

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 71

4th November 1926

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

## CONTENTS

- M. N. Roy: The British Imperial Conference.  
**Politics.**  
P. R. Dietrich: The Significance of the Elections to the Saxon Diet.  
John Pepper: The Change in the Policy of American Finance Capital.  
The "Russian Question" at the Ramsey Conference.  
B. Ferdi: The Political and Social Movement in Arabia.  
**China.**  
Tang Shin She: The Unequal Chinese Treaties and Minister Vandervelde.  
Tang Shin She: Revolutionary China.  
**The Miners' Struggle in England.**  
R. Palme Dutt: The Supreme Rally of the British Miners.  
Appeal of the R. I. L. U. on Behalf of the British Miners.  
The C. O. T. U. Organises a Solidarity Week for the British Miners.  
Appeal of the Red Sport International on Behalf of the English Miners.  
Ninth Anniversary of the October Revolution.  
Achun Babajev: A Typical Example of the National Policy of the Soviet Union.  
**The Labour Movement.**  
J. B.: The Strike Movement in Syria.  
**The Trial of Boris Stefanoff.**  
The Opening of the Trial of Stefanoff and Comrades.  
**The White Terror.**  
Storm of Protest against the Threatened Murder of Sacco and Vanzetti.  
**In the International.**  
The Agenda of the VII. Plenum of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.  
Declaration of the Representatives of the C. P. of Bulgaria and Latvia against Comrade Zinoviev Remaining at the Head of the Comintern.  
**The Co-operative Movement.**  
L. Chintchuk: The Session of the International Co-operative Alliance in Hamburg.  
**Obituary.**  
Edward Duncan: Eugen V. Debs.

## The British Imperial Conference.

By M. N. Roy.

The drama which is being enacted behind closed doors in Downing Street could be characterised as a comedy had it not been so tragic for the British Empire. It is a comedy because of the hypocritical speeches made for publication. They are talking of imperial unity and loyalty to the Crown while the conflict of interests becomes ever sharper. Baldwin virtuously concluded his inaugural speech with a quotation from St. Augustine: "In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things charity." But the Boer General Hertzog, who lacks Anglo-Saxon politeness, brusquely turned the tables and demanded that the basis of the imperial federation should be "liberty in essentials; unity when self-interests permit; charity — to none." The frankly separatist views of Hertzog are shared, if not as openly, by Canada and Ireland.

The Conference will last a month. Evidently inter-imperial relations have become so critical that a determined effort must be made to find a *modus vivendi*. In political and constitutional issues London seems to be prepared to make concessions, provided that economic supremacy remains unimpaired. That is, if the Dominions would sincerely accept the principle of imperial preference and effectively apply it in practice, their demands as regards internal autonomy and international status

could be reluctantly granted. Although Chamberlain's long report on foreign affairs is not published, it is reported that he even did not raise the question of ratification of the Locarno treaties by the Dominions. That is a great concession. It places the Dominion governments outside the jurisdiction of the British foreign office.

In view of the acuteness of the situation the British Government decided to beat a timely retreat as the best strategy. Three important Dominion delegations (Canada, South Africa and Ireland) came to the Conference determined to raise the constitutional question and the question of international status. The delegates are fully supported by public opinion at home.

Hertzog, who bore arms against the British during the Boer war and who even after reconciliation with Britain stood for an independent South African Republic, completely defeated the loyalist South African Party of Smuts in the last election and became the head of the government. Ever since he came to power Hertzog has repeatedly put forward the separatist programme of Boer nationalism. The agitation for a South African Flag was the acute manifestation of the separatist sentiment. A few days before the Imperial Conference met in London a great mass meeting was held in Johannesburg to celebrate the

"Afrikaaner Day". Four ministers of the Hertzog Cabinet including the acting Premier were present. In that meeting Malan (one of the ministers) declared that the Government had decided unanimously to pass the Flag Bill next year. Malan, accused the South African press of defending imperial interest as against national interests and declared that the press was owned by peoples overseas and that the editors are foreigners.

Undoubtedly this demonstration of nationalism was to strengthen the hand of Hertzog in the Imperial Conference. And Hertzog did not disappoint his followers at home. He took the first opportunity to state his case, and in doing so did not mince words. He demanded: "1. In principle, unrestricted freedom of action to each individual member of the Commonwealth; 2. In practice, consultation with a view to co-operative action whenever possible."

This conception of imperial unity, if accepted, would reduce the Empire to a sort of loose entente likely to drift apart under the growing pressure of economic interests.

Canada has not come with any friendlier mood. Mackenzie King may be a better diplomat than the Boer, General Lourens, but his diplomatic words are pronounced on the background of formidable facts. He has swept the country in the recent election which was fought with clear nationalist slogans. The country has supported him in his challenge to the authority of the British Governor General. He has defeated his opponents who were backed by the Governor General because of their imperial orientation. The Conservative Party, behind which stand the financial interests closely connected with London Banks, has been vanquished at the polls. The Liberal-Progressive combination, led by King came to power with the following programme: 1. Canada is de facto independent, but de jure still subordinated to the sixty year old British North America Act passed by the British Parliament. This state of affairs must be changed; 2. Canadian Parliament should have the same sovereign right to manage domestic and foreign affairs as the British parliament; 3. Canada should not be reduced to the status of a colony by the interference of the British Governor General.

These are very clear issues, and the government of Mackenzie King is committed to them. When King showed reluctance to attend the Imperial Conference to press these vital constitutional issues, he was urged by the nationalist politicians who wanted him to back up Hertzog in the Conference.

Then there is Ireland. The Irish delegate, Fitzgerald, expressed his intention to raise the questions of War and of the functions of the Governor Generals. His views are that the Dominions should not be considered to be technically or legally in a state of war simply by virtue of the fact that Britain was at war.

The Conference will have to sit much more than a month if such grave conflicts of interests are to be composed. But in this critical period of its economic existence British Imperialism can hardly afford to sharpen the issues of inter-imperial relations by stubbornly opposing the points of view of the Dominions or by insisting upon London's hegemony over foreign affairs. Diplomacy is considered to be the best way out of the crisis.

But neither diplomacy nor concessions, in questions of foreign relations would touch the background of the conflicts. Rifts in the background of the relations between the Dominions and the metropolis cause the discord in the political and constitutional superstructures. The basic relation is the economic relation.

Britain is losing her economic, financial and political hegemony upon the countries which formally are, and will be for some time, still parts of the British Empire.

The growth of a separatist tendency in the Dominions is closely connected with the decline of British capitalism. It is the cause and the effect at the same time. Industrialisation of the Dominions makes them progressively independent of the metropolis, but increases their need for capital. If it were possible to keep up a constant and increasing flow of capital from England to the Dominions on the most favourable conditions, the process of rupture in inter-imperial relations would not be so pronounced. The Dominions (with the exception of South Africa) developed largely with capital and labour exported from Britain. On the other hand, the large bulk of the raw materials produced in the Dominions found market in England.

Now both these basic relations between the Dominions and the mother country have changed. England is not able to supply the growing capital demand of the Dominions. Capital is available elsewhere on more favourable conditions. For example, no British capital has penetrated deeply into Canada. At the same time, a world-wide depression has caused a shrinkage of market in Britain for the raw materials from the Dominions. Since the latter are obliged to sell out of the Empire, they must also buy outside the Empire. Consequently, the programme of imperial preference in which British capitalism seeks a way out of the present crisis, becomes unrealisable.

Speaking outside the Conference hall MacKenzie King succinctly but clearly formulated the basic conditions for the relations between Canada and England in these words: "We want capital. We would take it from Britain; but if we cannot get it here, we must find it elsewhere." In his opening speech Baldwin did not fail to touch this foundation of inter-imperial relationship. He endeavoured to justify the present inability of London to supply the Dominions with capital on favourable terms by reference to what the mother country had done in the past. He reminded the Dominion representatives that down to the end of 1925 London had lent to the Dominions 850 million pounds. But he was constrained to admit "the reduction in the wealth and accumulated savings of this country (Britain) resulting from the world war". When Baldwin referred to the total investment of 850 millions (of which about 350 millions went to Canada) MacKenzie King must have taken a mental note of the 400 million pounds of American capital invested in Canada mostly since the war.

Recently the South African Trade Commissioner in London stated that every year his country was sending more raw materials abroad. Last year's balance was 17 million pound sterling. He said that South Africa must increase her export because she must have capital in return.

Similar difficulties underlie the economic relations with all the Dominions which possess the autonomy to determine the direction of their trade and protect their industries by raising tariff walls. These difficulties frustrate all the efforts to enforce the principle of imperial preference. And it is around this basic question of economic relations that the main battles of the Conference will be fought.

In his speech to the Conference the President of the Board of Trade stated that in the first half of the current year one third of the British imports came from the Empire and half of the exports went to the Empire. This fact shows that imperial preference operates against the interests of the Dominions and in favour of England. British manufacturers gain by the preferential tariff whereas the producers of raw materials and partly finished commodities in the Dominions lose. Consequently it is natural that the Dominions possessing the autonomy to determine the direction of trade and in fiscal matters do not take kindly to the scheme of imperial preference. An effective operation of this scheme may help out British capitalism; but all sentimental considerations of racial and language affinity taken together cannot induce the Dominions to sacrifice their economic interests on the altar of the Empire.

Then there is the question of Empire settlement. Most of the Dominions need labour. Britain is suffering from the incurable malady of unemployment. Why not settle the Dominions with the British unemployed? It is a very simple proposition on the face of it; but here also arise serious complications. At this time when the Dominions are drifting farther and farther away from the control of metropolitan finance, emigration of British workers means an irrecoverable loss of so much labour power for British capitalism. Their inability to export sufficient capital to the Dominions makes the British bourgeoisie very reluctant to encourage emigration to the Dominions. Thus the Empire settlement scheme remains a paper scheme.

In spite of the frantic attempts to stabilise British capitalism on the basis of a self-contained imperial unit, the process of disruption goes on. The Empire will continue still for some time as a loosely bound federation or rather entente working in co-operation whenever and wherever possible without prejudice to self-interest. But the hegemony of Britain is gone for ever. This is being demonstrated in the Imperial Conference.

## The Significance of the Elections to the Saxon Diet.

By Paul Dietrich (Berlin).

The elections to the Saxon Diet have resulted in a considerable success for the Communist Party. The C. P. of Germany is the only Party that is able to record a great increase in votes. The Social Democratic Party and also the Right parties have, on the other hand, suffered tremendous losses. The Social Democratic Party of Germany has, according to the figures at present to hand, lost 300,000 votes, as compared with the last Diet elections held in 1922. The gains of the Communist Party as compared with the Diet elections in 1922 amount in round figures to 75,000, which increase consists for the most part of former social democratic votes. The rest of the votes lost by the Social Democratic Party have gone in part to the "Old Social Democratic Party of Germany", but the greater part, however, has gone to the recently formed Economic Party and to the Revaluation Organisation\*) which came forward in the elections with its own list of candidates.

In the district of Leipzig the Party polled only a few thousand votes less than it polled at the Reichstag elections in May 1924. In Dresden the Party even surpassed the vote polled in May 1924 by 3000. The Party has gained, altogether, over 47,000 votes compared with the Reichstag elections in December 1924.

The position of parties in the new Saxon Diet will be as follows:

Communists	14 (10 in the old Diet)
Social Democrats	31 (40 in the old Diet)
Old Social Democratic Party	4 (0 in the old Diet)
German Nationalists	14 (19 in the old Diet)
German People's Party	12 (19 in the old Diet)
Economic Party	10 (0 in the old Diet)
Democrats	5 (8 in the old Diet)
National Socialists	2 (0 in the old Diet)
Revaluation Party	4 (0 in the old Diet)

In the old Diet, after the split in the Social Democratic Party, the bourgeois Parties had, along with the Old Social Democratic Party, over 50 seats, while the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party had, together, 46 seats. As a result of the present elections, the bourgeois Parties, from the Democrats to the National Socialists and Revaluation Party, including the Old Social Democratic Party, again have a majority of 6 seats over the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party. On the other hand there has taken place a change in the relation of forces between the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party in favour of the latter.

On the basis of this relation of forces there are three possibilities in regard to forming the government: a government embracing all bourgeois parties, from the old social democrats to the National Socialists, or the Great Coalition, i.e. the alliance of the Social Democratic Party with the Old Social Democratic Party, the Democrats and the People's Party, or there is the third possibility of a government of the social democrats and old social democrats which would have to rely on the support of the Communists. Our Party however would neither support nor tolerate such a government.

There is little doubt that the Social Democratic Central Committee will declare itself in favour of the Great Coalition. The so-called Left social democrats in Saxony will submit to the dictates of the Central Committee; as even after their se-

paration from the 23 renegades they have in all questions carried out the policy of the Central Committee. Hermann Müller was able to declare at the election meetings without any contradiction, that there is not in the whole party, even in Saxony, a single member who is opposed on principle to the Great Coalition. The election manifesto of the Saxon Social Democratic Party deliberately refrained from making any statement regarding the question of the Great Coalition. The setting up of the Great Coalition in Saxony would lead to a further clarification of the situation and finally bring to naught the manoeuvres of the "Left" social democrats!

The victory of the Communist Party in the Saxon election campaign is of extraordinary importance not only for the German Party, but for all sections of the Communist International. The Party gained this victory as a result of the tactics of the united front which were introduced by the Open Letter of the E. C. C. I. and consistently carried out in the course of the last year! The great election success is the result of a thorough and definite work of enlightenment as to the role and the tasks of the C. P. of Germany and as to its relations to the Social Democratic Party as a Party which constantly betrays the workers. This success is all the more important as the Party has not yet completely overcome its weaknesses, the causes of which lie in the wrong policy of the Party after the Frankfurt Party Conference and which led to it being almost completely isolated from the broad masses of the working class. In addition to this the Party is at present suffering from the constant attempts at disruption on the part of the Ultra-Left Opposition, which hamper and hinder the Party in exerting all its recruiting power upon the working class.

The Saxon elections have confirmed the fact that, under the leadership of the Communist Party, the advanced section of the German working class, after a period of decline of the revolutionary movement, after the period of deflation which reached its highest point in 1925, is beginning to free itself from the passivity which is fostered by the Social Democratic Party and the trade unions, and to march forwards. After the campaign for the expropriation for the princes which was introduced and politically led by the Communist Party, and which set going a broad mass movement; after the struggle of the Hamburg dock workers along with the ballot in favour of a strike on the part of the Berlin underground railway workers, the result of the Saxon elections means a great advance on the way to a victorious defensive struggle against the capitalist offensive.

The success of the C. P. of Germany on the one hand, the great loss of votes on the part of the Social Democratic Party on the other hand, acquire all the more importance when we bear in mind the strong organisational basis and the great superiority the S. P. G. possess in the press, and thereby in agitation and propaganda. The fact that our Party has only won a quarter of the votes lost by the Social Democratic Party, while the remaining three quarters were cast partly for the old social democratic Party, and partly for the bourgeoisie, confronts the Party with the task of continuing its work with greater energy among the working masses, and in particular among the petty bourgeois strata in town and country.

The Party is able to record a great success in Saxony. It is now confronted with a new and even greater task: to win over those sections of the working population which are against any coalition with the bourgeoisie, but which in this election campaign once again fell victims to the demagogy of the "Left" social democrats in Saxony. With the winning of these sections the Party will have captured a position which will place it in a position to give expression to the will of the Saxon working class.

\*) This is a petty bourgeois organisation formed to represent the interests of the victims of inflation, who demand a "revaluation" of their depreciated savings etc. Ed.

## The Change in the Policy of American Finance Capital.

By John Pepper.

The manifesto of the bankers was indeed signed by the financial magnates of England, Germany, France and the United States, the chief impelling force behind this manifesto, however, is the change in the policy of the most powerful army corps of world imperialism, in the attitude of American finance capital.

American finance capital is attempting to break down the tariff walls in Europe because it is thinking of breaking down the tariff walls of the United States of America.

The traditional policy of American finance capital is a policy of high protective duties. British imperialism could allow itself the luxury of free trade as long as it possessed a world monopoly or as long as its hegemony was not shaken. American imperialism developed into a "junior robber" in the embittered war of defence against British large industry and has always shown a very strong tendency to high protective tariffs. The transference of the hegemony from England to America in the imperialist competitive struggle led to a change in the attitude of the two greatest imperialist rivals. In Great Britain stronger and stronger tendencies to adopt a system of high protective tariffs are becoming evident, whilst in America financial capital is beginning to steer its course towards free trade.

In America, the accumulation of capital is advancing with gigantic steps.

No country in the world knows such powerful trusts as the United States of America.

For American imperialism, the export of capital has become a vital interest. In 1925 America exported 1200 million dollars of capital, in the first six months of 1926 533 millions, and there is an increasing tendency to invest the exported capital not in State loans but in the industries of Europe, Canada and Latin America. Of the eleven milliards of capital which America has invested abroad, no less than 6,232 millions are invested in industry. In the first six months of 1924 only 12% of the American capital exported went to industry, in the first half of 1925 as much as 37% and in the first half of 1926 no less than 45% was invested in industry.

The growing accumulation of capital, the increasing development of trusts which has already led to almost 100% monopolies in all important fields of industry, the fact that the export of capital has become a vital necessity for American imperialism, the enormous investment of capital made abroad by American finance capital, the increasing penetration of important branches of industry abroad by American capital — these are the economic foundations of the significant change in the policy of American finance capital.

For the past year there have been symptoms indicating this change. For many years the prevailing policy of America rested on two pillars: a policy of high protective tariffs which reached its culminating point in 1922 with the introduction of the McCumber-Fordney tariff law, and the slogan of "Away from Europe!" In recent times, American finance capital has introduced a movement against both which is increasing in strength. The new slogan of American finance capital is:

"Co-operation with Europe" and "Break down the walls of the high protective tariffs".

American capital has invested so much in European industry that it must see to it that it gets interest on this capital. The milliards of debts of the European States to America have been funded in recent times, and Europe must now begin to pay off both interest and capital. Europe can, of course, only pay both interest and principle in the form of the export of industrial articles. The high protective tariffs of the United States, however, make it impossible for European industrial products to penetrate into America. The Shylock of American finance capital will have his pound of flesh and that is why he is now in favour of breaking down the protective tariff walls.

Financial capital is of course the most important and powerful factor of political life in America, but even this financial capital would not have been able to carry through this far-reaching and sudden change, were it not that important and deep-rooted political changes — caused by and due to the mighty imperialist rise of America — had occurred in American life in recent times.

The first of these political factors is the "cleansing" of the ruling Republican party. In consequence of the last election, of the presidency of Coolidge, of the La Follette split, the petty

bourgeois and farmer elements have left the Republican party en masse, so that it has become definitely a party of finance capital. The first consequence of this great change in the social structure of the Republican party was that the party and its Government openly dropped the "anti-trust policy". The political squirmishes in the party battles, great and small in America in the last few decades, have been nothing but the fight of the petty bourgeoisie and the farmers against the trusts. No country has so many anti-trust laws — and in no country are the trusts so highly developed and so powerful as in America. The whole policy of Roosevelt, Bryan and La Follette consisted in leading and betraying these petty bourgeois movements against the trusts. The rise of imperialism, the unlimited power of the trusts, the favourable state of affairs, which has lasted for years, have made it possible for the Republican party to declare itself openly, without any mask, in favour of the policy of finance capital.

The second political factor which makes this change in the policy of American financial capital possible, is the new attitude of the masses of farmers to the question of high protective tariffs. The establishment of the system of industrial high protective tariffs in 1922, only succeeded because the masses of farmers at the same time stood up for the introduction of high agricultural protective tariffs against European and South American competition. The great agricultural crisis which followed, shook the faith of the farmers in the efficacy of agricultural protective tariffs. High protective tariffs keep up the prices of industrial articles in America, whereas, at the same time, in spite of the protective tariffs, the prices of agricultural products are low and are still falling. American finance capital is now, in increasing measure, finding the discontented farmers a powerful ally in this campaign against the high protective tariffs.

There is, however, a third factor in political life which affects this question and which makes it possible for financial capital to carry out its new policy. America is becoming more and more a country of small investors. Thanks to the cunning "democratic" distribution of the investments in capital, millions are interested in the export of capital. The more this imperialist development progresses, the larger becomes this section of small investors which bears a certain resemblance to the "classic" institution of "rentiers" in pre-war France. These small investors want their interest, they are therefore in favour of "co-operation with Europe" and of breaking down the protective tariffs which prevent the influx of this interest into America.

The economic and political factors described above are working together to produce the new turn in the policy of American finance capital. The finance capital of the "Eastern" banks, under Morgan's lead, is the pioneer for breaking down the wall of high protective tariffs. Some sections of finance capital, however, are still in favour of high protective tariffs, especially the elements whose interests are not in Europe, but in Central and South America. Two poles are constantly becoming more sharply crystallised; on the one side New York, on the other side Chicago; New York as the centre of "Eastern" financial capital being against high protective tariffs and wanting to introduce a "European policy", whilst Chicago stands up for the protection of the "American standard of living" and propagates a "Pan-American policy".

The American Federation of Labor, as the organisation of the aristocracy of labour, is declaring its solidarity with the industrial bourgeoisie and is in favour of maintaining the high industrial protective tariffs, as it is well aware that with the abolition of the protective tariffs for industrial products, the prohibition of immigration, i. e. the protective tariff against the importation of labour power must also fall.

Without this analysis of the changes in the social structure of America, it is impossible to understand the most recent manifesto of the bankers. The policy of the manifesto is the policy of Morgan, is the policy of American finance capital. "Away with the high protective tariffs in America" — so that American capital can better extort its tribute from Europe; "away with the customs barriers within Europe" — so that the industrial countries, where American capital is invested, can better crush the agrarian countries. "Away with the monopoly of foreign trade in the Soviet Union" — so that a clear path to the Soviet Republic may be opened for capitalism; these are the latest slogans of American finance capital. The international alliance of the working class of Europe, of the proletarian State of the Soviet Union and of the proletariat of America must fight against these slogans.

## The "Russian Question" at the Romsey Conference.

(Leading article of the "Izvestya" of 21st Oct. 1926.)

In the beginning of October a conference took place in Romsey, Kent, in the home of the British Transport Minister between the British and German industrialists. The subjects under discussion at the conference are unknown. The whole conference is veiled in mystery, although the European press has published its suppositions and assumptions with regard to these negotiations. Further: The Ambassadors of France and Belgium have attempted to penetrate the "secret of Romsey", as the British newspapers have reported. This curiosity of the French and Belgian diplomats is extremely significant. Our press has already pointed out that immediately after the meeting between Briand and Stresemann in Thoiry, British diplomacy became very active to prevent Germany from a rapprochement with France on the one hand and to create a counter-weight to this rapprochement on the other. The meeting between Chamberlain and Mussolini was no doubt a move towards the second aim. The conference of Romsey was probably intended to assist in achieving the first aim.

At the present time British diplomacy is doing all in its power to draw Germany to its side and thus to prevent a rapprochement with France. A number of clues point to the fact that the Romsey conference was intended to bring about such agreements between the British and the German industrialists which would have the effect of questioning the industrial unity of France and Germany. The attitude of British heavy industry towards the newly created steel syndicate which, as is known, Great Britain has not joined, plays without a doubt a role in this matter. It is just this part of the negotiations in Romsey which is most secret of all.

The conference did not attempt to avoid the so-called "Russian question". The conference was hardly at an end when a section of the British press declared that a few of the German participants in the conference had attempted to secure the participation of the British financiers "in their risky and doubtful enterprises in Russia". Amongst these enterprises is, in the eyes of the British press, the carrying out of that part of the German 300 Million mark credits to the Soviet Union which has not yet been granted.

We may therefore take it as proved that in one form or another the question of relations to the Soviet Union were discussed in Romsey. The attempt of the British press to anticipate matters by announcing that the "Russian question" was only discussed because a section of the German industrialists had decided to extend "the burden of risk" for their operations in the Soviet Union to the British industrialists and financiers is very suspicious (this "burden", by the way, is shared by the German government and by the governments of the individual German states).

In the meantime a communication has been published in the "Daily Herald" of 11th of October about the Romsey Conference in which the discussion of the Russian question is by no means presented in such an innocent form as it is in the sections of the British press mentioned above. The "Daily Herald" declares that several of the British delegates spoke against the commercial agreement between Germany and the Soviet Union. A proposal was made to form an anti-Soviet United front of all capitalist countries. A proposal came from the British delegates to grant the Soviet Union no credits whatever until all the demands presented to the Soviet Union had been complied with. The British representatives pointed out that such co-operation would quickly lead to a satisfactory understanding with Russia, whereupon it would then be possible to come to an agreement concerning the apportionment of Russia into economic spheres of influence.

This was the way in which the "Russian question" was treated at the Romsey conference.

It must be assumed that the French and Belgian ambassadors who are attempting to pierce the secrecy around the negotiations, are only interested in so far as the negotiations between Germany and Britain might affect the interests of their own country. The Romsey conference is also a secret for the Soviet Union, a part of which however has been betrayed

thanks to the revelations of the "Daily Herald". We are by no means surprised at the proposals of the British industrialists. We have already heard of such proposals and plans for a financial and economic boycott of the Soviet Union with a view to coming to an "understanding(?) with the Soviet Union. Here we are interested in another side of the question: We have the right to know what the German industrialists answered their British colleagues in this matter. The German press is either silent upon this side of the negotiations in Romsey, or limits itself to general phrases. But the whole character of the conference, the participation of statesmen like the German ex-Prime Minister Cuno and the British ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer Robert Horne, and others, forces us to the conclusion that not general but quite concrete proposals were discussed in Romsey.

The more exact details are made known to the public opinion of the Soviet Union as to how the "Russian question" was raised in Romsey and how the British proposals for a financial and economic boycott of the Soviet Union were received, the less reason will the Soviet Union have to draw the conclusions which are unavoidable from the revelations of the "Daily Herald".

## The Political and Social Movement in Arabia.

By B. Ferdi.

### The Political Situation in the Moslem Countries on the Eve of their Fights for Independence.

With the exception of Persia and Afghanistan, all the Moslem countries in the Near East belonged at one time to the Turkish Empire. The imperialist Great Powers had — especially after the Young Turk revolution in 1908 — carried on the same policy of disorganisation as they had towards Turkish rule in the Balkans. They exploited the feelings of enmity which divided the Turks from the Arabs in order to rouse the latter against the Government of Constantinople. The groups of feudal leaders and landowners who were in their pay were compelled to cultivate a certain spirit of independence in the people in order to promote their separatist tendencies. Thus the French and the English, quite unintentionally, were the first to arouse the Arabian nationalism which they are frequently obliged to combat.

When, in 1920, the Turks, in order to defend their independence against the victorious imperialists, took up arms against the decision which condemned Asia Minor to be a colony, the peoples of Iraq, Syria and the Hedjaz etc. were still living on the remnants of their illusions of freedom. The Turkish yoke had for so long been represented to them as the source of all their troubles, that the mere fact of the establishment of an independent administration was in their eyes the most certain guarantee of their future happiness. The presence of the imperialist armies of occupation did not in the least disturb their happiness, for these armies had delivered them from the humiliating rule of the Turks. The intruders were regarded as saviours.

At first the nomadic tribes fought alone against the presence of these military forces. The citizens of the large centres, the religious castes (Sheiks) and the feudal landowners not only enjoyed every honour but they had the possibility of raking in large gains, in that, side by side with British and French firms, they participated in their lands being turned to profitable account. The situation of the middle classes, including the intellectuals who at one time had co-operated in the Ottoman administration, was quite different. The ruthless methods of exploitation and plundering resorted to by the foreign capitalists under the protection of the armies of occupation, deprived them of all possibility of further development and turned them into mere wage-earners.

The events in Turkey necessarily made a deep impression on this population. The great success of the Turkish nationalists in 1922 stirred up in these subjugated masses the feeling for national liberation which had not yet been awakened. This accounts for the revolts which followed one another and which are far from being at an end.

### The Imperialist Intrigues.

In this situation it became evident that there was everywhere a tendency to united effort and for a higher body to be created which would be capable of carrying through its authority. The activities of those who were fighting against imperialism might with great advantage have been conducted by the Caliph under the auspices of Turkey. In the meantime however the Kemalists had abolished the Caliphate in the interests of their internal policy.

This historical reform filled the imperialist Powers with hope. Each of them thought there was a prospect of its being able to pay a creature who was to play the part of Caliph, so as once and for all to establish the authority of that imperialist Power in the Moslem world.

Italy made efforts to win over the famous leader of the Senussi to her side, France patronised Yussuf, the treacherous Sultan of Morocco and counted on being able, in certain Syrian circles, to exploit the fact of the Ottoman dynasty being turned out of Turkey.

As regards Great Britain, she had had her man ready for a long time. In accordance with an old tradition, she relied in Persia on the family of the Kadjars, and in Arabia supported the Hashimids against the Turks. She placed great hopes on the present head of the family, Hussein, who had received the Kingdom of Hedjas as a reward for the services he had rendered the British army against the Turks during the great war. Furthermore, each of his sons had been made king of one of the mandatory territories (Iraq, Trans-Jordania etc.).

But the well-tried policy of Great Britain met with reverses both in Persia and in Arabia. The servile attitude of Hussein towards Great Britain had discredited him in the eyes of the population to such an extent that a man, coming from the deepest deserts of Arabia, the religious head of the Wahabiti and King of Nedzd, easily conquered the Kingdom of Hedjas and deprived the corrupt Hashimid of the throne.

With admirable pliancy, British diplomacy cast aside the one who had been defeated and tried to approach Ibn Saud. He however had good advisers and knew what he was doing. After the overthrow of the Caliphate, the powerful organ of the Indian Moslems, the "Committee for the Caliphate" turned to this undisputed leader of Arabia and supported him with all the means in its power. The intrigues of Great Britain only succeeded in detaching a few renegades from this committee. There can be no doubt today as to the anti-imperialist tendencies of the new King of Hedjas. When Ibn Saud concluded a treaty with the British Empire, recognising its sovereignty, it was thought that he had been bribed. It soon transpired however that the treaty only secured him advantages and that Ibn Saud had not undertaken any compromising obligations.

### The Conference at Cairo.

The agents of Great Britain who clearly understood the situation, continued their intrigues against him. Their aim was to thrust Ibn Saud and his adherents on one side and to solve the question of the Caliphate in favour of one of the princes who was under the influence of Great Britain. The person they had in view was none other than King Fuad of Egypt. He was persuaded to summon a meeting of the Moslem theologians of all nationalities to Cairo, in order to solve the question of the Caliphate before the Congress which the followers of Ibn Saud intended to convene in Mecca on the occasion of the Pilgrimage in 1926. At the end of that winter a meeting of clerical dignitaries without any authority did actually take place in the Egyptian capital. The nationalist Press unanimously denied that the delegates possessed the qualifications necessary to enable them to pass resolutions. In any case the greater part of the invitations remained unanswered. Only a few of the congregations of the countries dominated by Great Britain, France and Italy sent representatives.

### The Aims of the Congress in Hedjas.

In the programme of the Congress of Mecca the question of the Caliphate was not even hinted at. The aims they had set themselves were far humbler ones. It was merely a case of interesting the whole Moslem world in the fate of Hedjas which is regarded as the common property of all the faithful and to ensure good conditions of safety and hygiene for the pilgrims, guaranteed by the support of all the Moslem States.

The imperialist circles had at first spread rumours to the effect that Turkey, Afghanistan and the Moslem Republics of the Soviet Union were not to be invited to these discussions. The idea was to rouse the suspicion that the imperialists had a hand in it. Facts however soon showed that these assertions were an invention from beginning to end.

The speculations on religious splits in Islam proved vain. The invitations were responded to with a characteristic unanimity. There can be no doubt that the various interpretations of Islam which, until a short time ago, were the cause of embittered fights, have now been placed in the background owing to the increased desire of the Moslem peoples to free themselves from the imperialist yoke, for which purpose a strengthening of the bonds of solidarity is necessary. In all Moslem countries the conviction prevails that Hedjas is destined to be a centre of support for all national fights for liberation, as is at present the case with Syria.

### The Results of the Congress of Mecca.

More than 80 delegates took part in the Congress, apart from 157 invited guests. The most important Moslem States, including Turkey, were represented. Ibn Saud himself opened the Congress and made a speech in which he begged the delegates to exercise complete freedom in bringing forward and passing resolutions with regard to what seemed to them useful for the well-being of the Moslems. He only requested them not to touch on those questions which were a permanent matter of dispute between the various Moslem sects. Furthermore he asked them not to concern themselves with international politics.

The question with regard to visiting the Holy Places was discussed at greatest length. According to the doctrine of the Wahabiti, it is heathenish to cover the holy sepulchres with a roof and to throw oneself on the ground before these memorials. As a matter of fact, as soon as they had conquered the Holy Ground, the Wahabiti demolished some of these monuments. For the same reasons, the inhabitants were indignant at the traditional special caravan from Egypt. These incidents served the British Press as a pretext for carrying on a violent campaign against the Wahabiti, in order to make an attempt once more to sow dissension among the Moslems.

The Congress appointed a special commission composed of representatives of all the points of view, which was to regulate all the questions of religious customs and traditions. The King of the Hedjas undertook to submit to the decisions of this competent commission and to carry them through. The commission was also instructed to find a basis for an understanding and an amalgamation between all the sects of Islam.

The question was also discussed at length as to whether this Congress should be given a permanent character and should set up organs for propaganda in various countries. This question was not settled in the affirmative. But the mere fact that it was resolved to hold a similar congress every year in Hedjas or in some other independent Moslem State (Turkey, Afghanistan, etc.) and to set up a kind of general secretariat with Chekib Arsbaan (a representative of Arab nationalism who is well known in the diplomatic circles of Europe) as secretary, proves that this arrangement is destined later to be transformed into a permanent organisation.

At the suggestion of the Turkish delegate, the Congress resolved that the statutes worked out for Turkey, Afghanistan and Yemen should only be given legal validity after they had been passed by the governments in question. This document provides that everything possible should be undertaken in order to transform Hedjas into a modern and flourishing country and that efforts should be made to create, through general cooperation, all the conditions necessary for the social, religious, economic and literary development of the Moslem nations.

A resolution of great economic importance was that regarding the railway line of Hedjas which, in its time, had been constructed by the Ottoman Government out of the money collected in all Moslem countries by voluntary contributions. After the great war, this line was appropriated partly by France and partly by Great Britain. The Congress resolved to demand that it be returned to the Mussulmans and that, in view of the fact that it is the common property of all Mussulmans, the Government of Mecca should be entrusted with its management. The Congress further resolved that each Moslem people should contribute towards the construction of a new railway between Mecca and Medina in order to facilitate the pilgrimages.

A whole number of sanitary measures was resolved upon in order to ensure good hygienic conditions for the hundreds of thousands of the faithful, who come to visit the Holy Places. The most important point is the provision of wholesome drinking water for Mecca and Jedda, the building of large hospitals etc. For this purpose, all the religious funds which are at present in the various countries, are to be centralised in Mecca.

Before it separated, the Congress passed a resolution of a political nature, which was not confirmed by the delegates of Turkey and Afghanistan, doubtless out of diplomatic considerations. It was a question of the restitution of the districts of Akaba and Maan to the Kingdom of Hedjas.

The statement made by the Indian delegate Shevket Ali in the name of the Mussulmans who are subject to the imperialist rule, was particularly impressive. He asseverated that the peoples at present languishing under the foreign yoke are always prepared to give every material and moral support to the independent Moslem States in their struggle to increase the power of Islam.

To summarize, it may be said that the Congress of Mecca was crowned with complete success. The intention is that it should be the first effective act of solidarity of the Moslem world which is progressing towards its political evolution and national liberation. It has made it possible for the Turks to break down the barrier which had been formed between them and the rest of the faithful in consequence of the secular revolution carried through by the Kemalists, and to resume their place in the great family of the Moslem peoples.

#### The Communist Point of View.

No one can deny the enormous importance of these movements from the point of view of the world revolution, movements which are stirring to their very depths hundreds of millions of human beings, who are enslaved by the imperialist Powers, movements which may one day shatter the foundations of imperialism in Asia and Africa.

It is a matter of course that these fermentations have nothing in common with the proletarian movement and with Communism, if they are estimated according to their social content and their political and economic aims. What we are witnessing are the efforts of the petty bourgeoisie of these countries, supported by the masses of the peasantry, to secure for themselves the necessary conditions which will enable them to develop freely.

It is therefore necessary for the Communists to be very careful as to the attitude they take with regard to these movements. In so far as these movements are anti-imperialist factors, we must support them in every way that depends on us, in order to ensure their success. We must however never forget either their bourgeois nature nor their predominantly capitalist tendency and we must not allow ourselves to be taken in tow by them but must carefully preserve the independence of the communist organisations. Our Communist Parties in Turkey and Palestine take these peculiarities into consideration and are following a perfectly correct line in this respect.

## CHINA

### The Unequal Chinese Treaties and Minister Vandervelde.

By Tang Shin She

Sun Yat Sen said: "The numerous unequal treaties are for China nothing more nor less than documents of enslavement. There can be no question of altering them, of improving them; they must be torn up!" As early as in 1900, in the so-called Boxer insurrection, the Chinese people tried instinctively to do this. But, without the revolutionary theory, the action — which was moreover turned to its own account by the Manchu dynasty, — was doomed to failure. The imperialists described the defeated revolutionaries as bandits. Later, Sun Yat Sen expounded in his war programme a method of tearing up these documents of enslavement, according to which method the masses of the people are acting in their present struggles.

The massacre of May 30th 1925 so completely convinced the population of China of the necessity of the immediate destruction of these unequal treaties that the bourgeoisie and even the lackeys of the imperialists, the military rulers, felt compelled to place this demand in the foreground. When, during the course of this year, the Belgo-Chinese Commercial Treaty of 1865, the Franco-Annamese-Chinese Commercial Treaty of 1885 and the Japano-Chinese Shipping Treaty expired, not only did the merchants who were particularly concerned, demand that the present Government be overthrown, but even the Peking Government decided to refuse the renewal of the treaties. The cunning Japanese as well as the French immediately declared that they were ready to revise their shipping treaty. The Chinese Ambassador in Belgium had informed Vandervelde, the Belgian social democratic Minister for Foreign Affairs, that the Belgo-Chinese Treaty (subject to ten years' notice) which had hitherto always been renewed, would expire for the sixth time in October 1926 and that this time it would not be renewed on the part of the Chinese; negotiations were therefore to be entered into with regard to the conclusion of a new equal treaty. Vandervelde, the devoted henchman of the monarchists and capitalists, replied:

"China has at the present moment no responsible government; as soon as one is formed, the question can be discussed."

At the same time, Vandervelde began to negotiate in China with Chang Tso Lin and the Peking Government with regard to a dollar loan to be paid by Belgian and French capitalists to the amount of 15 millions, in return for railway concessions in the province of Chili. The draft agreement for this loan was signed on August 28th. On this occasion Vandervelde succeeded in persuading the Chinese Government to postpone terminating the Belgo-Chinese treaty for three months and to entrust the negotiations with regard to it not to the Chinese Ambassador in Belgium but to the Chinese Ambassador in Switzerland. When the Ambassador from Switzerland wished to take up negotiations in Brussels, the Chinese students in Belgium forced him to leave that country. In doing this they gave Vandervelde occasion to make a definite statement that China had no right whatever to give notice to terminate the treaty of its own accord. Should China nevertheless insist on giving notice, the matter would have to be laid before the Hague Court of Arbitration. In reply to this, Chinese bourgeois papers expressed the opinion that the matter under dispute ought to be laid before the League of Nations. The Chinese living in Europe protested violently against the matter being brought before this instrument of imperialism.

Negotiations then took place in Geneva. When the Chinese Ambassador in Belgium returned from the negotiations in Geneva, he issued on October 1st the following declaration to the Chinese:

"I have been commissioned by the Chinese Government to negotiate before the League of Nations in Geneva with regard to the postponement of the termination of the Belgo-Chinese Treaty which has been demanded by the Belgian Foreign Minister. Vandervelde however declared that he did not demand any prolongation; he declined altogether to negotiate with me, which means that he intends the treaty to run for another ten years. Thus, China having offered Belgium an inch Belgium seeks to take a mile..."

At the end of his declaration, the Ambassador in Belgium calls upon all Chinese, whether from the North or the South, to take their stand in favour of the abolition of this disgraceful treaty. In the meantime the Chinese students in Belgium did a great deal of propaganda work. On October 23rd they declared in a proclamation:

"If China is not given satisfaction by October 27th, all the Chinese living in Belgium, including the Embassy, will leave the country."

On October 22nd, Vandervelde, that noble representative of the 2nd International, once more agreed in a conference with his capitalist masters, that the Belgo-Chinese Treaty of 1865 was still in force (in spite of notice to terminate it on the part of the Chinese). It was further resolved that

"should China fail to observe the treaty after October 27th, on which day, in the opinion of the Chinese Government, the treaty ceases to be valid, Belgium would bring the matter in dispute before the Hague Court of Arbitration."

This is the understanding between the peoples which has been propagated by Vandervelde himself!

Why are the Japanese and French prepared to revise their treaties which expire this year and why do the Belgians refuse to do so, in spite of the threatened boycott and of diplomatic complications? The reason is that the two first feel that they have a stronghold in other treaties. Thus the Japano-Chinese Commercial Treaty is connected with the Japano-Chinese Peace Treaty of 1895, and the Franco-Annamese-Chinese Treaty with the Franco-Chinese Commercial Treaty of 1858. Belgium has no other treaty beyond the commercial treaty. Vandervelde, the social democratic Minister, finds no other way of guarding the privileges of his capitalist masters in his policy of understanding between the peoples, than that of denying to China the right to give notice to terminate the treaty, and of laying the affair before the Hague Court of Arbitration.

All the unequal treaties concluded with China are linked up with one another. If China were actually to give notice to terminate all treaties which expire henceforth, she would nevertheless never be free, as many of them, especially the "peace" treaties, are intended to last for all time. For this reason the Chinese revolutionaries object to having to start bargaining all over again each time, they are fighting to abolish all the unequal treaties at one blow. Until this time comes, they are encouraging any single action which may start the ball rolling.

What great interest has the Belgo-Chinese Treaty for the Belgian capitalists? Although Belgium has only concluded one treaty with China, she holds all the privileges which the other Powers possess. She has received many special concessions, such as railway lines, ore deposits etc. The administration of the Peking to Hankow and the Lung-Hai lines are in her hands. For a time she even competed with America for the concession to construct the Hankow to Canton line. With the help of the Catholic priest St. Lebbe, Belgium has brought more than 100 Chinese into the country to be educated at her expense.

The leaders of the 2nd International, the traitors to the working class, the accomplices of the imperialists, have, in recent times, clearly shown their attitude to the Chinese people. Social democracy has unmasked itself to the Chinese people, both by the arrest of more than 40 Chinese students in Berlin last year at the command of the social democrat Grzesinski, and by the behaviour of Vandervelde, the socialist Foreign Minister, with regard to the unequal treaties, which is truly an example to other imperialist countries.

## Revolutionary Shanghai.

By Tang Shin She.

According to the latest telegraphic reports from the Far East, a state of war has been declared in Shanghai because of the danger of a revolt of workers and students. The seriousness of the situation is characterised by the fact that the population has destroyed the railways between Shanghai and Nanking and between Shanghai Wusung, thus rendering any railway communication with Shanghai impossible.

Shanghai is the largest treaty port in China. It is nominally Chinese, but as a matter of fact, the rule is in the hands of the imperialists since they have their own administration, their own police, their own consular jurisdiction, their own troops, warships etc. After the events of May 30th 1925, the power of their lackey, Sun Chuan Fang enabled them to nominate their agent as Lord mayor even in the Chinese town. In spite of the direct and indirect rule of the imperialists in the whole of Shanghai, or even because of it, the revolutionary movement spread more quickly among all strata of the population than before. This is demonstrated particularly by the strikes which have been going on since June, by the election campaign for the Chamber of Commerce and by the disbandment of the Chinese merchant militia.

More than two hundred thousand workers have taken part in the strikes between July and the present time, never less than ten thousand being out at the same time. The strikes involved not only foreign but also Chinese works. They spread from the

factory workers to the categories of municipal and transport workers; they were more of a political than of an economic nature. Although the Trade Union Council and the unions were constantly prohibited, the workers maintained their organisation the whole time. The employers and the police were even compelled by the workers to negotiate with these prohibited organisations. At an anti-imperialist demonstration on September 7th of the current year, the anniversary of the signing of the Boxer Treaty, there were violent encounters with the police both in the Chinese and the foreign quarters. In any case, the two hundred thousand organised workers of Shanghai form a united front. They have been trained by the numerous strikes and fight with skilled tactics against their oppressors. They are the nucleus of Red Shanghai and the stronghold of the Chinese revolution.

It is a known fact that the students in Shanghai are very radical. There are more than ten colleges in the town. In consequence of the students' revolutionary activities, the imperialists, with the help of the Municipal Council, forced the professors and the heads of the schools to carry on a reactionary policy against the students in the schools. In the Spring of this year, the students of one of the Shanghai colleges were called upon to take an oath that they would not actively concern themselves with politics. The students embarked on a strike which lasted for months and finally five hundred of them left the school. Members of the Communist party and of the Kuo Min Tang have been and are being simply expelled from other colleges. In quite recent times, the chief union of the Chinese students has been prohibited by Sun Chuan Fang. The ten thousand students in Shanghai are also a great assistance to the movement in the town and to the Chinese revolution.

The small and middle tradesmen are also exploited and oppressed by the large bourgeoisie and the imperialists. The conflicts between the small tradesmen and the bourgeoisie have become so acute of late that the former have left the Chamber of Commerce and formed organisations of their own. On May 30th 1925 they even formed a united front with the workers and students. In recent times, they have been carrying on an embittered campaign against the taxation policy of Sun Chuan Fang and against the new municipal administration. (Formerly the tradesmen had an autonomy in the municipal administration, of which they have been deprived by Sun Chuan Fang.) These many hundreds of thousands of small tradesmen are always active in the revolutionary movement, but they are extremely hostile to the large bourgeoisie, the military rulers and the imperialists.

A remarkable struggle is going on between the two tendencies within the bourgeoisie. To the one group belong only "Compradore" (large traders), to the other compradore and employers. The former are vassals of Great Britain, the latter of Japan. Until recently the Japanophile group had a strong, well-armed militia. Their leader was indeed, for a time, the chief mayor of Shanghai. The bourgeoisie has repeatedly proved to be a traitor to the revolutionary movement. Nevertheless, when it suits their own interests, they are thoroughly radical, they advocate particularly the abolition of the unequal treaties and sympathise at times with the workers who are striking against the imperialists. The imperialists consequently describe them also as Red. At the order of the imperialists, Sun Chuan Fang has taken from them the posts of chief mayor and President of the Police. He has succeeded in withdrawing the Chambers of Commerce from their influence and in playing the management into the hands of the pure compradore group. Finally, on August 28th, for reasons which are not yet apparent, he disbanded the militia of the employers' group.

The middle classes of Shanghai are engaged in a bitter fight against the imperialists and Sun Chuan Fang. In July, the bourgeois women organised several demonstrations because of the rise in prices and of the heavy taxation, on which occasion there were violent encounters with the police. The "better class" bourgeoisie is fighting against Sun Chuan Fang and the imperialists under different slogans. They are, for instance, opposing the opium trade, which is carried on by the imperialists in common with the military leaders in Shanghai and from the profits of which the enormous armies are maintained.

Looked at as a whole, the city of Shanghai with its two millions of population, is divided into two fronts. To the one belong the imperialists, the military rulers, the professors and the compradore group, the other the workers, students, small tradesmen, middle class and employers. Needless to say, the last group is much the stronger.

In spite of the arrest and execution of numerous students and workers in Shanghai, the law and the police no longer have the necessary power to arrest the current of revolution; neither has Sun Chuan Fang any control over the mutinies amongst his troops. This is why the imperialists centralise their navy and marine forces in Shanghai. The fate of the revolution in Shanghai depends to a large extent on whether the imperialists can come to an agreement amongst themselves.

## THE MINERS' STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND

### The Supreme Rally of the British Miners.

By R. Palme Dutt.

The renewed and intensified fight of the British Miners, after six months of intense struggle, when the whole capitalist world and the whole reformist labour leadership was counting on their collapse, has transformed the situation. The overwhelming Left Wing victory at the Delegate Conference of October 7, and the fighting policy there adopted, have rallied the whole front. The Government now shows signs of very great anxiety on the position, moving on the one hand to new peace feelers such as the Derby mediation suggestion, and on the other hand to extreme measures of open force such as banning of meetings by the Miners' leaders and the threatened arrest of Cook. The enthusiasm created in the working class by the miners' supreme rally has forced the General Council to concede the calling of the Conference of Trade Union Executive on November 3rd to decide on the question of a levy. Thus the fight is entering on a new and even more intensified phase; and, if there is no weakening by the Miners' Executive and every effort is made by the working class forces, the possibilities favourable to the Miners are greater than at any previous point since the end of the General Strike.

The decisions of the October 7 Delegate Conference mark the turning point in the situation. For three and a half months the Miners' Executive had wavered, retreated and attempted one compromise after another. Every concession and attempt at compromise only strengthened and hardened the Government's and Owners' stand, culminating in the ultimatum of September 24, which declared as the Government's proposals not only lower wages and longer hours, but also district and local agreements and the elimination of the Miners' Federation. These proposals were overwhelmingly defeated by a vote of the districts; and then at the October 7 Delegates Conference the Left Wing at last won the victory. By a striking vote of 594,000 to 194,000, against the open opposition of all the Miners' leaders, including Cook, and of the Miners' Executive, the Communist and Minority Movement policy, which had been advocated for the past four months, was adopted on the proposal of South Wales. This policy, which is now the official policy of the Miners' Federation, contains six points:

1. Status Quo terms: no reduction of wages and no increase in hours.
2. Withdrawal of Safety Men.
3. Approach to Unions for Levy and Embargo, and calling for Special Trades Union Congress to determine this.
4. Stopping of Outcropping Coal (irregular individual production at surface).
5. Propaganda in weak areas by whole Federation strength, including all Mining M. P. s.
6. Central Control by the Federation Executive, superseding all local barriers and divisions.

The adoption of these decisions (ratified by a vote of 460,150 to 284,336 in the districts) created consternation in the capitalist camp and in the ranks of the reformist labour leaders, who had been openly prophesying a speedy collapse. The capitalist press pronounced them "Counsels of Despair"; the "New Statesman" found them "foolish and indefensible decisions"; the "New Leader", the organ of the I. L. P., which had actually before the Conference suggested the acceptance of the Government's

proposals as possibly "good tactics", and had in any case washed its hands of the miners' problem with the comforting statement that "those of us who are not miners may congratulate ourselves that the painful choice does not lie with us", now hastened to express its disapproval and alarm: "We regret, as we believe that all their friends regret, the startling decision of the Delegate Conference, against the advice of its leaders, to support the desperate proposal of withdrawing the safety men from the pits".

But the results of the decisions, even though only partially carried out, soon caused a change of tune. The Miners' Executive was reconstituted as a "Central Council of War" in the heart of the coalfields, and at once got to work in the Midlands where the principal break in the front and return to work had been taking place. The effect was electrifying. New confidence was established by the signs of return to a strong front; and thousands of men who had gone back came out again. The new wave of strength, resulting from the Communist lead, had to be admitted by the Daily Herald, which on October 14, under the heading "Tide Turns for Miners", reported:

"Large numbers of the men who had returned to work are now out of the pits and standing loyally by the Miners' Federation. In the coalfields the miners are rallying to the fighting lead of last week's delegate conference."

The official government admission of the total of returns to the fight since the new policy has been 20,000 — and this in the face of wholesale police intimidation, as well as attempted bribery and corruption. The Notts Miners' Council and the Leicestershire Miners' Council, the majority of whose members had gone against the Federation, were now reunited in support of the Federation policy. The New Leader had to admit its bewilderment at the change in the situation:

"Against odds to which every other body of men would have succumbed long ago, the miners are struggling with a courage which refuses to admit the possibility of defeat. The results are already surprising."

What has been the effect of the new policy on the Government? A twofold effect has been visible. In the first place new talk of peace has begun to arise from several Ministers. Even Joynson-Hicks came out on October 13 with an "appeal to the warring elements to realise that the time has come when enough fight has taken place, and honour should be considered satisfied". Lord Eustace Percy, a member of the Cabinet, declared on October 22 that

"the mineowners have been very ill-advised from every point of view, whether as to policy or tactics, to refuse national negotiations".

Finally, Lord Derby declared the hope that "some means might be found even now that would reconcile the antagonistic interests and bring a peace that would be satisfactory to both parties", and offered his own services as mediator:

"I know perfectly well that more harm can be done than good by anybody butting in and pretending to be a mediator, but if I can be of any use, there is nothing would give me greater pleasure."

The reasons for these transparent attempts to draw the miners anew into negotiations, after the previous brutal knock-out language of the ultimatum, are obvious in the economic situation. The completely unexpected continuance of the miners' resistance has destroyed all the Government's calculations. Churchill's airy pretences two months ago that the country could easily stand the strain of the stoppage can no longer be maintained. The imports of foreign coal of four million tons a month, already increasingly difficult to secure in the world shortage, are wholly inadequate to meet a normal requirement of fourteen million tons a month, and the highest estimates of blackleg coal can only affect a very small fraction of the remaining deficiency. This makes a prolonged continuance impossible save at a ruinous cost to the whole of British industry. The fall in the export trade since May, compared with last year, is £ 55 millions to the end of September; against 147 pig iron furnaces in blast in April, 6 were in blast in August; the cotton trade is on half time; railway losses to the end of September amount to £ 20 millions. The total loss is estimated by the Financial News at £ 3,000,000 a day; and by the President of the Federation of British Industries at nearly £ 4,000,000 a day, or £ 56 millions to the end of September.

In the face of this situation, the Government cannot pursue a waiting policy, but, in view of the miners' refusal to surrender, is compelled to endeavour to force matters to a rapid conclusion, either by policy of peace proposals and endeavouring to entangle the miners in new negotiations to split their ranks, or else by a policy of intensified force and open violence to break their resistance. It is clear that both tendencies exist in the Cabinet, and in point of fact they can be and are likely to be combined. The most recent events show a yet further phase in the victory of the Extreme Right in bourgeois policy, and the initiation of new measures unparalleled in industrial struggles in Britain and once again showing the political and revolutionary character of the present struggle. The Right Conservative Press, not only the *Daily Mail* and the *Morning Post*, but also the *Daily Telegraph*, are now calling with one voice for the arrest of Cook. Fascist threats on the lives of the miners' leaders are abundant. The drafting of hordes of police and mounted police into the mining areas to charge crowds wholesale, striking right and left, has become the regular policy of the Government to create terror and drive back to work. Most significant of all, in view of the success of the miners' executive campaign in the country, is the new order, first put into operation on October 24, prohibiting meetings to be addressed by the miners' leaders. It is not yet clear how far this order will be generally applied. For its first application, at a meeting at Heath Hayes in Staffordshire, a force of 500 foot police and 30 mounted police was sent, and Cook was prevented from speaking. All this indicates a completely new phase of struggle, which may develop with extreme rapidity.

The General Council, met by the Miners' Federation on October 22, shamelessly continued its refusal of either levy or embargo, but was compelled to concede the calling of a Special Conference of Trade Union Executives to consider the question of a levy. The question of the embargo was referred to the railway and transport unions, whose official answer, under the leadership of Thomas, Havelock, Wilson etc. is already known.

The greatest need now is to take every possible step to intensify the struggle at once, to meet the intensified attack of the Government. The fight is now at its most decisive stage. The decisions of the October 7 Conference have still only been partially carried out. The withdrawal of the safety men has only been begun in a few places locally on rank and file initiative, and no national lead has yet been given. The battle against blackleg coal needs to be taken up, over the heads of the officials, by the miners direct to the workers in the docks, in the ports and on the railways. Finally the fight for international help must go forward more than ever.

The events of the past few weeks have shown more clearly than ever before the tremendous possibilities of victory if a strong stand is made, if there is no weakening and if every force is put into the field.

## Appeal of the R. I. L. U. on Behalf of the British Miners.

An appeal of the R. I. L. U. to its affiliated organisations points out that the British miners have given an excellent example through six months steadfastness and heroism of how to defend class interests. The British miners have been cynically betrayed by the international organisations like the *Amsterdam International* and the *Int. Miners Federation* whose members they are. Only the R. I. L. U. and the international Propaganda Committee of the Revolutionary Miners, particularly their sections in the Soviet Union, have done their full duty. These are organisations to which the British miners are not affiliated. A victory for the British miners is still possible if the assistance of the broad masses in all countries is increased. There is no more important task at the present time than the assistance of the exhausted but still fighting British miners.

## The C. G. T. U. Organises a Solidarity Week for the British Miners.

The C. G. T. U. (*Confédération Générale du Travail Unitaire, French Unitarian General Federation of Labour*) has extended its relief action on behalf of the British miners. The leaders of the C. G. T. U. have decided to call for a voluntary levy among the workers organised in its ranks, amounting to 1% of their wages. In order to popularise this measure, a "British miners' week" will be arranged on the occasion of the celebration of the 7th November.

The trade union organisations affiliated to the C. G. T. U. have been called upon to carry out the necessary preparatory measures. At all the preliminary meetings and at all the central demonstrations an urgent appeal is to be addressed to the workers for solidarity for the fighting English miners.

The leaders of the C. G. T. U. have issued the following slogans for the 7th November:

Workers, come in your hundreds of thousands to the mass demonstrations on the 7th November!

Against the 12 milliards of new taxes and against high prices!

For increase of wages, bonuses for high prices and the 8 hour day!

Rally in your hundreds of thousands to the aid of the British miners!

## Appael of the Red Sport International on Behalf of the Locked-out English Miners.

To all Working Class Sportsmen of the World!

Moscow, 22nd October 1926.

The English coal miners who on the first of May last took up the fight against the English capitalists, are, right up to the present moment, standing unshaken by their demands and are continuing the struggle.

The miners are fighting for the interests of the entire working class.

This struggle has now entered on a particularly critical phase, as the means of existence of the miners are becoming exhausted. The revolutionary organisations once again call upon the proletariat of the whole world to increase the aid for the miners.

There can be no member of the workers' sport movement who does not stand for the class struggle. The working class sportsmen are participants in the class struggle; they must not permit the bourgeoisie to throttle the miners. Expression must be given to class solidarity with the fight of the English miners. The miners who are physically exhausted in the struggle, must be given material support. The help of every class conscious and revolutionary working class sportsman is necessary. At the present time there must be no meeting of working class sportsmen, the proceeds of which meeting are not devoted in the first place to supporting the English coal miners. The workers sports organisations of a number of countries have already given a splendid example of fraternal working class solidarity by the organising of collections for the fighting English miners.

The worker and peasant sportsmen of all countries of the West and of the East should follow this example.

Long live the international solidarity of the working class sportsmen with the fighting English miners!

The Presidium of the Red Sport International.

## THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

### A Typical Example of the National Policy of the Soviet Union.

(The Socialist Soviet Republic of Usbekistan.)

By Achun Babajew.

Chairman of the Central Executive Committee of Usbekistan.

The Socialist Soviet Republic of Usbekistan, which came into being as one of the republics in the former colonial territory of the Czarist Empire in Central Asia, is the best evidence as to how the Czarist State carries out its declarations and principles and solves the national question.

In the family of nations of the republics which belong to the Soviet Union, the Republic of Usbekistan is the youngest offshoot. It is only three years since the period of peaceful economic construction began in this Republic. Until 1923 the fields and open country of Usbekistan were swept by the flames of turbulent war and the vassals of the Czar — the Emir of Bokhara and the Khan of Khiva — who had been driven from their thrones, organised, with the help of their accomplices, the lackeys and agents of world capital, the robber bands (Basmatshes) who terrorised the whole country for five years. These bands of robbers consisted mainly of the rich aristocracy (Beys), traders and corrupted elements, former officials of the Emirs who for many years had exploited the millions of inhabitants of the country, and enormous sacrifices and efforts were required on the part of the workers in the country in order to get rid of this brigandage.

When the civil war came to an end, the fields of Usbekistan were to a large extent in an untilled condition, the irrigation plants were destroyed and the economic life had come to a standstill. The success which the young Republic has achieved in the last two or three years is all the more surprising and deserving of admiration.

The economic life of Usbekistan depends greatly on agriculture. The main occupation of Usbekistan is the cultivation of cotton, to which aim the efforts of the Czarist colonisers were formerly chiefly devoted. The latter clung obstinately to the possession of the cotton plantations which were worked by the indentured labour of the Dechkanin (the Usbekistan peasants), who had been deprived of their rights; the plantation owners scooped in fabulous profits by the sale of the cotton.

The Soviet Government freed the Dechkanin from the tentacles of the blood-thirsty colonisers. The State undertook to grant credit in the form of money, seed and agricultural equipment to the Dechkanin who cultivated corn, at the same time undertaking the responsibility for the water supply and for the irrigation of the fields. In the economic year 1925/26 alone, the peasants who cultivate grain received credit advances from the State to the amount of more than 29 million roubles, and that without counting the seed-corn, the draught-animals and the agricultural equipment supplied them in advance. The outlay for the water supply increases from year to year. For this purpose, 5,926,000 roubles were spent in the economic year 1924/25 and 7,895,000 roubles in the current economic year.

The land-reform carried out by the Soviet Government in the current year is of quite special significance for the life of the Republic. The land belonging to the rich aristocracy (the feudal landowners), the large merchants and the clergy was divided amongst those who work the land with their own hands. In connection with this land reform, 56,830 new farms were apportioned to peasants who had never previously owned land. In addition to allocating land to these peasants, the State provided them with the necessary means of production, the equipment, draught-animals etc., on credit.

The Czarist colonisers had no interest whatever in introducing any advanced methods of agriculture into the cultivation of the soil of Usbekistan. The Soviet State on the contrary is doing everything in its power to lighten the arduous labour of the peasants and to provide them with all modern technical equipments. Under the colonisers, the Dechkanin did not even dream of the existence of a mechanical plough, whereas this year

more than 1000 tractors are already working in Usbekistan. The introduction of modern agricultural machinery increases from year to year by many millions of roubles.

For Czarist Russia and the colonisers, Usbekistan was merely a source of raw materials. They never troubled of course, to establish any local industry.

The Soviet Government is following quite a different path. In the former Czarist colony, it is calling into being native industry and building works and factories. In this country which, until now, did not even know what a factory chimney looked like, chimney after chimney is springing up, and the ranks of the proletariat, formed from the native population, are growing and consolidating. Gigantic sums are being allocated for the electrification of the country and about 18 large electric power stations are being built, the best of which and one of the largest in the Social Union, the power station of Bos-Duisk, has started working this year.

The Czarist Government did not concern itself in the least with the cultural development of its colony and bequeathed to the Soviet Republic of Usbekistan a legacy consisting of a population, 96% of whom were illiterate. If individual inhabitants of Usbekistan have nevertheless succeeded in acquiring an education, it is exclusively on a religious basis, in the clerical schools, in which their clergy, with the help of the Koran have trained the Dechkanin of Usbekistan into devoted slaves. Until the revolution in Usbekistan there were only isolated secular schools, especially such in which the instruction was in Russian.

At the present day the Republic spends a considerable part of its Budget on the education of the people. The network of schools spreads further and further from year to year. In 1925/26 alone, 508 elementary schools were established, 434 being in the "Kischlaki" (villages). In these schools 79,577 children are instructed in their native language. Apart from this, there are at present in Usbekistan 37 technical schools of the trade unions, 39 secondary schools and 2 institutions for higher education, in which 11,900 pupils are being instructed. More than 1000 citizens of Usbekistan are being educated at the Universities of the Soviet Union and other institutions for higher education which were barred to them before the revolution. Moreover dozens of inhabitants of Usbekistan graduate at the Universities of Western Europe.

The Soviet Government is also making itself responsible for extending the network of hospitals. The Republic spends more than 2.5 million roubles per annum on the preservation of health as against 200,000 roubles allotted to this purpose by the colonisers. Let us then ask ourselves who is actually in control of this young Republic, the territory of which was until recently devastated under the despotic rule of Czarist officials and vassals of the Czar — the Emir and the Khan with their dignitaries. In the interval between two Soviet Congresses, the highest authority in the Republic is the Central Executive Committee appointed by the Congress. At present the Central Executive Committee is composed of 29 workers, 152 of the Dechkanin and 17 intellectuals. The Soviet of the People's Commissaries — the executive body of the Government — consists of 5 workers, 3 of the Dechkanin and 3 intellectuals. Of the leading personalities in the Soviet institutions of Usbekistan, 90% are natives of Usbekistan, 75% of them belonging to the Dechkanin, 20% being workers and 5% intellectuals.

Under Czarism, the natives of Usbekistan were absolutely excluded from the apparatus of State and the Government, and the official language was Russian and Russian alone. In the Soviet Republic of Usbekistan, the language of the prevailing nationality was introduced into the apparatus of State. The rights of the national minorities however (in Usbekistan there is, apart from the Usbekistans a considerable number — almost 25% — of other, smaller nationalities) are preserved throughout the country. Thus for instance, among the 1720 Soviets, 477 use the language of the national minority in question, all of them having the same rights as the Usbekistans to be taught in their native language and to other cultural and social institutions. In Usbekistan, which embraces so many nationalities, the national hatred and friction which had developed such intensity under the Czarist regime, have ceased altogether under the Soviet Government with its strict observation of the national rights of each individual national group.

The Soviet Government has freed Usbekistan from the yoke of nationalism. The workers of Usbekistan have, of their own free will and in accordance with their unanimous wish, joined

the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics as a Republic possessing equal rights in every respect.

At the present time, the Soviet Republic of Usbekistan is still far behind the other Republics which belong to the Soviet Union. Even to-day however the brother peoples of the suppressed colonies can learn much from Usbekistan.

By the example of Usbekistan which, under the Soviet Government, has, in the course of three or four years, developed from a subjugated Czarist colony into a flourishing Soviet Republic, they can learn a practical lesson as to the only way which will lead them to freedom.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Strike Movement in Syria.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

Two circumstances are influencing the strike movement in Syria, which is continually becoming more intensive: on the one hand the growing revolutionary agitation in connection with the revolt which, in spite of brutal punishment, prohibition of the press, deportations etc., cannot be suppressed. On the other hand the continual worsening of the economic situation, the sinking of the already low wages and the increasing paralysis of industrial undertakings, as a result of foreign competition and which is leading to wholesale unemployment.

Apart from Damascus, where the working population is for the greater part in the camp of the insurgents, but where practically no industry exists (in fact there is only one leather factory in the Midan quarter), the three most important towns are: Beirut, Aleppo and Homs.

In the past Summer the strike movement was most powerful in Beirut. The young trade unions in this town were taken over by revolutionary elements, and one after another strikes broke out in the various industries, in fact even in the municipal undertakings, tramways etc. The strike movement which, owing to lack of experience and insufficient strike funds, very quickly assumed the form of demonstrations and revolutionary actions, frightened the French government and that part of the native bourgeoisie allied with it. A number of "energetic" measures were immediately adopted in order to throttle the strike. In the first place all "dangerous" leaders were arrested, kept for months in prison and finally sent to Ruad, the island where political prisoners are exiled.

In Aleppo, where the strike extended to the railway workers, the government was at first cautious enough to meet the demands of the strikers and then, after the calling off of the strike, by means of arrests and wholesale dismissals, took its vengeance and secured itself against a repetition of attempts to strike.

But the economic balance did not last long. There was an offensive on the part of the factory owners in Homs which gave occasion for fresh strikes. On the 4th October the owners of the Homs textile factories decided to make a considerable reduction in the wages of their workers. The weavers refused to work for lower wages and are now on strike. As even apart from this the market possibilities for textile products are very small, the owners are threatening to close the factories entirely if the workers do not return, and are attempting, in addition to this, to intimidate the strikers by engaging unemployed workers.

A strike movement of the weavers in Aleppo, which likewise commenced at the beginning of October, ended in a victory for the workers. In this case a court of arbitration, consisting of representatives of the authorities, was set up, which also this time, as in Summer, in view of the threatening general political situation, granted most of the workers' demands. It is true that the settlement, which provides for a wage increase of 17.5%, is only a provisional one; it is only valid for about 6 weeks and the factory owners hope that during this time they will be able to deprive the workers of their success.

As the fundamental cause of the economic crisis in Syria is the ruinous economic policy of the French, every economic movement is at the same time politically directed against French imperialism. This results in a sharpening of the conflict, which in the suppressed colonial countries is much greater than in the more or less settled conditions of present-day Europe.

## THE TRIAL OF BORIS STEFANOV

### The Opening of the Trial of Stefanov and Comrades.

Bucharest, October 29, 1926.

The trial of Boris Stefanov and his comrades has been fixed by the Military Commander of the II. Army Corps for Monday 1st November. In addition to Stefanov the accused include the trade union functionaries Josef Illyés and Luka Laszlo, as well as two students, Bernhard Zaharescu and Lisa Dijour.

The indictment which comprises 76 pages of type writing, charges the accused with the crimes of high treason, espionage, conspiracy against the security of the State, as well as creating an atmosphere of unrest among the population of the country. The indictment is based upon the penal law, the military criminal code and the provisions of the State of Siege.

The only evidence which can be brought against the accused is that they have been carrying on communist propaganda. Boris Stefanov is described as a special "criminal" who drafted an agrarian programme, which, among other things, calls for the expropriation of all the big landed estates in favour of the peasants, the free distribution of the soil among the poor peasants and the provision of dwellings for agricultural workers, and calls upon the workers to join the Communist Party.

Boris Stefanov is also charged with the crime of having written articles in a paper which appeared in a perfectly legal manner. Thus it is stated in the indictment that he is responsible for all articles appearing in the "Socialismul" (the former Central organ of the Communist Party of Roumania). It is sought to substantiate this charge by pointing to the statutes of the Comintern and of the Balkan Federation, in which it is expressly stated that all members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party are responsible for the articles appearing in the organ of the Party. Among the incriminating articles are such as demand for the national minorities equal rights with the national majorities, and such as call attention to the savage suppression practised by the Roumanian oligarchy. Special attention is called to the conclusion of an article which states:

"Fresh arrests are being carried out because the Communist Party is the only Party which has the courage to proclaim the right of plebiscite by the national minorities".

Regarding the "part played by Boris Stefanov" the indictment states:

"Boris Stefanov was in close contact with Bulgarian Communist agents. He is on the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Roumania and approves (!) the plans of Dr. Rakovski, who intends to overthrow the Roumanian State. He came originally from Bulgaria and made known his revolutionary plans at a Party Conference held on the 3rd and 4th October, in which he urged that advantage should be taken of the discontent of the poorer peasant population by promising them land, cattle and agricultural implements".

As regards all the accused the indictment states:

"From what has been said before it is to be seen that these leaders of the Communist Central Committee seek by every means, by manifestoes, appeals to subscribe to the Soviet loan, by strikes and congresses, to take advantage of the good faith of the workers to create an atmosphere of depression, of unrest, of uneasiness and constant uncertainty and nervousness, as well as to incite the population against the authorities, whereby they endeavoured to discredit every act of the government in order, as a result of the general discontent, to cause a revolt to break out against the existing authorities and also against the authority of the king".

The indictment is not lacking in humour. Nearly three pages of typewriting are devoted to a description of the Ukrainian territory which was swept by civil war, in order to prove how the Communist Party wished to "convert Roumania into a wilderness".

\*) Since the above was written, it is announced that the trial of Comrade Stefanov has been postponed for another month. Ed.

On account of these "crimes" Stefanoff, according to the proposal of the Public Prosecutor, is to be sentenced to **lifelong imprisonment** and the other accused are to receive sentences of **from 5 to 20 years imprisonment.**

In all 186 witnesses have been summoned to appear at the trial. The Prosecution can bring forward as "witnesses" only police and Siguranza spies. The Defence will move that there shall be called as witnesses: political prisoners from all the prisons of Roumania; participants in the general strike of 1921; peasants who took part in the various peasants' revolts, leaders of the Parties of the national minorities as well as of the most important political parties of Old Roumania, the former Prime Minister Bratianu, Avarescu and several Ministers and the head of the Siguranza, Romulus Voinescu. Of course, it is doubtful whether the Ministers will be prepared to appear before the court.

The prosecution is represented by the Royal Commissar R. Hotineanu, one of the most notorious blood hounds of the Roumanian courts of justice.

The Defence have briefed the Secretary of the "League for Human Rights" in Roumania, C. G. Costa-Foru, the well-known Bucharest lawyer, Cruceanu, and the President of the Roumanian Law Society Dem. Dobrescu.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### Storm of Protest against the Threatened Murder of Sacco and Vanzetti.

The protest movement of the workers against the decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts which has refused to grant a new trial to the two revolutionary workers, is being joined in by ever greater masses of workers.

Not only are the Communists protesting, but also broad sections of reformist workers. These latter are deriving from the Sacco and Vanzetti case a good object lesson as to what the much praised democracy really means for the workers in the bourgeois State. For revolutionary workers there is no pardon from the bourgeois class courts, even if they prove their innocence a hundred times; that is the first lesson to be drawn from this shameful trial in Massachusetts by all workers who still have democratic illusions. The second lesson which follows the first, is that only the power of the working class can prevent the annihilation of the best champions of the proletariat. The organised working class has grasped these lessons; this is proved by the powerful protest in the various countries.

In America hundreds of protest meetings are being held every day, at which the workers indignantly demand the immediate release of Sacco and Vanzetti. It is worth noting that the house of judge Webster Thayer who refused to grant a new trial to Sacco and Vanzetti, is constantly guarded by police.

It is further significant that even such a Conservative bourgeois paper as the "Chicago Tribune" wrote on 25th October regarding the case of Sacco and Vanzetti:

"Some of the leading jurists in this country are supporting the fight of the two men against the sentence, which is now generally recognised to be unjust and which is based upon the most flimsy evidence".

In Paris, on 30th October, a meeting attended by a hundred thousand protested against the threatening judicial murder of Sacco and Vanzetti. The words of Comrade Cachin who appealed to the unity of the workers in order to save the victims of American class justice, were enthusiastically received by the crowd.

In Italy, the native country of Sacco and Vanzetti, the protest movement is likewise growing. The workers of Turin, Milan, Rome and Genoa have given expression to their protest in numerous telegrams, addressed to the American Embassy.

The Red Front Fighters' League in Berlin has sent the following telegram to the American Embassy:

"In the name of ten thousands of Red Front Fighters we protest against the planned judicial murder of Sacco and Vanzetti and demand the cancelling of the sentence".

It is now necessary to mobilise the forces of the working class in every country so that the American bourgeoisie will not venture to lay hands on Sacco and Vanzetti.

## IN THE INTERNATIONAL

### The Agenda of the VII. Plenum of the Enlarged Executive.

The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. has fixed the following agenda for the Seventh Plenum of the Enlarged Executive:

1. The world situation and the immediate tasks of the Comintern. (Speakers: Bucharin, Kuusinen).
2. Questions in connection with the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. (Speaker: Stalin).
3. The lessons of the British strike (Speaker: Murphy).
4. The Chinese questions (Speaker: Taupingshan).
5. Communist work in the trade union movement. (The treatment of this question will probably take place in commission) (Speakers before the commission: Losovsky, and a representative from the Czechish and the French delegations).
6. Communist work in the peasant movement (The treatment of this question will probably take place in commission) (A representative each from the Italian, German and Chinese delegations).
7. Questions relating to the individual sections.

### Declaration of the Representatives of the C. P. of Bulgaria and Latvia against Comrade Zinoviev Remaining at the Head of the Comintern.

"In the name of the C. P. of Bulgaria we express our complete solidarity with the declaration of the Delegation of the E. C. C. I. at the Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. of the C. P. S. U. of 23rd October 1926, in which it was declared that it is impossible for Comrade Zinoviev to remain and to work at the head of the Comintern. Owing to our absence from Moscow it was impossible for us to sign this declaration at the time.

Moscow, 26th October 1926.

The representatives of the Bulgarian Communist Party.

W. Kolarov. G. Dimitrov.

"As I was not present at the meeting of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. of 23rd October 1926, I request that my signature be added to the declaration of the representatives of the Communist Parties regarding Comrade Zinoviev."

Moscow, 27th October 1926.

In the name of the C. P. of Latvia.

P. Stutchka.

## THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

### The Session of the International Co-operative Alliance in Hamburg.

By L. Chintschuk.

The attacks of the representatives of the Right Wing of the International Co-operative Alliance upon the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union were especially heavy during the last session of the Central Committee, held in the middle of October in Hamburg. They attempted to weaken our influence in the international co-operative movement. For this purpose they accused us of publishing in the foreign Press attacks upon the Alliance and of interfering in the affairs of foreign co-operative organisations. The Right wing pointed out that such action was contrary to the rules of the Alliance and that the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union should therefore have no place in the Alliance.

The atmosphere became especially electric during the reading of our protest in regard to the delay to our motion of revision of the plenary committee's resolution concerning the organisation of international co-operative help for the British

miners. The representatives of individual organisations endeavoured beforehand to persuade us, representatives of the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union, not to bring forward the motion. But in view of the fact that we would not listen to their proposals they determined to take up the offensive in this question and, in order to defeat our motion, accused us of interfering in the affairs of other countries. The result of the voting actually was that our motion was rejected.

In the question of the modification of the statutes of the Co-operative Alliance the Right wing again tried to limit our rights in every direction. They brought forward a motion to regard the Soviet Union as a single country and limit its representation, in accordance with the rules of the Alliance, to seven seats, whereby the individual republics of the Soviet Union would be deprived of the right to send representatives of their own. This proposition was accepted only with a relative majority: 19 votes were cast in favour, 15 votes against, while 5 votes were withheld. In this question a number of organisations, which usually voted with the German and the Polish groups in the Alliance and against us, came over to our side.

The Belgian delegates had put forward a motion for compromise, according to which the rules of the Co-operative Alliance should be altered in such a way that for the Soviet Union the greatest number of members on the Central Committee should be raised to 10 (according to the rules, no country may have more than 7 seats). The motion of the Belgians was rejected by 23 votes against 19. In view of such a result of the voting, the Swedish representatives made a third proposal, which was accepted by a large majority. It was to the effect that the question should once more be referred to the Executive committee, so that the interested parties might arrive at a more acceptable solution of the matter.

The question of the elaboration of the future political programme of the Co-operative Alliance also gave rise to acrimonious debates. First of all, the official speakers rose and, put forward several demands for an improvement in the position of the toilers and expressed the hope that these questions might be solved by the League of Nations. In my speech I pointed out that the political neutrality, to which the Alliance considers itself to be bound, is the chief cause of the alienation of the Alliance from the working masses, an alienation which exists despite the fact that the Alliance comprises 50 million members. In order to solve the economic and political questions with which the Alliance is faced, it is necessary that the Alliance abandons the principle of political neutrality and goes over to the platform of international Labour solidarity and close co-operation with the proletarian parties and trade unions. I pointed out the danger of co-operation on the part of the Alliance with the League of Nations and also the necessity of taking the initiative and convoking an international workers' economic conference, whose task it must be to work out ways and means for the creation of an economic united front of the workers' organisations and a programme of international economic demands.

As the voting results on the individual points clearly showed that all the attempts of the representatives of the Right wing of the Co-operative Alliance against the co-operative societies of the Soviet Union are built upon sand, they decided to postpone, to a time which would be more favourable for them, the question of the "attack upon the Alliance", which they had brought up. In all probability, the next sitting of the Central Committee of the Alliance will take place in Brussels in April 1927.

When we consider the results of the sitting of the International Co-operative Alliance at Hamburg, we must recognise that they are of great significance. Obviously the pillars of political neutrality are giving way. The co-operative societies are a rallying ground of the working masses. The co-operative societies of the West are practically the only organisation which gather about them great masses of women. The Social-Democratic parties are trying with all their forces to get the co-operative societies on to their side and to make out of them a firm economic and political foundation. If the co-operative societies once abandon the principle of political neutrality, accept the principle of international solidarity among workers and begin to regard themselves as a part of the international Labour movement, they will be transformed into a tremendous economic and political force for the toilers. In order to achieve this we are carrying on our struggle in the International Co-operative Alliance.

## OBITUARY

### Eugene V. Debs.

By Edward Duncan (New York).

In the history of the American Labour movement the name of Eugene V. Debs, lately deceased in New York, will assume a place of honour. When one recalls the people, who in the eighties and nineties of the nineteenth century, played a prominent part in the dawn of the American Labour movement, two figures stand out above all others: Samuel Gompers, whose name is the symbol of an agent of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the Labour movement, and Eugene V. Debs, whose name is inseparably connected with the development of the revolutionary proletarian movement. Debs, who was a worker on the Western Railway, stood in the foreground of the class-fights of the eighties and nineties and during these years he gained his revolutionary training. In the great railway strike of the year 1894 he was the leader. He was very soon thrown into prison. At this time his range of vision was limited to the interests of the trade unions, but the experience which he gathered in the fights and the Socialistic literature which he read in prison influenced him so much that, when he became free, he declared that from that time onward he would belong to the revolutionary wing of the Labour movement.

Debs took part in the founding of the American Social-Democratic Party in the year 1900 and became its greatest leader. When, in the year 1905, the trade unions began to change into organs of the Labour aristocracy, the reaction of the process took the form of the organisation of the Industrial Workers of the World (I. W. W.), which pursued the utopian policy of dissolving the old trade unions and setting up new revolutionary organisations. Debs was one of the founders of this movement, along with Haywood, De Leon and others. Later on Debs saw the unwisdom of this policy and devoted himself exclusively to the Socialist Party. On several occasions the Socialist Party nominated Debs as candidate for the presidency.

During the period of degeneracy of the Socialist Party, in the years 1910 to 1912, when Haywood was expelled from the Central Committee and all the members of the Left Wing were expelled from the party, circumstances began to grow unfavourable for Debs. The ideological level of the party sank still lower.

The cause of Debs' ideologic backwardness was the weakness of his knowledge of Marx. Marxism was not at that time available in the United States in a pure form. There prevailed a mixture of trade-union ideology, unclear ideals of the farmers, of the petty bourgeoisie of the towns and of the Labour aristocracy, which was at that time taking shape. There was also perceptible a certain influence from the Socialism of Lassalle, brought over from Germany. Debs was a man of feeling without any clear point of view, a man who continually groped with revolutionary instinct for the paths of revolution.

When the world war broke out, Debs did not go with the traitors, and it seems incomprehensible that he could co-operate with certain social patriots. Less overt traitors, such as Hillquit, Berger and others, kept the old warrior in check.

When the Russian Revolution blazed up, old Debs was moved to the depths of his soul by the magnitude of the conflagration.

When he began to call himself a "Bolshevist from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet" and to denounce the Imperialist war, he was sent to prison for ten years.

The last few years of Debs' life were full of great tragedy. As he came out of prison, old and broken, he fell into the hands of the social traitors, who are now at the head of the Socialist Party. Debs' old relations with them were too strong for him to sever. The Socialists of the stamp of Hillquit exploited him without the slightest sense of shame. But still, guided by his revolutionary instinct, Debs repeatedly pitted himself against them. All that remained of the "Left Wing" of the Socialist Party during recent years was embodied exclusively in the person of Eugene V. Debs. For the last five years he held himself aloof from party politics and gave moral support to the movement of the proletarian united front, in which the Communists participated.

Debs was no Communist, but his name is closely associated with the whole history of the revolutionary movement in the United States.