brought peace nearer, or brought the Government, as it was stated that it would, to help the miners? On the contrary. The Government's attitude at once hardened. The miners' terms, the Times declared on September 24th, "five months ago would have brought peace and rejoicing"; now more was demanded. The bourgeoisie, confident of victory, raised the terms. Wages were sacrificed; hours were compromised; there remained the National Settlement, i. e. the recognition of the Miners' Federation, as the last defence to smash. The mineowners declared that they could only negotiate with the Districts (of which there are twenty four). The Government at first endeavoured to save appearances by the Churchill formula of September 8th, which conceded the reality of district negotiations to the mineowners, but proposed first a national laying down of "agreed principles" and subsequent national confirmation. The reformist leaders immediately clung to this thin straw of salvation: Cook declared that the Government could secure "fair play" for the miners, that Churchill was a "strong man" to coerce the mineowners, and so forth; the Daily Herald spoke daily of divisions in the Cabinet, that Churchill would resign if his policy were not carried out etc. The Communists were alone in declaring that any division between the Government and the mineowners was absolutely secondary, and that the workers would be fools to look to the Government for assistance instead of seeing in the Government the leader of the enemy forces. The event soon proved the Communists right, and left the reformist leaders in impotent bewilderment and indignation. The Prime Minister, Baldwin, returned from abroad; a series of Cabinet meetings, meetings with the coal-owners, and consultations of the Conservative Party Chiefs took place, as a result of which the Churchill formula was thrown over, and a new Government declaration of terms issued on September 17th as follows:

- 1) District negotiations to prepare provisional proposals.
- 2) Resumption of work on the basis of these,
- 3) A National Arbitration Tribunal to receive appeals

on issues customarily settled by national agreement, other than hours, and issue legally binding awards.

Thus the last point, the National Settlement, is thrown over by these terms. Not only are wages to be lowered and hours

to be lengthened; but the Miners' Federation is to be refused any right in future to speak for the miners; the Miners' Federation, whose unity the men have built up and sacrificed for during the past two generations, is to be broken up and dismembered into its component parts. District is to be set against District in out-throat competition of workers' rates, and the workers are to be thus disorganised and driven down without defence as slaves for the future. This is the policy of the British Government in 1926.

This policy represents a victory of the extreme Right forces. It is not the normal policy of modern capitalism to oppose national collective agreements and national recognition of trade unions; on the contrary, in the typical developed industries, such as railways, engineering, iron and steel etc., it is preferred by the capitalists as more convenient. The demand of the coal-owners for district settlements is in part a reflection of the reactionary and backward character of the whole organisation of the industry. But it also reflects a new feature — the fear and hatred of the new revolutionary character and tendencies revealed in the Miners' Federation, and reaching even to the leadership of the Miners' Federation. In the expression of the mineowners themselves, what they object to in the Miners' Federation is that it brings "politics" into Trade Unionism. To deal with Thomas and Bromley is one thing; and the centralised organisation makes more easy the disciplining and repression of the workers. But Cook and Smith have not only themselves been less tractable, but it has been abundantly made clear that the forces behind them in the Miners' Federation are far more revolutionary than they are. Therefore the mineowners have declared that the Miners' Federation must go, and Capitalism has united behind them.

The taking up of this extreme reactionary demand of the coalowners by the Government, representing the united capitalist class, is a political act of the first importance. It means that the Government and the bourgeoisie are determined to extract the last ounce of advantage out of their hoped-for victory, that the attack is not only against wages and hours, but is also a direct attack against working class organisation, and in particular against the Miner's Federation, not merely as the organisation of the miners, but as the vanguard, in economic and political organisation and action, of the working class and of the new beginnings of mass revolutionary development. The attack on the Miners' Federation is parallel to the attack on the Communist Party, and the projected legislation against Trade Union rights, as also abroad to the armed intervention against the Chinese national struggle and the preparations against the Soviet Union.

The miners' fight is every day more clearly a political fight of the entire capitalist class, organised by the Conservative Government, against the working class. Not only are wages and hours to be attacked, but working class organisation is to be attacked. It is significant that the culminating attack has been launched only after consultation with the Conservative Party chiefs. The mining dispute is already estimated by the Government's own spokesmen to have cost 200 to 250 million pounds. This is more than the capital value of the mines; less than this would have provided a subsidy for ten years; less than this would have enabled the Government to buy up the whole mines. The significance of the dispute for the capitalist class, which is ready to face these losses, goes beyond the mines to the whole economic-political field, national and international.

Such an attack can only be met by the united working class. The extremity of the present attack is solely due to the desertion of the miners by the General Council and by the international reformist leadership, and to the subsequent mistakes and weakening of the miners' leaders. The miners are having to face alone the combined attack of the whole capitalist class. The weakening of the miners' leaders, their capitulation to the General Council and to MacDonald, their abandonment of their previous positions, is the reflection of their despair of the assistance of the other workers and their fear of the break up of the miners' organisation. The miners' leaders, instead of fighting to the last, exerting every possibility of fighting, and then only, when every possibility of fighting was exhausted, leading an organised retreat, have sought useless paths of reconciliation with the General Council, with "public opinion", with the Government, conceding more and more during the actual progress of the fight, striving to damp down the resolution and resistance of the miners, introducing the first break

into the unity of the Federation, and thus in fact, during the past two months, instead of leading, disorganising the fight.

The miners have not weakened. After twenty one weeks, all the main areas have remained solid. The only terms of compromise submitted to ballot, the Bishops' Memorandum, was rejected. The new proposals of the Federation have, according to Cook's own statement, met with a flood of resolutions of protest from lodges all over the country. Officials advocating surrender have begun to be removed in the districts.

This heroic, supreme stand of the miners, fighting now for the most elementary rights of existence and of organisation, and fighting for the whole working class, must not be in vain. Events have shown conclusively the fruitlessness of the path which the miners' leaders have pursued for the past three months of seeking a peaceful compromise with the aid of the reformist leaders who have betrayed them, and the justice of the Communist declaration that the only alternatives are to strengthen the fight or to surrender. When every possibility of the fight has been exhausted, then the alternative has to be faced of accepting a temporary truce under dictation. But the possibilities of the fight have not yet been exhausted. The safety men can be still called out, as is the demand all over the coalfields. Material aid to the miners has still to be effectively organised, both in Britain and in the other countries outside Russia. Over the heads of the reformist officials the appeal against blackleg coal can be made straight to the workers in the docks and on the railways. And in every country where the coal is being produced and transported to break the British miners, the appeal and agitation can go straight to the workers, to the miners and transport workers, to stop this.

The miners are looking to the workers with full right for support. Reinforcements must come to them, for the time is short.

POLITICS

Pilsudski's Plan of Attack against Lithuania.

By Arthur Rosenberg (Berlin).

The Berlin "Welt am Montag", the organ of the "pacifist" von Gerlach, publishes a sensational report regarding a Lithuanian-Russian Treaty, said to be directed against Poland. According to this paper, a Treaty is about to be signed between Lithuania and Soviet Russia in which Soviet Russia declares that she does not recognise the Polish occupation of Vilna. Thus the Treaty incites Lithuania to wrest Vilna back from Poland by force.

Herr von Gerlach is by no means a novice in foreign politics. He was an eager champion of Germany's entry into the League of Nations and was present at the last meeting of the League of Nations in Geneva. There is not the least doubt that Gerlach obtained his sensational report from League of Nations' circles.

It is a shameful distortion of the facts to maintain today that Lithuania is cherishing military plans against Poland. For several months past it has been an open secret that the exact contrary is true. When in May last Pilsudski seized power in Poland, he immediately took up again his old plans for converting Poland into a great power. For this the union of Lithuania with Poland is an indispensable pre-condition. It is well known with what eagerness Pilsudski is piling up armaments, how he caused his Free Corps to march to the Lithuanian frontier and how he made use of every means in order to compel Lithuania to capitulate.

Since the robber campaign of the Polish General Zeligovski who carried out the seizure of Vilna, diplomatic relations between Poland and Lithuania have been broken off. The League of Nations permitted the Polish act of robbery against Vilna. In fact, in 1921, the League of Nations intervened with a proposal to the effect that Poland should swallow the rest of Lithuania along with Vilna. The League of Nations, it is true, suggested that Vilna should be given back to Lithuania, but that in return Lithuania should conclude a permanent alliance with Poland, and that in all military questions and questions of tariff and foreign policy, Lithuania should be under Polish suzerainty! The masses of the Lithuanian people indignantly rejected this project, for the Lithuanian peasantry has not yet forgotten how the Polish big landowners in the country behaved towards them

in former times. The setting up of an independent Lithuania meant the driving out of the Polish landowners. Should Poland regain control over Lithuania in any form, it would mean the return of the Polish junkers. The mass of the people is therefore against any foul compromise with Poland and realises that Soviet Russia is its natural protector.

Lithuania has never recognised the Polish occupation of Vilna. How then could it be expected that Soviet Russia, in concluding a treaty of friendship with Lithuania, should recognise it on her part? The lying assertion that Soviet Russia somehow wishes to incite Lithuania to a military attack against Poland flies in face of the facts. Soviet Russia has shown on hundreds of occasions that she wishes to live in peace with her neighbours. Equally well-known, however, is the unbounded lust for adventure of the ruling class of Poland.

Thanks to the help of England, the Pilsudski government achieved important successes in Geneva. Poland has not only been elected into the Council of the League, but the meeting of the League has expressly declared Poland to be eligible for re-election to the Council of the League after the expiration of the period of three years. This was a special vote of confidence on the part of the international counter-revolution in the State of Pilsudski, which is directed against Bolshevism. The efforts of Chamberlain in Geneva have also brought about a German-Polish rapprochement. The Polish Foreign Minister, Zalewski, held negotiations in Geneva with the German delegation. It is believed that these will be followed by negotiations for a commercial treaty between Germany and Poland. In connection with this the much-disputed question of the right of Germans to settle down in Poland is to be cleared up, and the conflict regarding the Upper Silesian Oxygen Factory in Chorzow is to be settled. In addition to this the eager politicians in the League of Nations are already considering the question of an understanding regarding the Polish corridor. A few days before the "Welt am Montag" published its sensational report, Herr Breitscheid expressed in Geneva his longing for an understanding between Germany and Poland. Breitscheid, with his characteristic modesty, requested Poland in the first place at least to abolish the transit visas for Germans travelling through the Polish corridor. Another German politician, the President of the Reichsbank, Schacht, during his recent stay in Vienna, put forward the project of a German-Polish rapprochement by means of which Poland should become an economic colony of Germany. The actual plans of the participating governments probably represent a middle-course between Breitscheid and Schacht.

In any case the negotiations are in full swing, the object of which is that, in the event of Polish fascism making an attack upon Lithuania, Germany will guarantee it freedom from any attack in the rear. When the friends of Poland attempt to spread the news that Lithuania is cherishing plans for attacking Poland, it means, perhaps, the prelude to a coup de main of the Polish volunteers against Kovno. Pilsudski is also reckoning upon the inner differences in Lithuania. The present government in Lithuania consists of the Left parties, including the social democrats. The clerical-conservative opposition is preparing to come into power again. Poland, by setting one Lithuanian party against the other, hopes to bring Lithuania to voluntary submission. A short time ago the Lettish foreign Minister, Ulmanis, visited Lithuania on behalf of Poland. He sought to persuade the Lithuanian politicians to submit to the inevitable and accept Polish suzerainty. The bourgeois and socialist politicians of Lithuania are vacillating. It is only the Communist Party of Lithuania that gives real expression to the will of the Lithuanian masses for independence. The Communist Party in Lithuania, jointly with the Communist Party of Poland, issued an appeal to this effect and which clearly explained the situation: Should it come to war between Lithuania and Poland, then Lithuania, should she offer resistance to Poland, would be fighting against the imperialists for her independence. Poland, on the other hand, would be fighting for the annexation of Lithuania, for the enslavement of the Lithuanian people in order to prepare for the offensive of world imperialism against the Soviet Union.

Should Lithuania fall into the hands of Pilsudski, then the united front of the anti-Bolshevik Border States from Finland right down to Roumania would be complete. Therefore, the Polish plans of attack against Lithuania are not only the affair of the Lithuanian proletariat, but they concern the whole international working class. The German working class must frustrate Stresemann's conspiracy with Pilsudski just as the English wor-

king class must oppose Chamberlain's conspiracy with Pilsudski. In the same way the French working class must take an interest in the secret military agreements of the French government with Poland and Roumania. The vigilance of the European working class can and will thwart the robber-campaign of the League of Nations against Lithuania and Soviet Russia.

The Significance of the Results of the Elections in Canada.

By Stewart Smith.

The Canadian general elections of September sound the death-knell of British Imperial domination in her first Dominion. In 1918, Canada became an equal signatory with Britain in the Versailles Treaty; in 1921, supported by the United States, she pressed in the Washington Conference for Article X., giving the Dominion parliaments the right to decide on external conflicts; in 1922, she strongly resented Winston Churchill's call to arms after the abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty; in 1923 she concluded a Fisheries Treaty at Washington, without the signature of the British Ambassador; a year ago, she refused to sign the Locarno Pact, and sponsored Art. IX., — "The present Treaty shall impose no obligation upon any of the British Dominions or upon India, unless the government of such Dominions or of India signifies its acceptance thereof"; Canada concluded a Treaty with Belgium, her representatives replacing the British Ambassador; she replied to a suggestion that Canada should contribute some millions yearly to the upkeep of a squadron in the British fleet with an Act of Parliament making it impossible for governments, without the consent of Parliament to conclude agreements involving military expenditure; and decided to send a special, permanent representative to Washington. And as if to cap all this, in 1926, with the odds of a smuggling exposure against him, Mackenzie King and his government are returned to office, with the Wall Street Journal loudly acclaiming him the representative of American Finance.

And this, after the whole tradition of "British Democracy" was violated to give his conservative, flag-waving imperialist, opponent, Meighen, the inside of the election track. Lord Byng, the Governor-general did, what no English King has done for a hundred years. And in so doing definitely returned Canada to the position of a "colony". He refused King the dissolution of Parliament, gave the government to the conservatives, and then granted dissolution. Upon this, the unripe nationalism of the Canadian bourgeoisie matured to full bloom. Its chief spokesman, Bourassa declared:

"Beware of tomorrow! If you allow a Governor-general, a subaltern of the British government to accord or refuse dissolution as he likes and he decides which party shall be out and which Party shall be in, you will wake up to find Downing Street will be the judge in Canada's political matters."

White House or Westminster?

Bourassa merely gives voice to the antagonism between the interests of Downing Street and those of the Canadian bourgeoisie. Actually, the political interests of the Canadian bourgeoisie lie much closer to White House than to Westminster. The rapid industrialisation of Canada during the war, and the post-war depression, which brought a large part of Canadian industry under indirect American control, has made Canada, economically, socially and so far as foreign policy is concerned, no more than, (as the U. S. department of Commerce says) "the northern extension of the United States". Thus, in the question of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Canada's position was virtually that of White House. And still later, at Locarno, Canada saw clearly the possibility of implications with France, and refused to sign. In the eastern questions, this is even more the case. Bourassa asked in Parliament, "have we the same interests in Iraq and Mosul as the oil hunters of England have?" And in accordance with the position that King has taken at the Imperial Conferences since 1923, an Act of Parliament was passed, that "before his Majesty's Canadian ministers advise ratification of a treaty, con-

vention or agreement involving military or economic sanction, the approval of the Parliament of Canada shall be secured". King's victory at the polls is a victory for White House and a defeat for Westminster.

Downing Street and Wall Street.

Canada, nonetheless, remains a part — in area one-third — of the British Empire. Half a million square miles larger than the United States; possessing 537,8 million acres of productive land against America's 293.8 million; 800 million acres of timber against America's 500 million; 3,635 millions tons of iron ore on the island of Newfoundland alone, against America's total 4200 million; one-sixth of the earth's coal reserve and 90% of the world's nickel; water-power to supply the industrial demands of one hundred millions of population — in this Canada, England sees gigantic immigration possibilities and resultant upon this an enormous trade impetus. In regard to the new interest of British capital in Canada (noticeable particularly in the Midland Bank chairman becoming a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway) the "Morning Post" of Aug. 11th, states, "that policy is necessarily related to the policy of inter-imperial migration". Already the flow of capital has commenced, and immigration to Canada, according to official reports is 66% higher for the first six months of 1926 than for the corresponding period of 1925. Apart from Canada's grain, this is her primary importance for England.

On the other hand, for the United States the situation and attitude of Canada is of equal significance. One-fourth of her total foreign holdings are in Canada. She is already dependent upon Canadian timber resources for her pulp wood, and Canadian mines for some of the most important non-ferrous minerals. But of greatest importance is the fact that "within a few years the United States will cease to produce a sufficient supply of wheat and meat to feed it's own population. The Canadian wheat fields will then become indispensable". (Nearing and Freeman in "Dollar Diplomacy"). The continuation of America's prosperous home-expansion is going to depend to a large degree upon the breaking down of the trade boundary to the north. And already in June, 1925, the Bulletin of the National City Bank was urging freer trade with Canada, and bemoaning the high Fordney tariff, and Canada's duty on grain going to America. This is Canada's importance for America.

Political Interests in Canada.

But the Canadian bourgeoisie, itself, is a much larger factor than either of these two, having in its possession a preponderating proportion of Canada's wealth, and there will be no bridging of the gaps between these interests in Canada. By a brief examination of them, the real significance of the election becomes plain.

Britain desires to exclude America from the Canadian market by a high tariff wall, at the same time maintaining her 33 1/3% preference on the Canadian market; America seeks freer relations in trade with Canada, and would possibly be willing to offer free trade in natural products, allowing Canada to maintain intermediate tariffs on manufactured commodities. On the other hand, while the American factories in Canada (automobile etc.) are thriving on preferential treatment within the Empire, the cotton, woollen and boot and shoe industries, etc., are in the most vigorous opposition to British preference, which is successfully competing with them.

Meighen is the representative primarily of the large railway interests and the British Empire Steel Corporation, but also of the smaller anti-British preference Canadian capitalists. He would raise a high tariff wall against all imports. This would make possible the profitable transport of B. E. S. C. O. coal to central Canada, and would be a severe blow to U. S. coal interests. He would cancel all Empire preference agreements a blow to the American branch factories. And finally, his avowed policy would be to maintain the grain duties, and possibly raise them to guarantee shipment through Canadian ports, a longer haulage for the Canadian Pacific. But even this stolid Orange, imperialist changed his previous slogan of "Ready, Aye Ready", and declared the decision of a government to enter a foreign conflict "should be submitted to the judgement of the people at a general election, before troops leave our shore. Even in Meighen, Downing Street finds no true representative

But King is much more the representative of pure American interests, than those of the Canadian bourgeoisie. Behind his slogan of American reciprocity he has united the right wing of the farmers' Progressive Party, after splitting them away from the increasingly class-conscious left. His autonomist attitude to British Imperialism has drawn to him the support of the French masses of Canada. And his pose on Old Age Pensions, and the sedition clauses of the Criminal Code, enacted at the time of the Winnipeg Strike, has been a fairly successful bid for the support of the workers. He stands at the same time for Reciprocity with America, and a policy of Imperial Preference. The former in response to a natural economic development; the latter, to secure orders for American "Made in Canada" goods.

"Imperial Influence" in Canada.

In 1911, Laurier refused to accept in entirety, Churchill's Dreadnaught building plans. "Imperial Influence" was brought to bear upon him. America offered him, what Canadian governments for fifty year had gone begging for to Washington, free trade in natural products and the maintenance of intermediate tariffs on manufactured goods. He was defeated at the polls. Canada was at this time a British possession in the real sense of the term. The English capitalist class had awakened to Canada's importance.

In 1926, King has over-stepped the colonial bonds a hundred times. In his resolution on military agreements, he has created a dangerous precedent for all of the Dominions. And at the same time has created the basis for a more decisive position at the forthcoming Imperial Conference. In 1926, rather than being defeated, with odds against him, he is returned with a larger majority in parliament than he received at the last election. How will "Imperial Influence" deal with King?

This leads to the fundamental question. Can England check the separationist tendencies of her Dominions across the seas? Can the "far-flung Empire" be held under her political domination? Australia demands the withdrawal of the British governors. South Africa would fly a flag of her own. In Canada, the bourgeoisie demands the abolition of British Preference, the farmers demand reciprocity with America, the French masses declare for independence, the Labour Party calls for Complete "Self-determination", and the Communist Party, the real party of the masses leads the fight for complete separation, and a Workers' and Farmers' government. America's "peaceful penetration" threatens to develop implications of a different character. The interests of the mature bourgeoisie of the Dominions is incompatible with British foreign policy. The manifest destiny of the Dominions is separation from the Empire.

The Military Revolts against Primo de Rivera.

By Jar (Madrid).

A military revolt, the second of this year, has recently occurred in Spain. Primo de Rivera's government which holds power as representing the military Party, has been forced to resort to the most drastic means in order to overcome the large number of officers who are fighting against his dictatorship. The last two military insurrections bore entirely different characters. The military revolt of June 24th had an entirely political significance. The movement was led by some democratic leaders, a number of Generals belonging to the old political parties, and a few officers inclined to republicanism. The reason for the collapse of the plot was not the activity of the police, who are wont to fling into prison anybody who is known for his opposition to the dictatorship, but was mainly due to disagreement existing among the various groups engaged in the plot. While Generals Aguilera and Weyler and the democratic leaders wanted to demonstrate to Alfonso XIII. their power and to give the king an opportunity of dismissing Primo de Rivera, the republican officers attached to radical groups were really preparing an anti-monarchist movement.

Since the year 1917 when they were first formed, the "Juntas Militares" have had great influence in the politics of Spain. They were created to deal with questions of the officers' profession, but they soon became the most powerful instrument in the hands of the capitalist reaction. The "Juntas Militares"

have controlled Spanish politics and have really been the cause of all the government crises since 1917.

Primo de Rivera's coup d'état in 1923 meant the end of all the Juntas with the exception of the artillery. As Primo de Rivera claimed to be representing the aims of the army, he had to get rid of those "Juntas" which would have been a constant menace to his power. In order to achieve this end, he conducted a policy of corruption, granting all kinds of positions and honours to the leaders of the "Juntas". But there existed an old rivalry between the infantry and the artillery officers, the latter being considered as the most cultured and technical elements of the army and therefore made greater claims.

Some months ago Primo de Rivera was anxious to receive the title of Honorary Colonel of the artillery. This appointment should, in the ordinary way, have been decided by the vote of the artillery officers. The latter made plain to Primo de Rivera their opposition to his aim. This opposition, together with the old rivalry between the artillery and the infantry, the last-named being supported by Primo de Rivera, was the reason for the new decrees issued by the War Minister, which entirely changed the old method of promotion of artillery officers by seniority. It was these decrees that caused the revolt of the artillery officers, as they did not wish to recognise Primo de Rivera's authority.

The artillery officers responded like one man to the summons to revolt, and the artillery barracks were made ready to resist any attack. As Primo de Rivera did not at first know what attitude the king would be likely to adopt he played for time, and delayed answering the protests of the artillery against the decrees which were the cause of rebellion. But on the other hand he quietly went on with all his plans and the decrees were carried out. This attitude of Primo de Rivera further infuriated the artillery officers. Even the cadets in the school of artillery joined in the revolt, and whilst a meeting of the "Union Patriótica" (the dictators own party) was being held, they forced their way into the meeting and broke it up.

These facts caused Primo de Rivera and his government to realise the gravity of the situation and the seriousness of his position. Consequently, on the 5th of September martial law was declared throughout Spain. Decrees were issued according to which the artillery officers on the active list were deprived of all their functions, privileges and pay, and were even forbidden to wear their uniforms. Another decree was issued under which the soldiers of the artillery were freed from obeying the orders of their superior officers. The following "Communiqué" of the government gives some idea as to how the situation stood: "The Minister learned today that the head of the artillery section, without the previous knowledge of the Minister or of the General Staff, issued instructions to officers on leave to return to their regiments. Further, the Colonel commanding the regiment of Artillery of Segovia, acting without the authority of his superiors, ordered his force to remain in barracks as a precautionary measure in case they "should be attacked by other troops sent from Madrid".

The excitement in all Spain was tremendous. A real civil war was declared between the government and the artillery. The civilian elements, realising that this fight would mean the end of the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera, were prepared to stand by the rebels; and the latter were ready to resist any armed attack on the barracks.

But on the evening of the same day there came news that the rebels had surrendered without a fight. What had happened to bring about such a change in the mood of the artillery troops within a few hours? The officers were actually engaged in fighting, but the leaders of the rebellion gave orders to surrender, which were unanimously obeyed. Some few days later the facts became known: The officers of the artillery are for the most part aristocrats (Oscar Perez Solís, the communist leader who has already served two years in prison in Barcelona and who was also an artillery officer, can be regarded as an exception) with strong monarchist feelings.

In the conflict between Primo de Rivera and the artillery officers the monarchy was in a very difficult and embarrassing position. The Rebels' Committee, therefore, tried to negotiate with the king. The artillery Committee stopped the king's automobile on its way to Madrid and explained the situation to him. The king promised them the immediate dismissal of Primo de Rivera and also that those taking part in the rebellion would not be punished, with the result that the Rebels' Committee

gave orders to surrender. Nevertheless some artillery barracks continued to resist for two days more.

These are the actual facts, of which Primo de Rivera took advantage in order to create the impression of having gained a victory. He then appointed infantry and cavalry officers to take over the command of the artillery barracks. The heads of the movement were brought to trial and were condemned to imprisonment for life. All this had a great effect upon the artillery officers who are at present inclining more and more to Republicanism, as they regard king Alfonso XIII. as responsible for all the reprisals and repressions. They also feel that they have been betrayed by the heads of the movement. Politically the artillery officers can now be regarded as conspirators against the Spanish Monarchy and Primo de Rivera's dictatorship.

Outwardly Primo de Rivera has scored a big success; but as a matter of fact the end of his dictatorship is not far off. Almost all the army is conspiring against him. There is no government in Europe which has such a hostile majority of the population against it as the present dictatorship in Spain. King Alfonso wants to save his crown and is prepared to help anyone who is conspiring against Primo de Rivera. But the position of king Alfonso is so precarious that the end of Primo de Rivera's dictatorship would very likely be followed by that of the monarchy.

HANDS OFF CHINA

The Capture of the Headquarters of Wu Pei Fu.

Hanyang, September 7, 1926.

Yesterday the advance-guard of our army captured Hanyang, which contains the biggest arsenal in China. Today the revolutionary troops have already marched into Hankow. The population of these towns, particularly the workers, students and small traders, received us with great rejoicing. Everywhere leaflets and bills, conveying a hearty welcome, were distributed by the workers and peasants. On our entry the population crowded the windows and roofs; shouts of joy greeted us; the sound of music was heard everywhere. Troops of speakers from the political department of the army proceeded immediately to the public places, to all the temples and all the street-corners and delivered propaganda speeches. Great placards were posted on the houses bearing the inscription: "The victory of the revolutionary troops means the victory of the revolutionary population!" "Down with Wu-Pei-Fu!" "Down with the imperialists!" etc. Tomorrow, or the day after, the company of actors of the Political troops will arrive and perform revolutionary pieces before the population. Tomorrow or the day after, the workers' and peasants' organisations will arrange a liberation festival.

Now a few words regarding the fights which preceded the victory! On the 27th of August we took possession of the fortress of Djinsetchow (in Hupe), an important railway junction between Hupe, Hunan and Kiangsi. A severe bloody battle was fought here. 2800 killed and wounded remained on the field. Wu-Pei-Fu received a bullet wound in the breast from his own fleeing troops. In his fury at the troops who were running away, Wu-Pei-Fu himself shot several high officers. Thereupon whole companies deserted him, and he found himself compelled to flee to Hankow.

After capturing Djinsetchow our revolutionary troops immediately proceeded to Wuchang. Wu-Pei-Fu now wished to show his strength and commanded his followers to defend the city walls of Wuchang right up to the last. The revolutionary troops, however, had already occupied the suburbs and the railway station. That they have not up to now captured the town is due to the fact that they do not wish to fire upon the population.

As Hanyang, regarded from the strategic standpoint, is more important than Wuchang, the Canton troops crossed the Yangtse river and attacked the first-named town. Hanyang, along with the arsenal, had up to now been occupied by General Liu-Tso-Lung who had already for long been in contact with the revolutionary troops. The natural fortress within Hanyang the Kuisan mountain —, however, was guarded by Wu-

Pei-Fu's own troops. When the Canton troops attacked Kuisan from one side, Liu-Tso-Lung's soldiers undertook an attack on the other side and Wu-Pei-Fu's forces were forced to retreat to Hankow. Thus Hanyang, which it was believed could only be overcome after severe fighting, fell into the hands of the revolutionary army without any loss whatever.

As a result of this defeat of Wu-Pei-Fu the traders of Hankow, who wished to avoid a street fight in their town, demanded of Wu-Pei-Fu that he immediately withdraw. Thus, on the 6th September, at 6 o'clock in the evening, Wu-Pei-Fu left the town in a northerly direction, after having forced the traders to hand him over a large sum of money and after his troops had plundered the place pretty thoroughly. In order to maintain law and order in the two towns the revolutionary army appointed General Liu-Tso-Lung as security commissioner.

Within the city walls of Wuchang there are still, approximately, 6000 of Wu-Pei-Fu's soldiers under the command of General Liu-Yü-Tchun. The traders in this town have requested the revolutionary troops not to fire on the town with heavy guns. The traders have offered the besieged troops of Wu-Pei-Fu the sum of 100,000 dollars if they immediately disperse. In any case these troops, who are cut off from all communications, will not be able to hold out for long.

The three towns of Hanyang, Hankow and Wuchang form the shape of a letter "Y". Hankow and Hanyang lie on the left side and Wuchang on the right bank of the Yang-tse river. Between Hankow and Hanyang there is the river Hansui. The three towns have together 2 million inhabitants. Here there are a great number of transport, textile and metal workers. The important railway strike in the year 1923 against Wu-Pei-Fu commenced in Hankow. The Communist movement started in these three towns earlier than the Kuomintang movement. Now, after the capture of the towns by the revolutionary troops, both parties are beginning to grow rapidly.

Against Intervention in China.

By H. Eidus.

The victorious onward march of the Canton Revolutionary Army on the North is rousing world imperialism to both oppression and fear. For them Canton's victory would mean the loss of their privilege to suck the blood and sweat of the Chinese toilers. For decades back the British, Japanese and other Imperialist Powers have looked on China with its population of four hundred millions as a very dog placed at their disposal by a kind fate to exploit to the full.

When the foreign imperialists' oppression of the Chinese masses had exceeded all bounds, when human endurance, ay, even that of the Chinese coolie, was unable to stand it any longer, the masses of China rose in revolt against their oppressors. But it was the revolt of despair. They could not count on winning, for the foreign "devils", as the Chinese then rightly called their exploiters, were too powerful for there to be any prospect of success crowning their struggle. Such was the Boxer Revolt which closed with the still greater enslavement of China. The 1900 Treaty which was the result of the revolt's suppression still presses its stranglehold to this very day on the Chinese worker and peasant.

All along China has lived in daily mortal fear — foreign warships in her ports their long-range guns trained on her towns. When their rights and privileges have been threatened, the imperialists have not hesitated to wipe whole towns and villages from off the face of the earth. Recent Chinese history is full of such bloody pages, and one need not go far back to seek examples of the shameless predatory attitude of the foreign capitalists towards the Chinese people. It is not so long ago that British war vessels used their guns on the town of Wan-hsien, demolishing over 1,000 buildings and killing some thousands of the peaceful population. "Epic" incidents like that are to be found here and there on every page of the history of the mutual relations between the Chinese people and their foreign blood-suckers.

The British, Jap, French and other robbers have not yet managed to bring the Chinese people to the level of dumb, driven cattle, to the level of slaves that will lick their master's boots. That being so despised of the foreign capitalists, the Chinese coolie, has become a fighter for his own emancipation. The Chinese people have gone through a splendid schooling:

long years of foreign capitalist oppression and the many shootings of its finest sons have taught it to fight for its existence, for a free life in its own country. The October Revolution of the Soviet Workers has also played a tremendous part in the awakening of China, that giant in the chains of World Imperialism.

China has not only awakened from its age-long slumber, it has already begun to fight no half-hearted struggle, but a war to the death against its oppressors. Today the Chinese toiling masses have already learned to make use themselves of bullets, and not rifle and bullet alone, but heavy armaments as well, aeroplanes, tanks, etc., and are already able, and what is the main thing, already dare, to turn these weapons on their white exploiters.

More; the China that is now fighting for its emancipation already knows who are its friends, who its foes. For today it is not simply China that is fighting the foreign imperialists, but the toilers of China, the millions on millions of the labouring masses with their spearhead, the Chinese proletariat. On one side the front stand Chinese peasants, workers, handicraftsmen and petty traders; on the other, the foreign imperialists and their hirelings, Wu-Pei-Fu, Chang-Tso-Lin, Sun-Chuang-Fang, and other Chinese militarists. The broad masses of China now fighting so bravely know that the workers the world over, including the proletarians of Britain, Japan, as well as the U. S. S. R., are their friends, and that the capitalists of all countries, and in particular the British and Japanese capitalists, are their sworn enemies.

Not without reason have the British, Japanese and other foreign manufacturers and bankers, been scared into losing their heads at the onward march of the victorious Kuomintang Army of Canton which has shattered the forces of that British henchman and hired cut-throat, Wu-Pei-Fu, now fighting alongside that other Anglo-American placeman, Sun-Chan-Fang, and which is now preparing to do battle with Chang-Tso-Lin, that faithful cur of the Japs.

The victory of the Canton Revolutionary Army, the army of the Chinese workers and peasants, is upsetting the mental balance of the Japs and the British, and now they are beginning to talk of intervention in China in order to drown the fire of Revolution in that country in the blood of their workers and peasants. The proletariat of Britain, Japan and other countries is now faced with the danger of shortly having to spill its blood on the fields of the vast stretches of China for the glory and behoof of the British, Japanese, and other foreign capitalists. The world proletariat must be on its guard! It must watch every move of the bourgeoisie so as to prevent its being hoodwinked with the help of the social traitors into attacking the revolutionary workers and peasants of China. "Hands off China!" must be the watch-word the workers of Britain and Japan must thunder out in reply to their bourgeoisie when it plunges its fangs into the body of the Chinese working people.

Appeal of the E. C. of the Young Communist International.

Moscow, 18th September 1926.

An appeal of the E. C. of the Y. C. I. to the working class and peasant youth of the whole world and to the soldiers and sailors of the imperialist forces, declares:

The young proletarians of the whole world must follow the present events in China with strained attention. The victorious advance of the revolutionary Canton troops opens up a wide perspective for the masses of the people in their struggle for emancipation from the bloody bonds of international imperialism. The revolutionary working class movement is developing swiftly in the freed districts. The mercenaries of Wu Pei Fu, the agent of the British exploiters, have been smashed. The imperialists realise the danger and are hurrying to provide the bloodhound with armed assistance.

They are preparing a great intervention in China. The reactionary British government which has adopted the rôle of the gendarme of the world is of course the first to take the initiative in the attack upon the Chinese people. The British imperialists are sending one cruiser after another to the Far East and have bombarded peaceful towns, murdering

hundreds of unarmed inhabitants, as for instance in the town of Wanshien. Feverish negotiations are being conducted with the imperialists of other countries, particularly with Japan, for the purpose of forming a united front against the masses of the Chinese people. The agent of the Japanese imperialists, Chang Tso Lin, is provoking the Soviet Government in Manchuria. The imperialists, clinging to the power which is slipping from their hands, will stop at nothing in order to light the flame of a new world war and, at the same time, to start a crusade against the staunch ally of all oppressed peoples, the U. S. S. R.

Comrades, Brothers, young proletarians of the whole world! You were and must always be in the front ranks of the struggle against imperialist war. The workers of the world must not permit the imperialists to drown the struggle of the Chinese people in blood. Let us fight as one man against this new criminal plan of the imperialists! Brothers, soldiers, sailors, you dare not permit that they use you as murderers against your Chinese brothers who are fighting for their elementary rights!

Drive bloody imperialism out of China!

Long live the revolutionary struggle of the Chinese people against international imperialism!

Long live the international solidarity of the proletarian youth!

The Executive Committee of the
Young Communist International.

THE BALKANS

The Murder of Tkatchenko and the Roumanian Democracy.

By D. Fabian (Bucharest).

Tkatchenko has been murdered. The same tragic fate is threatening Boris Stefanow and the other political prisoners. And it now appears that not only the Roumanian Oligarchy is guilty of the murder that has been carried out and the murders that have been planned, but that the democratic parties also have a share in the guilt, in fact that some of those responsible for the murder of Tkatchenko are to be found in the ranks of the Roumanian Social Democracy! For Tkatchenko was a Communist, and in Roumania there exists a single united front against the Communists extending from the Oligarchy to the Social Democrats.

Two days after Tkatchenko's arrest, when it was already evident that the Siguranza wished to murder him, the "Socialismul", the central organ of the Roumanian Social Democracy, wrote as follows:

"A fresh communist conspiracy has been discovered... The details — all too precise, all too exact — given by the daily papers convince us beyond all doubt that this time it is a case of an actual conspiracy... Our protest therefore are in vain..."

The Social Democrats, however, were not content with merely accepting and approving the lies of the Siguranza — the phantastic assertions of the latter were published without comment by all the Democratic papers —, they were not content with openly assuring the Oligarchy that "this time" it had a free hand and need not fear any social democratic protest; they went even further: At the moment when the Siguranza were whetting the knife in order to slay Tkatchenko, the Social Democrats also contributed their share towards keeping alive and intensifying the pogrom mood against the arrested comrades. "Our indignation", wrote the "Socialismul" of August 22, "is too great and we find no words in order to protest in the sharpest manner (against whom, against the murderers? No, but) "against those who do not cease (by their communist activity) to play into the hands of the reaction."

Thus the Social Democrats encourage the terror against and the murder of Communists in order to find out in the end that the latter are themselves responsible for everything. It is the Communists, therefore, who play into the hands of the reaction, because they are so obstinate towards the Terror and those who support it, because they wish to organise the revolutionary proletariat of Roumania, and because, regardless of the legality of the oligarchy which is held in such awe by the Social Democrats, they are not deterred from fighting for

the emancipation of the working population in town and country.

Where, however, was the Roumanian Democracy, where was the much-vaunted peasant democracy when Tkatchenko fell a victim to vile murder? The "democratic" and "independent" papers, after publishing word for word and without comment the inventions of the Siguranza regarding the "conspiracy" alleged to have been discovered, refused to print the smallest corrections or refutations on the part of those accused by the Siguranza. They even refused to sound the alarm that the lives of the arrested were in danger. And today, when even the Siguranza are not able to cloak or conceal their crimes, when even the bourgeois press abroad prints indignant reports regarding the murder — today, when even some "Left" Roumanian social democrats are finally attempting to make a timid protest, these newspapers content themselves with a few non-committal observations regarding lawful and unlawful official murders. What is the explanation of this contemptible and scandalous attitude of the Roumanian bourgeois democracy? The explanation is to be found in the complete decay and collapse of bourgeois democracy in Roumania even before it had properly begun to develop.

In spite of all the efforts and manoeuvres of the democratic opposition parties (National Party, and Peasant Party), the Liberal Oligarchy has not only remained in power for four years, when its term of office should have expired, but has remained in power beyond this period. The opposition attempted to come to an understanding with the court and the Oligarchy. But this readiness to betray their principles not only showed to the Oligarchy that the democratic opposition did not constitute any real danger, but on the other hand confused and demoralised the masses. Instead of accepting the outstretched hand of "democracy", the oligarchy rejected it as being too weak and uncertain, and General Averescu was called to take over the government.

The hopes of the democratic leaders of coming to power by means of an alliance with the existing regime proved illusory. At the same time the hopes of the social democratic leaders of being able to overthrow the oligarchy by supporting this "democracy" proved equally illusory. But neither the Social Democracy nor the Democracy of Roumania were able to draw the only possible conclusion from these disappointments, i. e. the necessity of a life and death struggle against the oligarchy and of rousing the masses of the people against this regime. Such a collapse of the policy of reconciliation with the existing regime could only result in the complete demoralisation of the democratic and social democratic opposition.

One section of the Siebenbürgen National Party (under the leadership of Goldisch) immediately went over openly to the oligarchy and took part in the Averescu government. Another section of this Party (Vaida-Voevod) is at present negotiating with regard to going over to the Liberal Party. Finally, a third section of this Party (Jorga) declares itself ready to go over into the government camp. With the Peasant Party, however, there exists a powerful group (Lupu etc.) which is in favour of co-operation with a Party "capable of governing" (i. e. the Liberal Party or the Averescu Party). "We can no longer remain in the opposition" is the slogan of this group. Thus the Oligarchy still remains victorious over the "Democracy" and the Social Democracy of Roumania.

This victory, however, is not a victory over the people: it is a victory over those who mislead the people by their democratic phraseology and betray them in the name of democracy. The Oligarchy has succeeded in drawing over into its ranks a portion of the democratic leaders. It has succeeded in ideologically subduing the others, and in disintegrating and splitting the democratic parties. It has so completely entangled the democratic and social democratic parties with the oligarchic regime, that the murder of Tkatchenko could be carried out before the eyes of all these democrats without their moving a finger to prevent it.

At the same time, however, it has opened the eyes of the masses, who are realising more clearly every day the futility of hoping for success by legal struggle and democratic means. The Oligarchy is creating such favourable conditions that the existence of the Communist Party is being justified in the eyes of the masses and the Communist Party is being recognised by the broad masses as their only leader in the fight for their emancipation from the yoke of the oligarchy.

ECONOMICS

The Economic Position in the Yang-tse Valley.

By Tang Shin She.

The provinces generally considered as actually forming part of the Yang-tse Valley are Kiangsu, Nganhui, Kiangsi, Hupe, Hunan and Szechuan; in close economic relation with these there are the provinces of Chekiang, Honan, Shensi, Kansu and Kuichow. When the Canton-Hankow railway line is finished, Kwangtung and Kwangsi may also be included. The economic district of the Yang-tse Valley, excluding Kwangtung and Kwangsi, has, according to the last census, taken in 1925, a population of 233,394,327, which represents more than half the population of the whole of China.

There are 16 ports on the Yang-tse, i. e. apart from those on the coast: Chungking, Wanhsien, Ichang, Shasi, Siangtan, Changsha, Changteh, Yochow, Hankow, Wuchang, Kiukiang, Wufu, Anking, Chingkiang, Nanking and Pukou. Shanghai, which is close to the mouth of the Yang-tse, should, of course, also be included. The chief harbours are: Shanghai, on the sea, and Hankow, about half-way up the Yang-tse. Of the 17 ports, 11 are so-called Treaty Ports, 10 of them English and one, Nanking, French. Of all the towns of China, Shanghai is the most important as regards customs revenue. According to statistics of the Port Customs Offices furnished for the year 1924, the port customs revenues of Shanghai amounts to 39.58% of the total port customs revenue. Hankow collected 8.4% and was third on the list. In comparison with Hankow, Shanghai showed an immensely greater revenue, but then it is a seaport. Hankow, on the other hand, is the central harbour for the distribution of goods to the interior of China.

Let us now consider the transport trade in the Yang-tse valley. The Yang-tse River is navigable as far as 1900 English miles from its mouth. From Shanghai to Hankow, a distance of 595 English miles, the river can be navigated by big ships drawing 22 feet, from Hankow up to Ichang, a further 370 miles, ships drawing 17 feet may pass, from Ichang to Nanhsien, 200 miles, the depth permits a 6-foot draft, from Nanhsien to Ibin, 500 miles, 3-foot draft. The remaining stretch is only navigable for sailing ships. The tributaries of the Yang-tse-kiang are navigable, as follows:

Szechuan: 1619 English miles, including 217 miles open to steamers; Hupe: 1440 English miles, including 500 miles open to steamers; Hunan: 702 English miles, including 275 miles open to big steamers, 37 miles open to small steamers; Kiangsi: 2132 English miles, including 260 miles open to big steamers, 160 miles open to small steamers; Nganhui: 1022 English miles, including 540 miles open to small steamers; Kiangsu: 1377 English miles, including 13 miles open to big steamers, 1001 miles open to small steamers.

In the Yang-tse Valley there are, therefore, 10,192 English miles of navigable waterways, including 1948 for big steamers and 2755 for small steamers. There are in the Yang-tse Valley seven big steamship companies: 2 English, Butterfield & Swire and Jardine, Matheson & Co., 2 Japanese, two Chinese and one American company. The Butterfield & Swire company, on whose behalf the great massacre was perpetrated near Wanhsien, owns 9 big steamers for the Shanghai-Hankow stretch and 6 smaller ones for the Hankow-Wanhsien stretch. The Jardine, Matheson & Co. navigation concern has 5 for the Shanghai-Hankow route and 6 for the Hankow-Wanhsien route. The Japanese company has 2 big steamers and 4 small ones; the Chinese company 10 big steamers and numerous small ones. The Chinese steamers are principally for the passenger service and the Japanese and English chiefly for the freight service. The reason for this is to be sought in the fact that the Chinese merchants prefer to transport their goods in foreign ships, first of all, because it is more favourable in regard to customs rates and, secondly, because it is less dangerous in times of war. There was an interesting report in a Hankow newspaper in April of this year. It was here stated that there were 67 steamers plying on the Hankow-Wanhsien stretch, including 43 Chinese

ships, the whole fleet sailing under foreign flags, viz., English, French, American, Italian and Swedish. These flags were purchased from the respective consulates or merchants. If anything happens to a Chinese vessel flying such a flag, the respective consulate is entitled to claim damages. Not only the Chinese steamers but Chinese sailing ships, too, try to procure foreign protection as far as possible. The foreign merchants and consulates are by no means reluctant to entertain this lucrative business. For some time past, the Japanese have been busy building small steamers for the Chinese shipping trade. According to reports published by the newspapers, there were 96 Japanese steamers on the Yang-tse-kiang and its tributaries. It will be seen that the carrying trade on the Yang-tse is exploited chiefly for the benefit of the Imperialists.

The following railways operate in the Yang-tse district: Ningpo-Shanghai, Shanghai-Nanking, Pukou-Tientsin (all three under English control), Pekin-Hankow (French control), Kiukiang-Nanchang (Japanese control), Hankow-Canton, but so far running only between Hankow and Chuchow (English control). A railway line between Hankow and Szechuan has been planned, and the English, Americans, French and, previously, the Germans, secured privileges. The English contemplated constructing a railway from India, via Tibet, along the Yang-tse, passing through Hankow to Shanghai. The Japanese desire to extend the Kiukiang-Nanking line as far as Foochow. It will be noted that the railways are also controlled by the Imperialists.

The influence of the English prevails chiefly from Hankow to Shanghai. On the upper reaches of the Yang-tse a number of Imperialist powers compete, including Japan, England, America and also Germany. Up to the present the Japanese have had the advantage and their centre has been Hunan. The Americans are doing their best to get a footing in Chungking. In Hunan the Germans already have a certain amount of influence which they are trying to extend to Szechuan.

The Yang-tse district also possesses rich iron ore and coal deposits. The best known coalfields lie near Pingsiang on the Hunan-Kiangsi frontier (already occupied by the Canton army), the best known iron-ore deposits are in the neighbourhood of Tayeh in Hupe (also in the possession of the Canton Government). All these iron and coal mines belong to the Hanyeping concern, which is nominally Chinese though it is completely in the hands of the Japanese by virtue of loans and contracts. The works belonging to the concern are situated in Hanyang. Altogether, the enterprise employs 100,000 hands; it is the largest works in Asia.

The Valley of the Yang-tse is the most important industrial district of China; the most prominent industry is, the manufacture of textiles, mostly cotton spinning. In Shanghai alone there are 53 cotton mills and in Hankow there are 4; while Wuchi, Nantung and Changsha also count in this line. The silk industry centres chiefly in Shanghai, where there are 60 factories. The largest and most important textile mills are on the Lower Yang-tse in Kiangsu. Most of the mills are in the hands of Japanese; next come the Chinese and then the English. On the upper Yang-tse the factories are mostly Chinese. The metal industry predominates in Hanyang, Hankow and Shanghai. The china industry of Kingtehchen in the province of Kiangsi is of great significance.

Agriculture in the Valley of the Yang-tse is of special importance for the whole of China. Rice, tea, soya beans, vegetable oil and cotton are the chief products, though silkworm culture and cattle breeding are worthy of mention. Silk and tea from the Yang-tse district are imported into every country in the world. Most of the silk is exported from Shanghai, tea from Hankow, Kiukiang and Shanghai. In former times the whole population of China could be fed upon rice from the Yang-tse district. Owing to one-sided treaties, to customs under foreign control and to military rule in China, the Yang-tse district no longer supplies the whole of China with rice, and some is imported from Anam, Siam, Korea and the Philippines to the treaty ports. In 1919 rice to the value of 8,300,000 Haiquan Taels (1 H. T. is equal to a little over 3 shillings) was imported and in 1924 imports of rice represented 63,248,000 H. T. The reason why the Yang-tse Valley can no longer furnish its own requirement of food is partly that the peasants no longer plant rice, because the Imperialists, who manipulate the Chinese customs, import at lower rates into the treaty ports and consequently cause large quantities of rice to lie and rot in the interior of the country, and partly because the peasants are compelled by the military power to plant opium. It is owing to the

fact that the economic position of the Yang-tse district is being brought to ruin by these Imperialistic raids that the revolutionary movement is ripe.

The harbour of Hankow is, as stated above, more important than that of Shanghai, for it is not only an exporting centre but also a centre of distribution for the whole of the Yang-tse Valley. The revolutionary troops have already occupied this town, which means that the key to the economy of the Yang-tse district is in their hands.

THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

The British Strike and the Tasks of the International Trade Union Movement.

By M. Tomsky.

I.

Report at the Enlarged Plenary Session of the Moscow Trade Union Council.

According to all proletarian rules, I ought to have been making a speech in your name to-day or to-morrow at the British Trades Union Congress in Bournemouth, and the fact that I am not doing so is, as you very well know, due to circumstances beyond my control (laughter). In view of the fact that I am speaking here to a no less honourable audience (laughter, applause), I will take the liberty of saying to them, through the medium of this meeting of the Moscow Trade Union functionaries, some of what I intended to say in person to the British workers at the British Trades Union Congress.

In my opinion, it is impossible to-day to speak on any single question of the international Labour movement without touching, lightly at any rate, on the history of the British miners' strike and the general strike in May.

The Nature of the General Strike.

Last May the British mineowners literally drove the British miners into a corner and declared: — Either you will agree to worse working conditions and renounce all claim to a wages agreement on a national scale or we shall close the mines. Thus the affair actually began with a lock-out and not with a strike. It is of special importance to remember this at the present moment, as we find that the speeches of the British trade union leaders contain statements which put the matter in quite a different light.

As an answer to this lock-out the English trade unions resolved to support the miners in their fight by the proclamation of a general strike. In forming this resolution they took the view that the employers' attack on the miners was a signal for an attack on the economic achievements of the whole British working-class. These indisputable facts are, however, turned upside down by the leaders of the General Council. We hear from the lips of the President at Bournemouth that the strike was not a general strike but a "national" strike. The telegram, unfortunately, fails to explain what is the difference between a "national" and a general strike.

In what way is this strike distinguished from a general strike? Perhaps in that not everything, but only the whole of the transport and the most important branches of industry were brought to a standstill? The object of this was to keep those workers who could not help in the miners' fight at their work, and not to create superfluous ballast by drawing them into the strike. This is why the workers in the most important branches of industry, the whole of the transport workers, the dock workers, the workers in the metal industry, the electrical industry etc. were called upon to join in the strike. We however call that a general strike.

The strike began under unequal conditions. Whereas the English trade unions had talked a great deal about the approaching conflict in May, but had taken no steps to make suitable preparations for this conflict and to ensure the victory of the miners, the other side — the mineowners and with them the Conservative Government had, instead of indulging in

empty words and loud talk, been making zealous preparations for the fight which was imminent. In the very first days of the strike it became evident that it was not a case of a fight against the mineowners, but against the Conservative Government; for the miners were faced, not by an army of the mineowners, but by the army of the British Empire, fully armed, with steel helmets; for the police were mobilised against the fighting workers, the police who are not in the service of the mineowners but in the service of His Majesty's Conservative Government; the Courts, which worked by summary procedure during the strike, relentlessly sending the strikers to prison, were not the courts of the mineowners, but the Courts of His Majesty's Conservative Government. Neither were the military armoured-cars which paraded the streets of London during the strike, the property of the mineowners; they were mobilised by the Conservative Government which is in the majority in the Parliament which works on the basis of the so-called English democracy. The police batons which rained down on the heads of the strikers in the streets are also the property of His Majesty's Government.

Nevertheless the leaders of the British trade unions not only maintained at that time but continue to maintain that it was an economic strike.

Under the leadership of the General Council, the workers of the most important branches of industry, the main forces of the English working class rushed in serried ranks to the assistance of the miners. The capitalist class which is organised according to all the rules of "the democracy" and "the Constitution" on the other hand, came to the support of the mineowners. The bourgeoisie had control of the whole bourgeois Press, to counterbalance which the workers had, apart from two or three weekly journals, only the small "Daily Herald", the organ of the Labour Party, which is rather vacillating in its ideology and which, as a matter of fact, did not play a quite straight game during the strike. It is, of course, a matter of common knowledge that the Press plays a most important part in the period of preparation for a fight.

As the time for the fight approached, it became evident that the English trade unions were neither technically nor morally prepared for the strike, whereas the mineowners who had the Government in their hands, thus had control of a well-organised apparatus for strike-breaking, of the whole police, the army, the legislature and of a Constitution altered to suit the occasion. Should we therefore describe the fight as economic or political?

To whom could a general strike submit demands? To the mineowners? An economic strike consists in the workers, who are united in some organisation or other, saying to the employers or to a group of employers: Either you satisfy this or that demand or we shall down tools. That is an economic strike. A strike of this nature is at present being carried on in our country by the workers in the concession-holding concerns of the "Indo-European Telegraph Company". The trade union says: -- We will work under such and such conditions; other conditions are offered them and therefore the strike is on. When however the miners are fighting against the mineowners and are helped by the metal workers, the railwaymen, the workers in the electrical power works, the dock workers etc., and the whole life of the country is consequently paralysed -- for no government can govern nowadays unless it has control of the means of transport -- only those who know nothing of the Labour movement, nothing of the class war, can call such a strike an economic strike.

Leaders of a Fight, who Do not Want to Fight, who Do not Desire Victory.

During the strike we saw on the one side a capitalist class which thoroughly understood the significance of events, was technically prepared for the fight and had at its disposal an organisation which unfolded as if by magic; it had control of the Press, an automobile basis of its own, a distribution of products of its own etc., etc. On the other side were the trade unions who were not prepared either morally or technically, under the guidance of middle-headed leaders. These "leaders" daddled the whole time about the strike being a "purely economic" strike and about their having no intention of violating the foundations of the Constitution, without perceiving that, the moment the fight began, the capitalist Government had,

for the time being, thrown this same Constitution into the waste-paper basket.

The liberty of the subject is always suspended when the State is in danger -- every strike, be it understood, is a threat to the State from the point of view of the capitalists. This is the idea of the bourgeois constitution. When the right of assembly is granted, there is always a clause to the effect that meetings in barracks, in railway workshops etc. are prohibited, the right to interpret, to apply or not to apply the constitution being in the hands of the capitalist class. This is the meaning of the bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois constitution.

What, on the other hand, was the chief concern of the leaders of the British trade unions during the strike? Their chief concern was to assure the workers and the bourgeoisie that they did not wish to violate the Constitution, that they had no evil intentions, Heaven forefend, against Parliament, that they did not for a moment wish to introduce politics into the fight. They maintained that the fight was exclusively a "national", "industrial" strike, and they carried their "loyalty" so far that when the Russian workers offered them help, they declined that help so as not to make a bad impression on bourgeois public opinion. The bourgeois papers, they said, have always written a great deal about "Russian gold" and, if we now suddenly accept this help, there will again be a great outcry made about the "cursed Russian gold".

This fact indicates that the leaders of this strike limited it from the beginning within the bounds of national proletarian sources of help: that in doing so they cut themselves off from international proletarian support and did not wish to link their fight with the fight and with the solidarity of the workers of all countries. In this way they as good as said to their opponents: -- We have so much and no more, and when we come to the end of it we shall capitulate.

Where did Treachery Begin?

It was a matter of great concern to the trade union leaders as to how bourgeois public opinion would interpret the acceptance of help from abroad. Should a bad interpretation be put upon it, then they would refrain from accepting financial support for the whole duration of the strike. This is analogous to an army refusing to accept supplies of munitions and provisions during the fight. Was it ever to be imagined that bourgeois public opinion would be in favour of support for a strike? How could anyone count on winning over bourgeois public opinion to the side of the workers in face of an experienced, rich, class-conscious bourgeoisie such as is the English, with its colossal, venal yellow bourgeois Press apparatus? Public opinion, the attitude of mind of a hostile class must be reckoned with in so far as it makes it possible to take one's bearings in the fight. If however we steer our course according to public opinion, it amounts to nothing more nor less than the betrayal of the interests of our own class.

We saw how the whole bourgeois class with the whole apparatus of power of the bourgeois State, with all the solidarity and unanimity of which it is capable, gathered round the mineowners. We saw also that the miners, at the onset of the fight, seemed to receive the support of the General Council and of the other unions. We saw, it is true, how the battle-front of the workers deployed -- timidly and hesitatingly indeed -- how the concerns of vital importance, the power stations, railways etc. were brought to a standstill. We saw further how this general strike was led without enthusiasm and how shamefully it was ended at a time when there was in reality no sign that the British working class was likely to suffer a defeat. A large number of responsible comrades maintain that the statement, according to which the battle-front was demoralised on the eighth day of the strike by deserters and strike-breakers, is a wicked calumny on the millions of British workers who in this fight, showed unexampled courage, solidarity and enthusiasm.

Why was the general strike stopped? This is the first question to which the leaders of the strike will have to give an answer. After the mineowners had proclaimed the lock-out of the miners, the general strike was begun; it was shamefully called off on the ninth day. Did the ninth day then bring any change for the better in this conflict? No! Sir Herbert Samuel promised

Mr. Pugh something very important, then declared that he had not done so or that if he had, he had had no authority to do it, — and on the basis of this parleying the greatest strike in the world came to an inglorious end. Where can we find an objective factor which would have justified the supposition that the general strike or, as they chose to call it, the "national" strike was condemned to failure or that the cause of the miners had been advanced by a hair's breadth? Why did they stop the strike? Had the position of the miners improved after the first nine days of the strike? No, the position has not even improved now after four and a half months of heroic fighting. Why was the general strike nevertheless called off, why was the duty of supporting the miners not carried out to the end?

Why are the miners now alone in their fight, and how can they be helped? This is the second vital question which the whole British working class and its Congress should deal with in the first place. Yes indeed! the miners, left to their fate in this shameful way, have for more than four months, been carrying on their heroic fight under conditions of terrible distress and privations.

We ought not mechanically to compare the English worker with our Russian worker. His habitual standard of comfort and culture is much higher than that of our worker. Up to the present time, the English worker has been the best paid worker. In view of this standard of living, it means enduring enormous suffering to remain on strike for four months with an average weekly allowance of 18 pence.

Before the outbreak of the conflict in the coal industry, the leaders of the British trade unions declared that they were quite aware that the attack on the miners was a prelude to an attack on the whole working-class of England, an offensive against all the economic achievements of the English working-class, that the reduction of the standard of living of the miners was the beginning of a struggle for the reduction of the standard of living of all English workers.

We prophesied this and when, on your instructions, I spoke at the Hull Congress, I told the English workers that the Dawes plan, it is true, hit the German worker in the first place, but that after a time it would hit the English worker too, since it was a stick with two ends. The reduction of the standard of living of the German worker will be followed by an attack on the standard of living of the English worker. At that time my words were regarded as political agitation, but they have since been completely confirmed by the course of events. The attack on the miners is an attack on the whole English working class. The miners are only the first on whom the blow has fallen; they are however in reality carrying on a fight against the reduction of the standard of living of the whole English working-class.

Do the leaders of the British trade unions now grasp this fact or do they not? If they do grasp it, how can they, from the point of view of the interests of the working class, from the point of view of the immediate tasks of the class war, let the miners fight alone, suffer strike-breaking coal to be imported, allow this coal to be transported by British railways and unloaded in British ports?

The General Council states, as it did at the Berlin session of the Anglo-Russian Committee, that it could not call upon the workers to join in the fight, to give more active support immediately as, in consequence of the strike, in consequence of the want of coal, in consequence of the crisis which was developing, 50% of the English workers were either entirely out of work or on short time. This argument is only to the discredit of the leaders of the British trade unions. They can of course say to the broad masses of workers in a demagogic way: "See, the miners are continuing to strike, they will not submit to the General Council, with the result that English industry has no fuel, that the works are brought to a standstill and that the workers in other branches of industry are thus placed in a difficult situation. The miners, in pursuing their own economic interests, are placing hundreds of thousands of English workers in a precarious situation." Such speeches can be heard in England to-day. There is however not a shred of truth in them. They are an impudent misrepresentation of the actual state of affairs, as the situation is, in reality, exactly the reverse.

If there is to be a fight, let it be a relentless fight.

British trade unionism was faced by the problem that it must either parry the first attack of capital on the miners in the way demanded by circumstances, and declare war right along the whole line, or it must, without fighting, shamefully accept

worse conditions for the workers and relinquish all that they had achieved hitherto. "If there is to be a fight, let it be a relentless fight" — this is what the workers said in their resolution at Hull; and this is, indeed, a proletarian point of view. A fight without being afraid of coming up against the Constitution, Parliament etc.! Nay, indeed, these, perhaps, are the very institutions at which it would have been necessary to strike the first blow. (Applause.)

In connection with the miners' struggle, it would have been the duty of the General Council to accept the class battle along the whole front, to repulse the first general frontal attack of capital and to lead the British working class to victory, possibly at the cost of great suffering and great privations. This is what was demanded by the interests of the whole of the British working class. Do they imagine that we carried through the October Revolution without sufferings, privation and sacrifice? Have the most important economic achievements of the workers been accomplished anywhere without suffering, without fighting, without privation? Even though the general strike had lasted for weeks, the question of the relation of forces between Labour and capital would undoubtedly have been solved in favour of the workers, and that would have saved the English workers from future suffering and privation.

One of the arguments of the British trade union leaders with which they tried to justify the calling off of the general strike, was that they wished to prevent hundreds of thousands of workers being exposed to suffering and privation. But has this wish been fulfilled? No, for the suffering and privation are only now beginning, and the British working class, in a weakened position, will have to face a succession of attacks on the part of capital if the miners' struggle ends with a defeat.

The Conservatives have given the English workers a splendid lesson on the nature of the "Constitution" and the nature of "Democracy". At the height of the battle between the mine-owners and the miners, which was waged round the question of the hours of work, collective agreements and reduction of wages, the government passed an act putting an end to the seven hours' shift. That is the nature of the "Constitution". Then the trade union leaders come along and say: "We do not wish for a political fight, we are opposed to political fights, the present strike is merely an economic conflict."

The class struggle is a political struggle and also at the same time an economic struggle. We told the English trade union leaders in our report at the Anglo-Russian Committee — at that time they found no fault with our point of view — that only a fool would imagine that there could be an economic attack of capital unaccompanied by a political offensive, would imagine that the ruling class would make an economic attack without supporting it politically. Such an event is impossible. We know from our own experience that when we made an economic attack on the bourgeoisie, took the factories from them and deprived the landowners of the land, we at the same time sent out Red Army troops, defeated those who were recalcitrant and issued stern decrees. For had we attempted to observe political passivity, we should not have succeeded in taking from them either the land or the factories. Was this an economic or a political fight? Let anybody who will imagine matters as though it had been merely an economic fight, as though we had taken away the factories and the land without an interference of politics!

The fight which is being carried on by the miners, bravely, in isolation, deserted, by all other groups of the English working class, is a fight which will decide the question as to who will be crushed. Will capital crush the miners, will it force first of all the most intrepid and resolute fighters, and after them the whole British labour movement on to their knees and dictate always and everywhere to the workers at their pleasure, or will the miners, supported by the working class, repulse the offensive all along the line?

A final victorious fight against capital and against its offensive is, of course, impossible in England under the rule of the Conservative government. It is absolutely impossible under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie to put once and for all a victorious end to the attack of capital on the achievements of the workers. The first problem which faces the English workers as we Russians see the question, is the problem of power, the question of the replacement of the bourgeois government by such a labour government as would really guarantee the na-

tionalisation of the mines, and would not carry on a policy of empty words as did MacDonalld when he was in power and as the Trades Union Congress is doing now in the person of the trade union leaders. MacDonalld, when in office, said that he had no objections on principle to the nationalisation of the mines, but that the decision of this question must be postponed for a year or two, i. e. until he would no longer be in the government. The question of the miners in its present form, which raises before the eyes of the English working class the question of power in a concrete form, should be the main question, the centre of interest at the Trades Union Congress.

The International Significance of the Fight of the English Miners.

"Cain, where is thy brother Abel? — General Council, what hast thou so far done for the support of the miners, why are they isolated and in what way dost thou propose to the English workers to help them?" This is what the Congress should ask the leaders of the General Council. We look in vain however for a single one of these questions on the agenda of the Congress. The questions on the agenda concern the industrial unions, the extension of the powers of the General Council, the question of support for the unemployed and so on. There are among them questions which were always important and always will be important — which were important two years ago and will still be important in five years, which are of equal importance in England, in Germany, and in our own country. These questions might just as well be discussed at a Trade Union Conference in the Argentine. But we look in vain down the agenda of this Congress for a report on the miners' strike and on the question as to how the miners should be supported who are fighting on an enormous front and in the interests of the whole working class, in the interests not only of the English working class but of that of the whole world.

Anyone who represents the English strike as a purely national question, which has no connection with the whole international fight of the working class and with the present tendencies of capital as a whole, merely shows that he understands nothing and sees nothing of what is going on outside England, or, to put it more correctly, outside his own trade union office. In such circumstances all the talk of our international tasks and international activities is not worth a farthing. Have we not, from the very first day of our meeting with the representatives of the British Trade Unions, emphasised over and over again that the offensive of capital is an international phenomenon, arising out of the whole economic situation of the present post-war period, out of the new phase of development of the new capitalism? Is it not clear to every thinking person that the offensive of capital against the working class and against its achievements is nothing more nor less than an attempt to solve the question: at whose costs shall the productive forces destroyed by the war be restored, at the cost of the bourgeoisie or at the cost of the workers? The bourgeoisie wants to place the whole burden of the cost of this reconstruction on the workers' shoulders. This is the whole point of the bourgeois attitude to the question of nationalisation, of the intensification of work, of the cheapening of production by lengthening the hours of work, reducing wages and "adapting wages to the national index". Wherever we look we see the same phenomena: in Germany, in France and in England — in one country more pronounced, in another in a slightly veiled form. In its first stages this phenomenon seemed scarcely to touch England. Today, however, it finds expression precisely in the country of classic capitalism — England, in the most pronounced and classically consistent form. Anyone who does not realise that this is an international movement, that when the working class in any country is fighting in opposition to the enemy class this fight must be supported by the whole International Labour Movement, that such an attack of capital can only be repulsed with the help of millions and tens of millions of workers in other countries—anyone who does not understand this is either out of his senses and is afraid to look. Truth straight in the face or, out of cowardice, is clinging to the coat-tails of the bourgeoisie. Let each choose the explanation which suits him best.

The question of the standard of living of the English workers is closely connected with the low standard of living of the German working class.

In the world market English capitalists compete with German and American coal, and the question of their capability of competing forces them to exert pressure on the standard of living of their workers, because German coal is cheaper in consequence of the low wages and longer hours of work of the German workers. Is this not an international question? Just because this question is of a pronouncedly international character, just because the solution of this question is of importance for the whole International Labour Movement, just because the fight against the offensive of capital depends upon it, because an important question of the fight between Labour and capital of the fight against the offensive of capital is being decided on this sector of the proletarian front, just for this reason we, the trade unions of the Soviet Union, could not ignore the question of the English strike — we had to "interfere" in this fight.

In What Did Our Famous "Interference" in English Affairs Consist?

I now come to the question of the way in which British trade unionism characterises our "interference in English affairs". They are extremely indignant. This indignation is loudly echoed in the British bourgeois Press which is besides itself with astonishment that the Russians presume to interfere in English affairs. This catch-word has been taken up by the whole Reformist Press of Western Europe. I will describe in a few words wherein this cursed "interference" in English affairs consists.

We could not, of course, regard the English general strike as a purely "national" phenomenon, as a "national" strike. We realised the deep international significance of the fight which has developed in England and regarded it as our duty to "interfere" in English affairs. This "interference" found expression mainly in that, immediately after the outbreak of the strike, we called upon our more than 8000 transport workers who were engaged in loading naphtha for England to join in a solidarity strike, to which they readily assented. They kept up the strike not only during the general strike but even after the general strike had been called off, when the English seamen and railwaymen were already transporting coal.

This was the first fact of our "interference" in the fight of the English workers against the English capitalists. The second fact of the interference was that we called upon all our trade union members to dedicate a quarter of their daily wages to the support of the striking miners; and from these sums we sent a few million roubles for the support of the strike. The leaders of the General Council regarded this as an "interference" in their internal affairs and declined the support. The strike suffered a shameful defeat — there is no other word to describe it.

How did the strike begin? It began with an appeal from the General Council to the workers: "At such and such an hour lay down your tools!" The workers laid down their tools and the strike began. The breaking off of the strike followed on another appeal: "At such and such an hour resume work!" The workers took up their tools and asked: "Under what conditions?" The answer was: "That is your own affair." The industrialists immediately began to dictate conditions to the workers, under which they were prepared to reinstate them. Can this be called a proper ending to the strike? It can only be called desertion on the part of the leaders, cowardice, abandoning the workers, who had been called upon to fight, to their fate, and treacherous isolation of the miners in their fight.

Let any moderately honest Reformist trade unionist answer the question: What is the duty of a strike leader? The duty of every strike leader is to carry on to the end a strike which has been begun and to conclude it in an organised manner. If you lead the workers into a strike, you must be prepared to say under what conditions the workers are to resume work. The leaders of the General Council, however, led the British workers into the fight and then said to them: "Now resume work, the conditions under which you do so are your own affair. We have led you hitherto, you may now do as you like." Could we pass over such facts in silence? Could we refrain from telling all Russian and English workers and all workers in general what we think about it? We could not refrain from doing so, and this was a further act of "interference" on our part.

In our declaration, which was passed by the plenum of the A. U. C. T. U., we gave a right estimate of the whole strike and of the attitude of the leaders during the strike. Could we have proceeded in any other way? No, that would have been impossible. When we saw that a question of the greatest international significance was being decided, when it became clear to us that in the fight which was proceeding between labour and capital, the interests of the workers were being scandalously betrayed, that the leaders were not doing their duty, not fulfilling the tasks they had undertaken, we considered ourselves in honour bound to say openly what we thought about it.

What is Our Conception of a Fraternal Alliance?

We hear from the General Council protests such as the following: "How is it possible that you, who are united with us in a fraternal alliance, who are working with us at the Anglo-Russian Committee, suddenly begin to insult us in the most abusive and unjustifiable terms?"

In our opinion it is not the terms which are used between labour organisations which are of importance, but their spirit. We do not consider that our connection with the English workers should consist in Purcell shaking hands with Tomsky or in their being photographed together. Is the fraternal alliance between the workers of the Soviet Union and of England, which is personified in the Anglo-Russian Committee, an alliance of leaders? A block between Purcell and Tomsky would not be worth a farthing. The essence of the question lies in the brotherly proletarian alliance between the English and Russian workers. We, in the innocence of our souls, imagine that a brotherly alliance means that if anyone hits you, I help you, and the reverse.

In our opinion a fraternal alliance is really an alliance of brothers; if it comes to fighting, we ought to fight together. If one is attacked, the other should help him. If you fight badly, we shall say: You are fighting badly, pull yourself together. We have a right to say this, as we intend to share your victory or your defeat. That is a fraternal alliance. It is just because this is our conception of fraternal alliance that we considered and still consider it our duty and believe that we have the right to help the English workers in their fight. At the same time, however, we consider that we are entitled to criticise the mistakes of their leaders, whilst giving them every right to criticise us without choosing their terms.

At the end of this year our 7th Trade Union Congress takes place, and we have invited representatives of the British trade union movement to attend it. We give them full liberty to criticise us. Criticise as much as you like, singly or in chorus, in whatever terms you choose (applause). We fear no criticism, as we report on every step we take at conferences, at large meetings of workers, answering for every step taken to the mass of workers called together by ourselves. We are prepared in advance to put any question they wish on the agenda of our Congress. If they propose a different agenda from that we have prepared, we will accept their proposals. We do not let anything pass unnoticed, but in their country, for some reason or other, two such "insignificant questions" as the question of the general strike and that of the support of the miners are left out of the agenda.

They regarded our declaration, which was indeed expressed in strong terms and in which the activity of the leaders of the general strike was criticised, as an interference in their internal affairs. This is a mistake for, from this point of view it would follow that a fraternal alliance means that if one of the leaders makes a mistake, if one of the leaders betrays the interests of the workers, the other must hold his tongue out of consideration for the fraternal alliance. This is evidently their idea of a brotherly alliance. We have no use for such an alliance, we will not accept an alliance of this kind.

We cannot renounce the right to exercise criticism, we cannot renounce the right to tell the workers the truth and we never shall renounce it. I will not now speak of the situation of the miners; I have spoken of it many times already; every proletarian thoroughly understands the difficulties of the miners' position. I will now pass on to a description of the relations between ourselves and the General Council since the general strike was called off.

(To be continued.)

Economic Consequences of the British Miners' Struggle.

By I. Taigin.

The struggle of the British Miners' has now been proceeding for nearly five months. A social conflict of such gigantic proportions is bound to have considerable effects upon the economic position of the country. We will give some of the most important facts and figures which go to prove this.

In the first place let us take coal. The average monthly output of coal in the year 1925 amounted to 20,700,000 tons. In the first four months of 1926 there were produced: in January 29,900,000, in February 21,700,000, in March 24,200,000 and in April 21,900,000 tons.

Since May work in the mines has been at a standstill. Thus, according to the most modest estimates, Great Britain has lost during the period of the struggle 85 to 90 million tons of coal, or more than a third of the annual production.

The coal crisis has had a devastating effect upon the production of metals. In 1925 the average monthly production of raw iron amounted to 525,000 tons, that of steel to 626,000 tons. In the year 1926 we have the following figures:

	Raw Iron (in thousand tons)	Steel
January	542	651
February	510	715
March	578	797
April	548	671
May	90	46
June	42	33
July	18	32

In other words, since the commencement of the struggle in May, production has begun to fall disastrously. Between April and July the production of raw iron has fallen to one thirtieth and that of steel to a twenty first part. As a matter of fact there is no smelting industry being carried on at present in England. Almost all the blast furnaces have been closed down.

The enormous decline in heavy industry has had a tremendous influence upon British foreign trade. In the first four months of the year 1926 the foreign trade figures were as follows:

	Imports (in million pounds sterling)	Exports
January	106	60
February	84	63
March	95	66
April	91	53
	376	242

Thus the average monthly foreign trade figures in the first third of the year 1926 amounted to 94 million pounds sterling imports, and 60 million pounds sterling exports. In the four months following, however, we get the following picture:

	Imports (in million pounds sterling)	Exports
May	74	46
June	87	50
July	91	57
August	101	50
	353	203

Thus the average monthly foreign trade figures in the period from May to August 1926 amounted to 88 million Pounds imports and 51 million Pounds exports. This signifies a decline in imports of 6% and in exports of 15% in comparison with the first months of the current year.

It is still more instructive to compare the foreign trade figures of Great Britain in the first eight months of the year 1925 with those of 1926:

	Import (in millions)	Exports Pounds Sterling	Total turnover of foreign trade
1925	766	518	1284
1926	729	445	1174
In 1926 a decline of	37	73	110

Thus we see that the total turnover of foreign trade has fallen by 110 million pounds sterling, or 8.5%. At the same time the amount of the imports has only fallen by 37 million pounds sterling or 5%, the amount of exports however, by 73 million pounds sterling or 14%. It is therefore clear that the unfavourable trade balance (and therefore also the payment balance) of the country has again increased considerably. In 1925 Great Britain drew a payment balance showing a very slight sum in her favour, as to the reality of which however one could easily doubt. How will it be, however in this year?

A similar phenomenon is also to be seen in regard to the railways. As the cessation of work in the mines naturally brings with it a great falling off in the transport of coal, the income of the railway companies experienced a sharp fall. In July 1926 the income of the railways was 30% less than in July 1925. Events have led to a considerable worsening of the financial position of the railways. According to the figures of the "Economist" of August 7th, the Great Western Railway paid its shareholders only 3% dividend as against 5.5% in the previous year. The London Midland and Scottish Railway likewise paid 3% instead of 5%. The London and North Eastern Railway paid no dividend at all, although last year it paid 5%. The same thing is to be seen in regard to a whole number of other railways. The shares of the railway companies have also greatly fallen as a result of the strike. Thus, for example, the shares of the Great Western Railway stood on August 6th at 85 $\frac{1}{4}$ as compared with 111 $\frac{1}{4}$ in 1925, those of the London and North Eastern Railway at 50 as compared with 83 $\frac{3}{4}$ in the previous year, those of the London, Midland and Scottish Railway at 71 as compared with 102, those of the Metropolitan at 63.5 as compared with 83 etc.

It is a matter of course that with such a decline in British economy unemployment was bound to increase. Previous to May the total number of the unemployed in the country amounted to somewhere about one million. At the end of August, after the miners had been locked out for 16 weeks, the number of the unemployed amounted to 1,581,000, that is about 600,000 more, of course excluding the miners. In addition to those officially registered as unemployed there was also an enormous number of short-time workers. Exact figures are lacking regarding the number of short time workers, but the following figures will enable us to gain some idea of their number. The number of short-time workers in the cotton industry in July 1926 was 34% higher than in July 1925. In the wool industry the increase in the short-time workers amounted to 105%, in the leather industry 63% etc.

It is in the light of the above figures that the prospects of the further struggle of the miners must be estimated. If the miners are able to hold out for some time longer the prospects of their victory will greatly increase. For it is precisely now that Great Britain is beginning to feel to the full extent the serious consequences of the conflict in the mining industry.

The stocks of coal available at the beginning of the struggle are now exhausted. The import of coal from abroad, even in August, did not exceed a million tons a week, while the normal consumption of coal in the country is 3.5 million tons a week. This figure, however, is only the average for the year; in Summer it is considerably below the average, in Winter considerably above. The Winter is now setting in. The consumption of coal is bound greatly to increase, particularly for the purpose of heating and lighting of dwellings. An increase in the export of foreign coal however, even only to 3 or 4 million tons a week, is hardly possible, having regard to the present conditions of the world coal market. And even if such a quantity of coal should be obtainable its import would place such a heavy burden upon the payment balance of the country that the mineowners would not be able to maintain their obstinate attitude for long. It must not be forgotten that the British payment balance this year threatens to show for the first time a considerable deficit. That is something at which the English bourgeoisie can hardly afford to laugh.

The Sabotage of Relief for the British Miners in Italy.

By Giovanni Germanetto (Milan).

The reformists in control of the Confederazione Generale del Lavoro (C. G. d. L.), supported by the Maximalists, have, in regard to the struggle of the English miners, furnished in the international sphere a fresh proof of their spirit of hostility to the class struggle. Since the beginning of the struggle of the British miners, the Communists, at all trade union conferences, as in Rome, Turin, Trieste, Genoa, Savona, Novara, Biella and other places, in the press, at the local trade union meetings, etc., had continually and repeatedly urged the necessity of supporting, not only morally but also materially, the British miners who are engaged in a severe struggle for the interests of the whole proletariat.

The reformists of the C. G. d. L. did not accept these proposals but maintained that the Italian proletariat, which is suffering from persecution by the reaction, cannot do anything for the British miners, and that instead of supporting the latter it must support the Italian workers who are engaged in a fight in Molinella.

The spirit of self-sacrifice of the workers of Molinella who are resisting the acts of violence of the fascists, is indeed worthy of support. The leaders of the C. G. d. L., however, are using this as a pretext. It must be pointed out that the workers of Molinella received immediate support from abroad as well as from at home: the trade unions of the Soviet Union recently sent them 15,000 Lire. In addition to this the German workers also contributed their share, but this was refused, it is true, not by the workers of Molinella, but by their reformist leaders. And if the relief given has not been greater, it is the fault of the leaders of the C. G. d. L. who never gave clear slogans to the masses and wished themselves to take credit for the heroism of the workers of Molinella.

In Molinella we have a case of workers who are reformists by tradition but nevertheless are fighting, whilst the leaders make political capital out of their heroism. In addition to this the workers of Molinella have repeatedly proved their internationalism in past struggles.

At the Conference of the C. G. d. L. of 16th July the communist representatives proposed that the British miners should be given not only moral but also material support. The C. G. d. L. by a declaration of its General Secretary, Buozzi, pledged itself to do so. The reformists afterwards declared however, that the Conference did not possess the right to make binding decisions. Because the communist representatives voted for the resolution in favour of moral support for the British miners, the reformists, together with the Maximalists, have attempted, in a demagogic manner, to represent the matter as if the Communists opposed material support.

The reformists had intended to drop all action for material support, when, on the 9th of August instructions from the I. F. T. U. arrived calling for organisation of collections. But even the instructions of the Amsterdam Trade Union International, to which the C. G. d. L. is affiliated, could not induce the reformist leaders to make a move.

On the 20th of August, therefore, the secretary of the Woodworkers Union, which is led by the Communists, wrote to the Executive of the C. G. de L., energetically protesting against the sabotage and informing them that if the C. G. de L. did not issue immediate instructions, the Woodworkers Union would on their own account arrange for collections, for which they could neither be charged with being over-hasty nor breaking discipline.

The Executive of the C. G. de L. finally decided to summon the secretaries of the various trade unions to a conference on the 30th of August, on the agenda of which there stood the struggle of the British Miners and the position in Molinella.

The General Secretary Buozzi, explained that the Conference had been called as a result of the "urgings of the Communists and the instructions of Amsterdam", and also in view of the necessity of affording relief to the workers of Molinella. He protested against the criticisms of the Communists regarding the extortionate loan granted by Amsterdam to the British miners, and proposed that 25,000 Lire should be

remitted to the British miners, the sum to be taken from the funds of the various Unions without holding collections.

The Communists proposed that instead of this a wide collection campaign be carried out among the workers, and declared themselves ready to cease for a time the collections for the Red Aid and for the Workers' Delegations to the Soviet Union, and also, for a period of twenty to thirty days, to hand over a portion of the collections for the Communist daily paper, "L'Unità". After the expiration of this period the collections for the workers of Molinella should be resumed.

A number of Maximalists and reformists claimed to be out and out internationalists, but emphatically opposed collections for the British miners.

In view of this attitude of the C. G. de L. the Communist Party publicly appealed to the Socialist Party (Maximalists) and to the Socialist Labour Party (Reformists) with the proposal to start collections, which the leaders of the C. G. de L., against all international discipline and against the demands of class solidarity, had refused to do.

The Maximalists declared the proposal of the Communists to be a "miserable game" and refused to take part in the action. At the same time they pointed out in their letter in reply that they had already instructed their local groups to start collections. When one compares the attitude of the Maximalists at the Conference of the C. G. de L., at which they declared themselves to be against collections, with this declaration, then one has a clear idea of the discipline which obtains among them.

The reformists raised a great outcry regarding manoeuvres, and at the same time rejected the proposal of the Communists for common action on behalf of the miners.

In spite of the serious economic situation, the Italian workers are actively taking part in the collections and are endeavouring by every means to help the British miners in their struggle, while the social democratic leaders are guilty of sabotage.

Appeal of the Centrosoyus for International Co-operative Relief for the British Miners.

The Daily newspaper "Cooperativnaya Shishn", in its issue of September 12, published a letter which the Centrosoyus has addressed to the International Co-operative Alliance and in which it stigmatises in the sharpest manner the neglect hitherto to organise international co-operative relief for the locked-out English miners. The Centrosoyus points out that on the 25th of May, by telegraph, and on the 1st of May at the Executive Sitting in Antwerp, it brought forward proposals to this effect, which however were rejected on account of "political neutrality". The Centrosoyus, at the meeting of the Central Committee to be held on the 12th of October in Hamburg, will again bring forward such a proposal, but states:

"It would be a crime to postpone the relief from the co-operative International for a further six weeks, as the need of the English miners has become exceedingly great and it is the elementary duty of co-operative solidarity to organise immediately a far-reaching relief campaign of the co-operators of all countries".

This campaign must prove that the co-operative movement stands wholly on the side of the working class in difficult times.

The letter of the Centrosoyus puts forward the concrete proposal that the co-operative Alliance immediately organise a campaign in support of the miners, and calls upon the co-operative organisations and the members of co-operative societies in all countries to arrange contributions and collections for the English miners.

"The moral and material relief from the co-operators of all countries will, along with the relief already given by the English co-operators, play an important part in strengthening the position of the English miners and in preventing their defeat."

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Twenty Five Years of the International Trade Union Movement.

By Fritz Heckert (Berlin).

The International Federation of Trade Unions is now "celebrating" the 25th anniversary of its foundation. This "celebration" is being marked by the Amsterdam leaders with a general recruiting week for those trade unions in all countries which are affiliated to the International Federation of Trade Unions. Mr. Johann Sassenbach, the German secretary in Amsterdam, as "the most suited" is contributing for the above occasion a commemoration article under the above title. It is necessary that we should examine both a little more closely: the international recruiting campaign and Sassenbach's article; the two are most characteristic of Amsterdam.

The position in which the proletariat at present finds itself is as deplorable as it could well be. The workers are still in retreat before the attacks of the employers and their Governments. The ruthlessness of the offensive against the workers is illustrated by Mussolini's destruction of the free trade unions in Italy, the English mining strike, the daily increasing oppression of the German workers by the heads of the trusts in the "rationalisation crisis", etc. Under such circumstances, it should be the duty of every honest workers executive to point out these conditions to the workers and suggest methods whereby the proletariat might escape from this situation or remove the oppression. Above all, it is unthinkable that the I. F. T. U. can evade answering these questions on the 25th anniversary of its foundation. This, however, is the case. The Amsterdam leaders have not made the slightest reference to these questions, let alone answered them.

If Amsterdam were to issue a description of the actual state of the proletariat, the workers would of necessity put a number of painful questions. For instance: "What has been done in the way of active support for the English miners?" "Why does Amsterdam demand 4 1/2% interest on the money lent to the locked out miners?" "What has been done to protect the trade union movement against Fascism?" "What is Jouhaux in France doing to prevent the crushing of the Riff tribes and the Druses?" "What measures are being taken against Pilsudski's policy of adventure and against the reign of terror in Roumania?" "How can the eight-hour day be recovered?" "What efforts are being made in regard to unemployment and for the victims of rationalisation?" "How is it proposed to fight successfully against the powerful trusts and against the State power as directed by the trusts and the bank magnates?" A hundred more such questions could easily be found. It is, therefore, clear that Amsterdam could have no desire to provoke such pertinent inquiries. Furthermore, as a measure of precaution, instructions have been given to hold "no recruiting meetings in localities where there is danger of disturbances made by Communists". The I. F. T. U. cannot even plead that a positive handling of such problems lies beyond the scope of the tasks with which it has to deal, for during the 25 years of the existence of the International Trade Union Movement Amsterdam has passed many solemn resolutions in which it has pledged itself to combat with all forces the evils of oppression, war and exploitation. Amsterdam's guilt cannot, therefore, be due to ignorance of the true position of the working class, but rather in the fact that it simply does nothing at all to conduct an energetic campaign against these things. The reason for this state of affairs is also very plain. Whoever commits himself to advocate class collaboration, to such an extent as the heads of the Amsterdam Unions have, can never again draw back and engage in the class struggle.

This is the fundamental reason for the importance of the I. F. T. U. In 1920 it was an imposing organisation with a membership of 28,000,000 — "the most important power on earth", as it was proudly called. To-day there are only twelve to thirteen million workers, employees and officials organised under Amsterdam. Every country has contributed to this retrogression. In Germany the membership of the three leading

trade-union organisations, sank from 10,000,000 to scarcely 5,000,000. The masses deserted, disillusioned by the negative results of the reformist policy. During the periods in which, under pressure from the masses the idea of class war prevails, the influence and membership of the unions increase; but, on the other hand, when the class-collaboration tendency of the reformist leaders is in the ascendant, membership dwindles and the power of the trade unions declines with appalling significance.

The trade-union movement needs a guiding principle to keep it alive. At the German Trade Union Congress in Breslau, one of the most prominent Amsterdam idea-seekers, the president of the Wood Workers Union, **Tarnow**, stated that the guiding principle of the Trade Union Movement was to be found in the effort towards "economic democracy". Permanent class co-operation is, therefore, to be a substitute for the ideology of the class war.

Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that the jubilee week of the I. F. T. U. was a dull and lifeless affair. The hard lot of the toiling masses and their daily experience is such a striking contrast to all the class-co-operation balderdash and reformist promises, that the policy, or lack of policy, would not suffice to interest a Sunday-school class and will certainly never attract big masses to the idea of trade unionism. Amsterdam's lack of ideas was most plainly manifested in the demonstration of the Berlin trade unions on September 19th. The appointed leaders specified that the demonstration should not be a demonstration of all workers, including those not belonging to organisations. The slogans of the demonstration were subjected to censorship. Class slogans were forbidden. The biggest German trade union, the German Metal Workers' Union, had not a single placard summoning men to join the union. On the other hand, one could read such slogans as: "The Metal Workers' Union pays its members removal allowances" or "The Metal Workers' Union delivers gratis to its members the Metal Workers' Journal". Not one placard of the reformists mentioned class warfare, trade union unity, international solidarity; all the placards calling for support for the English miners, for the strengthening of the trade unions and for the formation of a united front were brought into the procession by the Communists and against the opposition of Amsterdam.

Such was the miserable figure that Amsterdam presented in the 25th year of its existence, and equally miserable is the content of the brochure "Twenty-five Years of the International Trade Union Movement", which Sassenbach has written on behalf of the I. F. T. U. There is not a solitary great thought in all the 143 pages of the brochure. An uninteresting conglomeration of information, most of it irrelevant, concerning the various Amsterdam congresses. That is all that Sassenbach has to say about the history of the Trade Union International. Nobody could gain from the book any knowledge of the struggle of the masses or of any real international co-operation. It is not mentioned that in the Workers Association (I. International), founded by **Karl Marx**, there existed an international federation of the trade union organisations based on the class struggle. In short, the book does not deal with the present-day questions which the trade-union movement must face, it does not enlighten in regard to the movement in the individual countries, it does not explain the causes of the differences and conflicts which developed in the national and international trade union movement and prevented co-operation of the various tendencies. For example, of the vitally important discussions of the I. F. T. U. and the Russian trade unions, all we learn from the Sassenbach treatise is the following:

"The Russian question was continually in the foreground at the Vienna Congress. The resolution of the Vienna Congress recommending the Executive to continue its endeavours, as far as possible without lowering the dignity of the International Federation of Trade Unions, to bring the Russian trade unions into the International Trade Union Movement on the basis of the statutes and regulations of the International Federation of Trade Unions led to negotiations which up to the present have brought no positive results."

The indifferent character of Sassenbach's treatise appears most clearly from the criticism in the Social-Democratic "Vorwärts":

"The treatise, is really less a history of the International Trade Union Movement than a kind of minute-book of the most important proceedings of the Trade Union International covering the last twenty-five years... We should have preferred that Sassenbach had... written for us a real history of the international trade union movement for the use and benefit of all trade unionists... We should also have liked Sassenbach to tell us more about the first attempts to bring the trade unions of the various countries closer together..."

This collection of gems from the review of the "Vorwärts" relieves us of the task of criticising Sassenbach's book more minutely. We might, however, still mention that the book contains a picture of **Karl Legien**, the former president of Amsterdam and of the German trade unions, of whom **Herr Silverberg**, the chief speaker of the German heavy industries at the industrial session, reports:

"It must be admitted without reserve that the trade unions, inasmuch as they have at their disposal an old corps of trade union trained and disciplined members and reliable leaders, — in this connection I would mention the name of **Legien**, to his and to our honour — have won great merit by earnestly co-operating in leading the revolutionary movement from the workers' and soldiers' councils back to an orderly State administration."

It is superfluous to state that this praise from the trust magnate **Silverberg** and his offer of further co-operation was received by **Leipart**, the present chief president of the General German Trade Union Federation and third president of the International Trade Union Federation, with the declaration:

"I am betraying no secret in stating that the majority of the trade union leaders are in favour of a coalition with the bourgeois parties."

Uttered during the Jubilee Week of the 25th anniversary of the foundation of the International Federation of Trade Unions.

In the meanwhile, **Johann Sassenbach** must witness as the first result of his famous jubilee treatise the fact that on account of its uselessness, it has been withdrawn from circulation by the I. F. T. U. and handed over to the paper factory to be reduced to pulp. If this is a sign of things to come for the present leadership of the I. F. T. U., then the workers organised in trade unions throughout the world may congratulate themselves on the prospects, for only after the fall of such leaders will the international trade union movement be able to resume the class struggle. It is our task to hasten this process.

The Labour Movement in Turkey.

By **B. Ferdi**.

Historical.

The first attempt to create in Turkey a professional organisation on the lines with which we are at present familiar dates back to the year 1803, when a group of workmen in the State Cannon Factory founded the "Mutual Aid Society of the Ottoman Mechanics".

Such attempts were never long-lived, for **Sultan Abdul Hamid**, in his fear of organisations in general, had them systematically dissolved, while their founders and leaders were exiled. When the old regime collapsed in 1908, there existed half a dozen industrial centres with from 60,000 to 80,000 workers of various categories, without counting the manual workers and the season workers. The severity of the despotic rule had prevented the toilers from creating the semblance of an organisation. Nevertheless, under the pressure of economic conditions, a certain class-consciousness without distinctive tendency had arisen.

Immediately after the proclamation of the constitution in 1908, when the whole of the Turkish public was with the greatest enthusiasm forming organisations, the workers also made haste to organise themselves. The tendency was to imitate the trade unions of western countries. On the railways and in

the factories of the tobacco monopoly there were even strikes, which were then a novelty in the country. The Young Turks, in their role of representatives of Capitalism, were perturbed by this Labour movement and passed laws which prohibited trade unions and subjected strikes to a procedure so intricate as to make them impossible. This law is still in force.

The new Workers organisations were tolerated in the form of workers associations in accordance with the provisions of the Societies Act. The majority of the trade unions of the various branches of production originated during this time. After the world war there came another wave of more modern and more active organisations. In the year 1919 the Communists came upon the scene. At the same time as the Communists appeared, the agents of the Second International offered themselves as leaders of the working class. With the assistance of the troops of occupation, the adventurers, who called themselves Socialists, were successful within a short period in gathering several thousand adherents. It was an artificial movement which made a good impression in the beginning though it lacked a sound basis.

The Workers Organisations.

At present the workers are organised in three kinds of trade unions:

1. **The trade unions with a long past.** Most of these were created in the popular enthusiasm of the years 1908/9. The characteristics of these trade unions are their passivity, their extraordinary caution and their short-sighted views concerning the organisation of workers. In their activity they never go beyond the limits of their purely professional demands. Their leaders in general are old, slavish or corrupt officials.

In the course of the last two years, the Communists have made it their task to introduce healthier conditions into these organisations. Unfortunately, the routine of the organisations is such that this aim is a very difficult one to attain. Nevertheless, several successes can be reported: the leadership of the **Tobacco Workers' Trade Union** has passed into the hands of men in sympathy with our movement. In all the other trade unions an active minority keep the old leaders in a state of constant apprehension. The most important of the organisations are those of the printers, the **Constantinople dockers**, the workers of the tobacco monopoly, the ship workers, the tobacco workers of **Smyrna**, etc.

2. **The trade unions founded or developed by the bourgeois parties.** Among these are counted the workers of the steamship companies of Constantinople. The leaders are the confidants of the **Unionists** or of the **Kemalists**. Under pressure from the workers, however, they are often compelled to collaborate with the **Communists**.

To this category there belongs the **General Workers Union**, which was founded by the Communists with the aid of members of the Peoples Party in sympathy with them. During the past year, the Government arrested the secretary and several prominent members of this union and condemned them to hard labour on a charge of carrying on Communist propaganda. But at the congress held as a consequence of this incident several Communists, who were not generally known as such, were elected to the Executive and all the agents of the Kemalists were excluded. This trade union is now completely under the influence of the Communist Party.

3. **The trade unions which were founded by the Communists and are completely under their influence.** These organisations are mostly in the provinces. The revolutionaries have full control here. As far as the law of the land permits, they do their best to adapt themselves to the instructions of the Red International of Labour Unions. The munition workers of **Angora**, the railwaymen of **Eki-Chechir**, the miners of **Balir**, the chauffeurs, the mechanics and the railwaymen of **Adrianople**, the railwaymen, the metal workers and the weavers of **Smyrna**, etc., are organised in this fashion.

The old guilds must also be mentioned. In some of them the exploiter and the exploited are united in the same organisation. This is the case with the sadlers, a portion of the shoe-makers, a portion of the bakers. The guilds are subject to the control of the municipalities and have certain rights in

relation to the regulation of working conditions. There is a strong movement in favour of their abolition. In certain trades the workers are leaving the guilds in masses and founding trade unions (shoe-makers, bakers, etc.).

The Number of Workers.

Concerning the number of workers in Turkey, according to the rough estimate of the trade unions, there must be more than 250,000, of whom 40,000 to 60,000, a quarter, are industrial workers. Of this number only 25% are organised. The development of the working class and of their organisations has been irregular up to the present. This is a natural consequence of the instability of the economic position.

The agricultural labourers are not included in the above total. The peasant families who have no land and who sell their labour power are estimated to represent a total of 500,000. In the **Songuldak** district the workers who are engaged in the fields also work in the coal mines. The same thing is observable in **Adana**, where the workers go successively to the cotton plantations, then to the cotton-mills and then into the spinning-mills. Such conditions favour contact between the agricultural labourers and the town workers, and they facilitate the alliance of the two categories of workers.

Political Organisations.

The working class of Turkey is not yet politically organised. At the moment it is only the **Communist Party of Turkey** which is carrying on illegal political activity in its name. In the course of the last ten years there have been several attempts to create a legal labour party, but no encouraging result has so far been achieved. The **Labour Party**, the **Socialist Party**, the **Independent Socialist Party**, the **Social-Democratic Party**, the **Party of the Workers and Peasants**, have all been obliged successively to relinquish their activity on account of the indifference of the workers. The last-named party alone, several organisations of which founded the **Communist Party of Turkey**, played a significant role in the first year after the war and wielded considerable influence among the workers.

The Turkish workers are still deprived of the most elementary rights, which the workers of the West have possessed by force of law for several decades. The Turkish workers do not possess the eight-hour day; the working day often extends from sunrise to sunset, representing 15 to 17 hours per day at certain season of the year. They have not the right to create unions in the real sense of the word. There is no unemployment insurance, no health insurance, no employers' liability and no old-age pensions. The labour of the women and children is exposed to the whim of the exploiters. There is not the slightest measure enacted with the object of securing hygienic conditions for the workers.

The Future of the Working Class.

Having regard to the situation of the bourgeoisie, the position of the workers is not so bad. For the national bourgeoisie has only found a free play for economic expansion in Turkey during a period in which Capitalism in the whole world is entering upon its decline, while the proletariat is approaching the stage at which class warfare is everywhere assuming great intensity.

The Turkish workers are opposing their bourgeoisie in the confidence that they have the support of the international proletariat. Furthermore, they have a solid skeleton formation of revolutionary Marxists and organisers. Their ideology is developing quicker than that of the Nationalists. It may, therefore, be hoped that the workers in town and country will organise, despite all difficulties, and enforce their immediate demands which can be summed up in the slogans: **trade union rights, complete independence of the trade unions, and laws for the protection of labour.** In these fights the Turkish workers will not forget that their chief historical task lies in the overthrow of Capitalism for the purpose of introducing the dictatorship of their own class in alliance with the peasantry.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The Workers of Yugoslavia take the Question of Trade Union Unity into their own Hands.

By Josef Kovatch (Zagreb).

The trade union movement in Yugoslavia is very weak and very much split up. Among almost a million workers only 50,000 are organised and that in seven different groups of trade unions.

Three of these groups can be described as class-fighting groups: CRSOJ, the Central Organisation of the Independent (revolutionary) Trade Unions with 14,000 members; URSSJ, the Central Organisation of the "United" (Amsterdam) Trade Unions with 12,000 members and the three autonomous unions (The Union of Graphic Workers and the two unions of the Bank and Commercial Employees) with 8000 members.

There is no freedom of the Press in Yugoslavia, no freedom of speech or organisation. The 200,000 unemployed receive no benefit. Wages only amount to 40% of pre-war wages for unskilled, and 60% for skilled workers. For a long time these barbarous conditions have been stimulating the growth of an intense longing for trade union unity amongst the broad masses of workers. In the last few months this end has been pursued with such zeal and intensity of purpose that we may seriously anticipate the consummation of trade union unity.

On June 14th last the "autonomous unions" (Graphic Workers, Bank and Commercial Employees) met in Zagreb and summoned a conference of all three groups to be held in Belgrade on June 27th. The Central Organisation of the Amsterdamers sent — no representative. The representatives of the autonomous and of the independent unions were the only ones who put in an appearance. The Conference received 54 telegrams and letters of welcome from various parts of the country. Many of the local organisations of the Amsterdamers greeted the Conference.

The Conference passed a lengthy resolution in which it 1. resolved to continue its activities for the promotion of trade union unity; 2. emphasised the fact that the attitude of the Independents is in favour of unity while the Amsterdamers are for disunity; 3. resolved on a platform for the introduction of trade union unity in Yugoslavia.

The coalition platform of the "autonomous" groups contained the following four principles:

1. Proletarian democracy in the trade union organisations;
2. Independence of the trade unions from the parties;
3. Proportional representation in the elections of the trade union leaders and;
4. The united National Central Organisation shall not be affiliated either to Amsterdam or to Moscow.

The Conference sent a delegation to both central trade union organisations. The Independents declared their readiness to accept the platform of the autonomous groups as a basis for negotiations. The Amsterdamers, in view of the telegrams of welcome sent by their local organisations, did not dare openly to assume an attitude of rejection as they had done up to that time. They gave an ambiguous answer, but the ice was already broken.

In the middle of July the annual congress of the typographers took place. The leaders of the Amsterdamers made every effort to carry a resolution according to which the Union was to withdraw from all activities tending towards unity. The Congress, however, resolved to continue along the path of activities for the establishment of trade union unity. It should not for a moment be imagined that this resolution was passed by a "communist majority". On the contrary! Many non-party and even social democratic workers rebelled against the disrupt-

ive attitude of the leaders of the Yugoslavian Amsterdamers and against a similar attitude of the representative of the Amsterdam International who was present.

The union of graphic workers is the only large union, which includes all the workers in the graphic industry. With its 6000 members it is an organisation of some importance in Yugoslavia. The resolute attitude of its congress in favour of unity was consequently a significant victory for the idea of unity in Yugoslavia.

On July 10th the central of the Amsterdam trade unions gave expression to its views on the question of unity in a resolution. In this declaration the Central in question proclaimed itself to be the central organisation of the labour movement in Yugoslavia (the workers however are of a different opinion. J. K.), but to be nevertheless prepared to work for the "expansion of the union". When, in October 1925, four (!) desperate independent trade union functionaries went over to the Amsterdamers, the latter described this as "coalition". Now, however, when it is a question of amalgamation between the 14,000 workers of the Independent and the 8000 workers of the autonomous unions with the 12,000 workers of the Amsterdam unions, they call it an "expansion of the union". The 22,000 are to "affiliate" to the Amsterdamers; the leadership of the Amsterdamers is to remain unchanged in the united central organisation. A splendid example of what the social democrats understand by — democracy in the labour organisations!

The sabotage of the Amsterdam leaders, however, could not arrest the process which had set in within the working class. In various places discussions are being carried on between workers in the same works who are organised in parallel organisations as well as between local leaders. Those who are not organised, especially those who formerly belonged to organisations (in 1920 there were 250,000 workers in Yugoslavia organised in trade unions) are taking an active part in the discussions.

In the two most important industrial centres, Subotica (Maria-Theresiopel) and Nish, these discussions have led to complete understanding. In Subotica, Sassenbach (whilst passing through on his way to Sofia) was taught a good lesson, when the two organisations held a meeting in common before his very eyes and, in common, passed a resolution in favour of unity. On August 10th the Subotica workers who are organised in the Amsterdam group, addressed a frank, open letter to the local trade union council, expressing their approval of the action of the autonomous group.

Events in Nish are of still greater significance. After lengthy "private" discussions, an official conference of the two local bodies of leaders was brought about at the end of August by the initiative of the metal workers of both groups in the local railway-workshops.

"We know quite well", said Ljuba Stojicevic, the representative of the local Amsterdam organisation, "that these negotiations are a breach of discipline as regards our leaders in Belgrade, but we take the whole responsibility on ourselves. The workers will have union, even in opposition to the leaders if it cannot be done with the leaders.

After a few conferences at which the chief questions discussed were "equal or proportional representation" and "affiliation or no affiliation to a trade union international", a resolution was passed unanimously in favour of unity on the basis of the platform of the autonomous group. This resolution was thereupon passed by the plenum of both organisations. A short appeal was addressed to the whole proletariat of Yugoslavia. The minutes of the conferences and the resolution was sent to the whole labour press for publication. A public meeting of both groups in common was called for September 10th. A united action committee for unity was elected at the same time.

Activities for unity are making progress in other fields also. On July 29th the organisations of workers in the food trade held a conference at Zagreb. These workers only have provincial organisations, in most of the provinces even parallel ones. The question of unity was on the agenda. The representatives of the 1800 organised workers declared themselves in favour of unity on the basis of the autonomy of the union and of action on behalf of general unity on the platform of the autonomous unions. One group of the Reformists, representing 200 members

in Serbia and Bosnia refused to yield to the majority. The majority however, composed of the Independents and the Amsterdamers from Slovenia were opposed to partial unity, so that the question of unity was postponed; not however for long, we should think, for the will to unity and resistance to slavery is raising its head more and more openly and with greater resolution amongst all categories of workers.

General trade union unity and a resolute fight against the offensive of capital — in the teeth of all opposition!

THE WHITE TERROR

The New Wave of Terror in Italy.

By Fisa (Milan).

"Complete order prevails." On the day of the attempt on the life of Mussolini the printing offices of the Maximalist "Avanti" were wrecked. The editor of "L'Unita", Comrade Edmondo Peluso, was set upon in the open street by a band of fascists, under the leadership of one of the murderers of Matteotti, and seriously mishandled. Riotous demonstrations were held before the French Consulate and attempts were made to storm it. Devastations, mishandlings, acts of murder, state of siege in Trieste, where there were killed on the side of the fascists and of the Carabinieri. In short, "complete order prevails".

The fascist press was able very easily to spread lies regarding the "complete order" prevailing throughout Italy, because, two days after the attempt on Mussolini, the following decrees were issued by the Ministry of the Interior: "It is forbidden to publish news regarding the incidents that occurred in front of the French Consulates as a result of the attempt on Mussolini. It is likewise forbidden to publish any news of the damage done to printing works, of the mishandlings of journalists and private persons, etc., which have taken place as a result of the attempt on Mussolini."

The fascist government deludes itself that with such means of suppression it can conceal from the countries abroad the fact that, in every fascist organisation there are shock troops of murder gangs who have the classical task on behalf of fascism of holding the working population under terror. The misdeeds of these "unknown persons", of which only a very small portion can be reported in the proletarian newspapers, serve to support the actions of the police, who, of course, do not refrain from employing the most diabolical methods of torture against those opponents of fascism who are arrested.

The fascist government which "has restored legality and order", is demanding from the criminals that they shall renounce any claim to public fame, a renunciation which is compensated for by their being guaranteed complete immunity from punishment for any crime.

It is therefore a mere legend when it is said that the taking over of the Ministry of the Interior by Federzoni means a return to "legality". His appointment was only intended to mask the methods of the fascist police.

In Milan, immediately after the arrival of the news of the attempt on the life of Mussolini, twenty fascists forced their way into the premises of the "Avanti" which was "protected" by 25 carabinieri, and completely wrecked them without being in the least way hindered. Almost at the very same hour Comrade Peluso was attacked in the open street by a band of fascists, at the head of which was one of the murderers of Matteotti, and mishandled in such a manner that he became unconscious and had to be taken to the hospital. In addition to this, on the same day, the offices of the socialist lawyer, Cleriei, and of the reformist member of parliament, Treves, were wrecked. After a meeting of fascists in the Cathedral Square, an attempt was made to storm the French Consulate, and bands of Black Shirts paraded through the town, firing shots at the houses in which they presumed any of their opponents to be and mishandled all persons suspected by them.

Towards midnight the printing offices of the "L'Unita" were attacked and laid waste, causing damage amounting to 50,000 Lire. In this case also, a band of fascists was able to proceed un-

hindered with its systematic work of destruction, in spite of the fact that the premises were "protected" by Carabinieri, soldiers and police.

On the following day Comrades Terracini, Bibolotti and Ferragni were arrested and later conveyed to Bologna.

Also in a number of other towns, as in Florence, Bologna, Turin, Leghorn, Verona, Trieste and in a number of industrial districts, there were riots on the part of the fascists. In Bologna a young worker, Amadeo Fantoni, was fired at in the open street and so seriously wounded that he died two days after. In all Italy there were rowdy demonstrations against the French Consulates. The terror of the fascist bands found expression in a number of attacks and mishandlings, and the authorities supported them with hundreds of arrests.

This is the actual picture of the "complete order" of which the Fascists report in order to deceive foreign public opinion.

The New General Attack of the White Terror in Bulgaria.

By P. Z. (Sofia).

In Bulgaria under the Liapchev regime the white terror is again raging in the most horrible manner.

In August last, in Northern Bulgaria, in the districts of Trojan, Lowetch and Tetewen hundreds of peasants were arrested, under the pretext that they had been harbouring "robbers". The arrested, after being tortured in the most bestial manner, were foully murdered without any trial whatever. The bodies of some of the murdered peasants were found by their relatives in two mass graves on the road between Lovetch and Plevna. Up to now over a hundred peasants have been murdered. The corpses of more than 60 have already been found. The murdered peasants are members of the Peasants' League, Communists and non-party. Whole villages have been burnt to the ground. The entire population of over 15 villages, along with all the cattle, have been placed under arrest, not a living being is allowed to go beyond the confines of the village. They are all dying of hunger, the harvest has not been gathered in and is completely spoiled. In these districts a state of siege has also been proclaimed. The punitive troops are commanded by the notorious Lieutenant Colonel Ditchev, who is immediately under the orders of that wholesale murderer, General Wolkov. Even the bourgeois opposition papers have been moved to protest against these monstrous arbitrary acts and against the horrible acts of terror.

In the district of Schumla the Liapchev authorities foully murdered four Bulgarians, emigrants from Dobrudsha, and arrested eight others whose fate is not yet known. The murdered victims are Dotcho Michailov, a teacher and a member and well-known leader of the Dobrudsha national-revolutionary organisation, and three other prominent members of the same organisation. In this manner the blood of the murdered Dobrudsha revolutionaries has once again cemented the bond between the Bulgarian Prime Minister Liapchev and his Roumanian colleague Averescu, the murderer of Comrade Pavel Tkatchenko and the torturer of Comrade Boris Stefanov.

On the occasion of the holding of a Youth Day, Liapchev arranged a regular man-hunt against the youth. Wholesale arrests were carried out in Sofia and in the provinces. The prisons are again filled with hundreds of young people and adults, among them being many young girls. The arrested include two Sofia lawyers, Slavi Kolev and Dimitr Tchitchovsky. The chief editor of the opposition paper "Novini", Jordan Grantcharov, has also been arrested along with the rest of the editorial staff.

The arrested also include the well-known national poet Anton Strachimirov who is charged on account of his new novel "Choro" (Saturnalia), in which the cruelties following the crushing of the September revolt in 1923 are described. The whole edition of the novel has been confiscated. The life of the poet himself is in the greatest danger. There is every reason to fear that he will be murdered by the Zankov agents as was his brother, a former member of parliament.

New attacks have been undertaken against the **Trade Union Movement**. The well-known trade union leader **Assen Boyadjev**, member of the Central Committee of the General Federation of Labour (Independent), has been arrested on no legal grounds whatever. Assen Boyadjev was the chairman of the delegation of the independent trade unions on the occasion of the negotiations for trade union unity in Bulgaria. The life of the arrested champion of the workers is also in great danger. The Liaptchev agents have repeatedly announced to him and others their murderous intentions in the event of their not ceasing their trade union activity. It is urgently necessary that the international proletariat immediately intervene to obtain the release of Assen Boyadjev in order to save his life.

A portion of the arrested have been tortured to death in the most indescribable manner. The police prisons have been turned into grave yards. Thus, a few days ago, in the police prison of Novazagora, one of the arrested was hung in the stable of the police building. A young student has died as a result of tortures. Such cases have recently come to light in Radomir, in the village of Gol, in Jelesna (Trojansko), where a peasant woman died in the police prison as a result of torture, and other places.

The most energetic and prompt action of the international proletariat is the only means of saving the lives of the best champions of the workers still left alive in Bulgaria.

The international proletariat must demand: **Immediate release of all the arrested and a general political amnesty!** Examination and punishment of all the murderers who, in their official capacity and without trial, have tortured and murdered wholesale the peasants of Trojansko as well as the members of the Dobrudsha national revolutionary organisations.

The Bulgarian workers and peasants must be supported in their most urgent demands and endeavours:

An end to the persecutions of the independent trade unions and all other organisations of the workers; abolition of the barbarous law for the defence of the realm; removal of the murderous Liaptchev-Wolkov-Zankov government!

FOR THE UNITY OF THE C. P. S. U.

The Enlarged Executive of the C. P. of Switzerland on the Russian Question.

At the Meeting of the Enlarged Executive of the C. P. of Switzerland held on the 18th and 19th September, the following resolution was passed:

The differences within the Russian C. P. arise out of the difficulties of socialist construction on the one hand, and the various views regarding the international situation on the other.

The XIV. Party Conference of the C. P. of the Soviet Union laid down the line of the alliance of the proletariat with the middle peasants as the most important step on the way to organising the village poor for the purpose of united action of the village poor and middle peasants against the kulaks.

This alliance is a vital question for the existence of the Soviet Union. In the same way the Party Conference laid down the course for the systematic development of industry. The raising of heavy industry, in order to render the Soviet Union more independent of the capitalist market, is of decisive importance. The rapid development of industry, however, is impossible without a simultaneous raising of the agricultural production: failing this the Soviet Union would have to make far-reaching concessions to capitalism.

The XIV. Party Conference rejected the views of the "new Opposition" in the most important questions. It was the duty of the comrades who were in the Minority to co-operate in carrying out the decisions. The development of industry, of the co-operatives, and also of agriculture, has already shown that the line of the XIV. Party Conference is correct. It was the duty

of the opposition to point out, within the frame of the Party, the failures and difficulties which naturally occur and to fight together with the Party authorities in order to remove and overcome them.

The opposition, by its behaviour, has broken one of the most important principles of the Leninist teachings. By grave breaches of discipline and by undermining the confidence in the Party, it has endangered the unity of the Party. The unity of the Party is the most important precondition for the maintenance of the Soviet power and its economic and cultural progress. The opposition, by its fractional activity, has followed a course which, if it were permitted, would shatter the unity of the Party and endanger the Soviet power.

In the present period of relative stabilisation, the most important task is to extend the influence of the Communist Party among the masses of the proletariat. The new opposition in the C. P. of the Soviet Union has, whether it intended it or not, strengthened those groups in the Communist Parties which doubt the possibility of the victory of the working class under the leadership of the Comintern, and also those to whom the daily work in the trade unions and factories is too wearisome and who, as they doubt the possibility of winning the masses, reject the policy of the united front.

The Enlarged Executive of the C. P. of Switzerland, while approving the measures of the Plenum of the C. P. of Soviet Union, is at the same time convinced that the Parties of the Comintern must make use of the discussion of the Russian question as the occasion for very thoroughly studying the problems of socialist construction in Russia. In this sense the Enlarged Executive considers it necessary to conduct a thorough discussion in the Party sections and nuclei.

THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

Decision of the E. C. of the Y. C. I. regarding Comrade Vouyovitch.

Moscow, 23rd September 1926.

The Presidium of the E. C. of the Y. C. I. dealt with the case of Comrade Vouyovitch and adopted the following resolution with 29 against 2 votes:

"In the matter of Comrades Vouyovitch and Guralski mentioned in the resolution of the joint July plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Y. C. I. declares that Comrade Vouyovitch utilised his position as secretary of the E. C. of the Y. C. I. to carry on impermissible, conspirative fractional activity against the unity of the Communist International (the attempts to send plenipotentiaries into the sections of the Comintern, the use of ciphers etc.). In this way Comrade Vouyovitch has misused the confidence of the Y. C. I. which was expressed by placing him in the responsible position of secretary of the executive.

The Presidium of the Executive strongly condemns the action of Comrade Vouyovitch.

Having regard to these circumstances and after a speech of Comrade Vouyovitch in the session of the Presidium of the E. C. which showed that Comrade Vouyovitch obstinately persists in his fractional activities, the Presidium considers it impossible for Comrade Vouyovitch to continue his work in the E. C. of the Y. C. I. and decides to suspend Comrade Vouyovitch from his post as secretary of the E. C. of the Y. C. I. and from all his work in the Y. C. I. This decision will be placed before the ordinary plenary session of the executive committee of the Y. C. I. The question of the future work of Comrade Vouyovitch must be settled in agreement with the Presidium of the E. C. I."

Comrades Vouyovitch and Michaelis voted against this resolution.