

Andreyev: Report on the Berlin Meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6 No. 62

16th September 1926

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

CONTENTS

Our Warning. Leading Article of the "Isvestiya", Sept. 8th, 1926.

Tang Shin She: The War Manoeuvres of the Imperialists on the Yang-Tse-Kiang and Their Intrigues in Chinese Politics.

Politics.

Josef Haken: The Stabilisation Crisis in Czechoslovakia.

Fl. Stenger: The Poincaré Regime in Alsace-Lorraine.

F. N.: The Tangier Problem.

Appeal of the C. C. of the C. P. of Poland and of the C. C. of the C. P. of Lithuania to the Workers and Soldiers of Poland and Lithuania.

The Balkans.

B. Boshkovich: The Economical and Political Crisis in Yugoslavia.

Economics.

Eugen Varga: The Problem of the German Bourgeoisie: Rationalisation.

The Labour Movement.

Camille Fegy: The Mutinies in the French Fleet during the Moroccan War.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

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

The White Terror.

A. Nin: The Persecution of the Working-Class Fighters in Spain.

In the International.

Resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. of Italy on the International Situation.

Our Warning.

Leading Article of the "Isvestiya" of September 8th, 1926.

In spite of the first note of the Soviet Government dated August 31st, Chang Tso Lin's men gang hangers-on continue their activity. Admiral Shen expressed himself in a disgraceful manner in regard to the confiscation of the China-Eastern Railway's flotilla on the Sungari River. The school of the China-Eastern Railway was closed and sealed and the employees were driven away. In Peking itself, the Russo-Chinese University, which was under the protection of the China-Eastern Railway, has also been closed. The recent successes in North China seemed to have affected Chang Tso Lin's head. On the other hand, the "invisible" advisers, who are driving the Marshall of Manchuria on to a dangerous adventure, seem to impose their will very forcibly upon him.

The workers and peasants of the Soviet Union want to live in peace with all their neighbours. They are busy with the great Socialist construction, with the rebuilding of the national economy, of agriculture, with the development of industry, of the transport system and of commerce. They do not want any wars. They avoid international complications. The Soviet Government is bringing into reality the will of the peoples of the

Soviet Union. It has repeatedly proved its peaceable disposition. On this occasion, too, it will continue steadily in the path of peace, without fear of the obstacles and without giving way to provocation. It will lose no opportunity of facilitating the exchange of opinions which has been promoted.

There is a limit, however, to everybody's patience. The new note of the Soviet Government concerning the activity of Chang Tso Lin is a timely warning to the Mukden rulers and his foreign advisers that the events in Kharbin are straining the patience of the Soviet Union.

We have no doubt that the broad masses of the workers and peasants in the Soviet Union will unanimously support the protest of the Soviet Government against the breach of the treaty, signed by Chang Tso Lin himself, concerning the China-Eastern Railway, which treaty is based upon the principle of the complete equality of the Soviet Union and China. Again we have no doubt that they in common with the Soviet Government will rise in defence of this treaty. In order to frustrate the outrageous lying and slandering campaign of the Imperialists of the whole

world, we deem it necessary to call upon and warn the working masses.

We appeal first of all to the workers and peasants of China. You will be told that the Soviet Government is following a policy of conquest in Manchuria, just as the old Czarist Government did. You will be told that the "Red Imperialism" which is hidden behind the revolutionary make-up, actually wants to subjugate you and compel you to serve its interests.

That is lies and calumny. All aggressive action is foreign to the Workers' and Peasant's State, the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government was the first Government to conclude with China a peace and friendship treaty on the basis of complete equality. It voluntarily renounced the right of extritoriality and all other privileges which the Czarist Government had extorted from China. It restored to the China people the neutral district along the China-Eastern Railway and instituted in the administration of the railway equal rights for the Soviet Union and China. It has always had the greatest sympathy for the national liberation movement in your country. It will not change its standpoint on this occasion. It has no intention of pursuing a policy of expansion. It defends and will continue to defend the interests not only of the Russian workers and peasants but also the Chinese workers and peasants against the violence of Chang Tso Lin, that tool of foreign Imperialism.

We appeal, further, to the toilers of the whole world, but

especially to those in England and Japan. The big Imperialist States are playing with fire. In their hatred of the first workers' and peasants' republic they are capable of using any weapon. They plot intrigues, and organise political adventures in order to ruin the Soviets Union or, at least, to do it grave injury. At present they are concentrating their energy in Mukden. They trust to be able to make a point of vantage there from which to strike at us. "But every deed has its logic." If the storm breaks over the fields of Manchuria, it will inevitably spread to other countries. The working class of the whole world will be faced with the danger of war. **Bear this in mind and do something, before it is too late!**

The broad masses of the English proletariat have now to bear great responsibility. They were always opposed to war and frank friends of the Soviet Union. In 1920 they prevented the intervention of Lloyd George in the Russo-Polish war on the side of Poland. In 1923 they frustrated Curzon's ultimatum. In 1925 and 1926 they fought determinedly against the threatened breaking off of relations between England and the Soviet Union. The Trade Union Congress, which is being held in Bournemouth and at which five million organised workers are represented, can and must inform the Government: "We want no adventure in Manchuria!"

In the Far East storm clouds are rising. We want peace and would warn you of the danger which is threatening!

The War Manoeuvres of the Imperialists on the Yang-Tse-Kiang and Their Intrigues in Chinese Politics.

By Tang Shin She.

The Chinese Press reports that on August 14th three days after the orderly retreat of the Kuo Min Armies, Chang Tso Lin "captured" the Nankow Pass. As soon as their telegraph offices, which were the first to get word, published the news of the "important victory" of Chang Tso Lin, the English were mighty proud and boasted that the guns which had been made in Mukden under the supervision of the English General Setton had brought about this result. But now, for the attacks in the Yangtse district, it will not be guns from Mukden that will be used, but guns of their own made in the British Isles.

The English even demand an international cannon campaign in China, such as that in connection with the Boxer rising in the year 1900, and have already approached Japan, Italy, America and France with an appeal for support. According to the latest reports, Wanshien, an important harbour town on the Upper Yangtse in the Province of Szechuan, has been destroyed with English guns and hundreds of Chinese have been killed. There are already 15 warships belonging to the international Imperialists lying off Hankow. This is a sign that the Imperialists think that the time is ripe to make a move against the revolutionary powers of China, which have now captured the heart of China, Hankow and Wuchang.

A pretext for the fight against the so-called "Boxers" was found in the murder of a few diplomats and missionaries. In the spring of this year, the Imperialists under the leadership of the Japanese undertook to intervene in Chinese affairs on the pretext that the occupation of the River Peiho by the Kuo Min armies constituted a breach of the peace treaty of the Boxer rising.

What "ground" have the English on this occasion for their conduct in Yangtse? During the present war in the Yangtse district, the opposing generals advised the foreign consulates that no foreign or Chinese ships might pass through the war zone, or, if they did, then it would be on their own responsibility. Previously, in the many Chinese wars, it was understood that all foreign ships might freely cross the war zone at any time; a fact which was of immense advantage to the Imperialists, for (1) they could earn a great deal of money by taking over the transport trade which could not be operated by Chinese ships; (2) they could assist the leader who represented their interests by furnishing him with arms, munitions and troop transports. If anything happened to these ships, they then demanded double indemnity. The Imperialists had, there-

fore, to meet with no inconvenience during a war; on the contrary, they enjoyed all the advantages of profiteering.

The present prohibition on the part of the belligerents of the passage of ships constitutes no breach of treaty, as the Imperialists otherwise like to up it; it amounts to a warning to be cautious, communicated first of all by the Canton troops to protect foreigners from loss or injury. As regards the English, this amounts not merely to a business loss; they could not even hasten to the assistance of their lackey, Wu Pei Fu. For the other powers, too, it means the loss of the privileges which are not covered by treaties.

It is interesting to note that the incident on the Yangtse happened to take place between the English and Yang Sen, an adherent of Wu Pei Fu. Officers of Yang Sen accompanied by several soldiers wanted to go on board an English steamer and sail with it; just as they reached the middle of the river in their small boats, the English ship turned about at full speed so that the Chinese boat capsized and 58 people were drowned. As soon as the English ship arrived in Wanshien, the governor, Yang Sen, immediately sent several persons to investigate the affair. A British war ship wished to have these persons disarmed by British marines and fired upon them, wounding two of them. Another British warship bombarded the town in the meanwhile and caused terrible damage there. Thereupon, the Governor of Szechuan confiscated two English ships.

That the Imperialists do what they like with high officials and generals in China, has become already a matter of sport, but that a military functionary should turn upon the robbers by divine right is something unusual. We should be aware that the Imperialists are in close relation with high military commanders such as Chang Tso Lin, Wu Pei Fu, Sun Chuan Fang; they have, however, no respect for the lesser generals of their lackeys. Yang Sen, the Governor of Szechuan, is not a reactionary but rather somewhat progressive. He is an adherent of Wu Pei Fu, but only insofar as he desires to fight under his flag against the many other little generals of different orientation in Szechuan. Recently he has sent a number of delegations to Canton to express his sympathy for the Kuo Min Government. It is possible that Yang Sen desires to give the Canton Government a proof that he is earnest in his wish to join the fighting line against the Imperialists.

The English have been obliged to accept the defeat of Wu Pei Fu as a fact. They are now seeking another military

commander to serve their ends in the Yangtse-District: Sun Chuan Fang. This general has, up to the present, preserved an undecided attitude towards Canton and the Kuo Min Armies; it is true that he was in communication with them, but he has now gone over to the front opposed to the Reds. The English and the Japanese have long endeavoured to bring about an alliance between Sun Chuan Fang and Chang Tso Lin, who were previously bitter antagonists, and they have now succeeded in consummating this alliance. Sun Chuan Fang has always been an obedient lackey of the Imperialists and is extremely reactionary. He is a co-founder of the Constitutional Defence League, which is supported with English pounds, and, though it fights nominally against the Communist International, in reality it contends against the whole of the Chinese liberation movement.

Sun Chuan Fang's undecided attitude in the past is attributable to the circumstance that his power in the five provinces is built upon sand, a fact which we have often mentioned in these columns. The English newspaper in China, "North China Daily News", put rather mournfully the question on August 4th: Which of all the generals in the five Yangtse provinces are really subject to Sun Chuan Fang? Of the five provinces, Fukien and Kiangsi have long ago severed their connection with him; in both of these provinces there are also many generals who sympathise with the Canton Government. If the revolutionary troops of Canton wished to capture these provinces, they would merely have to march in and they would encounter little resistance. As a matter of tactics and in order for the time being not to make an enemy of Sun Chuan Fang, they have up till now avoided entering these provinces. Sun Chuan Fang, too, was not desirous of entering into hostilities with the Kuo Min Government. The destruction of Wu Pei Fu compelled the English to incite Sun Chuan Fang to oppose the Canton Government, this general had his eye upon the leadership of the Chili Party.

As the fights between Sun Chuan Fang and the revolutionary forces contrary to expectations have so suddenly become acute, the end of Sun Chuan Fang, too, may be anticipated at an early date, provided that the Imperialists do not intervene; on the one hand, the revolutionary armies have recently taken about the half of Kiangsi, on the other hand, the revolutionary movement is approaching ripeness in all of the five provinces. As soon as the Canton troops take Kiukiang (harbour town of Kiangsi) Sun Chuan Fang's headquarters, Nanking, will be in danger.

The Imperialists had two objects in intervening in China: They wanted either to destroy the Canton Government and the Kuo Min Tang or to win them over to their side. The Anfu (Tuan She Sui) Party would welcome the following solution: Co-operation among the five chiefs: Chang Tso Lin, Sun Chuan Fang, model Governor of Shansi, Feng Yu Hsiang and Chang Kai She and a common cabinet under the leadership of Tuan She Sui. The Anfu Party's statement regarding its attitude towards Kuo Min Tang is of interest:

"Our adherents work willingly together with the Kuo Min Tang. Sun Yat Sen was formerly opposed to such co-operation; later on we were unable to work with them, because we could not ascertain which was the right Kuo Min Tang; there was a centre in Canton and another in Shanghai and a distinction was made between Left and Right. Now we know that Chang Kai She is the leader of the Kuo Min Tang and we wish to work with him."

Sun Chuan Fang wrote a long letter to Chang Kai She about the middle of August in which he stated that he would not be disinclined to join forces with him, but Chang Kai She would have to decide to dismiss all the Communists from the Kuo Min Tang and all the Russians from the army. Naturally the revolutionary party, the Kuo Min Tang, and their leaders, are not willing to accede to the requests of the Imperialists and their lackeys. The best proof of this is that the leader of the Canton troops, Chang Kai She, made an attack upon Kiangsi shortly after receipt of Sun Chuan Fang's letter.

POLITICS

The Stabilisation Crisis in Czechoslovakia.

By Josef H a k e n (Prague).

Czechoslovakia was one of the first states of Europe in which the reconstruction of capitalism was taken up immediately after the war. The foundations of the Czechoslovakian republic were laid by the then minister of finance, Dr. Rasin, the best bourgeois national economist of that time, who proved himself capable, as practical and leading politician of the bourgeoisie, of putting the bourgeois plans into practice. His financial plans were supported not only by the parties of the bourgeoisie, but also by the Socialist parties. Rasin's plan of finance was the foundation stone for the consolidation of the capitalist economics in Czechoslovakia. A deflation was effected, the financial position of the banks strengthened. Rasin was a member of the most powerful group of banking capitalists; the burdens of taxation were thrust upon the broad strata of the people. This was followed by the reduction of wages and salaries, and wages were further depreciated by increasing prices for the necessities of life, and by higher rents.

The bourgeoisie, aided by the Socialists, redoubled its attacks upon the working population, and established its economic and political position on a firm basis. Many of the laws passed during the period just passed through have favoured the economic and political consolidation of the capitalists, and signify a strengthening of reaction. The Social Democrats have not only aided in the passing of these laws, but have actually proposed various of them.

The bourgeoisie, under the protection and with the co-operation of the reformists, has proceeded with increasing energy with the work of capitalist reconstruction, at the expense of the working class.

The reformists have promised themselves a great deal from the consolidation (firm establishment) of the bourgeois state. They have built up the whole of their economic, social, and political activity on the basis of this consolidation. And this same basis is the foundation of their trade unionist and political action.

They have employed this slogan of consolidation to lead the workers astray, promising to secure for them by these means work, bread, and the possibility of an ever greater social-political protection.

It would be wrong to maintain that the attempts at consolidation have had no success. We have however maintained from the beginning that such success as had been attained is of a temporary nature only, that the stabilisation is exceedingly unsteady, and that it has been purchased at the cost of enormous concessions on the part of the working class.

It is a matter of fact that the standard of living of the workers has been systematically lowered, and exploitation carried to a point of slavery.

The Communist Party alone has pointed out the true state of affairs, and has taken systematic action against the increasing impoverishment of the working class. Here special mention must be made of the energetic action taken against high prices last year, and of the even more successful action this year against the agrarian taxes. Both of these actions were carried on the one hand in Parliament, and on the other outside of Parliament, by means of a mighty movement in the working masses. This second action in particular was participated in by not only the indifferent workers, but by the workers belonging to both the reformist parties, despite the express prohibition of their leaders.

The bourgeoisie, however, is determined to continue its attacks, for the difficulties of stabilisation in Czechoslovakia force them to ever stronger measures.

The harvest has been gathered, and is declared by the official returns to be moderately good. The agrarian taxes have scarcely been put into force, but enormous rises in grain prices, and in the prices of the necessities of life, are already quoted in the markets. Within 14 days the price of corn rose at the Prague produce exchange by 15 kr. per 2 q., flour by 20 kr., barley by 40 kr., wheat by 4 kr., poppy seed by 30 kr. Maize,

field chicory, oats, caraway seed, etc., also rose considerably in price. The increased prices of agricultural products have brought with them a rising wave of higher prices for all the necessities of life.

The alterations in the laws protecting labour lessen this protection, and will further worsen the position of the poorer strata of the population. Preparations are being made for further weakening the laws protecting tenants, and for increasing rents. These steps mean a further reduction in the standard of life of the poor population.

When we remember that of late wages have been reduced by 40 to 60 per cent, and when we further take into account the reduction of real wages involved in the higher prices for the necessities of life, in the raised rents, and in the deductions from wages made in payment of sick club, old age, and invalid insurances we are able to form some slight idea of the frightful social situation of the working class.

One part of the bourgeois efforts towards stabilisation has been the introduction of the Ghent system of unemployment benefit. The Social Democrats are very pleased with this law, and it is principally their work. This alone demonstrates the unlimited confidence felt by the Czech Social Democrats in the consolidation of capitalism.

Despite these efforts on the part of the bourgeoisie, and despite the co-operation of the reformists, stabilisation is passing through a serious crisis in Czechoslovakia. The capitalists have been striving to concentrate financial capital, and large undertakings have been merged, but still Czechoslovakian capitalism is not on a firm financial footing, the state is in constant pecuniary distress, and at the same time the burden of taxation in Czechoslovakia is considerable.

Czechoslovakia being over-industrialised, since its foundation it has suffered from the difficulty of finding markets. One tenth of the existing industrial undertakings would certainly suffice to cover home requirements. What is to be done with all the goods produced? The lessened purchasing power of the greater part of the population diminishes the demands of the home markets, and foreign markets have not yet been permanently won. On the contrary, the export balance has become more and more adverse of late.

The lessened export is partially due to the Western tendencies of the Czechoslovakian government. Czech foreign policy has always been closely bound up with the Western capitalist states, especially France. But Czechoslovakia cannot find markets in this direction. The sole possible markets are the agrarian Balkan states, but these are restricting their orders to Czechoslovakia as reply to the introduction of the agrarian taxes. Other possible markets are Poland, and above all the Soviet Union, which last the Czech government has however not yet accorded a recognition de jure.

The products of Czechoslovakia are being supplanted to a great extent by German competition, for Germany has improved technical aids at its disposal, and can supply cheaper. The placing of Czech industry upon a modern technical basis would require enormous sums of money, and inland capital does not suffice for this. Of late Czechoslovakia has lost one market after another, so that its industries are plunging into a crisis extending like an avalanche. The permanent crisis in the coal trade is now accompanied by a crisis in almost every branch of industry. These crises have assumed catastrophic dimensions in the most important lines of export industry; the textile and glass trades. And even in the metal industry, which has been doing excellent business up to recently, extensive restrictions of output have been found necessary. The crisis has further extended to the electro-technical industry, to the ready-made clothing trade, and to the aeroplane building trade.

For the working class the consequences of this crisis are frightful. Unemployment increases rapidly. The estimate that at the present time there are a quarter of a million unemployed (out of 14 million inhabitants), and that these with their families count 600,000 human beings on the verge of starvation, will soon be too low. Besides these unemployed, there are many workers who are only employed for three or four days in the week, owing to the restrictions on production.

This catastrophic unemployment has led to the breakdown of the Ghent system of unemployment benefit. It has proved

that we were right in combatting the introduction of the Ghent system. The trade union organisations have in reality become relief associations, whose main care has been the finding of the money to pay the dole to the unemployed. Their capacity for action has been completely undermined by this. Lack of means has prevented the state treasury from paying its allotted share up to the present. The consequence is that the small trade unions have ceased to pay the unemployment benefit, and the other unions will be forced to follow their example within a short time.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia dealt with the situation of the working class in detail at its last session. It demanded the immediate convocation of Parliament for the adoption of extraordinary measures, and formulated the prerequisites for the liquidation of the catastrophe. The C. P. of Czechoslovakia stands on the brink of great mass and parliamentary actions, and has won for these the sympathy of not only the members of the Communist Party, but of the reformist and indifferent workers. The C. C. has issued a manifesto to the whole working class, appealing for participation in the action for the alleviation of the want and misery of the working people.

The stabilisation crisis is at the same time a reformism crisis, and especially a crisis for Social Democracy. The Social Democratic economic and political programme is completely bankrupt. The actions of the Social Democrats show their utter confusion. They are faced by the complete collapse of the basis of their tactics, indeed of their whole existence.

The stabilisation crisis is forcing the bourgeoisie to make further attacks upon the standard of living of the working class. The reformist workers, urged by necessity and influenced by the Communists, oppose the readiness of their leaders to continue their co-operation with the bourgeoisie in the efforts towards stabilisation.

Essential differences are observable in the political constellation. The difficulties of the stabilisation have drawn together nearly all the stronger parties of the bourgeoisie, without consideration of nationality. Consultations have already been held with a view to the formation of a bourgeois coalition which is to include German and Magyar representatives. The officials' government, convoked last year for a brief transitional period only, is likely to have a longer life than was expected, and will probably be relieved by a coalition of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties of all nations in Czechoslovakia.

The Czech reformist parties, which had already adopted the position of a moderate opposition during the spring parliamentary session, remain in this case permanently excluded from the parliamentary majority. This circumstance forces them to seek a new political platform. The Czech Social Democrats are endeavouring to approach the German Social Democrats and the Czech Socialists, with the idea of forming a so-called Left Block to be enlarged by those so-called advanced groups of the bourgeoisie which have had no representatives in Parliament up to now.

It is certain that this Left Block is rather intended to form a dam against Communism than against the bourgeoisie, and that it will further serve the purpose of awakening fresh illusions among the working class. Besides combatting Communism, the Left Block will perhaps take steps, with the aid of the "Residence" (Masaryk) against Fascism, which is becoming aggressive in Czechoslovakia. We find proof of this in the scandalous affairs involving Gajda, the Chief of the General Staff and a former general of Koltchak's.

It would be too hasty were we to designate the stabilisation crisis in Czechoslovakia as a bankruptcy, as an absolute collapse. The bourgeoisie will do its best to overcome the crisis, and solely at the expense of the working class. This is however bound to lead to an aggravation of class antagonisms, and to an exercise of pressure on the part of the proletariat for the struggle against the bourgeoisie, and against the stabilisation. This situation redoubles the tasks imposed upon the C. P. of Czechoslovakia. But it will prove itself capable of coping with these fresh tasks. A Party which could overcome its internal crisis so efficiently last year, a Party so united, so and disciplined, a Party growing both quantitatively and qualitatively, will be fully capable of winning over the masses of the proletariat, under the leadership of the proletariat.

The C. P. of Czechoslovakia issues the slogan of the **united fighting front of the proletariat** against the block of the bourgeoisie and against the Left Block. This slogan is being taken up to an ever increasing extent, both by the indifferent and the reformist workers, for these are rapidly losing faith in the capitalist stabilisation.

Sympathy for the C. P. of Czechoslovakia is growing, not only among the industrial workers, but among the peasantry and the poorer petty bourgeoisie. The Party is a mass Party, and this fact is due not only to its being the strongest political Party in the republic, but to the fact that its parliamentary and extra-parliamentary actions are actually comprehensible to the masses, and the masses take part in these actions and gain thereby more and more faith in the leadership of the Party.

It is true that the Party suffers from systematic persecution, but this rather increases its popularity than otherwise. The bourgeoisie and its governments would like very well to dissolve the Party and force it into illegality, but the strength of the Party is such, and the sympathy felt for it among the masses of the working population so great, that it is very difficult to carry out such an intention.

The leaders of the C. P. of Czechoslovakia stand firmly and unitedly together, and are fully aware of the difficulties of the situation, and of the difficulties to be encountered by the Party. And they are also fully aware of the responsibility resting upon them. The confidence which is felt in the Party leaders extends far beyond the confines of the Party itself. This again affords additional security for the success of further action on the part of the Czechoslovakian proletariat.

The Poincaré Regime in Alsace-Lorraine.

By Fl. Stenger (Metz).

The French Imperialist Government answered last July the publication of the Heimatbund (Homeland League) manifesto and the proclamation of the Executive Committee of the Strassburg Workers' and Peasants' Congress with reprisals against a number of the signatories of these documents. 10 railwaymen (Communists and members of the Homeland League), 2 teachers, 1 tax official, 1 chemist, 7 mayors, 4 municipal secretaries have been dismissed from their posts by order of the Government and turned on to the streets.

Against the 20 Catholic priests and Evangelic pastors, whose names also appeared on the reprisals list, no action has so far been taken. Evidently the warning of the Catholic authorities of Alsace-Lorraine has been taken to heart in Paris. The gentlemen have surely allowed themselves to be convinced of the utility of clericals to a Capitalistic State and have, therefore, given up their original intention of proceeding against this section of the community. It is believed in Paris Government circles that it is possible to come to an understanding with this order of "protestants".

These disgraceful punitive measures on the part of the Government provoked a great outburst of feeling throughout the country, expressed in the form of countless resolutions demanding the reversal of the measures of reprisal and calling for the intensification of the fight against French Imperialism.

The Government has already suffered a number of knocks. The disciplinary court of Strassburg, which, in accordance with Government dispositions, should have ordered the dismissal of a teacher and a tax-collector, has evaded the disposition and, instead of executing the dismissal, has merely imposed transference and fines. Further, the public counsel of Larreymines has requested the local Solicitors' Chamber to withdraw from the lawyer, Thomas, who also signed the manifesto of the Homeland League, the right to practise in the legal profession. The Chamber has refused to take such a step and maintains that the behaviour of the lawyer in question does not in any way call for proceedings of the kind, and added that it declines to proscribe the freedom of thought of one of its members.

The teacher Rossé, President of the Fédération des Fonctionnaires (Employees' Association), who was also brought to book, was re-elected as president at a congress of this association by 146 votes from an attendance of 149 persons, and at the same time a protest was made against the reprisals of the authorities,

constituting as they do a violation of the civil-servant's right to entertain any political opinion he may choose.

The fight against the reprisals and for liberation from the yoke of French Imperialism has developed within the last few months and become...

An extensive relief movement to aid the people who have been punished, has already begun. Money is being collected everywhere for their support. Meetings, held to discuss the Alsace-Lorraine question and the reprisals, are becoming more numerous.

Such a meeting was announced for August 22nd in Kolmar by both the Communists and the Homeland League. Within the last few weeks the Government has become nervous on account of the campaign against its policy of repression and was disposed to accept this event as a trial of strength. Although the demonstration was not officially prohibited, the Government is responsible for the occurrences in Kolmar on that Sunday.

The announcement of the meeting was scarcely published before the chauvinist press began a wild agitation against the "Autonomists". At the head of the band there marched, as usual when Capitalist privileges are to be defended, the Social Democratic newspapers, the "Freie Presse" of Strassburg and the "Republikaner" of Mülhausen.

This agitation was played right into the hands of the Fascists and Royalists for it permitted them much more freedom in their preparations for "action". Their ruffians streamed in from Belfort, Epinal and other localities. These were joined by the "volunteers", a pack which has apparently been organised to breed the wildest form of chauvinism.

These "picked troops" formed on Sunday in Kolmar, under the protection of the gendarmerie, a guarantee for the Government that the motherland would be defended against the "Autonomists". They met the leader of the Homeland League, Dr. Ricklin, (a man of about 60 years of age) and thrashed him with sticks. This happened under the eyes of the gendarmerie, who made not the slightest effort to protect the victim.

The same thing happened throughout the manifestation. The patriotic bandits continually attacked in their apache fashion the workers and clerks who wanted to demonstrate for their rights. It was again made clear to the workers that the Fascists, Royalists and the Republican Capitalist Government are leagued against them and that Fascism is being organised undisturbed under the wing of the Poincaré Government.

Arrests were made among those taking part in the demonstration, and several of the prisoners were sentenced the next day by the court of Kolmar and without any valid ground, to five days imprisonment for alleged "insult to the police force".

The events of August 22nd in Kolmar and the judgement of the local class-court have made broad strata of the working class an impression similar to that created in 1913 by the well-known Zabern, affair, when Prussian militarism brought the excitement of the population up to boiling point. At that time the lads armed themselves with revolvers and gathered from far and near in Zabern. French Imperialism is well on the way to provoke a similar occurrence.

The whole matter will have undesirable consequences for the oppressors. The working people of Alsace-Lorraine will double the energy they put into the fight which they have begun, under the leadership of the Communist Party, despite the Fascists and chauvinists and despite their allies, the Socialists.

The Tangier Problem.

By F. N. (Moscow).

Spain has brought up the Tangier question, shortly before the session of the League of Nations.

The geographical position of this little Moroccan town makes it the most important strategic point in the Mediterranean, and the key to the international ocean pathways in the hands of England.

For of what use are the strongest English fortresses, Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, and the "neutralised" Suez, with all

their maritime fulcrums, if Tangier is in the hands of a strong power? Cannons on the heights of Tangier, commanding Gibraltar, can transform this into a heap of ruins.

There are mighty regions behind Tangier, and, most important of all, it is unassailable from Gibraltar. Tangier has magnificent bays, headquarters for submarines, from where it is possible to stop all sea traffic between the Metropolis and the British Empire. In one word, England's ocean pathways and England's rule of the waves are only secure so long as Tangier does not belong to anyone representing a strong military power, and is not fortified with the modern technics of war. Now, as a matter of fact, every country which is anxious to secure its position in the Mediterranean, to increase its imperialist expansion, and to break the power of England, has commenced a cautious rapprochement to Tangier.

The agreements concluded between France and England on the 8th of April 1904 recognised France's rights in Morocco, but bound France at the same time not to fortify Tangier. Since then the policy pursued by England and France in the Tangier question has been limited exclusively to points of strategy. England defends, with all available means, the demilitarisation and internationalisation of Tangier. France on the other hand is endeavouring step by step to approach Tangier, holds back every other pretender, and makes every effort to increase its influence in Tangier. And France is succeeding to a certain extent in this. At the Algeciras Conference in 1906 France succeeded, with Russia's support, in gaining the upper hand over Germany, and not only secured its "right" to Morocco, a right this time recognised by all the countries participating in the Conference, but at the same time the right to the advantageous position which the French had already gained in actual fact in Tangier and adjacent districts.

After the war 1914/18 the Tangier problem again became a burning question, and after lengthy negotiations it found a solution in the so-called "Tangier Statutes", agreed upon between England, France and Spain on the 18th of December 1923.

Here three new points opposed one another; the French, the Spanish, and the "international", or rather the English. The first two contended with one another for the right to Tangier, whilst the third denied that either France or Spain had any right to Tangier whatever.

The Statutes internationalised Tangier and its environs, and subordinated it to a special legislative, administrative, juridical, and police regime. France received the fullest satisfaction possible under the given conditions. It recovered what it had itself abdicated to Spain in 1912. According to this agreement Tangier passed into the Spanish zone, that is, it was removed from the French protectorate, whilst according to the Tangier Statutes it remains under the sovereignty of the Sultan, that is, it is included under the protectorate of France.

The Statutes entrust the legal rights of the natives of the "special Tangier zone" abroad to the French diplomatic representatives.

The foreign consulates maintain intercourse with the Sultan through the French General Resident in Tangier. The administration is headed by a Frenchman, to whom the police are subordinate.

The natives are governed by officials of the government, that is, again by France. In this way France has practically had the complete protectorate over both Tangier and its environs, but without the right to erect fortresses.

Although the Tangier Statutes have already been put into practice, from the viewpoint of international law they are not legally valid until they have been agreed to by the whole of the states which took part in the Algeciras Conference.

Thus the Union of Soviet Republics (Russia having signed the Algeciras Agreement) has a right to express its point of view in this question.

This is the present position of the Tangier problem, seen from the viewpoints of history, strategy, and international law.

Spain has been at a disadvantage, and joined forces with Italy, which, not being immediately interested in the Tangier question, had been left out of the negotiations in 1923. Although the Tangier Statutes have been in practice for more than a year, still the fact that Italy was not included, makes their maintenance difficult.

The Italian subjects are in a favourable position as compared with the subjects of the countries which have signed the statutes. They are not subject to the Tangier administration, pay no levies, etc. This causes dissatisfaction, undermines the authority of the administration of this zone, and even endangers the maintenance of the statutes. For this reason the English government attempted last year to obtain Italy's agreement to the Statutes by means of concessions and recognition of some Italian claims. This would have given England the possibility of preventing a renewal of this unpleasant question, and of avoiding the danger that Spain and France would again insist upon their "rights" in Tangier.

England's initiative was however unsuccessful. France held obstinately to its view that the Agreement of 1912 obliges Italy to renounce all rights to Tangier, whilst Spain pressed its rights to Tangier even more urgently into the foreground.

The experience of the last war with the Riff Kabyles had shown England that the internationalisation of Tangier, even in its present form, is of great value. Were it not for this, Abd El Krim or the French would have taken possession of Tangier and its zone.

England might perhaps raise no objection against the Spanish claims, but it does not believe in the final and permanent pacification of the Riff tribes, and under these circumstances the transference of Tangier to Spain could, in the case of a fresh war in the Riff territory, cause the French to occupy Tangier. It is not fear of Spain, but these considerations, which cause England to hold to the Tangier Statutes. France's attitude in the question is as follows: The Statutes are to be maintained, for under present international conditions an expansion of rights in Tangier, no matter in whose favour, can only be at France's expense.

Italy, having received no satisfaction in Paris, has begun to seek it in Madrid. Primo de Rivera, demanding the transfer of Tangier and its pertaining zone to Spain as reward for its work of "civilisation", defends Italy's cause at the same time. It is important to note that the question has been taken up by a country whose own interests are at stake.

The revival of the Tangier question was intended at the same time to induce England to agree to Spain's receiving a corresponding position in the League of Nations. Italy's agreement is secured. The Spanish advance facilitates for Italy the possibility of insisting on being allowed to participate in the revision of the Statutes of 1923.

Spain's intention of convocating a conference of the states which signed the Algeciras Convention confirms the assumption that this campaign has been thoroughly well thought out, and not only by Spain.

This is the stage which the question has reached at the present time, and the position involves a regrouping of the Imperialist powers, that is, the danger of a fresh war.

Appeal of the C. C. of the C. P. of Poland and of the C. C. of the C. P. of Lithuania to the Workers and Soldiers of Poland and Lithuania.

The bourgeois world is preparing a new bloodbath. Pilsudski who is supported by Great Britain, is preparing a new imperialist war assisted by the Polish landowners who wish to recover their lost lands in Lithuania, in the Ukraine and in White Russia from the peasants.

Pilsudski's first aim is the annexation of Lithuania to be used as a cover for further conquests. Pilsudski has two possibilities of annexing Lithuania. He can send troops to Lithuania to make an "insurrection" there, that is to say to turn Lithuania into a colony. The second way is for him to arrive at an agreement with the Lithuanian clericals who will then make an insurrection against the petty bourgeois government of the People's Party and the Social Democrats and then appeal to Poland for assistance. As soon as the Lithuanian clericals have seized power they will incorporate Lithuania federatively into Poland. The

THE BALKANS

The Economical and Political Crisis in Yugoslavia.

By B. Boshkovich (Zagreb).

In spite of the stabilisation of the dinar and in spite of the favourable balance of trade, the economic crisis in Yugoslavia is at the present time becoming more acute. This economic crisis is due to an agricultural crisis, which, again, has an unfavourable effect on the industrial and financial difficulties. The bourgeoisie of Yugoslavia contrives to saddle the toilers with the results of the reorganisation of Capitalist economy. Unemployment is on the increase, the pressure upon the working class is growing heavier, bankruptcies are multiplying and ever widening circles of the people who have small or moderate possessions are becoming engulfed in the ruin.

The peasants, too, are beginning to feel the acuteness of the crisis. As early as the year 1923 the ground tax was raised by 500%. Against this must be set the fact that prices of agricultural products have fallen by 38%, while during this period the prices of industrial products have continued to rise. An especial aggravation of the position of the peasants is observable in those districts inhabited by the oppressed nations, for these are more heavily burdened than Old Serbia. In the non-Serbian parts of the country the ground tax represents up to 40% to 60% of the gross profit of the farms.

Another factor which tends to aggravate the position of the broad masses of the peasants in much the same degree as the "scissors" and the taxation, is the new land-reform, based upon the "lot purchase" system, i. e., the peasants buy the lots from the big agriculturalists. Thanks to this "reform" the peasants are made still more dependent upon the landowners and the banks.

The compromise of the Radić-Party with the Serbian Monarchy has not created any consolidation of the Yugoslav State regime with its many different nations. It leads merely to a general class differentiation among the oppressed nations, which, again, causes a regrouping of the forces of the classes and of the parties.

On top of all this there came the huge inundations which have jeopardised the harvests in the most fruitful areas. The total loss sustained through the inundations is estimated at 2½ million dinars.

Under such circumstances municipal elections were held in Serbia, Montenegro and Macedonia. In spite of the prevailing White Terror, accompanied by the usual "Balkan methods" — beatings, torture, arrest of the candidates of the opposition party, assassination of political opponents — the Government Party of the Radicals, who are supported by the Great-Serbian bourgeoisie and the well-to-do-Serbian farmers, met with defeat in many towns. In the Capital and in a number of other towns victories were gained by the Democratic Party of Davidovich, which opposes the "Radical" Government.

The defeat of the Radical Party is attributable in large measure to the internal strife between the Pasich faction and the faction of the Minister for Home Affairs, Maximovich, whom the Court circles favour. In Belgrad, for instance, the efforts of the Pasich faction at the polls were a great fiasco. A candidate of this faction, Bobich, received a total of only 2310 votes, the official candidate of the Radical Party, Kara-Ivanovich, — 6319 votes! Thanks to this factional fight, the Democrat, Dr. Kumandudi, proved to be a victor.

In these municipal elections the participation of workers, who are under the influence of the Communist Party, was insignificant. The workers knew beforehand that, no matter how the elections might go, all the mandates would be annulled on the basis of the "Act for the Protection of the State". This also happened in regard to the five mandates of the workers in Brod. At the first sitting of the Belgrade Town Council the Councillor Comrade S. Markovich, drew attention in his speech to the dreadful White Terror which raged throughout the election campaign and also to the bourgeois-role in which the names of deceased persons were entered, thanks to which circumstance the Radical Party won in many districts. Towards the end of his speech Comrade Markovich declared that the

clericals have already declared that there is only one way in which they can achieve power, and that is with the support of Poland. Ulmanis, the President of Lettland, recently journeyed to Kovno in order to advise the Lithuanian government to accept the Plan of Hymans according to which Lithuania will be turned into a colony of Poland. Chernov, the Socialist Revolutionary, also visited Lithuania in order to conduct an agitation against the signing of the agreement between Lithuania and the Soviet Union. They are all agents of Pilsudski and of Great Britain.

Whilst the Lithuanian clericals, Ulmanis, the President of Lettland, and Chernov, the lackey of Imperialism, are preparing the ground for the annexation of Lithuania by Poland and the transformation of Lithuania into a support point of the campaign against the Soviet Union, Pilsudski is mobilising troops and fascists upon the Lithuanian border with the view to a conquest of Lithuania. War is in sight!

Under these circumstances war between Lithuania and Poland cannot be regarded as an ordinary war between two bourgeois states both of which aim at annexations. On the one hand is the representative of international Imperialism — Poland which has become the vassal of Great Britain — and on the other hand the small and neutral Lithuania which in order to maintain its independence must run counter to the plans of Poland and Great Britain. In this war the resistance of Lithuania against Poland will be at the same time a struggle for independence against the imperialists, Poland however will be fighting for the annexation of Lithuania, for the enslavement of the Lithuanian people and for the preparation of an offensive of international Imperialism against the Soviet Union. A defeat for Lithuania would mean a strengthening of the Imperialists, a step towards the transformation of the Baltic states into a colony of the imperialist powers.

Comrades! You dare not remain neutral in the face of this swashbuckling policy of Pilsudski! You dare not wait until the horrors of a new war between Poland and Lithuania have burst upon you, a war which may develop into a new blood-bath amongst the peoples.

Workers, Peasants and Soldiers of Poland! The enslavement of Lithuania by Poland would mean a further strengthening of the reaction in Poland, a further strengthening of the dictatorship, a strengthening of Polish and international Fascism and a further enslavement of the working masses of Poland. In case of war the workers and peasants of Poland will be called upon to shed their blood for the interests of the British bourgeoisie. The whole burden of the war will have to be borne by the toilers. The finance crisis will be intensified and the difficulties will make Poland still more dependent upon Great Britain. Whilst Poland is destroying the independence of Lithuania, is turning it into a colony, it will be destroying its own independence at the same time, it will deliver itself over completely to the power of the British Imperialists. Remember that the annexation of Lithuania is only a beginning. You will soon be sent as the cannon-fodder of the British bankers to fight against the Soviet Union, to kill Russian workers and peasants and to be killed for the London Stock-Exchange.

Workers, Peasants and Soldiers of Lithuania! The new war means redoubled pressure upon the Lithuanian people by the Polish and Lithuanian bourgeoisie.

The Communist Parties of Poland and Lithuania strenuously oppose this new murder, they appeal to the masses of both countries to fight against this new danger of war.

Our slogans in the struggle against war and against Pilsudski are:

No annexation of Lithuania by Poland!

Away the enslavement of Poland and Lithuania on the part of British Imperialism!

Long live the rapprochement of the peoples of Lithuania, Poland and the Soviet Union!

Long live the right of self-determination of the suppressed peoples of Poland even to the point of secession!

Don't fire a single shot against the Lithuanian workers and peasants!

Long live the Workers' and Peasants' Governments in Poland and Lithuania!

working class did not regret in the slightest the defeat of the Radical Party, nor did it welcome the victory of the Democrats, for they all practised terror and violence against the working class.

The member of the Democratic Party, Davidovich, declared in a conversation with one of the staff of the Belgrade paper "Novosti" that if there had been any politically honest people in the Government they would long ago have resigned. The Bosnian Mussulmans in the person of their deputy, Dr. Spaho, and the Slovene Party, in the person of Dr. Korosec, welcomed the victory of the Democrats in most of the big towns and declared that this change in the relations of the political powers in Yugoslavia would give rise to a Government crisis. Concerning the Radić-Party, though they have joint the Government it is still not known whether they will remain loyal to the present coalition. It may be assumed that under certain circumstances Radić would break with the Government and ally himself to the Democrats and to the other parties of the Opposition.

In this way Yugoslavia is experiencing a serious internal crisis. The regime of the Great-Serbian bourgeoisie and their military Monarchy will lead to a further aggravation of this crisis.

ECONOMICS

The Problem of the German Bourgeoisie: Rationalisation.

By Eugen Varga.

The German bourgeoisie, like the English, is suffering from the difficulty in finding markets. But whilst in England the deflation was followed by increased powers of absorption in the home markets, in Germany the home markets have been narrowed down by the inflation. German industry is thus very anxious to export. In order to attain this object it is endeavouring, like English industry, to reduce the costs of production, and thus to increase its competitive powers in the world's markets. To this end it is striving for "rationalisation". As many misconceptions have arisen around this catchword, we shall endeavour to examine into the whole history of rationalisation, from the Marxist standpoint, with a view to discovering its economic import.

At the present time the German bourgeoisie understands under rationalisation every available method of increasing the profit of an undertaking. In order to obtain a clear idea of the subject, we must first differentiate between industrial capital and the working capital actuating the trade in commodities and money (loan capital, bank capital).

We are concerned solely with rationalisation as it touches industrial capital, which forms the basis of all capitalism. We shall not deal here with rationalisation in commerce, banking, etc.

Rationalisation in the sphere of industrial capital affects both circulation and production.

In the sphere of circulation rationalisation is taking two main trends:

a) The raising of prices above the price of production (the price of production as understood by Marx = cost price + average profit) by means of the monopolist merging of undertakings of the same kind.

b) Measures for lessening the share of non-industrial capital in the total profits.

It is superfluous to deal at length with the tendency towards industrial combines in Germany at the present time. It is however important to note that whilst during the inflation period the vertical trust formed the main type of combined undertakings, at the present time the tendency is again towards the horizontal combine, that is, the cartelling and trustification of undertakings producing the same goods, or the trustification of combined undertakings, accompanied by a specialisation of production in the individual works included in the trust, in accordance with any special local or technical advantages.

The attempt to lessen the share of non-industrial capital in the total profits is expressed in the endeavours to dispense with the middleman, and to establish direct communication between

producers and consumers, and in the endeavour to diminish the share taken by loan capital of the total profits.

To the working class this second method of rationalisation is a matter of indifference, economically speaking. It is a struggle in the capitalist class itself for the division of the spoil. (Politically it is of importance, since it weakens the unity of the bourgeoisie.) The formation of cartels, on the other hand, affects the working class directly, since the raising of prices above the price of production tends to lower real wages, unless rises in wages keep pace with the rises in prices.

The steps taken towards the rationalisation of production (the actual sphere of rationalisation) are of greater importance than those concerning circulation. The rationalisation of production may be divided into the following categories:

a) **The increased productivity of labour.** This means that technical progress, that is, the employment of improved means and methods of production, is utilised for lessening the time expended in making a unit of production. In this sense, rationalisation is nothing new. This has been going on ever since capitalism has existed. It signifies a real reduction of the price of production, without directly touching the division of the value produced into value and surplus value.

Indirectly, the increased productivity of labour, that is, the reduction of the cost price of a unit of production, means the possibility of reducing working wages, if the reduction of the costs of production extends to goods consumed by the workers. In accordance with Marx's theoretical assumption that under capitalism labour is paid for at its value, wages sink in proportion as the goods consumed by the workers cheapen. The capitalist share of the value produced increases, the real wages of the workers remain at the same level. Everything else being equal, this means an increase of the total profits of the capitalist class. But since the increase of labour productivity involves¹⁾ a displacement in the organic composition of capital that is, a tendency towards an increase in the constant factor of capital, the result is that the increased share of surplus value gained by capital by means of technical progress is accompanied by a lessening of the rate of profit. The combination of technical progress with monopolist determination of prices by the cartels aims at maintaining the old selling price in spite of the reduced cost of production, that is, it is an attempt to dam the tendency towards the sinking rates of profit resultant on increased productivity.

b) **Methods for producing relative surplus value.** Various of the endeavours towards rationalisation aim at reducing the working time required to make a unit of production solely by a better organisation of the work, that is, at reducing the price of production without improving the apparatus of production. This method is again nothing new, and has been employed again and again in different forms since capitalism came into existence. An important and interesting method of rationalisation is the endeavour to introduce uniform sizes and qualities for goods and parts of goods: standardisation. The reduction of working time required for the unit of production thus attained must obviously be classed in the category of relative surplus value; a closer examination would however be desirable.

c) **Increase of absolute surplus value by means of greater exploitation of labour.** This form of rationalisation affects the working class most of all. It involves not merely a simple lengthening of working hours, but aims especially at the intensification of work, at forcing the worker to expend more working energy in a given time. This last method is often designated as rationalisation, as if it were the sole form; this is naturally not the case. The introduction of the conveyor, and of other methods for automatically controlling and intensifying the amount of labour expended, are the chief means employed towards actualising this aspect of rationalisation. Work can however be intensified without the introduction of such technical innovations as the conveyor, simply by increasing the amount of work required within a certain time, by reducing piece wages or other methods. The whole of these measures have for object the

¹⁾ Under the organic composition of capital Marx understands the value ratio between constant and variable capital that is, between the capital invested in means of production, raw materials, etc., and that expended for wages. This value ratio depends on the technical conditions in any given case.

increased exploitation of labour, and increased expenditure of energy in the same time and for the same wages.

d) The enhancement of exploitation by the simple reduction of wages, a method which frequently results in the price of labour being forced beneath its value.

We see from the above that all the measures designated in the sphere of production as rationalisation are essentially endeavours to increase the rate of surplus value, in part by means of the increased production of relative surplus value, and in part by means of the increased production of absolute surplus value, or by the reduction of the price of labour below its value. We are of the opinion that there is no difficulty in classifying the whole of the methods of rationalisation under these categories of Marxism, and that it is an entirely wrong idea when the present rationalisation campaign is regarded by some of our comrades as something perfectly new and unheard of in the history of capitalism, as the Social Democrats represent it to be.

The German bourgeoisie is forced to resort to an increased exploitation of the working class.

If it is true that the whole of the processes being employed in Germany at the present time, under the name of "rationalisation", for increasing the profits of industrial capital, have already been in constant use during the whole of the history of capitalism, then this raises two questions:

1. Is the speed of rationalisation greater at the present time in Germany than is generally the case?

2. What success can this rationalisation bring towards improving the general situation of German economics?

1. With respect to the first question, it is difficult to measure the speed of rationalisation, that is, the degree of enhanced productivity of labour and of increased exploitation. Nevertheless, the impression gained is that in Germany at the present time the speed is greater than before, and greater than in other countries, with perhaps the exception of the United States. The cause of this increased speed we believe to be as follows:

The productive apparatus possessed by German industry is much greater than its markets, given the present cost of production. There is an acute inconsistency between possible production and possible markets. It is a universally acknowledged fact that where the productive capacity is not fully utilised, an increase in the cost of production results. The home markets are narrowed by the small purchasing powers of the German population, for wages are low, food comparatively dear, the pensioner class has disappeared, and the buying powers of the peasantry are reduced by the high taxation and the high interest on loan capital. A further cause of the weak inland market is the fact that a part of the values produced goes abroad as reparation instalments and interest on foreign capital, etc.

German industrial capital is thus faced with the necessity of exporting in larger quantities, in order to utilise the producing capacity as far as possible. This however implies a reduction of the costs of production, if successful competition is to be carried on with other countries, and is rendered the more difficult by the special obstacles (exceptional terms, tariffs) raised by many countries, and by the extremely limited possibilities of capital export. German industry is thus forced to rationalisation, that is, to the reduction of the costs of production and the increased exploitation of labour, by its peculiar position in the markets of the world. This explains why in Germany at the present time the speed of rationalisation is much more rapid than it has been in other countries.

Here the following must be taken into account. Although capitalism has been endeavouring, during the whole course of its history, to reduce the costs of production, it is not only economic factors which have been decisive for the speed of developments in this direction. In general it may be said that so long as a capitalist undertaking, or some whole certain branch of industry, is working at a good profit under the given conditions of production, there is no such urgent striving for a reduction of the costs of production. The capitalists take a rest, so to speak, and the speed of technical progress, of rationalisation, and of increased exploitation, slows down for the time being.

The political viewpoints are of even greater importance. Imperialism is built up upon the joint interests of industrial

capital and labour aristocracy. The capitalists are in a position to grant the labour aristocracy a higher standard of living, and they find themselves obliged to do this in order to ensure for themselves the support of the workers' aristocracy in their struggles against other imperialist powers, and for the exploitation of the oppressed colonial regions.

The present period of decay of capitalism in general, and in Germany and England in particular, is characterised by the fact that the European bourgeoisie, especially the German, is no longer in a position to maintain a labour aristocracy out of its imperialist super-profits. The German bourgeoisie is thus forced to rationalise, that is, to exploit the working class to an increasing extent, without consideration of the disadvantage that this injures its class position and weakens its power in an aggravated class struggle. It is thus no accident, but an economic and historical necessity, that at the present time the German bourgeoisie is advancing against the working class under the banner of rationalisation.

2. The German bourgeoisie, and the German Social Democrats, are promising themselves that rationalisation will bring them a greatly increased export in industrial goods, a fresh uplift of German capitalism. This uplift is to lead to an extension of production, by which the workers rendered superfluous by the process of rationalisation are to be reinstated.

We have no faith in the fulfilment of these hopes. The course of events during the last months has shown us that the crisis in German capitalism remains perfectly unchanged so far as the working class is concerned. The position of those capitalists who have withstood the crisis appears to have improved somewhat, but unemployment has not decreased. On the contrary, the mass dismissals of workers continue, and the firms are giving notice of further reductions of their staffs²⁾.

Here it must be emphasised that the methods for the increase of the productivity of labour, and for the production of relative surplus value, can only be actualised by an increase of production in the individual undertaking. The inherent inconsistency of the whole rationalisation idea lies in this fact. Rationalisation is imperative, that is, the price of production must be reduced, because the quantity of goods produced at the former cost of production, whilst the productive capacity has not been fully utilised, fails to find markets. For this reason the cost of production must be reduced. But the methods employed for reducing the costs of production cannot be separated from an increased production of goods, and markets have to be found for even more goods than before the rationalisation.

The German bourgeoisie is aware of this inconsistency, and is seeking to evade it to a certain extent by closing down works and destroying means of production. We hold this to be peculiarly characteristic of rationalisation during the period of the decline of capitalism. During the period of the rise of capitalism the inconsistency between the possibilities of production and sale were overcome by opening up fresh markets for capitalist products at home and abroad. But at the present juncture this upward development is impossible, and thus we are witnessing a double process in Germany: the increased production of goods forced by the rationalisation is counteracted by the laying idle and destruction of one part of the apparatus of production.

If this is true, it means that those groups of capitalists which are successful in emerging from the crisis, which carry out the rationalisation, and combine in monopolist trusts, will be able to increase their profits. But it will lead at the same time to a general worsening in the position of the working class, to increased exploitation, and to the formation of a constant and enormous reserve army of unemployed, as has already been the case in England for the last six years. The workers deprived of employment by the process of rationalisation cannot be enlisted in the process of production again by an extension of the capitalist methods of production at home and abroad. Thus rationalisation must be regarded as an attempt to secure the profit possibilities of one section of industrial capital at the expense of the working class. Rationalisation does not offer the whole of German capitalism any help towards a new and general uplift.

²⁾ The slight improvement in the labour market of late is due to the English lock-out.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Mutinies in the French Fleet During the Moroccan War.

By Camille Fegy (Paris).

On September 7th, four sailors appeared before the court-martial held on board the "Metz" in the Toulon roadstead.

The trial of Toulon is a new episode in the great fight which has lasted since 1925, i. e. since the heroic rising of the crews at the beginning of the Riff war.

The fight began on June 19th in the roads at Naples. Just as the anchor was weighed, the artificers and stokers of the warship "Courbet" refused to serve at sea and struck work for a number of hours.

Several days later, on June 24th, the artificers and stokers of the warship "Paris" held a meeting, while the ship was on the open sea in the vicinity of Mers-el-Kebir, and made a demonstration of protest against the Moroccan War, which they repeated a few days later in the roads of Brest.

There were also revolts on board the warships "Jean Bart", "Strassburg" and "Provence". The rising on the "Strassburg" lasted five hours; the crew were in command of the ship and prevented its departure from the harbour of Bizerta.

The agitation against the Riff war spread to all the harbours of North Africa. The Mediterranean Fleet, which had remained in the harbour of Toulon, as well as the flying squadrons of St. Raphael and Cuers Pierrefeu, were in a state of great excitement.

The General Staff was very greatly perturbed, for it feared that the men were getting out of hand. The Government ordered the suppression of the movement. The sailors, who were brought ashore in tens, were thrown into naval prisons or into special prisons. The courts passed their terrible sentences in camera. Two courts-martial, which were convened with great pomp on board the warships "Courbet" and "Paris" made an example of their prisoners and passed manifestly merciless judgements. The sailor Dumoulin got four years' imprisonment, Quillery three years, Vigne three years, Chavaux and Bigorne one year!

But still the fleet did not yield.

Several weeks passed and then a hunger strike — that tragic echo of the suffering of the condemned — broke out in the naval prisons of Toulon.

Thereupon the Atlantic Fleet paid its tribute: Two sailors of the "Voltaire", Bernard and Gozgis, were sentenced, respectively, to three and two years' imprisonment.

In Toulon the crews manifested their solidarity. Emile Cormier of the "Bretagne" was sentenced to one year imprisonment, because he had distributed leaflets containing the protest of the sailors against the arrest of their comrades, as well as the expression of their aversion for the Moroccan war.

The repressive measures became more severe; but in vain!

During the Moroccan offensive in the spring of 1926 the sailors again became turbulent.

The warships "Mühlhausen", "Moroccan" and "Senegalese" experienced demonstrations. Dreano, a fireman on board the signal ship "Lievain" refused to pay the salute of honour to Mulay Yusef, the vassal of French Imperialism. He was put into prison and brought before a court-martial.

Measures of suppression were again instituted. Leporier, a sailor on the "Mühlhausen" was sent to jail for two years.

Finally there was a mutiny on board the flagship "Metz". On August 27th, after days of excessive work, the artificers and firemen refused to do a double shift, which they were ordered to do in spite of the regulations to the contrary. The sailors stood solidly by them. The demands of the over-worked and under-fed firemen and artificers were acknowledged as justified. The promise was given to satisfy them. Several hours later, the General-Staff in the harbour of Bizerta arrested the "ring-leaders" of the mutiny, the sailors Petitot, Biget, Ronchail and Briere. They were subjected to a painful period of detention, reminiscent of the Middle Ages.

They have now to appear before a court-martial of French Imperialism on board the "Metz".

* * *

There are special reasons for these movements. The tremendous development of machine construction has made a vital change in the navy. Every warship has become a huge factory, in which progress in the machine industry is more concentrated than it is anywhere else.

The machinists and mechanics play an important part. For this reason the crews have become proletarian, and their attitude of mind has changed with the method of production. While they are at their boilers, motors, dynamos, precision instruments, the firemen, machinists, electricians and radio-telegraphists are no longer soldiers but workmen.

But while the working conditions and the attitude of mind have changed, the conditions of existence have remained the same.

The sailor, who through the task upon which he is engaged has become a workman, continues to be treated, paid and fed like a soldier. And, though his attitude of mind has become proletarian, he is still subject to the cruel, inhuman, military discipline.

The caste of the naval officers — this state within a state, whose power is so great that it surpasses the so-called power of the law — still remains in all reality the absolute ruler of the warships. The technical officers and staffs follow them. They, (chiefly the officers of high rank) have connections with the heavy industries, with the ship-building concerns and the big colonial and shipping companies. On the one hand, a wild, royalist aristocracy, on the other hand, representatives of the big Capitalists. If they are not both at the same time! The deck officers are characterised by the barriers of tradition; the technical branch by the barriers of interest; both by the same dull absolutism, the same opposition to the working class.

In this manner there formed two opposing factions on the warships, both of them animated by one and the same class spirit.

Both are interested in the same degree in the issue of the social fights between Capital and the proletariat, and both are subject to the rules of this fighting.

Every organised act of violence on the part of the staff provokes an embittered response from the crews, usually in the form of abstention from duty.

The Moroccan war, with the regular service on the high seas, with the poor food and the more severe discipline, necessarily led to conflict. Sailors of the light squadrons in the Mediterranean set themselves to oppose the demands of French Imperialism and declared the co-incidence of their interests and principles with those of the mountain-dwellers of the Riff.

Within sight of the Riff coast they have refused to obey orders as a demonstration of fraternal feeling for the people of the Riff.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

The Berlin Meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

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

I think, Comrades, that it is superfluous for me to read to you the correspondence which passed between the A. U. C. T. U. (Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union) and the General Council before the convocation of the last conference of the Anglo-Russian Committee. It was published in the press and is generally known. As will be seen from this correspondence, the A. U. T. U. C. categorically insisted that the first question on the agenda of the Anglo-Russian Committee should be the question of aid to the miners. In reply to our telegrams we did not receive any direct objections that the General Council was not in agreement with examining the question of the miners as first point on the agenda. I thought

it necessary to give this information, as you will see from the subsequent exposition of the work of the Anglo-Russian Committee that it has a certain significance.

Both delegations to the Anglo-Russian Committee were the same as at the Paris meeting, except that Comrade Purcell, who took part in the Paris meeting, was replaced by Comrade Swales, and Comrade Dogadov, who is on leave on account of illness, was substituted by comrade Ugarov.

Our "Disloyalty".

The Berlin meeting started with a statement by the chairman of the British delegation that we, the Russian delegation and the A. U. C. T. U., had not adequately observed the loyalty demanded in respect to the decisions of the Anglo-Russian Committee. We have been reproached with acting wrongly in publishing, at the Plenum of the A. U. C. T. U. and in the press, such a detailed report on the Paris meeting and on all the declarations there made.

We replied that there has been no infringement of loyalty, and that we, the Russian delegation and the A. U. C. T. U., have infringed no decisions of the Anglo-Russian Committee: In the first place for the reason that the Paris meeting passed no decision of any kind to the effect that this or that Party was forbidden to publish the documents of the meeting in connection with the report given to the body delegating us. We, the Russian delegation, gave no promise not to publish any documents, and, as I have already stated, there was no decision passed prohibiting such publication. The assertion that we have infringed the rules of work laid down for the Anglo-Russian Committee is thus entirely wrong, even from the purely formal point of view.

On the other hand, we declared that we find absolutely nothing unallowable in publishing in detail everything which occurred at the Paris meeting. On the contrary. We have held it to be our duty to take up our responsibility openly before the workers, for we are not of the opinion that the Anglo-Russian Committee represents an institution of absolute secret diplomacy, whose character forbids us to discuss openly what passes at its meetings. We declared that the working masses, at least in our country, are profoundly interested in the work of the Anglo-Russian Committee. The working masses are following with intense attention the proceedings of this organ of trade union unity in both Countries.

In view of the extreme degree of interest here shown by the broad proletarian masses, we cannot find ourselves justified in concealing anything whatever of the proceedings of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and we deem it no crime to hold ourselves responsible in detail before the Plenum of the A. U. C. T. U. The working methods of the Russian trade unions mean, however, that everything reported by us to the A. U. C. T. U. inevitably comes to the knowledge of the broadest masses. This is a constituent of our working methods. As I have already stated, we are not ruled by those diplomatic traditions which conceal what should not be concealed. The whole of the work done by our trade union leaders, and the whole of our work, is controlled by the masses. And we have told our English Comrades that they will have to reckon with this.

We further declared that we should not consider it necessary to repeat at the Berlin meeting such general discussions as were carried on at the Paris meeting — at least not at the beginning of the meeting. Our first work was to discuss the points of the agenda in succession, to come to our decisions, and then, if desired, to pass on to the discussion of each question. Let us first deal with the questions on the agenda, otherwise there is a danger that they will once more not be examined into, but will be smothered under a general discussion. We proposed that the meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee be commenced with the question of the miners. With this we concluded our declaration in reply to the proposals of the chairman of the English delegation.

The Struggle for the Agenda.

The order of the agenda was then discussed. The English delegation brought forward approximately the following objections against our proposals for the agenda:

The main objection was that the proposal to examine the question of the miners as first question was incorrect, as the Anglo-Russian Committee was created for quite different objects — for obtaining International Unity. The work of the Committee should begin with the unity question, and then all the other questions could be discussed. The question of the miners did not enter the direct competence of the Anglo-Russian Committee. (Comrade Tomsky: "And what purpose is the unity to serve?")

The British delegation told us that they had instructions from the General Council that the question of unity should be brought up first. Here purely formal objections first made their appearance. Another argument was that the question of unity had already been long on the agenda, and that as an old question it should be examined first. (Laughter.) A further argument that we did not quite understand was that the Russian delegation was endeavouring to break the rules of work and was introducing new methods into the work of the Anglo-Russian Committee. That the English have proposed one agenda and we another. They consider this infringing the rulings of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

We replied by saying that the establishment of rules of work for the Anglo-Russian Committee is a matter of mutual agreement between the two Parties. The English proposals cannot be considered as binding on the other side.

We strongly objected to the statement that the Anglo-Russian Committee has been formed solely for the question of unity. We declared that we know as well as the English comrades the objects for which the Anglo-Russian Committee was formed; we too have taken part in the meetings of the Committee, and are familiar with its statutes and decisions. All decisions hitherto come to by the Committee show that it was not formed merely for the question of unity, but for such questions as that of our joint struggle against the offensive of capital, and as that of mutual aid. All the decisions hitherto come to by the Anglo-Russian Committee have accentuated this.

We maintained that the question of the miners' strike cannot be separated from the question of unity. Unity, and the struggle for unity, will indeed arise out of a joint activity on concrete questions of struggle against the capitalist offensive. If the Anglo-Russian Committee enters carefully into the question of increased aid for the miners, and really promotes this cause, then this will be a stone in the foundation of the building of trade union unity. The struggle against the attack being made by capital on the miners in England, and the whole of the joint struggle against the offensive of capital, represents one of the stages on the road to trade union unity.

We also pointed out that our insistence on the discussion of the miners' question, as the first question on the agenda, is justified by the present position of the miners' strike, by the acuteness of the phase into which this strike has now entered. This question must not be postponed, for the privations suffered by the miners have already passed all limits, and the families of the miners are already starving in many districts. Thus the discussion of the aid to be given to the miners, as first point on the agenda, is of enormous moral and political significance.

We, the Russian delegation, undertake to discuss all questions. We shall not leave the conference until all questions have been discussed. But we demand — and the whole situation of the miners' strike demands it — that the miners' question be brought forward as first point on the agenda.

We declared in conclusion that we had received binding instructions from the A. U. C. T. U. to insist that the miners' question be dealt with as first point on the agenda. This was our reply to the objections raised by the English delegation. We are of the opinion that our arguments are perfectly adapted to the situation in the miners' struggle, and that our delegation has adopted a correct attitude.

We expressed our astonishment at the standpoint of the English delegation. To us it was perfectly incomprehensible that the English delegation should resist with such obstinacy the discussion of the miners' question as the first point on the agenda. We declare: We cannot understand these tactics on the part of your delegation. What is our object? Do you not consider the miners' struggle to be a highly important question? Was it necessary to quarrel for a whole day as to whether it should be discussed first or not? We needed a whole day to

persuade the English delegation to accept the proposal of the A. U. C. T. U. Does this look as if the English delegation felt any burning anxiety to discuss the question of increased aid for the English miners?

We finally asked the English delegation what they intended to do. The English delegation declared that it was not in agreement with our arguments. We referred to the instructions given us by the A. U. C. T. U., to discuss the miners' question as first on the agenda.

The session was adjourned in order that the separate delegations might consult among themselves and come to final decisions. During the adjournment our delegation again re-considered the matter in detail, and came to the conclusion that it had no right to make concessions. (Applause.) We had no right to yield on this point at a time when the miners' struggle is so acute, and immediate help necessary at any price. This is the factor which is decisive for the order of succession of the points on the agenda of the Anglo-Russian Committee. Further, we did not feel ourselves justified in setting aside the directions received from the A. U. C. T. U. on the agenda. After the adjournment we declared to the English delegation that we were holding definitely to our standpoint. I must say that even now the matter did not pass off without further discussion. After this renewed discussion, the English delegation once more retired to consult on the question, after which we received the following declaration from the English delegation:

"The British representatives proposed that there should first be discussion of the question of further unity of the International Trade Union Movement as the main object for which the Anglo-Russian Committee exists.

However, the Russian representatives stated that they were instructed to bring up on the Committee as first question that of practical steps for ensuring subsequent aid to the British miners and their families in their present conflict.

Under these conditions it was decided, without creating a precedent, that the usual order will be changed in order to give the Russian representatives the possibility of bringing up their proposals for joint consideration."

The declaration of the English delegation amounted to their ultimate acceptance of our proposals. But of course, as was proper, with a certain reserve, etc. Upon this, we, the Russian delegation, thought it advisable to make a written statement leaving no room for uncertainty as to our reasons for insisting on this point. I shall read this document:

"Declaration of the Delegation of the A. U. C. T. U. on the Question of the Agenda.

The delegation of the A. U. C. T. U., in categorically insisting on discussing aid to the miners as first point on the agenda of the Anglo-Russian Committee, considered that the organisation of this aid is the most important and primary task at a time when the miners' struggle is in a particularly difficult position, when all the forces of their enemies are concentrated against them, when miners with their families, about 3 million human beings, are subjected to privation and starvation, and when the workers of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union are impatiently awaiting the decisions of the Anglo-Russian Committee on this question. At this time the drawing up of measures for aiding the miners should become the primary task of the Anglo-Russian Committee as the organ of unity of the Trade Union movement of Great Britain and of the U. S. S. R.

It was indeed this question which the A. U. C. T. U., in its correspondence with the General Council re the summoning of the Anglo-Russian Committee, put forward as the main question for discussion at the meeting of this Committee.

Already at Paris, on July 30 and 31, the A. U. C. T. U. delegation had categorically insisted on discussing this question first, but the British delegates then stated that they had no authority from the General Council to do so, despite of the urgency of organising aid for the miners, and therefore the question remained undiscussed.

Finally, our delegation, when coming to the Berlin meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee, received binding instructions from the A. U. C. T. U. to have the question of aid to the miners placed as first point on the agenda.

The A. U. C. T. U. delegation, moreover, considers the question of aiding the miners as the direct and obligatory task of the Anglo-Russian Committee, arising out of the object for which it was founded, i. e. the joint struggle for unity and the struggle against the capitalist offensive.

The delegation of the A. U. C. T. U. thus considers the discussion and elaboration of measures of assistance to the British miners by the Anglo-Russian Committee as a step towards the practical realisation of unity, since the real unity of the international trade union movement can only be brought about by a determined united struggle against the capitalist offensive."

Our delegation considered it necessary to add the above declaration to the minutes of the Anglo-Russian Committee, in reply to the statement from the British side. This settled the question of the order of succession of the points of the agenda.

How did we present the Question of Aid for the Miners?

After the British delegation had declared itself agreed to discuss the question of aid for the miners as the first question on the agenda, our delegation gave a brief report on the estimate which it has formed on the situation in the miners' struggle, and on the practical measures which it proposes to the Anglo-Russian Committee. We once more explained that our unyieldingness is caused by the enormous degree of importance which we attach to the events in England, for we do not regard these events as purely national phenomenon, but consider the struggle of the English miners as a class struggle of international significance, so that the defeat of the English miners would be the defeat of not only the whole English working class, but of the whole proletariat of the world, whilst on the other hand the victory of the English miners means immediate victory for not only the English proletariat, but for the proletariat of the world. The character of the four months of struggle has already shown this.

We have pointed out that the general class significance of this strike consists of the fact that the miners are not only up against the enmity of the coalowners, but are confronted by the closed ranks of the whole of English capital. And not only have they to fight against English capital, but against international capital, for the sympathy expressed by the international bourgeoisie for the coalowners is by no means accidental. It is not by accident that the most important weapon for the strangulation of the English strike is the unhindered transport of scab coal from the different countries. The miners are faced by not only the capitalist offensive, but by the united and determined hostility of the whole apparatus of the English state. They have not only the mineowners to fight, but the government, which is openly supporting the mineowners. The miners have to fight against the Parliament, for the Parliament has passed the law on the eight hour day, opposed by the miners.

On the other hand, the miners are in an almost entirely isolated position, isolated from the working class front. One point showing this is the extremely inadequate material support. And it is again shown by the criminal passivity of the leaders of the Amsterdam International, of various Industrial Internationals, etc., whose help is less an aid to the miners than an aid to the coalowners for the strangulation of the strike. It is testified once more by the fact that the struggle is assuming forms in which the limits of privation, want, and starvation, have already been passed, and certain sign of wavering may be observed in the ranks of strikers who feel themselves to be in a completely isolated position.

All this indicates that the victory can only be gained with the aid of the most determined and urgent measures of international aid for the English miners. This is the sole means of ensuring a victory for the miners' struggle.

I shall now read to you the practical proposals which we submitted to the Anglo-Russian Committee for discussion, on the basis of this brief report:

Proposals of the Delegation of the A. U. C. T. U. in the Question of the Aid to be given to the Miners.

"The Anglo-Russian Committee, after a brief adjournment, took up its work again on 23. August 1926, and has dealt with the question of organising aid for the striking miners in England as the first point on its agenda.

1. The Anglo-Russian Committee, in the first place, welcomes the determination with which the British miners have been conducting for more than three months a heroic struggle against their employers, who are supported by the entire bourgeois class and by the Conservative government.

2. The Anglo-Russian Committee considers that in order to ensure the victory of the miners, an energetic increase of aid is necessary on the part of both the British and Russian workers, and of the workers of the whole world, for the capitalist offensive against the English miners is only one part of the attack being made by world capital upon the working class. Thus the victory of the English miners means at the same time the victory of the workers of other countries, whilst the defeat of the British miners is at the same time the defeat of the international proletariat.

3. The greatest danger for the strike, and a serious threat to the victory of the miners, is the unhindered importation of coal and other fuel from abroad to England, and the transport of coal within England itself. This places a most tremendous weapon in the hands of the English industrialists and the English Conservative government, a weapon for starving out the miners, for the foreign scab coal is a substitute for that which the English miners are refusing to produce. It is for this reason that the Anglo-Russian Committee considers it necessary to place an immediate embargo on the transportation of coal and other forms of fuel, both in transit for England outside the boundaries of the country and within England itself. The Anglo-Russian Committee appeals to the transport workers of all countries, and to the British transport workers, to carry out this measure, in order that the British employers may not be given the means enabling them to strangle the heroic strike of the miners.

4. The delegation of the General Council takes upon itself the task of immediately bringing before the General Council the question of operating in a practical way the embargo on coal within the confines of England.

5. At the same time the Anglo-Russian Committee appeals to the International Transport Workers' Federation to consider immediately the proposals of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and to undertake the practical carrying out of the embargo on transports of coal and other fuel to England.

6. The Anglo-Russian Committee also appeals to the separate national trade unions to undertake the conducting of the embargo.

7. The Anglo-Russian Committee appeals to the miners of all countries not to produce scab coal for Great Britain, and not to sabotage the heroic struggle of their English brothers. The Anglo-Russian Committee requests the International Miners' Federation to assume the task of control in this direction.

8. In the matter of material aid to the British miners, the Anglo-Russian Committee considers the passivity and delay displayed by the Amsterdam International, and by various of the industrial internationals, especially the Miners' International, to be absolutely impermissible.

9. The Anglo-Russian Committee considers it necessary for the General Council to propose to Amsterdam, and for the A. U. C. T. U. to propose to the R. I. L. U., that there should be increased collections in all countries in aid of the miners.

10. The Anglo-Russian Committee issues a special appeal to the workers of all countries, and to the labour organisations, to increase their collections for the miners.

11. The Anglo-Russian Committee considers it necessary that the General Council conducts an energetic campaign

within Great Britain for the organisation of collections among the workers, and of percentual contributions in the separate trade unions, for the miners.

12. The Anglo-Russian Committee takes cognisance with satisfaction of the statement made by the delegation of the A. U. T. U., showing that the Russian workers and trade unions are determined to continue in the future to lend every possible material aid to their brothers, the British miners.

13. Both sides undertake to bring before their respective General Councils, and the General Councils before their unions, the question of obtaining, for the period of the strike, the establishment of a voluntary one per cent levy on the wages of T. U. members in aid of the British miners.

14. The Anglo-Russian Committee considers that it would be extremely expedient and necessary for the General Council to appeal to the Labour Party to demand from the present British government that this ceases its policy of aiding the mineowners against the miners."

These are the practical proposals submitted by our delegation to the Anglo-Russian Committee, for joint consideration.

How did the delegation of the General Council reply to our proposals?

After our proposals had been made known, the chairman of the British delegation made a speech. He said that after profound thought (laughter) — I repeat verbally the declaration made by the English chairman — they found that our proposals evoked very great disappointment (A voice: They got the wind up), and that not one of the points which we brought forward for the consideration of the Anglo-Russian Committee could be accepted by them (A voice: Thomas would not allow it.) The most important thing they stated was that our proposals constituted a stage already passed through (laughter). Everything had already been considered and already done (A voice: What has been done?) and nothing more was demanded from the Anglo-Russian Committee. The acceptance of such proposals proposals would do more harm than good. (A voice: Harm to whom — the King of England?)

Again we were told that the Anglo-Russian Committee is not competent to take such decisions, and that it would overstep its competence were it to do so. As a final argument against us it was stated that we, the Russian delegation, were striving to impose our will upon the British trade movement by means of the Anglo-Russian Committee. We were striving to exploit the Anglo-Russian Committee for the purpose of dictating our will to the British trade unions, and these would certainly not submit to this. I shall not repeat with stenographic accuracy everything which the English delegation said, but I have briefly described the main arguments brought forward by the chairman and the individual members of the General Council.

(To be continued.)

THE WHITE TERROR

The Persecution of the Working-Class Fighters in Spain.

By A. Nin (Moscow).

Comrade Daniel Rebull, one of the most courageous fighters in the Spanish Labour movement, is at present being tried by court-martial in Barcelona. He was accused of slandering, in anonymous letters written in the year 1925, Primo de Rivera and Martinez Amida, Minister for Home Affairs and murderer of dozens of revolutionary fighters. Despite the fact that the handwriting experts in the case declared that the identity of the handwriting of the accused and that in the letters was "doubtful", the court-martial sentenced comrade Rebull to nine years imprisonment.

This judgement which would be a vile one even if the identity of the two samples of handwriting had been established, and which is doubly vile in view of the fact that the experts,

despite the pressure brought to bear upon them by the Government and the court-martial, felt obliged, at least, to doubt the identity of the specimens of handwriting, must provoke the indignation of the proletariat of all countries and also of all people who still have a sense of honour in their bodies.

The purpose which Primo de Rivera is fulfilling by means of this and similar disgraceful judgements, is quite clear. By brutal methods of suppression he wants to smash the Labour movement in Spain; he intends to rob the proletariat of its finest champions and has already disposed of the revolutionaries Pères Solis, Maurin, Fresno, Colomer and many others.

Daniel Rebull, who is well known in the Labour movement as "David Rey", is a metal worker. He has always been one of the most active members of his trade union, as also of the National Labour Association, in which he has occupied various responsible positions. His name is associated with the big proletarian fights of the period 1917/20. Years ago his aversion for the class-collaboration policy of Social Democracy with the bourgeoisie drove him into the camp of Anarchism. But as soon as the Russian October Revolution broke out, he became its enthusiastic defender. Two years ago he joined the Communist Party.

David Rey is one of the comrades who have suffered most from the suppressive measures of the Spanish bourgeoisie. Since the year 1920 he has enjoyed no more than two or three months of liberty. He has, therefore, been in prison for about six years.

The working class of all countries must raise its voice in protest against the regime of oppression in Spain. It must liberate David Rey and his companions from prison.

The courts-martial are continually at work in Spain. One case against the workers follows upon another. David Rey himself, together with a group of other Communist champions, former members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain, will very shortly again come up for trial. They will all be condemned to dozens of years of hard labour, if an energetic protest movement on the part of the international proletariat does not succeed in preventing the outrage. It is, therefore, the duty of the workers of all countries to deliver the self-sacrificing champions of the proletarian revolution in Spain from their blood-thirsty executioners.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

Resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. of Italy on the International Situation.

At the latest Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Italy the following resolution was passed:

The worsening of the economic and financial situation, and the growing political unsteadiness of the capitalist states of Europe, are signs that the general situation of capitalism is becoming acute.

Apart from the causes due to the internal unsteadiness of capitalist economics of Europe, the most important of the factors determining this crisis are the following: on the one hand the growth of the economic forces and of the political influence of the Soviet Union, whose progress on the road to Socialism is enabling Soviet economics to be withdrawn to an ever increasing degree from the influence of capitalism, and is deepening the unbridgable chasm between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world; on the other hand the financial penetration of America into Europe, accompanied by America's endeavours towards economic and political supremacy, and resulting in the aggravation of the antagonism between the United States and England, and of the antagonisms between the various capitalist states of Europe.

The latest events: the economic crisis in England, Germany, and Czechoslovakia; the financial crisis in France, Belgium, and Poland; the insurrections and general political restlessness from Portugal to the Balkans; the armed Pilsudski rising in Poland; the General Strike in England; all these events clearly confirm the temporary and relative character of the capitalist stabilisation as laid down by the theses issued by the Com-

intern. The General Strike in England, and the events in Poland, are of special importance, being far-reaching in effect and containing many lessons for the future.

The General Strike in England and the Tactics of the C. P. of Great Britain.

The General Strike in England has been at the same time the mightiest manifestation of the crisis of the decline of the British Empire, and the characteristic proof that this crisis is impossible of solution within the system of capitalist society.

Capitalism is no longer able to satisfy the most elementary requirements of life among the great working masses. The capitalist method of production oppresses the forces of production, and drives these to rebellion against it.

The English bourgeoisie made a preliminary attempt, as introduction to a broad offensive against the proletariat, towards a real and final stabilisation at the expense of the working classes; the working class replied with the general strike.

However the struggle of the English miners may end, this attempt on the part of the bourgeoisie may be regarded as a complete failure, for the advantages which capitalism might have won by its victory, have been destroyed in advance by the economic and political consequences of the struggle. Capitalist economics emerge from this struggle in very weakened conditions, and class antagonisms have been made more acute; the class consciousness and the will to revolution of the English proletariat are developing; fresh forces are gathering to withstand any new offensive which may be attempted by the bourgeoisie, and to prevent any real stabilisation of capitalism, to the end that capitalist rule may be finally overthrown.

During this phase of the actual development of the revolutionary forces of the English proletariat, the activities and tactics of the Communist Party are of special importance.

The C. C. of the C. P. I. approves the general outlines of the tactics adopted by the English Party during the general strike. After having mobilised the masses against the government commission (Samuel), the Party was the first to call for the general strike against the capitalist offensive, and afterwards it demanded and achieved the unification and centralisation of the movement split up in accordance with various categories and localities. At the first attempt on the part of the trade union leaders to restrict and throttle the movement and to rob it of every political significance and every value, the Communist Party reacted with mass agitation for the political aims of the strike. It issued the slogan of the committees of action which arose as expression of the will and the power of the masses. At the same time it proclaimed the slogan of the overthrow of the Baldwin government and the establishment of a real workers' government, and criticised even more severely than before the defeatist work and sabotage of the trade union leaders.

The directions and slogans issued by the Party are in full agreement with the principles of Communism, and were fully adapted to the exigencies of the situation. Their object was to extend and strengthen the movement up to the point of final victory. The overwhelming influence of trade union opportunism prevented this object from being realised.

The increased influence of the Party and its growing membership since the strike are the best confirmation of the rightness of its tactics.

Pilsudski's Armed Rising in Poland and the Tactics of the C. P. of Poland.

The armed conflict by which Pilsudski has seized power had its cause in the aggravation of the economic and financial difficulties of the state, and in the influences now decomposing the state of Poland.

The Witos government, born of agrarian feudalism and big capital, tool of a wildly reactionary and oppressive policy, appeared to the capitalist middle class and petty bourgeois strata as the real hindrance to any actual stabilisation, and these blamed it for their own unhappy position. To the working masses the Witos government was the government of reaction.

the slave driver over the workers, the tyrant suppressing any initiative or freedom in the labour movement, the one and only factor responsible for their miserable conditions of life and their limitless exploitation. To the national minorities the Witos government was the enemy to whom they owed their suppression.

Pilsudski, the national hero of the Polish petty bourgeoisie, mobilised all these forces in an armed insurrection, and seized power at the hands of civil war.

The middle classes imagined that they were pursuing an autonomous policy, and seizing power for the realisation of their own radical Left programme. The working classes, disorganised and too little influenced by the revolutionary vanguard, permitted themselves to be taken in tow by Pilsudski, from whom they expected an improvement in their conditions of living.

Apart from foreign influence (England) in the sphere of international politics (against the Soviet Union), Pilsudski's action had no other object than the stabilisation of the bourgeois state; thus it was inevitably reactionary and anti-proletarian.

The workers, the peasants, and the national minorities, thus deluded into supporting Pilsudski, and aiding the formation of the new government by their support in the insurrection and civil war, have been deceived in their expectations. The landowners and the capitalists have not been slow in exercising their political influence upon the government.

The petty bourgeois radical programme has disappeared. The exploitation and oppression of the working class, the position of the peasantry starving beneath the feudal agrarian yoke, the intolerable suppression of the national minorities, and even the conditions of living of the petty bourgeoisie, have not been improved in the least; on the contrary, all this is worse than ever in consequence of the general crisis.

This situation has given rise to a fresh political process in Poland, and this is going forward on the basis of a new revolutionary grouping around the working class. The semi-proletarian strata of the petty bourgeoisie are disintegrating into their heterogeneous constituents, and are going over to the working class.

These events in Poland teach a lesson to the workers of the whole world. They are a fresh historical confirmation of the correctness of the thesis issued by the Comintern on the impossibility of the petty bourgeoisie being able to exercise an autonomous and independent political function; on the impotence of the petty bourgeoisie to defeat agrarian-capitalist reaction, and to take the lead in this struggle. The anti-reactionary strivings of broad petty bourgeois strata can only be realised if carried on side by side with the working class and under its leadership, and when the combined action runs along the whole front of the class struggle. It is only thus that the struggle against reaction can really attain tangible results for the welfare of the workers, the exploited, and the oppressed.

The new situation in Poland, and its probable development, place great responsibility in the hands of the C. P. of Poland.

The C. C. of the C. P. I. is of the opinion that the tactics followed by the C. P. P. during Pilsudski's armed rising were wrong; it is in agreement with the criticism exercised by the E. C. C. I., and with the immediate intervention of the E. C. C. I. for the improvement of the tactics of the Polish Party. The decision of the C. P. P., to take part in the struggle, and to avoid the error of "neutrality" in an inner conflict of the ruling classes, was right. But the manner of participation in the struggle was an error, for the Party simply followed Pilsudski.

The communists should have fought with their weapons in their hands against the reactionary Witos government, but not as followers of Pilsudski, but in a proletarian class front. They should have made themselves the centre of another class grouping around the revolutionary proletariat and under its leadership. It was their duty to take up arms against Witos, but they should not have supported Pilsudski; they should have fought against him politically, destroyed the delusions among the working classes, unmasked the actually anti-proletarian function exercised by Pilsudski, the fraudulence of his alleged fight against reaction, and taken every opportunity of demonstrating his incapacity and impotence to carry on this fight to a finish within the confines

laid down by the petty bourgeois programme. In this way they could have freed the masses from Pilsudski's influence and mobilised them on the front of open class war.

The slogans issued by the C. P. P. should not have confined themselves to emphasising the necessity of taking part in the struggle, or worse still to telling the workers that their place was in Pilsudski's ranks. The Party's slogans should have possessed a class character, they should have accentuated the autonomous function and leading rôle of the proletariat, they should have aimed at mobilising and organising the masses in the front of class warfare, in mass organisations (workers' committees) expressing class consciousness and the will to carry on the movement. They should have created the prerequisites for the further political development of the movement, and have supplied this movement with initiative and guidance.

The C. P. P. should have acted on these lines of correct Bolshevik tactics, even if the majority of the workers had followed Pilsudski. The Party, in failing to do this, doubtless retarded the spread of its influence among the masses.

The C. C. of the C. P. I. expresses the hope that after the intervention of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I., and after its correction of the tactical line of the Party, the Polish comrades who have fought heroically against reaction, will correct their past errors rapidly and energetically, and will succeed in regaining their lost ground.

Prospects.

The economic and political events characterising the present international situation and its tendencies are a complete confirmation of our being in the midst of the crisis brought about by the decline of capitalism, and the entirely relative and temporary nature of any stabilisation of capitalism.

An important element of the situation, and a sign of the unsteadiness of the capitalist regime, is the factor which has been placed conspicuously in the foreground by the events in Poland. This is the shifting of class relations, the change in the attitude of the middle and petty bourgeois strata, especially where the backward development of capitalism renders these classes a more important factor than they form in countries with a more developed capitalism (England, Germany).

Whilst in 1920—22 these classes openly took sides for the reactionary and anti-proletarian parties, today they show a tendency to turn against the reactionary strata, and to join forces with the working class. This means that the petty bourgeoisie has ceased to be a mere passive mass at the disposal of the manoeuvres of the reactionary strata, that the ties binding the petty bourgeoisie to the capitalist bourgeoisie have become so loose that the capitalist class can no longer depend on the petty bourgeoisie as its certain ally against the proletariat.

This enhances the political uncertainty of the political rule of the bourgeoisie, and contributes to bring about the conditions required for the victory of proletarian revolution.

The analysis of the situation made by the Comintern, with its consideration of the two possibilities before us — a long or a short period of relative stabilisation, a phase of relative uplift and strengthening of capitalism, or a phase of fresh decline and renewed general weakening — this analysis retains its full value. The period of temporary stabilisation of capitalism is not yet over; we have not yet reached the beginning of a fresh period of immediate revolution. It may however be maintained today that the negative elements of the stabilisation are already showing a tendency to gain the upper hand, and that the forces which are disintegrating capitalism, are working with renewed energy. The stabilisation is already on the decline. The bourgeoisie sees the danger, and is endeavouring to save the stabilisation at the expense of the working masses. This means new and mighty class struggles, the issue of which depends on the developments in the general situation, and may mean revolution, or it may mean intensified exploitation and increased reaction.

In any case, the bourgeoisie will not succeed in establishing the final stabilisation of capitalism which they hope for. Not by these means. They will only prepare the ground for still severer struggles, which will continue till the bourgeoisie is overthrown.

The Policy of the Comintern and the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Under present conditions it is incumbent on the Comintern to prepare and organise the necessary forces to defeat the offensive against the proletariat. The English strike is the first act of this bourgeois offensive. The Comintern must continue the policy of the united front and of the organisation of unity among the working masses, must continue to strive to win over the majority of the workers, and must be unwearied in the endeavour to convert the attack being made by capitalism, into a counter-attack on the part of the working class, and into a revolutionary offensive for the realisation of the proletarian dictatorship.

The Comintern, whilst developing the policy of the united front, must make consistent efforts to maintain the Anglo-Russian Committee, which represents an important factor in the development of the united front tactics, and one of its most striking fulfilments. At the same time the leaders of the English trade union Left, who openly showed their opportunist tendencies on the occasion of the General Strike, must be severely criticised. The masses must be mobilised against these leaders, and induced to choose other leaders.

All those who consider that recent events demand a withdrawal from the Anglo-Russian Committee, either because the English trade union leaders are bankrupt, or because the situation has so changed that they are of the opinion that tactics must be changed also, commit an error which must be decidedly rejected.

On the one hand the revolutionary situation is not such that it demand a change from the immediate aims of the present policy of the Comintern, the policy of the united front and of the winning over of the majority of the working masses, to the more advanced line involving the organisation of the struggle for the immediate conquest of power. On the other hand, the bankruptcy of the Left trade union leaders of the English movement affords no reason to condemn the policy desirous of maintaining the Anglo-Russian Committee. The participation of the Comintern in the Anglo-Russian Committee is not based on the subjective element of faith in the opportunist leaders, or in an over-estimation of the revolutionary powers of these leaders, but solely on the fact that the English working class has taken a decided turn to the left, and that it is necessary and useful to form a connection with them, in order that they may be utilised as lever in the general international trade union movement.

This necessity did not cease with the General Strike. The Comintern must thus strive to maintain the Anglo-Russian Committee and must develop its policy further on the basis of the results of the General Strike, that is, it must combat the bankrupt leaders, and appeal to the English masses to replace these by others.

The Internal Situation in the Comintern.

The immediate tasks confronting the Comintern at the present time render it necessary to prepare the Communist Parties, with the utmost energy, for the struggles impending. The present situation will develop into an immediately revolutionary one only to the extent to which the Communist Parties fulfil their

task of winning over the majority of the decisive forces in the working class, of organising and preparing the Communist Parties themselves, and of preparing the working masses for the maturing struggles. One hindrance to the attainment of this object is the ideological deviations from the correct Bolshevik line in many Parties, whether these deviations be Ultraleft or Right, and the attempts at fraction forming resultant on these deviations.

The Comintern has clear political principles and a definite tactical method, both based on Leninism. Differences of opinion on various problems, and in the application of principles, are always possible, and in such cases discussion at the right time and place is always allowed and is indeed useful; but this does not demand or justify the organisation of fractions.

A fraction presupposes an antagonism in fundamental principles. Opposition against the principles and fundamental methods of the Comintern is however an expression of ideological deviation from Leninism, and can have no freedom of development and propaganda within the Comintern. Ideological unity is the fundamental principle of the Communist organisation. Therefore the formation of fractions is not allowed.

Special attention must be accorded to the Communist Party of Germany, on account of the Ultraleft fractional activity in its ranks, injurious to the work of the Party. The Comintern must endeavour to aim at the immediate liquidation of such extremist residue still remaining in the German Party from a dead past. The C.C. of the C.P.I. therefore approves of the expulsion of Korsch and Schwarz, with whom the Comintern can have nothing in common, and of the expulsion of Ruth Fischer and Maslov, upon whose initiative a fractional bloc with Korsch and Schwarz was formed.

The Comintern must accord more attention to the Communist Party of France, and strive to eliminate that possibility of opportunist deviation so frequent in the work of the C.P.F. Every form of fraction forming and group fighting must be severely censured, for in the present position of the French Party these fractional efforts greatly increase the difficulties experienced in France in forming a homogeneous and certain leadership, guaranteeing the continuity of Bolshevik guidance for the French people.

The C.C. of the C.P.I., having taken cognisance of the report of the C.C. and the C.C.C. of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the fractional activity of the opposition, expresses its full solidarity with the C.C. of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and with its energetic and determined attitude in the defence of the Party and of the fundamental principles of communist organisation.

If fractional activity is to be combatted and prohibited in every Section of the Comintern, it must be combatted and prohibited most strictly of all in the Party of the Soviet Union, for this Party bears the responsibility of leading the first proletarian state of the world. The opposition, in attempting to form a fraction, has failed in its duty to the Party and the Comintern. The C.C. of the C.P.I. approves of the measures taken against those responsible for these detrimental actions.

The C. C. of the C. P. of Italy.