

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 36

23<sup>rd</sup> June 1927

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

## CONTENTS

Karl Kreibich: The Danger of War in Permanency.

### Against Imperialist War.

B. Smeral: The Little Nations and the War Policy of British Imperialism.

Communication of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union.

### Hands off the Soviet Union.

Voroshilov: The Masses of the Workers and Peasants of the Soviet Union are prepared to defend their Socialist Fatherland till the last Drop of Blood.

The British Secret Service at Work. The Evidence of Sidney Reilly.

Who are those, who "Have Committed No Crime"?

The Soviet Press on the Warsaw Sentence.

### Politics.

Gabriel Péri: The Conference of the League of Nation's Council in Geneva.

K. Leski: Communist Successes in Poland.

Michel HOLLAY: The Political Situation in France.

### China.

Tang Shin She: The Breaking Up of the Labour Movement in Shanghai by Chang Kai Shek.

Sia Ting: The Peasant Movement in China.

The Trial of Mrs. Borodin and three Soviet Couriers in Peking.

### The Balkans.

K.: The Change of Government in Roumania.

### Labour Movement.

L. Heller: The Trade Union Conference of the Pacific Ocean Countries and the Labour Movement in the Far East.

### Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

Resolution of the Plenum of the E. C. C. I. on the Situation in Great Britain.

### The White Terror.

Execution of the Indian Revolutionary Singh.

### Co-operative Movement.

Algo: Our Proletarian Planks for the International Co-operative Day.

### Workers Delegations in the Soviet Union.

The Czecho-Slovakian Co-operative Delegation at Moscow.

### Obituary.

Comrade Rafik Jabbour.

### Ten Years Ago.

## The Danger of War in Permanency.

By Karl Kreibich (Prague).

When the danger of sanguinary conflict in the revolutionary class war is at its highest, social patriotic treachery is nearest. The truth of this adapted proverb has once more been proved in the days of the highest tension between Great Britain and the Soviet Union. The lackeys of the bourgeoisie, in their pale red liveries, have increased their attacks against the Soviet Union at almost the same rate as have their masters; and whilst, at the beginning of the tension between Great Britain and Russia, even the Berlin "Vorwärts" only wished to remain neutral, when there is a clash between revolution and counter-revolution, even the Prague "Sozialdemokrat", in whose case, in view of its insignificance from the point of view of the international bourgeoisie, it can be nothing but a work of supererogation, has, during the last few days, raved against the Soviet Union with an acrimony and a zeal which betrays that the alliance between the Social Patriots and the bourgeoisie is beginning to turn from an objective community of interests into a sentimental community of souls. For this reason we can sympathise with these noble souls that they remain callous and cool when English warships slaughter 7000 Chinese

in Nanking, but that they foam at the mouth when a few Russian aristocrats are shot in Moscow.

### The Deceitful Manoeuvres of the Bourgeoisie and the Social Patriots.

Every day is not Sunday, and the week day comes into its own again. Then it becomes a question of resuming the everyday work for the bourgeoisie. And since to-day war against the Soviet Union does not yet seem opportune to the bourgeoisie, since the workers need not yet be stirred up to direct fratricide, the work must be resumed which the bourgeoisie regards as appropriate when it is preparing for war, until the moment when it has resolved to strike out — at which moment immediate war propaganda begins — the work of soothing the masses, of hushing up the danger, of representing any resistance to the threatened danger of war as "war clamour", and in this way bringing things to such a path that the bourgeoisie takes the masses by surprise with the war, that it throws over their head the steel net of a state of war before they have resolved on any defensive action.

One of the best tried methods by which the bourgeoisie rules, is that of deceiving the working classes as to the true character of the period of history of the moment. A classical example of this is provided by the policy of the bourgeoisie in the period from the beginning of the imperialist epoch until the great war. That was the first period in world politics in which the Governments had to take into consideration the interest taken by the masses in their policy, to consider the moods of the masses and their movements of opposition. The epoch of the bourgeois revolution and of the formation of the National States was closed in Europe by the Peace of Frankfurt in 1871; the Balkans alone lagged behind in the rear in 1878, without at that time causing any appreciable unrest in the other parts of Europe. If we make the experiment of circulating a questionnaire amongst the workers of Central Europe, we can bet a hundred to one that in the memory of most of those who answer, the period from 1871 to 1914 or, at any rate, from 1878 to 1912 (Balkan wars) remains in their memory as an epoch of peace (from their experience, their reading and lectures they have heard).

But what was in reality the aspect of this period? With Great Britain's campaigns against the Afghans in 1878 and 1879 and against the Zulu Kaffirs, a chain of colonial wars began which was never to be broken, and these were soon followed by the wars of the imperialist Powers among themselves for the colonies (1898 the Spanish-American war) and spheres of interest and for the dividing up of the world. If we follow up the history of this epoch from 1878 to 1914, we have a clear picture of how the net of the threatened imperialist world war was being drawn closer and closer; we can, so to speak, see the war in the offing. If however we trace the mass movement of the working classes in this period, we see how, in spite of all the signals and cries of warning, they did not properly grasp the danger and were not prepared to meet it in the right way until finally, in 1914, in the twinkling of an eye, they were bowled over by the monster of the world war, and we almost feel the dramatic excitement of the spectator in a cinema who, in the most thrilling scene, wants to jump up and warn the unsuspecting hero of the murderer who is approaching by stealth.

The nearer the world war approaches, the more zealously and feverishly the Governments prepare for it, the more perfect do the arrangements for the pacifist deception become, from the Czarist manifesto to the Hague institutions, from the "guarantee of peace" of the Alliance to the meetings between monarchs. Even at that time, the pacifist humbug penetrated into the Second International. Was not the "long epoch of peace" an important argument of revisionism about the peaceful development into socialism? Were there not Van Kols who saw positive sides in the colonial policy, and Karl Leuthners, who saw them in the Triple Alliance? It is also interesting to read today some of the speeches in the Reichstag at the time of the crisis in Morocco. How many forewarnings of the 4th of August did we, as good Social Democrats, carelessly pass by at that time?

### The Imperialist War in Permanency.

The epoch since the world war exhibits all the phenomena of the pre-war period on an extended scale. The almost uninterrupted chain of wars has grown into a war in permanency. Murder has never ceased at all. We have also entered on a new epoch of colonial wars, the epoch of the defence of colonies and spheres of influence against the revolutionary uprisings of the population of those districts. The armaments for war, preparations, contradictions and dangers of war have become much mightier and more alarming than before the Great War. Consequently, the endeavours of the bourgeoisie to deceive the working masses as to the true character of the present character must be much more strenuous. The League of Nations and the guarantee pacts together with all the rest of the pacific humbug are the result of these endeavours, and moreover, behind these institutions, are hidden the efforts of the great imperialist Powers to guard themselves against premature explosions; for the experience of the world war has taught them that not only must every preparation be made for a war, but that the moment of its outbreak must be well chosen and should not come by surprise.

The imperialists can be well satisfied with the result of their endeavours to deceive the masses as to the true character of the present period as one of war in permanency. Millions

of workers who are under the influence of the Social Patriotic leaders, believe their asseverations that the danger of war is only a Communist clamour and that the League of Nations, the Treaties of Locarno etc. are actually guarantees of peace. Can there be a greater triumph for the imperialist propaganda than the fact that the leaders of the revived Second International can without being ignominiously turned out, announce to the masses the exact opposite of the truth and can represent the present period when peace is better ensured than ever, whereas, as compared with the time before the war, the danger of war is far more imminent?

Clausewitz, in his famous saying that war is the continuation of politics with other means (i. e. the means of force), has pointed out the close relationship between politics and war. To-day, his saying is out of date. Even the variation that the whole world policy of the imperialists since 1918 is nothing but the continuation of the imperialist world war with other means, does not express this enormous change precisely enough. In the present period of imperialism, politics and war have been welded into one, they form one unit. It may almost be regarded as a symbol that the imperialist statesmen, at the very time when they are sitting together in League of Nations Conferences or peace conferences, issue orders for the bombardment of Chinese towns and Riff villages in Morocco, and that Geneva and Locarno are at the same time centres for international profiteers who traffic in war material.

### The Class War in Permanency.

Not only the imperialist war however, but the class war also is in permanency to-day. The bourgeoisie, from its side only, has declared it in permanency against the revolutionary proletariat which at the same time has prompted it to conceal this war as it did the imperialist war, behind a pacifist delusion, in this case that of democracy and parliamentarism, in order to deceive the masses as to its true attitude towards them.

The parallel forces itself upon us. Neither the Paris Commune nor the murders in Chicago, neither the intensification of the revolutionary fights in Russia, nor the massacres of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie in other States prevented most of the leaders of the Second International from regarding the period of civil war as finally concluded and from considering it out of the question that the proletarian class war should develop into a civil war. The forged preface by Engels to Marx' "Class War in France" has remained for them the most precious jewel of political Marxist literature, and the experiences of the first Russian revolution of 1905 have existed for them only as interesting events in an exotic country which have as much significance for their "own" country, as have the canals on Mars for the actual geography of mother earth. The more the class fights have been intensified the more obstinately have these leaders refused to enter into any definite discussion, not to mention making any practical preparations for more serious methods of fighting. They have not gone beyond the ballot paper.

What are the occasional massacres instituted by the bourgeoisie against the proletariat from May 1871 in Paris to the fights on the Lena in 1912 as compared with the sanguinary war of extermination which the bourgeoisie has been carrying on against the revolutionary Labour movement from October 1917 until the present day? How many thousands of proletarians have been slaughtered by the bourgeoisie and their Social Patriotic executioners in Russia, Finland, Bavaria and Hungary, in the Ruhr district and in Central Germany, (March 1920 and 1921), in Roumania and Poland, in Yugoslavia and Italy? Has this murdering, this blood-thirsty class war stopped for a single year? The bourgeoisie carries it on uninterruptedly; whenever there is a pause, it prepares for the next wholesale slaughter.

This does not prevent the leaders of the Second International from holding out prospects of a victory of socialism by peaceful means even more than they did before the world war, and thus making the proletariat all the more defenceless, the more the bourgeoisie rages against it. For the Social Patriotic leaders are true philanthropists and pacifists, their heart bleeds when they think of the many proletarians who will have to allow themselves to be slaughtered in the next revolutionary fights so that the bourgeoisie may be victorious; for this reason they wish to make and maintain the proletariat as defenceless as possible so that as few victims as possible may be demand-

ed when it is defeated. It is only necessary to read the Austro-Marxists, to listen to **Otto Bauer** and **Julius Deutsch** and hear how they boast of having attained the same end as Noske without having sacrificed a fraction of the victims that he did.

### The Attacks on the Soviet Union.

The policy of the international bourgeoisie towards the Soviet Union is nothing more nor less than the combination of war and civil war in permanency. The bourgeoisie knows that the annihilation of the Soviet Power is a prerequisite for the final stabilisation of imperialism for which they hope and towards which they work. This is why it carried on war against the Soviet Power uninterruptedly from 1918 to 1921. Only when the bitter conviction was borne in upon it that it would not succeed in defeating it, whilst at the same time the complete and permanent exclusion of the Russian market intensified the crisis of capitalism, was the bourgeoisie moved to conclude a temporary peace and to enter into economic relations with the Soviet Union.

In doing so, the bourgeoisie tried to explain this change in its policy to the masses with the help of the Social Patriots, by means of a similar swindle as they employed later with regard to the introduction of the "New Economic Policy" in the Soviet Union. These same Social Patriots know very well from Lenin's writings, especially from his speech "On Taxation in Kind", that the "Nep", with State capitalism, was in essentials the original economic plan of the Bolsheviks after they had seized the power, but that it proved impossible to carry it out because of the sabotage of the bourgeoisie and of the technical intelligentsia and because of the war and the civil war which enforced war communism. They represented the "Nep" and State capitalism which had only become possible after the complete defeat of the bourgeoisie and after the termination of the war and the civil war, as a capitulation to capitalism on the part of the Soviet Government, as an unprecedented change in the economic policy of the Bolsheviks.

The social patriotic megaphones of the bourgeoisie are guilty of a similar deception with regard to the foreign policy of the Soviet Government. They know perfectly well that, from the very beginning, the Soviet Government announced its intention to carry on a policy of peace and of the restoration of economic relations, but that this was rendered impossible by the warlike machinations of the capitalist Governments against the Soviet Union. They however represent the matter as though the wicked Bolsheviks had at first intended to overrun the peaceful capitalist world with war, and as though it was only when this proved impossible that they were converted to a "more reasonable" foreign policy. The whole campaign of the Social Patriots of all countries against the Soviet Union, which is of course above all a campaign against the Communist International, is under the sign of this fraud.

In this way the international bourgeois can calmly carry on its subterranean war against the Soviet Union as an apparent action of defence against Communist propaganda and can, with the help of its Social Patriotic megaphones, represent any actual resistance to this action which does not stop short at the most infamous methods, as a justification of the war manoeuvres of the imperialists. This has been clearly shown by the attitude of the Social Democratic Press towards the execution of the monarchist conspirators.

The acts of individual terror, the attempts on people's lives, have been, to some extent, acts of despair on the part of the oppressed, not only of despair because of the tortures of the oppression but also because of their incapability of finding the right way to gain their freedom. Marxism and Leninism, just because they have taught the right way to liberate the oppressed, have always, in their policy, rejected the tactics of making attempts on people's lives. Such attempts however are also a means used by the rulers in order to deprive the oppressed of their leaders, if this cannot be done in a "legal" way. The ruling classes know that a loss of this kind is a far greater blow to the oppressed classes, because honest revolutionary leaders of the masses are rare, whereas bourgeois society produces monarchs, statesmen, politicians and prominent economists etc. in masses. The bourgeois society of post-war imperialism has developed the policy of murdering revolutionary leaders into a system, and when it has not been able to carry on war against the Soviet Power or to stir up a civil war,

it has sent out murderers against the leading personalities of the Soviet Union.

What however is the attitude of the leaders of the Second International in this respect? They suppress the documentary evidence about this policy of the bourgeoisie, they prevent the discovery of the connection between these acts of murder and preach indignation when the Soviet Power resists this campaign of murder. In this way, the Social Patriots support the infamous plans of assassination of which the bourgeoisie is guilty. Is it not more than characteristic that the party of the Social Revolutionaries was refused admission to the Second International as long as it employed the tactics of individual terror and of deeds of violence against Czarism, but has been allowed to join it since it turned its murderous weapons against the functionaries of the Soviet Power? And does not this International keep silence on this point, does it not approve and support the fact that the Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks are maintained in the same way and with the same money as the monarchist crew of Russian emigrants, as the murderers of Vorovsky and Voykov?

Days of this kind are very instructive, they refresh our memory with regard to things which have been half forgotten and to which little attention is being paid otherwise, and this ought to be turned to account even though the days of the culminating point of agitation and murderous attacks, which are so glorious for the bourgeoisie and its Social Patriotic creatures, once more give place for a time to more peaceful days.

## AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

### The Little Nations and the War Policy of British Imperialism.

By B. Smeral.

Capitalistic Great Britain is at present engaged in a desperate fight to retain its position of power. It was a vanguard of European capitalism in the historic period of its prime. It is now passing through an acute phase of the process of decline and decay of the capitalist system. The British bourgeoisie is now conscious where the greatest enemy of capitalism is.

The rage of British capitalism against the Soviet Union, the preparation for a new large-scale war is not a mere accidentally and temporary phenomenon. For a number of years capitalistic Great Britain will play in world politics the role of the principal active power of international Reaction, the centre of systematic organisation of the world counter-revolution, the enemy of the Soviet Union and of the instigator of a fresh conflagration of war. In order to prevent this crime, the proletariat and the oppressed of the whole world must rise in singleness of purpose.

It is the old tradition of the foreign and military policy of the British bourgeoisie not to pursue its own ends with its own means, but at the cost of foreign property and with the help of foreign blood. Ever since the Napoleonic wars capitalistic Great Britain has always concentrated its attention chiefly upon that country which it regarded as next to itself in point of power and consequently as its greatest opponent. Against this country it has then constantly sought by means of hypocritical slogans to incite as many other countries as possible to join in the fight. As far as possible it has held itself in reserve, saving its strength for the moment to come when the booty should be divided and preparing to violate and break the instruments of its policy. One could only expect that the British bourgeoisie would try at the present time to employ these tactics against the Soviet Union.

All the steps taken by British diplomacy indicate that one of the means upon which capitalistic Great Britain is reckoning on the vassalage of the little States of the Balkans, of Central Europe and on the Baltic. Will these countries enter the service of this crime? The bourgeoisie of the little States is naturally capable and prepared, against payment, to allow the population to die for foreign interests. But the toiling masses are beginning to grasp the consequences of British policy and, under the

influence of class-conscious workers, will not allow themselves to be led into the wanton adventure of a new war. The true interests of their countries militate against it.

This is not a question of the class interests of the proletariat. It is clear and natural that these are completely opposed to the war policy of British imperialism. But what have the little nations as such to expect in the perspective of the policy of capitalistic Great Britain? In important strata of the population of the little States the national consideration, the consideration of national independence plays a part.

The British capitalists would gladly erect in the Soviet Union in place of the Soviet regime the Czarist, nationalistic regime of big landowners, generals and capitalists. Would such a Russia be more advantageous than the Soviet regime for the national independence of the little nations along its frontier? The little nations in the Balkans, in Central Europe and in Eastern Europe rely for their national independence upon the principle of self-determination. In the whole world of to-day there is, however, no great power which must oppose the principle of the national right of self-determination so forcefully as capitalistic Great Britain, threatened, as it is, by the liberation movement of the oppressed colonial peoples. On account of its general position, Great Britain is compelled to hamper the industrial development of the little States in the Balkans, in Central Europe and in Eastern Europe and to force them down to the lowest rank of agrarian countries, in order that they may not be industrial competitors but markets and colonies.

The distant perspectives of British policy are, however, much more dangerous for the little countries. If British capitalists really succeed in destroying the industry of the little States and turning these countries into dependent colonial markets, a further thought will of necessity develop in the minds of London millionaires: Has this colonial territory not too many frontiers, inconveniencing our salesmen on their rounds? National feeling is ridiculous in the eyes of the sharks on the London Exchange. The problem of producing larger economic territories would then be solved not by revolution, but by counter-revolution. The revolutionary proletarian solution at the same time signifies the solution of the national question and of the peasant question. The counter-revolutionary solution signifies the rulership of landed proprietors, the loss of the national independence of the little nations and countries.

This would mean the reinstating of the rule of the knout, of the most brutal reactionary regime of White Terror and finally the restoration of the old "codes of justice", ending in revival of monarchism. The bloody, barbarian system of government which, with the help of Great Britain is raging in Hungary and Bulgaria, would then "unite" the whole of Eastern Europe and Central Europe.

The words uttered at the World Economic Conference in Geneva on May 7th by the editor of the British "Economist", Layton, were not the outcome of imagination:

"On account of the fact that many small States have been formed in Central Europe, the customs frontiers have been extended by 11,000 kilometers as compared with conditions before the war. From the economic standpoint these little States are an anachronism."

The course of history can not be revised! Just as after the Great French revolution a reversion from bourgeois society to feudalism was impossible, now, after the World War, after October, in the historic period of the decline of capitalism, social counter-revolution, which would destroy the productive power and the political and cultural life of the whole of humanity, cannot possibly succeed. If the British bourgeoisie is nevertheless compelled to unite its fate with the fate of the world counter-revolution, this is only a proof that it is condemned — in a state of perplexity, in the process of a truly desperate fight to retain the position of power it has so long enjoyed, and forced to enter upon a path of adventure and

The criminal intent will not succeed. But in order to restrain the criminal arm, a great development of power, the greatest activity and the fight of the masses are necessary. The impudent provocation of the British imperialists must mobilise in every country of the world the proletarians and all those who are oppressed.

## Communication of the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union.

Moscow, 17th June 1927.

The "Pravda" publishes the following Communication of the Presidium of the Central Council of the Labour Unions:

"Various trade union organisations have addressed enquiries to the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union with regard to the reasons preventing the convening of the Anglo-Russian Committee. Similar enquiries have also been made by numerous individual members of unions. The labour unions and the broad masses of the working class of the Soviet Union who fully realise the seriousness and the importance of the present moment, are justifiably concerned at the silence of the Anglo-Russian Committee which was founded to organise the efforts of the organised workers in both countries in their struggle against the danger of war, the offensive of capital and for the unity of the international trade union movement.

The Central Council considers this concern of the workers of the Soviet Union to be thoroughly justified, for the postponement of the meeting of the Anglo-Russian Committee by the General Council of the British T. U. C. with formal reasons in a moment when the danger of war threatens not merely the workers of the Soviet Union and Great Britain, but also of the whole world, gives rise to serious fears for the future of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The Central Council is of the opinion that the present significant and responsible moment demands that the Anglo-Russian Committee be called together as quickly as possible without consideration for formalities, in order to consider the measures necessary against war. The Presidium hereby publishes the correspondence, which has been carried on with the General Council concerning the calling of the Anglo-Russian Committee. The Central Council has done and is still doing everything possible, in order to convene the Anglo-Russian Committee and mobilise the forces of the proletariat for an active struggle against war.

The Central Council will do everything possible also in the future to urge the Anglo-Russian Committee to take action against the obvious danger of war. It will sharply fight against all attempts to mask inactivity by formal considerations, which would condemn the Committee to passivity and reduce it to impotence."

The "Pravda" then publishes the exchange of telegrams between the Central Council of the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union and the General Council of the British T. U. C.

Telegram of the Central Council to the General Council dated 14th May 1927:

"The latest events sustain the worst fears with regard to the preparation of an attack of the imperialists under the leadership of Great Britain against the Soviet Union. The raid upon the Peking Embassy of the Soviet Union and the arrest and torturing of its employees was, as is now clear, not only inspired, but a part of the plan for an offensive against the Soviet Union. The raid upon Arcos and upon the Trade Delegation which was accompanied by violence against the employees, is the second act, the direct continuation of the offensive which commenced with the Peking raid.

The Conservative Government of Great Britain has definitely removed its mask. Its policy towards the Soviet Union is to break off all connections, at first commercial relations and then diplomatic relations, and then to take still more aggressive steps. The real significance of these events must not be mistaken or underestimated.

The Central Council believes the moment to be serious and demanding the exercise of all the forces of the working class in order to oppose this dangerous policy. The Central Council is of the opinion that it is necessary to convene the Anglo-Russian Committee in order to consider a joint action on the part of the trade union movements of the two countries. If you do not consider this possible at the moment, then the Central Council will not press for it, in the assumption that the General Council realise the importance of the situation and will fulfil its fraternal duty and protest energetically enough against the policy of raids and an offensive against the Soviet Union."



Answering telegram of the General Council dated 18th May:

"Your telegram will be discussed by the General Council in its session next week. A protest has already been sent to the Prime Minister."

Telegram of the Central Council dated 25th May 1927:

"The latest events strengthen the contents of our telegram of the 14th May concerning the necessity of convening the Anglo-Russian Committee. Request immediate answer."

Letter of the General to the Central Council dated 29th May 1927:

"We hereby corroborate our telegram despatched to you yesterday with the following text: 'We cannot convene the Anglo-Russian Committee, we will however inform you as quickly as possible in the matter'."

Letter of the Central Council to the General Council dated 3rd June 1927:

"On the 14th May the Central Council directed a request by telegram to the General Council to convene the Anglo-Russian Committee on account of the open intention of the British Conservative government to break off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. On the 19th May we received in answer a short telegram from the secretary of the General Council, Citrine, informing us that our proposal would be considered by the General Council 'next week'. On the 25th May when the news of the definite breach arrived, the Central Council sent a short telegram to the General Council reminding it of the proposal of the Central Council and repeating it.

The Central Council regards the situation as serious, for the intention of the Conservatives to force war on the Soviet Union is clear to everyone. The only unclear matter is, when and from what side this war will come. Whoever is really against war cannot stand by with folded arms and wait for the 'unexpected' outbreak of war.

At the present moment the Anglo-Russian Committee has an extremely responsible role. The workers of the Soviet Union want to know what the Anglo-Russian Committee intends to do in the fight against the approaching war and in case it breaks out. The Central Council is of the opinion that not only the workers of the Soviet Union, but also the workers of other countries expect activity from the Anglo-Russian Committee, as every war brings with it the danger that it may develop into a world-wide war. The whole world is threatened with this danger. Procrastination and passivity are damaging and can lead to disastrous results.

The Central Council is of the opinion that any such procrastination and passivity would cause justified dissatisfaction amongst the working masses who regard the Anglo-Russian Committee as an organisation which has been created to fight against the offensive of capitalism and against the danger of imperialist wars. For this reason the Central Council requests a speedy communication from the General Council informing it whether or not the General Council is in agreement with the calling together of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Should the General Council by in agreement, then we request a communication concerning the date and the place of the meeting."

Telegram of the Central Council to the General Council dated 10th June 1927:

"Despite the extremely tense situation you have given no clear answer to our repeated request to convene a session of the Anglo-Russian Committee. Our affiliated organisations are enquiring as to the reason for the passivity of the Anglo-Russian Committee. This forces us, unless we receive a definite answer by the 14th of this month, to publish the correspondence between us on the subject."

Telegram of the General Council to the Central Council dated 10th June 1927:

"In reply to your letter of the 3rd June, the International Committee of the General Council proposes that Tomsky and Dogadov meet Hicks and Citrine on the 17th and 18th June for the purpose of a preliminary examination of those questions which you wish to lay before the Anglo-Russian Committee. Please telegraph whether date satisfactory."

Telegram of the Central Council to the General Council dated 11th June 1927:

"We have no objection to the preliminary conversations between the Chairmen and the Secretaries upon the agenda, but we must insist in the name of our organisations categorically, that on the date mentioned all the members of the Anglo-Russian Committee meet in Berlin and hold a plenary session. Events are moving swiftly, and every form of delay is impermissible. We expect an immediate answer, should no answer arrive we shall take it that the General Council is in agreement with our proposal, and all the Russian members of the Anglo-Russian Committee will then arrive in Berlin on the 17th inst."

Telegram of Citrine to Melnichansky dated 12th June 1927:

"I cannot arrange a plenary session of the Anglo-Russian Committee without the instructions of the General Council which will meet on the 22nd inst. In consequence, the full Committee cannot be in Berlin as requested on the 17th June. I request you therefore to telegraph immediately if you wish the chairman and myself to be in Berlin on the 17th inst."

Telegram of Melnichansky to Citrine dated 14th June 1927:

"The Russian Chairman and Secretary of the Committee will arrive in Berlin at the agreed time."

## HANDS OFF THE SOVIET UNION

**The Masses of the Workers and Peasants of the Soviet Union are Prepared to Defend their Socialist Fatherland till the last Drop of Blood.**

Speech of Voroshilov, delivered in a public workers meeting on the 9th June 1927.

A few months ago comrade Bukharin pointed out that the Soviet Union was, owing to various circumstances quite independent of our will, approaching difficult times. Since then I have stressed this fact in various speeches and pointed out that despite all our efforts, despite our determined peace policy, our enemies wished to force us into war.

Recent events have completely corroborated the analysis of comrade Bukharin. A few weeks after Bukharin's speech, we received the Chamberlain Note, and then followed the events which are now well-known. Our country is approaching a new period of difficulties, and it is our duty to prepare ourselves in all seriousness for the trials which are facing us.

One can still meet the opinion that we will be successful in our manoeuvring and be able to avoid a collision with the enemy. This opinion is to a certain extent justified, but it does not represent the whole truth. The whole truth is that we are now approaching a period of history in which our class enemies will inevitably force us into war.

**The Enmity of the World Bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union growing.**

What has been our international situation up to the present? The majority of countries trades with us, the majority of countries recognises us, but at the same time the capitalist world tells us through the lips of individual politicians, through the speeches of the representatives of the most reactionary section of the bourgeoisie, that it regards the existence of the Soviet Union as a temporary phenomenon which must be brought to an end. The bourgeoisie of the whole world is united in the fond hope that we will one day be destroyed. Not only Great Britain, but the whole capitalist world is of the opinion that we, that is, our State which has a new structure, who are building up socialism have no right to exist and must disappear from the stage. We have been in this situation now for ten years, since the commencement of the Soviet Power. Temporarily the situation relaxed, sometimes it was intensified. Now we are faced with a severe intensification. In face of this, can we expect a new period in which the hostility of the capitalist world towards us will relax?

I believe that the answer to this question is in the negative.

It was no accident that in the British House of Commons the representatives of the whole bourgeoisie supported the proposal of the Conservatives to break off diplomatic relations with us, although the British bourgeoisie as a whole is by no means interested in a breach of the diplomatic and economic relations with us. And because the whole bourgeoisie nevertheless supported the breach, then that proves that we have no right to expect a new spring of friendly and neighbourly relations with the outside world, but that, on the contrary, we must prepare ourselves for the worst. The comparatively peaceful period of our existence has, without a doubt, passed.

### Great Britain to the Front!

The British bourgeoisie has played and will continue to play the first fiddle in the attack against us. It broke off relations with us in order to give itself a free hand. The British government is doing its utmost to force us into war. The raid upon our Embassy in Peking, which was carried out under the instructions of British governmental circles, was intended to do this. The British capitalists thought that we would answer the insults and maltreatment heaped upon the employees of our institutions in China with active reprisals. They thought above all, that we would undertake armed action against Chang Tso-lin, who was directly responsible for the raid upon our Peking Embassy. The British capitalists wanted to kill three birds with one stone: By provoking us into war in the East, they hoped us to compromise us in the eyes of the Chinese toilers, they hoped also for an economic weakening of our country in consequence of the war and finally a weakening of the defence of our western frontier which would have made it easier for them to urge our neighbours against the Ukraine and White Russia.

But our Government realised these not over-intelligent plans of the British capitalists in time. We did not permit ourselves to be provoked. In a difficult moment we retained our coolness and level-headedness. Following upon the failure of the raid upon our representation in Peking, came the raid upon our Trade Delegation and Arcos in London. The aim of this raid was to discover documents which might have compromised our employees and been used as material to accuse us of anti-British propaganda. No such documents were found, and the British Government was compelled to declare that sufficient grounds were present for a breach with us without offering any concrete proofs.

The following acts of the British bourgeoisie are known to everyone. They are laid down both in the Note of Litvinov to Poland and in the statements of our Government published in the press. We accuse the British bourgeoisie very definitely not merely of bearing the responsibility for the organisation of the murder of Voykov in Warsaw, but also that the British Secret Service organises and supports incendiaries, bandits and murderers inside our country. The published statements of our government contained only a part of the proofs which are at our disposal. But this part is sufficient in order to show the increased activity of our enemies who are openly led by British official organs. We have arrested British spies very often before, we have obtained very often proof that the various white guardist organisations are supported by Great Britain. We have, however, never made any great stir about it. We knew very well that the proletarian world and the capitalist world could not live peacefully side by side.

But although we were aware of this primitive truth, we did our utmost to maintain the peaceful breathing space. Since the first days of the existence of Soviet Russia, Great Britain has fought us bitterly. First of all by armed intervention and then by supporting Koltchak and Denikin with money and arms. But we destroyed both these weapons of Great Britain.

From 1921 to 1924 the bourgeoisie hoped that although it were impossible to overthrow us by force of arms, it might be possible that we would be suffocated in our own economic difficulties. But the bourgeoisie was quickly compelled to recognise that this hope also would not be realised. The economic system of the Soviet Union grew and strengthened. Then apparently our enemies returned to the old methods of struggle. In recent years Great Britain has armed against us at a great rate in Poland, Esthonia, Roumania and Latvia. These preparations produced fruit in the form of a considerable increase of the military power of Roumania and particularly of Poland. If despite all this Great Britain has up to the present time not succeeded in driving these countries into a war against us, then

the reason is not lack of will on the part of Great Britain, but is the political situation which has prevented the formation of a united front against us.

The break off of diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union should logically have been followed by a military attack upon us. This was not the case, but the only reason was that the British bourgeoisie had obviously miscalculated. At the time it openly secured the support of other capitalist states, but in the decisive moment these states refused to keep their promises. Today Germany and even France, Italy, Poland and the Baltic states declare that their policy is not the policy of Great Britain.

From all this it is clear that, with the breaking off of relations with the Soviet Union, Great Britain has not achieved its aim which consisted in the immediate opening up of military operations against us. Great Britain is not sufficiently strong and will probably not become strong enough today or tomorrow to organise a war against us. Although in the immediate future war is not very likely, nevertheless we must reckon with war in one or two years. Although the British bourgeoisie has not succeeded in forcing us into the war, it will not permit itself to be discouraged. The British imperialists have too many reasons to wish passionately the destruction of the Soviet Union. With the October Revolution they lost very much capital invested in British undertakings in Russia and recently they have sustained very great losses in China. The development of the Chinese revolution is also shaking the power of Great Britain in India, the main basis of British imperialism.

All this causes Great Britain to an active and energetic opposition against us. It is of course no question that we are occupied in "making" the revolution in China and forging plots against the British government. The fact is that every revolution and every revolutionary movement inevitably expresses its solidarity with us. It could not be otherwise, for our country is the land of the proletarian dictatorship, the only country in the world in which a socialist economic system is being built up to give the whole of humanity freedom. It is for this reason that the capitalists of the whole world and in particular the capitalists of Great Britain who recognise their class interests most clearly, hate us so passionately.

Although I am personally of the opinion that war this year is unlikely, nevertheless the events are developing so quickly that we cannot prophesy with certainty what will happen in the near future.

### Will Great Britain succeed in forming a United Front against us?

It is understandable that Great Britain alone cannot fight against us. It has at its disposal the mightiest fleet of the world, but it has not sufficient land which for landing operations would have any serious importance in a struggle against it. It is superfluous to say that the bandit raids, the bomb attempts, as they were carried out in Leningrad, cannot lead to any noticeable results. Other measures are necessary to draw our country into war or to commence an attack upon us. It would be serious only if Great Britain were successful in forming if not a military, then at least an economic united front against us. Great Britain is attempting to do this. The hope that as we are no industrial country, an economic blockade would cause us great economic difficulties, forms the condition for a successful military attack upon us.

I don't believe that Great Britain will be able to form such a united front against. The interests of the individual capitalist countries are too contradictory. This was shown by the recent breaking off of relations with our Union by the British imperialists. Immediately after this action we received numerous offers capitalist groups in other countries to give us credit upon conditions not less favourable than those we received from Great Britain. Also, the capitalist states must take their own inner political situation, the spirit of the working masses, into account. And in some countries they must reckon that the breaking off of commercial relations with the Soviet Union would inevitably produce serious economic consequences concerned.

But in any case, we must be prepared for the worst, and the worst is that the British bourgeoisie will prepare with all its forces a united front for a military attack upon us. That can happen in two years time or in one year, it is even possible, though improbable within a few months.

### The Red Army, the Working and Peasant Masses are prepared.

What is our situation? A short while ago I visited the whole Ukrainian military district, I visited the Black Sea Fleet and the Donetz Basin, and I had occasion to observe the spirit of the working and peasant masses. I must say, that apart from the Red Army, which must of course be ready at any time, the workers and peasants are also prepared at a moment's notice to defend the socialist Fatherland with the last drop of their blood.

But to-day that is no longer enough. To-day it is probably not possible to defeat us with a direct military attack. Our army is in such a condition that it will be able to reject the attacks of the enemy. But in order to be really prepared to resist the enemy, we must also prepare the Hinterland. We must so prepare ourselves for the defence of the Soviet Republic that the economic system of our country will be able to work normally in case of war. It is a matter of course that we are opposed to war. We are building up our economic system, and the construction of socialism is developing at such a rate that in five or six years we will have an economic organism that will stand any pressure. To-day a war would cause us great economic difficulties unless we prepared ourselves properly.

The only way of avoiding these dangers is to redouble our whole economic work. This is not an empty phrase. If war should break out, then we shall have to do this anyhow, whether we like it or not. But if we do not do it at once, then we may arrive in a situation where a war would cost us everything that we have achieved in the previous comparatively peaceful breathing space. We must already begin to reckon everything exactly. In case of war we must know exactly what branches of production must be limited, what branches extended etc., how we are to dispose of our labour forces so that our economic system can continue without interruption.

The second task is to be watchful, and still more so than ever before. Our enemies are working with bombs and arson, more than ever before. This demands that every worker observe what is going on around him so that he as a member of the dominant class can guard the property of the Soviet Union with keen eyes. Such an atmosphere must be created that no traitor can worm his way into our ranks and that no traitor can harm us. Watchfulness and intensified work, these must be our preparations for war, for self-defence against attack.

## The British Secret Service at Work.

### The Evidence of Sidney Reilly.

Reilly gave the following information about his person:

"Signey George Reilly, born 1874, Captain in the British Army, Public School education, special subject chemistry, member of the British Conservative Party, condemned in absence in November 1918 in the Lockhart Process by the Supreme Tribunal of the Soviet Union."

About his life Reilly writes:

"In 1914 I volunteered for active service and received a commission in the Royal Flying Corps. In January 1918 I was transferred to the Secret Service in which I was active until 1921. In March 1918 whilst I was working for the Secret Service, I was ordered to Russia as a member of the British Mission to examine the situation there.

From a passive-observant attitude I, like the British Mission itself, went over to a more or less active struggle against the Soviet power for the following reasons..."

Here Reilly states that the chief reason which moved the British Mission to undertake an active struggle against the Soviet power was the conclusion of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Following upon the assassination of Mirbach, declares Reilly, the reprisals against the allied mission commenced.

"My active struggle against the Soviet power begins from this moment. My chief work was military and political espionage and the discovery of those active elements who could be utilised for a struggle against the Soviet Government. For the better purposes of my activity, I retired into illegality and received for this purpose the papers of a number of different persons. I lived chiefly in Moscow where I changed my rooms almost every day. My activity during this period is known through the Lockhart process."

In September 1918 Reilly left Moscow with the assistance of a secretary of the German Embassy in Moscow and went to Petrograd and then over Reval, Helsingfors and Stockholm and arrived on the 8th November in London.

"I was then nominated as political officer for South Russia and went to the Staff of Denikin. I remained in Odessa until March 1919 when I received instructions from the British authorities in Constantinople to supply the authorities in London and the representatives of Great Britain to the Peace Conference in Paris, with a report of the situation on the Denikin front. At about this time I became acquainted with Savinkov. During 1919 and 1920, I was closely connected with various representatives of the Russian emigrants. By the end of 1920 I was personally friendly with Savinkov and went to Warsaw where he was organising an expedition to White Russia. I took part in this expedition and thus came to Soviet Russia. I then received instruction to return to London, which I did.

In 1921 I still supported Savinkov. I called him once or twice to London, made him acquainted with influential circles there and made every possible arrangement for him. By the year 1922 my opinions had altered. I came to the conclusion that the best way to save the situation was to conclude a compromise with the Soviet power which would open the door for British commercial undertakings in Russia.

In 1923 and 1924 I was more active in my own private affairs, I was not very active in the struggle against the Soviet power, although I wrote in many English newspapers and still supported Savinkov. I also kept influential circles in Great Britain and America informed upon the Russian question, and in these years I went to America several times.

At the end of September 1925 I crossed the Finnish frontier illegally and entered the Soviet Union."

What is the significance of the statements? Above all they prove the participation of the British Government in the counter-revolutionary work against the Soviet Power in 1918 at a time when no official relations existed between Soviet Russia and Great Britain, and also during the course of the following years. The Secret Service agent Reilly was in constant touch with the British Government, received his instructions from its members and acted accordingly. The attitude of the British Government to Reilly is shown by the circumstance that his information was considered necessary for the British delegation to the Versailles Conference and that he was used to supply information to influential circles.

Why did Reilly enter the Soviet Union in 1925?

About the aims of his Russian journey in 1925 Reilly himself says the following:

"I entered Soviet Russia upon my own initiative because I heard of the existence of apparently serious anti-Soviet groups in the Soviet Union."

One of Reilly's aims admitted by himself was direct espionage and the financial support of the counter-revolutionary forces.

Was that all? In one of Reilly's letters which was certainly never intended for publication in the Soviet press, he expresses his opinion about the struggle against the Soviet power. This letter contains inter alia the following:

"The third measure without which I am deeply convinced there is no solution possible, is terror. A terror directed from a center point but carried out by small independent groups or persons against individual prominent representatives of the Soviet power.

The aim of terror is always a double one. The first and less important is the removal of dangerous persons, the second and more important is to bring the morass into movement, to make an end of the lethargy and to destroy the legend of the invulnerability of authority.

You may say that it is easy to speak of terror when one is safe abroad, but I tell you that I know people who are expanding tremendous energy in its preparation (in accordance with the present situation and the newest achievements of technique) and are prepared to begin immediately, if the necessary means are placed at their disposal."

That was the creed of Captain Sidney Reilly which was expressed in a confidential letter several years after his

"opinions had altered" in relation to the methods to be used in the struggle against the Soviet Power. Obviously this change of opinion exercised no effect on Reilly's plans with regard to terrorism. It was in accordance with these plans that he came to the Soviet Union. Here it was his task not only to collect exact information about the strength and the position of the anti-Soviet movement, but also to issue the necessary organisational instructions for the carrying out of the terror without which he was "deeply convinced there is no solution possible".

In the letter already mentioned, Reilly gives an exemplary description of the terrorist organisation:

"Such an organisation", writes Reilly, "demands a strong conspirative central point. Whether this can exist permanently under the given circumstances, I don't know. Russian history offers a very good example of such an organisation, i. e. the 'Narodnaya Volya'. I believe that it is necessary for the salvation of Russia to resurrect the Executive of this organisation (without the socialism) and utilise it for our struggle."

Finally Reilly writes in the same letter:

"I am convinced that a great campaign of terrorism would have a very considerable influence and would offer hope for a speedy overthrow of the Bolsheviks and would thus be in the best interests of the Russian cause."

Reilly discussed this double task of his before his departure from England with various personalities who were interested in the Russian question in London, inter alia with Churchill.

From the further evidence of Reilly we learn that Weiss carries out espionage for Great Britain in Finland and Esthonia and Micheljohn in Latvia and Lithuania, and that the general staffs in these countries have undertaken to supply them with all the necessary material relating to the Soviet Union. In Poland a similar task is fulfilled by Derbyshire who is supported by the Polish general staff.

The excellent British espionage work in the Baltic states makes it possible for the British Secret Service not merely to utilise the reports compiled with the friendly assistance of the various general staffs, for the purposes of Great Britain, but also to share them with the less intelligent American Secret Service. Reilly corroborates the fact that

"the British Secret Service hands over everything from the material at its disposal which might be of interest to America, to the American Secret Service".

The evidence of Reilly exposes the methods and means used by the British Government in its policy towards the Soviet Union, just as at the time of Lockhart, this policy is based upon espionage in direct connection with the counter-revolutionary forces within the Soviet Union and upon attempts to organise these forces for a campaign of terror inside the Soviet state. Reilly was only one, although a leading agent of Churchill and Joynson-Hicks. We must redouble our watchfulness in order that the successors of Reilly may not be more successful in their activities than he.

## Who are those, who "Have Committed No Crime"?

"The reign of terror is beginning", "Inhumanity without rhyme or reason", "Innocent victims of Bolshevik barbarity" — this is the manner in which the "Vorwärts" writes, and most of the Social-Democratic papers wrote similarly after the shooting of the 20 White bandits in the Soviet Union. In their wild agitation against the Soviet Union they surpassed even the bourgeois papers.

A German bourgeois paper, the "Braunschweigische Landeszeitung", now confirms what kind of "innocent lambs" the murderers and spies were who were condemned to death. In its No. 160 the following appears:

"For instance, Captain Elvengren, whose name appeared second in the official proclamation — and not without reason — was proved, in spite of all definite attempts at denial on the part of England, to have been employed for years in the service of England as an anti-Bolshevik agent. We have not arrived at this conclusion, because it is stated in Moscow that this former member of the cuirassier guard of Czarina Alexandra

Fiodorovna and scion of a Finnish family kept up communication through Finland in the summer of the year 1925 from Paris and London with the English spy, Sidney George Reilly, who was at work in Russia.

In the year 1922, I chanced to make the personal acquaintance of this former cadet of the Petersburg corps of pages, Elvengren while he was staying in Berlin upon some mysterious mission from Paris. Although at that time I had no idea that he was preparing, as alleged in present Russian communications, an attempt on the life of Chitcherin, who was going to Genoa to attend the Conference, and although I was greatly surprised at the amount of money the allegedly pitiable Czarist officer could afford to invest in the totalisator of the Mariendorf trotting-ground, I nevertheless remarked that this uprooted thirty-three-year-old adventurer fitted nicely into that category of Russian Czarist officers who at that time paid frequent visits to the English and French legations in Berlin.

But that they, who in Berlin, the European meeting-place of many politicians of the Russian regime of deputies, had not only carried on espionage for the English and French against Russia, but also against Germany, should to-day have adopted an attitude of reserve in London and Paris appears to us improbable. For instance, Prince Dolgorukov in particular, who, however, never honoured Berlin with his presence, was not only regarded as an implacable enemy of Germany; in Russian emigrant circles it was known only too well how zealously he occupied himself during his secret visits to Russia with English "interests", i. e., with the work of intrigue paid for by England and with attacks upon the Soviet system both in Russia itself and abroad."

## The Soviet Press on the Warsaw Sentence.

Moscow, 18th June 1927.

The whole press of the Soviet Union expresses dissatisfaction with the sentence of the extraordinary court in Warsaw upon the murderer of comrade Voykov.

The "Pravda" writes:

"The news of the verdict in Warsaw fills the hearts of the toilers of the Soviet Union and of Europe and of all people who are honestly striving for peace, with anger and indignation. By its verdict, but still more so by its recommendation to the President to milder the sentence, the extraordinary court has done everything to stress the consideration shown to such crimes and to such criminals.

This becomes all the more clear when one remembers how the same Polish courts have dealt with young communists sentenced for the killing of miserable spies and agents-provocateurs. The names of comrades Engel, Botwin, Kniewski and Rutkowski have not yet been forgotten. In these cases the Polish courts did not hesitate, they found no extenuating circumstances, they did not care for the youth of the accused, they made no recommendations to the President for mercy. But with the present crime, which was obviously intended to conjure up a serious international conflict, the Polish courts considered it fitting to recommend demonstratively a reduction of their own sentence. What worth can be attached to this sentence. Was not the Polish secret agent Murashko sentenced to the same term and afterwards pardoned by the Polish president?

The gesture of the Polish courts is thus a challenge to public opinion in the Soviet Union. By its whole attitude since the Soviet Note of the 11th June, the Polish government has proved that it is not prepared to fulfill the minimum demands of the Soviet government which were justifiably put up by the latter. The Polish government has taken no measures to examine the affair and to discover all those connected with it. On the contrary, the courts have done everything in their power to prevent the discovery of accomplices. Thus the Polish Government has played the role of protector of monarchist conspirators who published, the day after the murder, a collecting list for the benefit of the assassin.

The Polish Government has proved that it cares nothing for the opinions of the broad masses in the Soviet Union, nor for its own undertakings under article 5 of the Riga Treaty. The Polish Government has documented the fact that it is prepared to strain its relations with the peoples of the Soviet

Union rather than give up its friendship with the reactionary elements of one-time Czarist Russia. The Polish Government will have no cause to doubt that the peoples of the Soviet Union will fail to learn the lessons of the Warsaw process."

The "Rabotchaya Gazeta" declares that the Polish government acts as the pet poodle of the British conservatives. The sentence would act as spur to further activity on the part of the white guardist murderers instead of a warning to them.

## POLITICS

### The Conference of the League of Nations' Council in Geneva.

By Gabriel Péri (Paris).

At the Stuttgart Congress of the Second International, Harry Quelch, the British delegate, described the Hague Peace Court as a "thieves supper". In contrast to the Hague Court, the association of Government representatives and secret diplomats which meets under the name of the League of Nations, holds so-called public meetings. What however is the real character of these "public" meetings? Everything is arranged in secret before they are held. They are a mere show to camouflage criminal attacks or, in the best case, deceptive manoeuvres.

Never however did a council meeting of the League of Nations so closely resemble the association of diplomats at the Hague as the forty fifth which is being held at present. The reticence and the secret agreements went so far that the company of Chamberlain and Briand did not at first even want to admit Stresemann, the German Foreign Minister, one of their own set.

What was agreed to at that meeting, has not yet been made public. There is however no doubt that a plot was forged against the Soviet Union. At the public meeting of the League of Nations' Council, there was the usual exchange of empty phrases about disarmament. Whilst, following on the report of Benes, the Czecho-Slovakian Foreign Minister, about the preparations which are being made, Paul Boncour, the French Social Patriot, enlarged in hypocritical words on the "progress" towards disarmament, which is said to have been made, Stresemann expressed himself in pessimistic language. Not of course, because he has any interest in accelerating international disarmament, but because he wanted, in this way, to exercise pressure on the other Powers so as to induce them to agree to Germany increasing her military preparations. He was not suffering from disarmament pains but from those of increased armament.

Besides this, the Lithuanian question was on the agenda of the Council Meeting. But, after a few elastic declarations by Woldemaras, the Prime Minister of Lithuania, according to which the Lithuanian Government was ready to consider the political interests of the German population in the Memel district, and after a few words of thanks on the part of Stresemann, this question was removed from the agenda of the session of the League of Nations and transferred to the Secret Cabinets.

None of the great political questions under dispute were discussed at the League of Nations' meeting. The conflict between Yugoslavia and Albania, which, at bottom, is a conflict between Yugoslavia and Italy, and which has become still more acute in the last few days, was deliberately passed over by the League of Nations, although the Yugoslavian Government had appealed to it in this conflict and had especially demanded that the Tirana Treaty between Italy and Albania should be revoked. On the contrary, the Yugoslavian Government was compelled to describe its appeal as a mere communication. The Secretariat of the League of Nations therefore contented itself with communicating the appeal of the Belgrade Government to the leading members of the League of Nations by way of "information". Needless to say, the League of Nations thought even less of discussing officially the behaviour of the chief robbers, the British imperialists, and their vassal, the Polish Pilsudski Government, towards the Soviet Union, or the intervention of the imperialist Powers in China.

Once again we see how impotent is this body, which is so much praised by the Reformists, to "establish peace". Once again we see that its only purpose is to form the wings of the stage on which the great imperialist robbers act. Six Ministers, the Government representatives of the imperialist Powers of Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Belgium and Poland, met in Geneva under the leadership of the British Conservatives in order to forge plans of war against the Soviet Union and to prepare a united front of the "civilised States" against it.

As is generally admitted, the "Russian question", the preparation of a combined offensive of the European Powers against the Soviet Union, was the most prominent question discussed at the meetings which took place between the Ministers — at first Chamberlain and Briand conferred alone. These meetings were held in absolute secrecy and under the outward cover of phrases about the "unanimous will to continue the Locarno policy".

British policy, it is true, was not so successful, as Chamberlain and his consorts had imagined it would be. Ever since Locarno, they have been trying to spur on "European patriotism" to form an anti-Bolshevist united front. In the meantime, the Soviet Government is gaining in strength, is developing its industry, is increasing its prestige in the eyes of millions and millions of workers.

Even now it is doubtful whether British operations will succeed. In order to forge the anti-Soviet Block, the London diplomats have encouraged Italy's lust for expansion, have spread their protecting hand over the Tirana Treaty and over the colonisation of Albania by Italy. The Coalition between the British Conservatives and the Italian Fascists is not strong enough to bring the country of the workers and peasants to its knees. The British Government has consequently tried once more to gain the French Government as an ally. This again can only succeed at the cost of Italian and German wishes. On the other hand, a successful advance against the Soviet Union is unthinkable without Germany. Thus, the situation of British imperialism is by no means simple. It lacks the right kind of bait with which to allure the French imperialists.

On Germany, it is true, British imperialism can exercise stronger pressure. The German Government resists a new, inter-allied control of the raising of the fortifications on the Eastern frontier, of the fortifications in Königsberg, Glogau and Küstrin. At the same time it is demanding a reduction of the troops of occupation on the Rhine. In these points, the British Government is endeavouring, not without success, to meet the wishes of the German bourgeoisie and, in this way, to put an end to the tacking of the German imperialists and to bind them finally to the British policy against the Soviet Union. In all probability, a series of secret preliminary preparations for this purpose have already taken place in Geneva.

The pressure exercised by the British Government on Germany has already borne fruit. In the whole Hugenberg Press, a campaign of agitation against the Soviet Union has been started which is a worthy accompaniment to the campaign of agitation in the British bourgeois papers. What really matters to the British Foreign Office, was recently expounded with cynical frankness, by Augur, the well-known counter-revolutionary, in the "Fortnightly Review": Berlin must understand that it is inadmissible for a member of the European group of Powers to entertain relations with an organisation which maintains a hostile attitude to that group of Powers, to the League of Nations, to civilisation and to all the principles of the white race.

This is said by a great journalist who has always regarded it as his chief duty to represent as the best of all worlds the Czarist regime which ran with blood and abomination and which was a mockery of any kind of civilisation.

This then is the object of the present negotiations in Geneva: a union with British imperialism in an attack against the Soviet Union.

The League of Nations only represents the scenes behind which war preparations are going on. Nevertheless it differs from the Hague Peace Court, which it so closely resembles: The Hague Peace Court has, it is true, done nothing for peace, but it has not hatched a war. The League of Nations is preparing for war.



## Communist Successes in Poland.

By K. Leski (Warsaw).

Neither the terroism of Pilsudski's Fascist dictatorship, nor the effect of the police apparatus and the fighting organisations connected with it, nor yet the activity of the P. P. S., can damp the revolutionary ardour of the Polish working masses. It grows from day to day and spreads terror in the bourgeois camp and in the head-quarters of the P. P. S.

While our ears are yet ringing with the echo of the overwhelming electoral victory of the Warsaw Communists (when 75,000 votes were registered for the invalid list of the Left Labour wing), the Warsaw proletariat has once more come forward with a powerful protest against the Pilsudski Government and its crimes.

60,000 workers passed in solemn silence before the bier of Comrade Voykov, the representative of the victorious proletariat of the Soviet Republics in enslaved Poland; 50 wreaths were deposited by the workers of Warsaw factories; mourning demonstrations took place in the prisons, and a great demonstration also on the occasion of the transportation of Voykov's body to the railway-station. And all this was a further flaming threat to the ruling classes and their sanguinary dictator, a renewed declaration that the Polish proletariat is ready to take up the fight against the capitalists and large landowners, that it refuses to be misused in the interest of a criminal war against the Soviet Union and that it will fight in defence of the Soviet Union, its proletarian home, and for the establishment of a Workers' and Peasants' Government in Poland.

With the like slogans of "Down with the Fascist Dictatorship!", "Hands off the Soviet Union!", the workers have been gaining new victories at the provincial elections.

On June 12th, municipal elections took place for the second time at Pruszkow (a fairly large workers' colony in the neighbourhood of Warsaw). As may be known, the January elections were declared invalid there in consequence of the victory gained by the "United Workers Block" (Communists and Left P. P. S.), covering 11 mandates out of 24. In spite of Government terrorism and massacres, which were instituted just before the elections among the workers of Pruszkow by fighting organisations of the P. P. S. specially sent from Warsaw, our comrades remained unshaken.

The elections brought the Workers Block an increase of 441 votes (2923 instead of 2485), while the official P. P. S. only registered 792 votes (against 751 in January). The revolutionary Left wing of the workers formed the strongest group at Pruszkow, for even the United Camp of the Nationalists and Anti-Semites only totalled 2872 votes.

On the very same "Black" Sunday (June 12th), the reformist party suffered a severe defeat at Wloclawek. At the elections for the Sickness Insurance Societies the Communists gained the absolute majority of mandates (16 in place of the former 9, out of a total of 30). The P. P. S. position dropped from 10 to 4, representing a loss of 6 mandates. The growth of the Communist forces was almost exclusively at the cost of the P. P. S., for the Christian Democrats lost only one mandate, while the Jewish "Bund" lost two in favour of the "Poale Zion".

Both the P. P. S. and the Pilsudski press have up to the present preserved an awed silence.

The National Democrats, however, are raising the alarm and attempting to exploit the Communist victories for their own ends. Their Warsaw organ writes as follows:

"If there are still any doubts that the Communist movement is raising its head in Poland and is gaining in strength and influence, the election at Pruszkow last Sunday will alone suffice to put an end to any illusions on this subject. The Pruszkow report, moreover, is confirmed by the results of the election at Wloclawek.

These are no mere coincidences. They are typical of general circumstances in Poland.

The success of Communism is at the same time the decline of the Socialist influence. The working masses, but recently under the guidance of the P. P. S. and destined according to various plans to form the bulwark against Communism, are now far from playing any such part. The banner of the P. P. S. is surrounded only by a remnant of its faithful adherents.

It would be altogether heedless and not at all in keeping with actual facts, if we were to attribute the advance of Communism in Poland mainly to the agitatory activities of

the Communist Party. We all know that they meet with great difficulties in this connection. If they have nevertheless remained victorious in this struggle, it is a sign that the roots of their success are implanted deeper in Polish actualities.

The economic situation plays a very important rôle in this regard. Although the factors at present in power endeavour to persuade us that the economic and social situation is of the rosiest, the working masses judge of the situation quite differently. Prices have risen and continue to rise from day to day. And the wages which are paid in the depreciated zloty currency remain far behind price formation. Unemployment weighs heavily on life in general in Poland.

Generally speaking, circumstances have arisen in our State existence which render possible and facilitate the Communist wave. The wave grows, and the problem of the struggle against Communism becomes the vital problem of Poland's existence."

The political game of the National Democrats, the party of M. Dmowski, is apparent. The National Democrats are at pains to make Pilsudski who wrested the power from them, altogether responsible for creating the conditions which "facilitate the Communist wave." At the same time the National Democrats wish to persuade the dictator that it is only in the "National Camp" that the will and the might can be found which are necessary for fighting the Communists. Therefore they should be allowed to take part in the Government.

The "Red Danger" and the common hatred of the workers and peasants will doubtless still remove the yet existing reasons of discord between Pilsudski and the leaders of the National Democrats. The outcome of this approach will be the rise of terrorism, that only weapon which is left to the fated bourgeoisie. But even this weapon will fail them.

## The Political Situation in France.

By Michel Hollay.

For several weeks past France's home politics have been subjected to violent oscillations. In the second half of 1926 the fall of the franc caused the rupture of the Left Bloc. When their leaders, Herriot and Painlevé entered Poincaré's Ministry of "National Unity", the Radical Socialists veered to the Right. At the Congress of Lyons the Socialist Party also directed its policy to the Right and proved a constitutional pillar of bourgeois society. And while Poincaré, the saviour of the franc, overwhelmed the French people with new taxes amounting to thousands of millions, Painlevé, the Radical Minister of War submitted his imperialistic project of armaments, Herriot, the Freemason and Radical Minister of Instruction, fraternised with the bishops, and the Socialists unanimously voted for the mobilisation law of the "Socialist" Paul Boncour.

The "national unity of all constitutional forces" had become a fact. It was to be strengthened against Communism in France as the first and essential step towards opposing the Soviet Union. Barthou, Minister of Justice, initiated an elaborately worked-out case of espionage against the revolutionary workers, which, however, rested on far too weak a basis. Sarraut, Minister of the Interior, with the blood of Gallifet in his veins, started a furious persecution of the Communists. The entire press, from the Royalist "Action Française" to the "Socialist" "Populaire", is set on attacking Communism and the Soviet Union.

Only one factor was neglected in preparing this wholesale reactionary plan, but it was the most important factor, the French working class. Poincaré's cruelly oppressive financial schedule, the warlike mobilisation and military armament plans of the Socialist Paul Boncour and the Radical War Minister Painlevé, the simultaneous offensive of the capitalists against the workers' wages, the rise in the cost of living, and the war-agitation against the Soviet Union now threaten to ruin the stabilisation programme of the bourgeoisie.

The supplementary elections, a true barometer of home politics, point to "Red". In the almost exclusively rural department of Aube, the slogan which was supported by one and all, from the Fascist Lafont to the Socialist Renaudel, was as

follows: "All against one! All patriots, good Republicans, against the Communists, those traitors and enemies of civilisation!" The Communist candidate was not elected. But the result in itself amounts to a great victory of the Communists in their fight against economic and political reaction, in their struggle for peace. The 9000 Communist voters of 1926 increased in the first election campaign to 15,800. In the second campaign, the Communist candidate united 25,000 votes. The "National Bloc" won by a majority of only 3000 votes. That cannot be called a victory. The reaction is well aware of the fact, for the outcry against the Communist danger has become all the louder and culminates in the demand for the "British panacea", the rupture of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

On the same Sunday two further elections also took place. At Jory, a suburb of Paris, the Communist mayor had been removed from his office. For the sake of ensuring an election on a broader basis, two other Communist town-councillors likewise demissioned. The candidate put up was the sailor Dumoulin at one time condemned to four years' arrest for anti-militarist propaganda on board the warship "Courbet" during the Moroccan war. The outcome of the election was a splendid victory for the Communists and for the amnesty. Of 7838 registered votes, 4358 fell to the share of the Communist list. In comparison with the elections of 1925, the Communists gained 700 votes, while the National Bloc lost 2000 and the Left Bloc 200.

At the elections in a relatively bourgeois district of Paris, the so-called "Grandes Carrières", the Communists doubled their number of votes (advancing from 1798 in 1925 to 3288), while the Socialists lost half their former total (registering 4594 instead of 9324) and the National Bloc maintained the level of 5544.

What is the purport of these returns? Though no general conclusions can be gained from these few individual elections, they yet speak unmistakably of a vigorous process of radicalisation among the French working population as also of the rally of the French bourgeoisie around the standard of reaction.

They show the tendency of the population of France to collect around two opposite poles, the bourgeois and the Communist, and the tendency towards gradual dissolution on the democracy. These elections have caused the greatest consternation part of the parties of the Left Bloc, the parties of bourgeois in the Radical-Socialist and Socialist parties. If these two parties desire to save their present Parliamentary position, they will again have to form a Left Bloc for the general Parliamentary elections which are to come off in the spring of 1928. But this can only be possible, if the French Socialists veer still more to the Right. For even now the "Quotidien", the official organ of the Radical Party, has formulated its conditions to the Socialists.

"If an alliance with the Communists is automatically prescribed (as in connection with elections at which the Communist candidate is placed at the head of the parties of the Left), any grouping of the Democratic forces is out of the question."

A further possibility, which depends on the attitude of the Radicals is that this critical situation of the old Left Bloc parties may endanger the Poincaré Ministry. Already various indications of crisis are apparent, chief among them the fact that the Parliament has refused the plan so energetically defended by Poincaré of handing over the match monopoly to the Swedish match trust.

Meanwhile the reactionary course of the Poincaré Government is being further pursued. The arrest on May 1st of Monmousseau, General Secretary of the Unitarian Trade Unions, has recently been followed by that of comrade Pierre Semard, General Secretary of the Communist Party of France, who was quite illegally taken to prison on his return to Paris from the last meeting of the E. C. C. I., although the police had no due authority to arrest him.

In direct contrast to this violent political persecution of the revolutionary workers, we may witness the comedy which the French authorities allow Daudet, the leader of the Royalists, to play with them. This Royalist, condemned to six month's imprisonment for libel, defied the police by entrenching himself behind wire entanglements in the house of the "Action Française" with several hundred Royalists to defend him. That the

police prefect should finally have come in person to conduct him in a private car to the prison with the promise of every facility and a speedy release for this non-political delinquent, while at the same time our comrades are treated so brutally that three anarchists have for the last 20 days been on hunger-strike to enforce their release, is highly characteristic of the increasingly reactionary directives of the Poincaré Government.

## CHINA

### The Breaking Up of the Labour Movement in Shanghai by Chang Kai Shek.

By Tang Shing She.

Under the banner of Chang Kai Shek a kind of Fascist trade-union movement is being formed in China. Even before his betrayal, Chang Kai Shek started in the territory occupied by his troops opposition organisations against the trade unions, recruiting the members from among degenerated elements. In reply to the objection that two trade unions could not exist side by side, he declared that this implied the freedom of the workers. He then instigated quarrels between the two organisations, the result often being free fights. On such an occasion, at the beginning of March, a trade-union leader was murdered in Kiangsi, and on March 31st, during a demonstration against the Nanking bombardment, an awful massacre occurred in Chungking, whereby two hundred workers were killed and eight hundred wounded. The slogan issued by Chang Kai Shek was: "Samenists (supporters of the three principles of the doctrine of Sun Yat Sen) against communists". In other words this meant: the official trade unions are communistic, while his were "Sunyatsenistic".

Chang Kai Shek worked most energetically in Shanghai against the Kuo Min Tang and against the trade unions. On the morning of April 12th he disarmed the Shanghai Workers' Militia under the pretext that the workers were always fighting among themselves. Several hours previously he had dispatched the members of the trade unions, which he had organised, to attack the head office of the Shanghai Trade Union Association and the quarters of the Workers' Militia. In the course of the disarmament a hundred workers were killed.

The organ of Chang Kai Shek, "Min Kuo I Pao", contained in its issue of April 13th a leading article concerning the attack containing the following:

"... In the great mass of the workers there are naturally the most various elements; there are also many vagabonds in the trade-union movement and the Workers' Militia. As the workers have in many respects not represented the interests of citizens in general, the latter have for a long time been dissatisfied with the workers' militia and the trade-union association. The slogan of the Shanghai workers: 'Long live the armed insurrection' gave rise to great uneasiness among the citizens. But as the workers themselves were not unanimous and internal fighting has occurred in the Workers' Militia, Comrade Pehtsungchi (Commander of Shanghai) and the soldier comrades of the 26th Army Corps rightly disarmed the workers. If the workers would understand this action, they would not only not turn against the revolutionary army but adopt a sympathetic attitude towards it..."

This article clearly shows the bearing of Chang Kai Shek: It was the desire of the citizens of Shanghai, i. e. of the big bourgeoisie and of the foreign imperialists, with their 20,000 soldiers in the city, to disband the Workers' Militia. It was also distinctly expressed in the article that the power would have to be placed in a single hand, i. e. the hand of Chang Kai Shek. He would have to be dictator; whoever opposed him, would be "counter-revolutionary".

After the disarmament of the Workers' Militia and the occupying of the offices of the Shanghai Trade-Union Association, Chang Kai Shek immediately formed a "Committee for the Unification of the Trade-Union Movement". The Shanghai Trade-Union Association and the Workers' Union formed by it were

requested to give up their names and to call themselves the "Chief Association of the Workers Union".

The Shanghai workers fought energetically to retain the Trade-Union Association, and at noon on the 12th recaptured its offices. They guarded it the whole of the night and until noon of the next day. They then formed a demonstration and marched to the headquarters, where, in order to demonstrate their peaceable intention, they sent their wives and children on in advance. They demanded the return of the arms. Chang Kai Shek's bands opened fire with machine-guns on the unarmed crowd. In a moment hundreds of people, including many women and children, were writhing in their own blood. Of the worker delegation sent to the headquarters they arrested 90 persons on the shameless ground that they were soldiers from the remnant of Chang Tsung Chang's army and had them shot.

From then on they shot all the workers and left-wing Kuo-Min-Tang people who fell into their hands. Any passer-by in the street was liable to be pointed out as a Communist by one of Chang Kai Shek's catchpools and promptly killed. Naturally, the labour leaders were the first to suffer. On April 11th the President of the Shanghai Trade-Union Association, Wang Sho Hua, was lured into the house of a Chinese police spy in the service of the French a member of the Shanghai ragamuffin proletarian organisation "Chin Ban" ("Green Band"), and murdered. The procedure of Chang Kai Shek was the exact counterpart of the Fascist Terror in Italy.

What is the "Chief Association of the Workers' Union"? In reality it is only a mask for the "Green Band". And the members of the Green Band? They wish to become once more the rulers of the Shanghai proletariat, as they were in 1925. The "Green Band" is a public secret organisation in Shanghai. Thieves, murderers, gamblers, opium dealers, in short, every kind of criminal element, belong to it. Corrupt officials, police and officers are also connected with it. The whole of the proletariat of Shanghai was subject to it. Nobody could find work without its mediation. It can well be imagined how the workers were exploited by such "leaders". The foreign police used these people as spies in their service. In any case the "Green Band" was a very powerful factor. After the formation of the trade unions it completely lost dominion over the proletariat and, consequently, a source of income. The trade unions were, therefore, its deadly enemy.

Chang Kai Shek gladly made use of these enemies of the trade-union movement to further his interests against the Chinese revolution. After April 12th he nominated a leader of the "Green Band", Yang Fu, as chief of the "Special Department of Headquarters". His task was, of course, to proceed against the workers and revolutionaries.

The brutal procedure on the part of Chang Kai Shek provoked tremendous excitement among the population of Shanghai. In order not to lose esteem completely, he still calls himself a nationalist and supporter of Sun Yat Sen. After all the slaughter and the utter enslavement of the workers, he is still trying to attach them to his side; on May 1st he arranged celebrations and distributed large quantities of cake. He himself published an imposing manifesto in connection with the May celebrations, containing numerous Democratic slogans, but finishing, however, with the following: "Down with the deceivers of the workers, the communists!" "Down with the Communists, who exploit and oppress the workers!" "Down with the Communists, who are destroying the national revolution!" "Down with the false workers' organisations, and rally to the genuine workers' organisation!" "Long live the genuine Kuo Min Tang, long live the Nanking Government!"

The 20 slogans, which he issued on May 1st and which are used as a catechism in his territory, have in point of fact only the three following significances: 1. In order to win the workers over to his side, he declares himself their representative and champion. 2. He urges the workers to relinquish class-war and live at peace with the capitalists and bourgeoisie under his rule. 3. Vituperation against the Communists and against the Kuo-Min-Tang people, who collaborate with them.

In the rest, in the propaganda directives of his Kuo-Min-Tang Central he adopts a sharp tone against the Second International.

On May 12th Chang Kai Shek published an edict concerning the "settlement of conflicts between workers and employers", entirely in favour of the employers. In Par. 2 appears the following:

"In case workers and employers are unable to come to an agreement in a conflict, they must submit the matter to the Shanghai Workers' and Employers' Court of Arbitration. During the course of the negotiations, neither party may resort to direct action, e. g. workers must not strike, and employers must not lock their men out."

Par. 3 runs:

"The judgement of the Court must be accepted by both parties, otherwise the Government will adopt compulsory measures."

The workers are hereby practically deprived of the right to strike.

From the general attitude of Chang Kai Shek it appears that he still desires to make tools of the workers, but this he can only do by refraining from destroying the Revolutionary Labour Movement.

## The Peasant Movement in China.

By Sia Ting.

China is an agrarian country. The peasants constitute an overwhelming majority — about 95 per cent — of the population. The broad masses of the peasantry, who are of the utmost importance in the development of China, had to suffer most under the existing regime. For this reason the movement began among the Chinese peasants, who now play in the Chinese revolution a part which will develop day by day until their just claims are fulfilled.

The regime of outrageous injustice and oppression, under whose yoke they have groaned for thousand of years, is that of the "landowners" (by which is meant people who own more than fifty Chinese Mu), a yoke which has been aggravated by the large crowd of Chinese profiteers. Under the cloak of "loans for their support", which poverty compelled the peasants to accept, the profiteers have robbed them of their last possessions.

So far, the Labour Movement in China has not developed to such an extent that there can be a question of close co-operation between the working class and the masses of the peasants. Apart from the inadequately developed Trade Union organisations, one of the chief obstacles was the reign of terror directed against Trade Union organisers.

The significance of the peasant movement is particularly great in the following provinces: Hupeh, Kwangtung, Kiansi and especially in Hunan, where numerous Trade Union Associations, representing the interests of the peasants, are active and, indeed, successfully active.

Below we give a sketch, based upon a description, which appeared in the Chinese Communist periodical, of the main points of the peasant movement in Hunan, where it has achieved the greatest development:

### I. The organisation of the Peasant Unions of the Province of Hunan.

This organisation developed in two greatly differing periods:

1. The period from January to September 1926: the first effectual period of organisation, which was characterised by the fact that the dictatorship of the reactionary generals made the work of the unions secret and "illegal".

During the period from July to September the revolutionary troupes routed the reactionary general Chao. During that epoch the unions only numbered 400,000 registered members, though they were actually supported by nearly a million sympathisers.

During this epoch the peasants did not actually take part in the fight, but they officially helped the revolutionary army by supporting the unions.

2. The period from October 1926, to the beginning of 1927: this is the second, purely revolutionary epoch.

The membership roll of the associations increased by nearly 75 per cent. It now embraces 2,000,000 members, representing in reality a mass of 10,000,000 people, namely, the families of peasants and sympathisers, only the chief person of which can be registered in the association.

Half of the peasant population of the province is organised. In several districts (Siangthan, Siangshiang) practically the whole of the peasant population belong to the district unions.

In consequence of the marked progress of the union and of the importance which the peasant unions have acquired, the peasants are beginning to work on their own initiative, and they have succeeded in the course of four months in creating in the villages a revolutionary movement which is quite new.

**II. Directives in the revolutionary period of the peasant movement of Hunan.**

The peasants adopted the complete application of the programme which they had arranged, namely:

- a) To fight the landowners and profiteers.
- b) To destroy completely the feudal regime and the century-old traditions of the peasants, whose spirit had petrified under this hollow system.
- c) To fight and drive out the corrupt and predatory functionaries of the decadent administrations of the towns.

At the present time this peasant movement in Hunan is animated by such will to fight and to win that the purpose of the peasant union is practically fulfilled, for the whole power is centralised exclusively in their hands. All questions affecting the peasants, can be liquidated only by the peasants themselves.

**III. The three strata within the peasantry and their roles.**

But in spite of the great success of the unions and their significance in the national revolution in China, the work which they have done is not that of the entirety of the peasant population. In consequence of the existence of "castes", divided according to wealth, not all of the peasants have participated in the revolution. Certain strata have even taken up a distinctly hostile attitude towards it.

Three main strata have been developed:

**1. The very rich farmers.** They desire one thing only: the defeat and destruction of the revolutionary movement and the dissolution of the revolutionary unions. They want the reactionary generals to gain the upper hand in order that the demands of the broad masses of the peasants be flooded away in blood.

But on account of the final and secure constitution of the peasants unions this caste of plutocrats was obliged to renounce its wishes and was even requested and compelled to join the associations.

**2. The middle farmers.** These regard the Chinese revolution with a certain amount of indifference. They do not know whether to wish or to fear its success. They are opportunists enough not to oppose it, and, acting under compulsion, they have joined the unions, in which they form isolated and inactive masses.

**3. The poor peasants.** They have full power in the unions, of which they are the leading party. They served (also during the illegal period in the first half of 1926) and they still serve revolution. They alone are the active and progressive element in the associations.

They are the real fighting force against the land profiteers.

The three strata of the population are represented in the Peasant Unions by the following percentages:

Rich farmers . . . . .	10 per cent
Middle farmers . . . . .	20 per cent
Poor peasants . . . . .	70 per cent

The mass of poor Chinese peasants is the reliable basis of the revolutionary Wuhan Government, which can count upon the firm support of the peasant population.

## The Trial of Mrs. Borodin and three Soviet Couriers in Peking.

Moscow, 18th June 1927.

The preliminaries in the process against Mrs. Borodin and the three soviet couriers who were arrested by the Chinese counter-revolutionaries, began on the 17th June in Peking.

During the examination, a number of documents were presented as evidence. Mrs. Borodin denies that they were in her possession and declares that they are completely unknown to her. The same documents were also presented as having been found in the diplomatic baggage of the couriers. Amongst these documents were ten leaflets in Russian and other leaflets in

Russian and Chinese, allegedly issued in Vladivostok. The couriers declare that their baggage was searched thoroughly three times in their presence and that no such documents were found. The documents confiscated in the diplomatic post were all in the Russian language. An affidavit has been filed in the process by the Captain of the vessel in question declaring that nothing whatever of a compromising nature was found in the diplomatic post.

Instead of the American lawyer Fox, who has been refused permission to act for the defense, the soviet lawyer Kantorovitch and two Chinese lawyers will act for the accused.

## THE BALKANS

### The Change of Government in Roumania.

By K. (Bukharest).

The Avarescu Government, which was supported by one party, has been supplanted in an unexpectedly short time by a new government a coalition government. The head of the new Government is Prince Stirbey, the administrator of the Crown lands, who "belongs to no party". The following parties are represented in the Government: the Liberals (Bratianu's party), the National Peasant Party ("Zaranists"), the Independent Peasant Party with Dr. Lupu at its head, and Argetoianu, a member of the former Avarescu Cabinet. The change of Cabinet was not preceded by any obvious conflict in Parliament or in the Senate. It was due to acute differences of opinion between Bratianu and the Court clique on the one hand and Avarescu on the other hand, dissensions in questions of economic and home and foreign policy.

The Liberal Party of Bratianu represents the interests of large financial capital in Roumania. The largest undertakings and the largest banks in the country, including the National Bank, are in their hands. They have the soundest financial organisation at their disposal and represent the most influential bourgeois political factor in the country.

General Avarescu and his circle entered the arena of political life as creatures of the Liberals. The Liberals made use of General Avarescu as the most pliable and convenient tool in the most difficult political moments. In 1907 they made use of him to suppress the peasant revolt. At that time, Avarescu, at their dictate, had 11,000 poor insurgent peasants shot who were demanding bread, work and land. The Liberals then made use of Avarescu at the time of the war. The defeated army of Roumania was in course of being dispersed. Desertion became a mass phenomenon. In order to arrest the disintegration of the army and reorganise it, the Liberals crowned General Avarescu with the halo of a victorious general.

After the war, the Liberals again aimed a blow at the proletarian mass movement with the help of Avarescu. In 1920, Avarescu, as Prime Minister, dispersed the Socialist Party numbering 200,000 members, and the trade union organisations in which 300,000 workers were united. It was a daily occurrence for persons to be arrested, tortured and shot for "attempted flight".

The Liberals regarded Avarescu as an indispensable reserve to whom they have handed over the power when they considered it desirable and from whom they took it again at their own sweet will.

The last Avarescu Government was also thrust to the fore by the Liberals. Its Government programme came into being on the basis of a pact with the Liberals.

Although Avarescu was always dependent on the Liberals, he was ever on the search for an opportunity of freeing himself from the Liberal leading strings. He had pursued this aim with special energy since last year. Supported at home by a section of the circle of officers in high position, by a section of Transylvanian capital (the Goldisch-Goga group), by a section of the village bourgeoisie and, in his foreign policy, by Chamberlain and especially by Mussolini, Avarescu tried to steer a course in direct opposition to Bratianu's policy. Whereas the Liberals are endeavouring to restrict foreign capital which dominates large fields of Roumanian life and to get possession of the wealth of the country himself, Avarescu was perfectly willing to attract foreign capital. From Mussolini he received a loan of 200 million Italian lire in return for large petroleum

concessions. The Queen was sent to America to tout for money.

Negotiations were carried on with Germany with regard to a loan to the amount of 200 million marks. Avarescu was prepared to accept extremely unfavourable conditions, i. e. one hundred million marks were to be paid to Roumania in the form of credit in kind (railway material), forty millions were to remain in Germany for the stabilisation of the lei; nevertheless Roumania would have had to pay interests at the rate of 8% per annum on the whole sum.

Avarescu granted a concession in respect of an area of 500,000 hectares at the mouth of the Danube for fifty years to German capitalist companies, the foreign capitalists being given the right to exploit this district unrestrictedly in any way they chose.

The differences of opinion with regard to home policy between Avarescu and the Liberals found expression in the question of their attitude towards the peasant movement. The great agrarian reform which was carried out after the war, did not solve the peasant question. A total area of 5,800,000 hectares of land was taken from the landed proprietors, but only a part of it was distributed amongst the peasants. The peasants were given 1,800,000 hectares of it under extremely hard conditions. After the reform, there were still more than two million peasant families left without land. This gave rise to the development of a vast mass movement amongst the peasants, which developed rapidly and inspired the bourgeois rulers of the country with terror. As long as this movement exists, the Roumanian bourgeoisie cannot set itself any great aims in its foreign policy. Having destroyed the labour movement through the White Terror, with the help of the Reformists and Centrists, the ruling class now regards the destruction of the peasants movement as the chief task before it.

Avarescu and Bratianu are trying to realise this aim by two different methods; Avarescu with the help of the Fascist Terror and of an open military dictatorship, the Liberals by splitting up the peasant movement through corruption and through infecting a section of it with bourgeois ideas and also by isolating the other section of the movement. The military Fascist dictatorship would, for the time being, arrive at the desired end more rapidly, but it would have a bad effect on the economic situation of the country and would damage the interests of the Liberals, and — the chief point — a military dictatorship in Avarescu's hands can be used against the Liberals.

The first step towards putting the Liberal plans against the peasant movement into effect, was the amalgamation of the Peasant Party and the Transylvanian National Party which was carried out a year ago. The second step was the split in this united party. Dr. Lupu, the well-known "Left" peasant leader, seceded from the party and founded a "Right" Peasant Party of its own. The third step was the formation of the present Coalition Government under the leadership of the Liberals. The crucial point in the anti-peasant strategy of the Liberals is their attempt to put up combined lists with all the Government parties at the coming election. But this is also where they meet with the greatest difficulties. The peasant masses are openly opposed to this capitulation to financial capital on the part of their leaders.

In its foreign policy, the Avarescu Government was linked with Mussolini. The fact that Avarescu directed his policy along the lines laid down by Mussolini, won for Roumania Italy's recognition of the Bessarabian Protocol. At that time, Bratianu approved of the course steered by Avarescu in foreign policy.

Serious differences of opinion between Avarescu and the Liberals have only cropped up since the conflict between Italy and Yugoslavia, and especially since the Treaty of Friendship between Italy and Hungary was concluded. Italy's advance in the Balkans cannot but lead to disturbances, to armed conflicts and finally to war. A war in the Balkans however is by no means in accordance with the intentions of the Liberals. The agreement between Mussolini and Bethlen strengthens the political predominance of Hungary and increases the lust for revenge of the Hungarian irredentists. Next to their fear of the Soviet Union, the Liberals are most in terror of Hungary; they are concerned about Transylvania, where Buda Pest capital is still firmly rooted and where three millions Hungarian still live under the Roumanian rule. It was not without good reason

that Bratianu demanded after the treaty of friendship between Hungary and Italy, that,

"in the name of the King and in the interest of the nation, the helm of foreign policy should be steered towards the old allies, Paris, and especially London".

Avarescu agreed nominally, but as a matter of fact he did not carry out this instruction. Prompted by Mussolini, he offered obstinate resistance until the last moment. For a whole week, he kept secret the commission he had received from the King to form a government of the "National Coalition" consisting of all parties; he established a censorship over all newspapers and began to take measures for introducing a military dictatorship. Nevertheless, the powerful Bratianu clique literally drove him out of power. For the time being, Bratianu is carrying on his policy through his brother-in-law, Prince Stirbey, and may take it over personally at any time — a policy which aims at gagging the worker and peasant movement and the movement of the oppressed nationalities more slowly but more systematically and thoroughly than the dictatorship planned by Avarescu could have done, and which is driving Roumania more and more into Chamberlain's wake.

(According to the latest telegrams, Prince Stirbey has resigned, and Bratianu has been entrusted by the King with the task of forming a cabinet of his own. Ed.)

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Trade Union Conference of the Pacific Ocean Countries and the Labour Movement in the Far East.

By L. Heller.

In the last two years the Chinese revolution and the growth of the Left wing in the labour movements of India and Japan as a result of the general change in universal economy and politics in the Far East have attracted the attention of the ruling classes and of the reformists alike in a growing degree to the labour movements of the East.

In India, where the labour movement is still greatly influenced by the bourgeois and Right nationalist elements, reformists meet with no very serious difficulties in their activity. The representatives of the British Labour Party and British trade unions who have been sent as delegates to India have already made successful attempts to bring the labour movement of India under the influence of British trade unionism and thereby also under the influence of the ruling class in Great Britain.

In Japan the situation is somewhat more complicated. There the Right wing under the leadership of Susuki had to effect a decided split, thus still further dividing up the already dismembered movement in Japan for the purpose of turning the Rodo Sodomei (Japanese Labour Federation) into a body-guard of the reformist tendencies in the country. This naturally did not hinder the rapid development of the revolutionary wing of the Japanese labour movement, but the entire Japanese bourgeoisie and the reformists of the world have now an ally in the Rodo Sodomei.

The most difficult problem with which the reformists are faced, is the position in China. True, there are yellow labour organisations in Southern China, at Canton, e. g. the Kwantung Federation and the Union of Mechanics, but these are the only props the reformists have in all the vast realm. The reformist organisations comprise only one per cent of all the trade union movement, and outside Canton they command only quite insignificant groups. The overwhelming majority of the labour movement, very nearly 99 per cent. pronouncedly represents the standpoint of revolutionary class warfare.

With a view to forming a breach in the Chinese labour movement, it was resolved that the international reformist forces be mobilised. To his end the Pan-Asiatic Workers' Conference was envisaged at Geneva two years ago, on the occasion of the conference of the Labour Office attached to the League of Nations. The purpose of this planned conference was obviously that of combining the Chinese labour movement with the reformist movement in India. But the Pan-Asiatic Con-



ference has not yet been realised by reason of the resistance which the Chinese workers offered to the reformist plans.

The latest events in China have encouraged the hopes of the reformists, who hastened to exploit the new situation with a view to penetrating into the Chinese labour movement. A few days after Chang Kai-shek's coup, the Right Japanese organisation known as the National-Socialist Party, sent its delegates to Shanghai for the purpose of getting into touch with the new "associations" of Chang Kai-shek, which in their turn sent representatives to Tokio. According to press reports the attempt was made to convoke for this summer some conference after the manner of the Pan-Asiatic Conference originally planned.

The proletariat of Asia is to be saved from the influence of the Red International of Labour Unions. The connection of the labour movement of the East with the revolutionary labour movement of the West and the workers of the Soviet Union is to be loosened, the labour movement of Asia being drawn into the sphere of interests of the reformists (i. e. of Amsterdam) and the Geneva Labour Office attached to the League of Nations. In this way the labour movement of the East is to be rendered harmless to international imperialism, which is the real task which has always occupied, and still occupies, the attention of the reformists. The fact that in all these matters the conduct and initiative are in the hands of the League of Nations Labour Office, which has erected a special branch at Tokio for the purpose of more effective work in the countries of the Far East, plainly shows for what interests the reformists are at work in the East.

But far in advance of the reformists, the revolutionary wing of the labour movement turned its attention to the Far East.

In contradistinction to Amsterdam, which was until quite recent times in all essential details a purely European organisation, the R. I. L. U. has from its very inception endeavoured to be truly international — and has indeed succeeded in being so — international in the sense that it represents the revolutionary labour movement of all countries and all continents. Already five years ago the labour movement in the Pacific Ocean countries attracted the attention of the R. I. L. U. Already on the occasion of its Second Congress, in the year 1922, the suggestion of the Australian delegation regarding the convocation of a workers' conference of the Pacific Ocean countries, was accepted. This occurred at a time when the danger of an armed conflict between the United States and Japan appeared particularly acute. But the immediate danger passed over, and the convocation of a conference was postponed. It was, indeed, partly replaced by the Congress of the Transport Workers of the Far East in the year 1924, at which representatives of China, Indo-China, and the Philippines were present. It was not until 1926 that the question of convoking this conference was again broached.

The Trade Union Conference of the Pacific Ocean Countries, which was to have been opened at Canton on May 1st, was intended to be on a particularly broad basis as regards participation. The organisatory committee consisted of the Trade Union Council of Sidney (Australia) and the All-China Labour Federation. All steps were taken to ensure this conference being attended by representatives of the broad masses of the Chinese trade union movement and also by the peasant movement of Japan, which is well-known to be in close connection with the Japanese workers' movement. It was likewise intended that the conference be attended by representatives from the Japanese colonies Formosa and Corea, the Philippines and the East Indian Islands, and the American countries bordering on the Pacific, viz. Canada, the United States, Mexico, and Central America.

The entire political position appeared highly favourable for the convocation of such a conference. However, the counter-revolutionary coups at Shanghai, Canton, and a number of other towns of Southern China altogether altered the position and very greatly impeded the task of convoking a conference, since in all these large cities the revolutionary movement was denounced as illegal, while the big industrial centres of China were divided from one another by the military operations. The Governments of Great Britain, Australia, and Japan did what they could to prevent the conference by purely disciplinary means, such as the arrest of delegates and the refusal of passports. Nevertheless, the conference was merely delayed and transferred from Canton to Hankow. In spite of all ob-

stacles, a considerable number of delegates from Japan and the representatives of Java, Corea, and the American Pacific Ocean countries succeeded in reaching this centre of the revolutionary labour movement.

The Trade Union Conference of the Countries of the Pacific Ocean concentrated its attention on central questions of international politics, the intervention in China, the war preparations of the British imperialists against the Soviet Union, the general effect of imperialism, the labour movement in the countries of the East with special reference to India, and the rôle of American imperialism in relation to the broad masses in Latin America. The conference passed a number of important resolutions: 1. To support the Chinese revolution. 2. To protest against the intervention of the imperialists in China. 3. To oppose the danger of war in the countries bordering on the Pacific. 4. To support the national liberation movements in India, Corea, Java, the Philippines, and the countries of Latin America. 5. To support the programme of economic demands of the working classes.

Special attention was paid by the conference to the question of the unity of the trade union movement. This question is of particular importance under circumstances such as prevail in the East. Any one who has been in the Far East will know how isolated the workers of the individual countries — China, India, Japan, — are from one another. This both by reason of the great geographic distances, and also in view of the fact that the labour movement is still very young in those countries. The separation, however, is yet far greater, for the Chinese, Indian, and Japanese workers employed in the same factory, or the sailors and stokers of these nationalities serving on the same ship, keep apart from one another and form their own separate groups. The imperialists systematically encourage this separation with all means at their command and very often incite the workers of the different countries against one another. Any approach among the workers of the various nationalities of the Far East to one another meets with the most vehement opposition on the part of the foreign capitalists. The problem of unity in the countries bordering on the Pacific is therefore of the utmost significance and the cry for unity more than usually convincing.

A special resolution passed by the conference referred to the International Labour Office attached to the League of Nations. The reformists of the type of Susuki in Japan attempted to convince the workers of the countries of the East that the Geneva Labour Office was doing very important work. As in a number of Eastern countries there are no laws at all in regard to working hours, the reformists were able to make a great amount of propaganda and to point to the resolutions which were passed in Geneva in the interest of the workers of the East but were never fulfilled, as to quite outstanding achievements.

In a resolution in this connection, the conference declared it

"a matter of duty to warn the workers of the whole world against any connection with the International Labour Office in Geneva and to denounce all labour leaders who maintained such a connection to the detriment of the true interests of their followers".

"The honest workers", the resolution goes on to say, "have nothing to expect of this bourgeois institution of Geneva. We want neither class peace nor class collaboration, but only a consequential class warfare against the exploiters."

At the close of the conference a Secretariat was instituted, which will be of great importance for the development and consolidation of the connection among the organisations represented at this Conference as also for the standardisation of their activity. This Secretariat will comprehend the workers' organisations of China, Japan, Corea, the United States, Australia, and the Soviet Union. It will prepare the convocation of a Trade Union Congress of the countries bordering on the Pacific, to take place in the course of 1928.

The Trade Union Conference of the Pacific Ocean Countries will be of the greatest significance not only for the Chinese labour movement which is just at present experiencing such hard times, but also for the labour movement throughout the world. More than ever before, the labour movement in China requires the active support of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world. At the same time the workers of Europe

and America and the countries of the Pacific, represented at the conference at Hankow must clearly understand that the cause of the Chinese workers is in fact the cause of the workers of all the world, and that the danger of war which the British imperialists are provoking by their attacks on China and the Soviet Union and their warfare against their own workers is a factor which by virtue of the common interests of the proletariat of East and West, must serve to unite the proletariat of the world.

## PLENUM OF THE E. C. C. I.

### Resolution of the Plenum of the E. C. C. I. on the Situation in Great Britain.

1. This Plenum re-affirms the July theses of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I. on the General Strike, in which the struggle of the British workers in May 1926 is treated as the turning point in the history of British Labour and also the resolution of the VII. Enlarged Executive on the British situation in connection with the defeat of the miners.

The prediction of the Enlarged Executive that the defeat of the miners would serve as a signal for the attack by the reactionary forces both on the internal and external front in Britain have been fully justified. Since the defeat of the miners, British imperialism has not only increased military intervention against the Chinese Revolution, but is also feverishly preparing a new war directed against the Soviet Union; while at the same time launching an attack on the trade unions, in order to weaken and destroy those basic organisations of the British working class.

2. The slight and temporary improvement in trade due to replacement of stocks following the heroic miners' struggle is now coming to an end, leaving the basic industries of the country without clear prospects of a real revival. The capitalist class seeks desperately to find a solution for this situation in launching further attacks on the working class and in engaging in warlike adventures, particularly against China, and in preparations for war against the Soviet Union.

3. The long series of provocations directed by the British Government against the Soviet Union, and, especially the raid on the Soviet Trade Delegation and the breaking off of trade and diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and the British Government's incitement of the border States to attack the Soviet Union, and the feverish activities in organising a Holy Alliance against the Soviets, on the other hand, reveal the true role of British imperialism as the chief danger to world peace.

This danger is further intensified by the fact that British imperialism's war against China and the ideological and technical preparations for world war on the part of the British Government, are openly supported by the leaders of the Labour Party like Snowden and MacDonald, and the leaders of the General Council, like Thomas. They have been assisted by the so-called Pacifists and "Lefts" who have continually lulled the working class with the legend that the gigantic campaign of the capitalist press against the Soviet Union and the military intervention in China were the work of a small group of Die-hards and were in no way a menace to peace. All activities of British imperialism confirm, however, the correctness of the position adopted by the Communist International and the Communist Party of Great Britain in warning the British workers and the workers of the world that the adventurous war policy of British imperialism is the result of its continued process of decline.

4. The Budget this year has shown a heavy deficit, leaving the Government, which does not dare to impose heavier taxation on its own supporters, with no resources to finance social reforms calculated to improve, however slightly, the condition of the working class. The Government is also unable to hold out to its petty-bourgeois supporters any hope of the tax-reductions or the trade revival which they were confidently promised by the Government's spokesmen at the last election.

In connection with the breaking off of relations with the Soviet Union, loud protests are being made by industrial and

commercial circles which maintain that the Baldwin government is delivering blow after blow to industry and trade. Business circles correctly estimate the breaking of relations with the Soviet Union as the loss of a market which will render the depression more acute and will increase unemployment.

The Government not only refuses to concede to the workers and the petty-bourgeoisie any benefits, but is moving more and more to attack the social services wrung from the capitalist Government by the workers. Such measures as the Government's Poor Law Reform Bill and the Blanesburgh Report on Unemployment Insurance are indications of the policy of the dominant class to attempt to stabilise British capitalism at the expense of the working class and the petty-bourgeois elements.

5. The General Strike and the miners' lockout emancipated hundreds of thousands of workers from allegiance to the capitalist political parties. The failure of the government to satisfy the needs of the petty-bourgeoisie is alienating amongst this section of the population many of those who supported the government at the time of the 1924 elections.

These developments are reflected in the constant fall of the Government vote at the bye-elections. The sharpening of the class struggle in the country renders it impossible for the Liberal Party to regain its lost influence over the workers, or to arrest the general drift towards the Labour Party; the possibility, however, of its winning support at the coming elections from a section of the petty-bourgeoisie, who are growing disillusioned with the Conservative Party must not be excluded. Even from the point of view of parliamentary democracy, the Conservative Government does not represent more than one-third of the electorate and is being driven more and more to pursue an open Fascist policy.

6. The sharpening of the class struggle in Great Britain finds its expression in the sharpening of the differentiation in the labour movement. While new groups of workers have been coming into the labour movement, while the rank and file workers in the labour movement have been moving to the Left, the Labour Party and the Trade Union bureaucracy have moved towards a rapprochement with the capitalist class on all the burning questions of foreign and domestic politics, such as the miners' struggle, the Trade Union Bill, intervention in China, the preparation of war against the Soviet Union, industrial peace, Americanisation.

7. The adoption by the January Conference of Trade Union Executives of the General Council's report on the General Strike, with its condemnation of the heroic miners' struggle, was the first general demonstration that the trade union bureaucracy is united as to the necessity of wage reductions in the interests of the stabilisation of British industry.

8. The January Conference should be considered as a part of the general campaign of the Trade Union and Labour Party leaders against the General Strike as a weapon in the workers' struggle, and on behalf of "industrial peace". They have thereby stimulated the capitalists to bring forward the Trade Union Bill which attempts to impose upon the unions by law the policy which the reformists have been urging the trade unions to accept voluntarily. The propaganda of the Trade Union bureaucracy in favour of industrial peace revealed the fundamental identity of their policy with that of the capitalist class. The propaganda of industrial peace hindered the workers from preparation in defence of their organisations, and actually encouraged the capitalist government to launch the anti-Trade Union Bill.

9. While advocating industrial peace with capitalism, the Trade Union bureaucrats and Labour Party leaders have been pursuing a merciless attack on the Communist and Left wing workers. Local labour parties have been disaffiliated for refusing to carry out the Liverpool decisions against the Communists; trade union bureaucrats have co-operated with the reformist Labour Party officials in denying the Communist trade unionists their rights in the Labour Party, and one union has definitely refused to permit Communists and Minority Movement members to run for official trade union positions.

10. While trying to distinguish itself from the Right wing reformists by using Left phrases, the Independent Labour Party has supported the Right wing bureaucracy on all practical questions. The "Socialism in our Time" proposals of the I. L. P. having as their starting point the next Labour government have no relation to the immediate struggle of the workers. This enables the I. L. P. to use Left phrases while actively

assisting the Right wing in its struggle against the Communists and the Left wing workers. The decisions of the last I. L. P. Conference not to place Ramsay MacDonald on its delegation to the Labour Party Conference does not involve a break with MacDonaldism (as revealed in the statement of the chairman that they supported MacDonald as leader of the Labour Party); it is only an attempt of the I. L. P. leadership to conciliate the working class elements in its ranks.

As the class struggle develops and the differentiation within the Labour movement proceeds at an accelerated pace, the I. L. P. finds it more and more difficult to play the middle role which it has chosen for itself between the Communists and the reformists. Experience shows that it cannot secure even the assent of the I. L. P. trade union officials to the deceptive Left catch words which it issues from time to time, the I. L. P. members in positions of responsibility in the Labour Party and the trade unions preferring open MacDonaldism to MacDonaldism concealed behind Left phrases.

The development of the class struggle in Great Britain shows clearly that the I. L. P. while issuing Left slogans, confines itself to Right wing activity, lining up with the T. U. bureaucrats and reformist leaders of the L. P. in all essential questions of the class struggle, i. e. the question of the responsibility for the defeat of the General Strike, the miners' struggle, the "Hands off China!" campaign and the fight against the Communists.

While the sharpening of the class struggle makes it increasingly difficult for the I. L. P. to play the independent role which it formerly did in the labour movement and reduces it more and more to the role of the "Left" lackey of the reformist bureaucracy, this does not in any way minimise its danger to the working class, but on the contrary, increases it. The Left pacifist phrases which it trumpets like the "Left" phrases of the T. U. leaders — Hicks, Purcell, and others — continue to be a source of deception to those workers who are disgusted by the imperialist phraseology of Thomas and who do not yet understand that Left phrases unaccompanied by a real fight against imperialism only help to prevent a real struggle against war.

The Communist Party must expose the union of the Left phrases with the Right deeds, proving to the workers on the basis of their everyday experience that a party like the I. L. P. standing between the Communist Party and the labour bureaucracy cannot in the present stage of the class struggle in Britain play a really independent role and must therefore serve as a lackey of the reactionary bureaucracy.

11. The development of the Chinese revolution, challenging as it does the whole basis of British imperialist power not only in China but in India and the colonies, has as its result military intervention by British imperialism and exposes the reformist leaders as the allies of the British government. The reformists approved of the sending of reinforcements, refused to demand the withdrawal of troops, were opposed to the setting up of "Hands off China!" committees and did everything possible to stifle the mass movement of the workers against intervention in China.

Finally, when the pressure of the working class forced them to demand the withdrawal of troops from China, they seized the first opportunity to discard this demand indefinitely. The reformist leaders did the work of Chamberlain in pushing forward the demand for "negotiations" in preference to the demand and the fight for the complete withdrawal of all troops and warships. The "demand" for negotiations was meant to support the imperialist claim that British imperialism had certain rights in China which might properly be made the subject of negotiations. They obscured the fact that the British imperialists were in China in virtue of forcible invasion and the issue before the British workers was not the issue of forcing the British government to negotiate but of forcing it to evacuate the territory which it had seized in China.

The I. L. P. and other pacifist groups in the Labour Party and Trade Unions, while demanding formally the withdrawal of troops, prevented all forms of action which would lead to the withdrawal of troops, refused to have a united front with the Communists against intervention and spread pacifist illusions as to the possibility of resisting war by individual refusal to bear arms, to manufacture or transport munitions and war material.

12. The Communist Party of Great Britain fought energetically against the imperialist policy of the Labour Party and

the pacifist sophisms being spread by the I. L. P. The Party slogans such as "Help China to smash Baldwin", "Defeat of British imperialism means a victory for British labour" and "Withdraw all troops and warships from China!" correctly linked up the defence of the Chinese revolution with the struggle of the British workers against the Baldwin government. The Party has succeeded in getting many "Hands off China!" committees set up, it has distributed leaflets to the troops and has carried out an energetic campaign in the ports.

13. At one pole we have the continued inability of British imperialism to solve its problems, and thus to arrest its decline, except partially, by directly attacking the wages and conditions of the workers in Britain and by intensifying its exploitation of the colonial peoples. At the other pole we have the continued improvement and strengthening of the position of the Soviet Union. This has led to an intensification of the antagonism towards the Soviet Union by British imperialism — an antagonism which has received fresh fuel not only from the fear inspired in British capitalism by the revolutionising of the workers in Britain and by the rising tide of the revolt of the colonial peoples, especially in China, but also from the actual assistance rendered to the British miners by the Russian workers and the active sympathy shown by the Soviet Union to the Chinese revolution.

This antagonism has finally led to a series of attacks on the Soviet Union, which culminated in the violation of all obligations undertaken by Great Britain in respect of the Soviet Union and the breaking off of diplomatic relations. The leaders of the Labour Party actually supported the entire policy of the Baldwin government in respect of the Soviet Union confining themselves to a criticism of the methods of the Conservative government.

14. The period which lies between the miners' lockout and the Trade Union Bill bears witness to the growing movement of the masses to the Left on the one hand and the growing rapprochement of the trade union bureaucracy and the employers on the other hands. The development of the National Left wing movement within the Labour Party, based on the rank and file, the excellent response to the M. M. Conferences, the successes won by the Party and the M. M. in the Trade Union elections in the coalfields bear witness to the growing Left movement amongst the workers.

These undoubted successes achieved by the Left wing of the Labour Party and the Minority Movement should not, however, blind us to the fact that both these movements are yet comparatively weak in the face of the strength of the trade union and Labour Party bureaucracy. The National Minority Movement, while politically it has now considerable national influence and, particularly amongst the miners, contains several leaders nationally recognised, still shows that its organisational strength lags behind its general influence.

The National Left wing movement which has developed in the local Labour Parties on the basis of the workers' fight against the attempts of the bureaucracy to reduce the Labour Party to the level of a bourgeois Liberal Party has shown signs of vitality and progress. Its attempt to organise the Left wing in the Labour Party around a definite programme and not around a few vague "Left" phrases, has rallied the active Left wing workers, though the hostility of the bureaucracy towards the movement has alienated the parliamentary purveyors of Left phrases like Lansbury and Co. The attempt of the reformists to deride the movement as a Communist intrigue has had little effect on the Left workers who have worked with the Communists within this movement.

Much still requires to be done: 1. To clarify the movement politically, and 2. to help in the development of the organisation throughout the country. The Communist Party will render every assistance in this necessary work and will prove to the workers by deeds that it is the real leader in the struggle against the imperialist bureaucratic corruption of the Labour Party.

15. The anti-Trade Union Bill represents the most decisive departure on the part of the British capitalist class from their old methods of dealing with the trade union movement. It is connected with a series of other measures such as the Blanesburgh Report, which attacks the unemployed, and the Government Scheme of the Poor Law Reform which has for its object the liquidation of bourgeois democratic institutions such as the Boards of Guardians and the transfer of their functions to bodies like the Country Councils less amenable

to working class pressure and control. The Labour Party and Trade Union bureaucrats have absolutely refused completely to oppose those measures, but on the contrary have decided to try and amend them by agreements with the Conservative Government. They have thus assisted the Conservative Government in entering on a ruthless struggle against the Labour movement.

16. The Trade Union Bill represents the highest point yet reached by the capitalist offensive against the workers and as such is the prelude to further reductions in wages, lengthening of hours, and worsening of factory conditions, the development of the attack on China and the preparation and launching of the military attack on the Soviet Union.

At a moment when the capitalists are building huge combines which stretch across the frontiers of several industries, when the capitalist State is revealing itself openly as the tool of the trustmongers and the financiers against the workers, which obviously dictates to the trade unions the necessity to concentrate and centralise all their strength to the utmost, the Trade Unions are forbidden to use the only effective weapon of struggle which would avail against the power of the trustified employers and the capitalist State. At the moment when international cartels with enormous resources are developing and when there is an obvious tendency on the part of British capitalists to link up with such cartels, the British unions are forbidden to fight these mammoth organisations of capital, with anything more effective than the effete methods of nineteenth century trade unionism.

The General Strike is declared illegal, the mass sympathetic strike is declared illegal, strikes on any scale whatever against war are illegal, the right of the trade unions to establish discipline and solidarity in the struggle against the employers, is attacked, Trade unionism in Municipal and State employment is undermined, an attempt is made to separate the State employees from the working class in general, the collection of the political levy by the trade unions is interfered with, thus striking a blow at the parliamentary action which the reformists have declared is the alternative to direct action; and the Attorney-General is given unlimited right of supervision over the trade union movement in order to ensure that the provisions of the Bill are adhered to.

The object of this Trade Union Bill is to paralyse the unions and give the Government a free hand to carry out its policy on three main fronts:

1. The attack on the wages, hours and working conditions of the British workers.
2. The further development of its fight against the Chinese Revolution.
3. The preparation for war on the Soviet Union.

The Baldwin Government dares to pose as the representative of the community at the moment when it attacks the majority of the population — the working class — by smashing the trade unions, upon which the workers rely in the struggle to defend their interests, as it also poses as the friend of peace and freedom while waging war against the Chinese revolution, and preparing war against the Soviet Union.

17. The Bill is the expression of the sharpening of the class struggle in Great Britain which culminated in and resulted in the application of Fascist methods on the part of the Tory Government. Up to the very last moment the capitalist class of Great Britain had hoped to control the trade unions from within by means of the capitalist minded bureaucracy, which basically defends the point of view of capitalism. The development of the Left wing which takes the lead in the Minority Movement culminating in the experience of the General Strike convinced the Government that they could not fully rely on controlling the trade unions through the bureaucracy and must resort to a complicated system of repression for shackling the unions.

The declaration of Baldwin that the Bill is necessary because of the growing influence of the Minority Movement in the trade unions reveals the mind of the Government. While Baldwin deliberately exaggerates the actual role which the Minority Movement had in the trade union movement, in order to frighten the shopkeepers and the reformist leaders, stimulating the latter to further attacks on the Communists and Left wing workers, he was correct in assuming that its influence

was growing and is bound to continue to grow as the economic conditions of Britain worsen and the bankruptcy of the reformist leaders of the Trade Union movement becomes clearly revealed.

18. The effect of the anti-Trade Union Bill has been to rouse the whole working class against the Government notwithstanding the efforts of the reformists to stifle its initiative and confine the agitation to safe channels. This was shown in the size of the May Day demonstrations which were larger than those held in 1926 on the eve of the General Strike. Amongst the workers there is a strong desire for unity in the struggle against the Bill and some of the disaffiliated Labour Parties and Trades Councils have improved their position in the localities by the energetic campaigns which they have carried out against the Bill. The workers support the Communist point of view of the necessity of strike action against the Bill and, in case of a General Strike, they would show an even greater solidarity than in May 1926.

The nature of the campaign of the reformist leaders against the Bill is revealed not only by their attitude to a General Strike, but also by their refusal to link it up with the fight against the war in China, thus leaving the imperialists a free hand in their war policy and weakening the actual fight against the Bill.

The opposition of the Trade Union bureaucrats to the Bill is loud, but insincere. The measures advocated in the Bill, with few exceptions, fit in with the policy which the trade union bureaucracy was advocating prior to the introduction of the Bill. The Conference of Executives showed that the leading trade union bureaucrats were not prepared to advocate the General Strike or any other form of industrial action against the Bill, but were content to make a show of opposition to the Bill in order to secure the workers' votes at the coming election.

The leaders of the Labour Party have refused to obstruct all parliamentary business until the Bill is withdrawn or until the Labour Party is suspended one by one from the House of Commons. They have contented themselves with ordinary parliamentary opposition to the Bill. Already they have announced to the workers that the Bill will certainly pass through parliament but that the workers can repeal it after the next General Election, without informing the workers of the fact that the Bill is one of a series of measures (which include also the reform of the House of Lords) designed to make the victory of the Labour Party impossible.

In thus fooling the workers by declaring that it will be easy to repeal the Bill after the next General Election, the Labour Party and Trade Union leaders reveal their counter-revolutionary role.

The experience of the fight against the Trade Union Bill and against intervention in China has fully confirmed the thesis of the VII. Enlarged Executive as to the consolidation of the trade union bureaucracy, a number of former Left wingers having passed openly over to the Right. A few leaders like Hicks and Purcell continue to play the role of a sham Left wing, using Left phrases but acting as the lackeys of the Right wing on all essential questions.

19. Both Trade Union and Labour leaders have refused a united front with the Communist Party in the struggle against the Trade Union Bill and have endeavoured even during the fight against the Trade Union Bill to pursue their policy of disruption within the Labour movement by the disaffiliation of Left wing Labour Parties.

They have utilised their experience of the months previous to the General Strike and have opposed the formation of Councils of Action because such Councils are liable to develop into a means of mobilising the workers to bring pressure upon the leaders. They have worked to stifle local initiative in the campaign by placing the control of the campaign in the hands of paid trade union and Labour Party officials, who refuse to take into consideration the views of the rank and file. Their local conferences to explain the Bill to the workers have been so arranged as to refuse the rank and file the right to express their opinions. The organisation which the Trade Unions and Labour Party leaders have set up to fight this Bill is an organisation stifling the initiative of the workers and holding them back from action.

20. The E. C. C. I. confirms the correctness of the policy of the C. P. G. B. as adopted at the special C. C. meeting

of April 12th. At this Plenum the C. C. laid down the following tasks in connection with the Bill:

1. To explain to the workers of Great Britain the meaning of the Bill as an attack on the workers and as part of the preparation for new war.

2. To break through the bureaucratic restrictions hampering the campaign and to mobilise all the workers in the localities in Councils of Action representing all sections of the labour movement, in order to carry on an intensive campaign against the Bill.

3. To organise the pressure of the masses on the Labour Party in Parliament to undertake the obstruction of all parliamentary business as a weapon against the Bill.

4. The organisation of real mass demonstrations, i. e., parades of workers in the streets.

5. The exposure of those who urge that the Bill must go through, and that Labour's only hope lies in the next General Election.

6. Intensified propaganda for Workers' Defence Corps.

7. The direction of all agitation against the Bill around the demand for a real General Strike of all workers to stop the passage of the Bill through Parliament and force the government to resign. The General Strike to be organised by a special conference of Trade Union Executives, with ranks and file representation, such a special conference to be secured by the organisation of mass pressure by the workers in the factories, trade union branches local Labour Parties, etc.

21. The struggle against the Bill will sharpen the process of differentiation in the Labour movement, leading to a closer unity amongst the majority of the bureaucracy against the Communists and Left wing workers both in the Labour Party and in the Trade Union movement. On the other hand the rally of the Left wing workers and even many of the lower grades of Trade Union and Labour Party officials towards the Party will become more pronounced. The Communist Party of Great Britain has a great opportunity before it provided it can solve the complex and difficult problems with which it is confronted. These problems were the subject of thorough consideration at various full sessions of the C. C. of the C. P. of Great Britain and District conferences.

22. In determining its policy in relation to the Trade Union Bill, the C. P. of Great Britain was correct in putting before the workers the slogan of a real General Strike for the struggle against the Bill and advocating the resignation of the government.

23. The E. C. C. I. recognises that the question of the disaffiliated Labour Parties and their struggle to retain their position in the localities places special obligations on the Party to co-operate energetically with the Left Wing workers in assisting those organisations in their struggle. It approves the attitude of the Party C. C. towards disaffiliated Labour Parties as embodied in the resolution of the C. C. of the C. P. G. B. passed by the C. C. meeting of February 2nd, subsequently confirmed by the resolution of the Political Secretariat of the C. I.

24. The E. C. C. I. approves of the anti-militarist work already undertaken by the Party. The E. C. C. I. warns the British Party against the danger of pacifist and semi-pacifist tendencies and traditions, which are particularly dangerous in the present situation in Britain, when the Conservative Government is openly preparing for new wars.

25. The Plenum of the Executive Committee regards the circular letter of March 25th of the General Council to the Trades Councils with the ultimatum that they sign a document demanding the breaking of all relations with the Minority Movement as an attempt on the one hand to disorganise and demoralise the Trades Councils as a reprisal for their activity during the General Strike and the miners' lockout, and on the other hand, as a part of the general campaign of the reformist bureaucracy to isolate the Communists and the adherents of the Minority Movement, thereby helping the Baldwin Government to carry through the Trade Union Bill as well as its imperialist policy of war with China and preparations of war with the Soviet Union.

The Plenum proposes that the Communist Party of Great Britain shall continue to conduct with greater energy the campaign of exposing the General Council in connection with this disgraceful and unprecedented ultimatum, and shall undertake a campaign among the Trades Councils and in the Trade

Unions with a view to this document being rescinded at the first opportunity.

26. This E. C. C. I. declares that all the tasks of the British Party in the present period should be subordinated to the fight against the aggressive policy of British imperialism, which finds its expression in the anti-Trade union Bill, in the war against China and in the preparations for a new war, and the support which this policy is receiving from the reformist leadership. In order to mobilise the workers for a successful campaign against the Baldwin Government, the C. P. G. B. must carry out an intensive struggle against the Right Wing policy of Labour Party reformists and Trade Union bureaucrats and the splitting anti-Communist decisions. The immediate tasks are as follows:

a) Intensive fight against the anti-Communist decisions particularly in the trade union movement and the development of a powerful campaign in the local Labour Parties, the Trade Unions, etc. in order to secure the reversal of the anti-Communist decisions, thereby clearing the way for a struggle against the imperialist corruption of the Labour Party by the bureaucracy. In this way the Labour Party will be made a more effective instrument of working class struggle.

b) The more active co-operation of the Communist Party members with active Left wing workers.

27. The attack of the T. U. bureaucrats on the Trades Councils and on the rights of Communists and Minority Movement members, must be countered by building up a mass Minority Movement as the primary means for the reorganisation of the Trade Union movement, and the replacement of the reformist leaders by revolutionary workers. The Plenum in view of this records that hitherto insufficient assistance has been given by the Party to the Minority Movement.

28. In connection with the war danger the C. P. G. B. must:

1. Carry out in its press and pamphlet literature a more exhaustive exposure of the aims of the British imperialists with regard to the Soviet Union, showing that the breaking off of relations is a part of the campaign of provocation leading up to war with the Soviet Union.

2. Must force the labour movement to link up its campaign against the T. U. Bill with a campaign against the war on China and the warlike attitude of the British Government towards the Soviet Union, under the slogans of: "A war on the Soviet Union is a war on the British workers", "The defeat of Baldwin is a victory for the British people", "War on the wage-cutting union-smashing Government which is preparing war", "Prepare mass action to defeat war-mongers", "Force resumption of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union".

3. Must explain to the Party members more fully than hitherto the role of the Communist Party in the struggle against war.

4. Must expose pacifist slogans and policy, particularly those of the I. L. P. and the so-called Left leaders of the T. U's.

5. Explain to the workers the principal methods of fighting the war danger.

29. The Communist Party should continue to explain to the workers the importance of unity between the workers of Great Britain and the workers of the Soviet Union which becomes imperative in face of the militarist policy of the British government. The Party must explain to the workers that it is due to the sabotage of the whole General Council from Hicks and Purcell to Thomas, that the Anglo-Russian Committee has not so far accomplished its great task. The General Council has always played a double game on the question of unity with the Russian workers. It has defended unity in words, while hampering the establishment of a real alliance between the workers of both countries.

This policy of the General Council was clearly demonstrated during the last sessions of the Anglo-Russian Committee, especially on the question of the General Strike, the fight of the miners, and the fight against the intervention in China. The Communist Party must especially explain the real meaning of the last Berlin Conference, when the General Council, instead of enlarging the functions of the Anglo-Russian Committee, insisted on, and carried through, the restriction of the constitution of the Committee.

The Comintern fully approves the statement of the Communist Party of Great Britain which places the blame for the



results of the last Berlin Conference on the shoulders of the General Council. The history of the work of the Anglo-Russian Committee for the last year fully justifies the position taken by the Communist Party of Great Britain in explaining to the workers that the General Council is responsible for the concessions made by the Labour Unions of the Soviet Union, while those concessions prove anew that the Trade Union movement of the Soviet Union is sincerely in favour of real unity.

At the same time, the Plenum approves of the campaign which the Communist Party is conducting among the miners to establish unity between the British miners and the miners of the Soviet Union. The criticism of the miners' leaders who are in practice preventing the establishment of an Anglo-Russian Miner's Committee, is fully justified. Those leaders not only refused to set up a Joint Miners' Committee, but they even conceal from the British miners the proposal of the miners of the Soviet Union to that effect.

30. The warlike attitude of British imperialism with regard to the Soviet Union, its military intervention in China, its brutal suppression of the colonial peoples under its control, makes it necessary for the C. P. G. B. to intensify its campaign against imperialism, exposing to the workers the policy of British imperialism, combating imperialist tendencies in the Labour Movement, demonstrating to the workers that the colonial peoples are fighting the same capitalist enemy that they are fighting, and that the unity of the labour movement with the struggling colonial peoples will ensure the victory of both. The C. P. G. B. must continue its efforts to establish the closest relations between the C. P. G. B. and the workers', peasants' and nationalist governments in the colonies and to assist the colonial peoples in their struggle for independence in every possible way.

31. In view of the great role which the youth has to play in the struggle against imperialism, war, and militarism, the Party must give assistance to the Young Communist League to carry out its tasks.

32. Organisationally, the chief task of the C. P. G. B. is to correct the disproportion existing between its membership in the mining industry and the other basic industries in the country and to develop the party as a powerful mass Party of the workers. This Executive reaffirms the organisational task as formulated in the resolution of the VII. Plenum relating to work amongst women, the Y. C. L., Factory groups. A special effort must be made to increase the number of factory groups and factory papers. The political education of the new members must be undertaken in the most energetic way, with a view to consolidating the recent gains of the Party. The fight against the Trade Union Bill and the danger of war must be made the basis of the most energetic recruiting of new members.

33. The E. C. C. I. recognises that the situation created by the severing of diplomatic relations places great responsibility on the small Communist Party of Great Britain, but is confident that the British Party will be able to maintain and enlarge its contacts with the mass of the workers, and will be able, as in past crises, to carry out an energetic Communist policy, leading the masses in the fight for the resignation of the Baldwin Government.

The following practical activities must be engaged in around the slogans already enumerated:

1. A careful exposure of the British Government's campaign of forgeries and provocations directed against the Soviet Union and an explanation of the military and diplomatic measures already undertaken by Great Britain in pursuance of its policy of encirclement.

2. An explanation of the achievements of the Soviet Union in the building up of Socialism and the importance of the growing strength of the working class in the Soviet Union which follows from this, enabling the workers of the Soviet Union to assist the workers in all other countries in their struggle against oppression.

3. The demonstration of the fact that the Government after supporting the wage offensive of the employers and introducing the Bill to smash the trade unions, is now proceeding to disorganise the trade of the country by creating unemployment.

4. The Party must link up the campaign against the breaking off of diplomatic relations and the danger of war with the campaign against the Trade Union Bill and insist that the Labour Party and the T. U. C. should conduct a joint cam-

paign against the T. U. Bill as well as against the breaking off of relations with the Soviet Union.

5. The Party must emphasise the necessity of the workers in the localities setting up Councils of Action to prepare the struggle against the Bill and against the war danger and must intensify its agitation for a General Strike to force the Government to resign.

The Plenum believes that the C. P. G. B., in this difficult hour which the British and the world proletariat are now experiencing will be able to mobilise the masses for a real active struggle against the reactionary Government, which is now launching an attack on the British workers, the Chinese people and preparing new and terrible wars directed firstly against the Soviet Union.

## THE WHITE TERROR

### Execution of the Indian Revolutionary Narayan Singh.

Shanghai, 18th June 1927.

The death sentence passed by a British court upon the Indian revolutionary Narayan Singh who killed the head of the Anglo-Indian police, has been carried out.

## THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

### Our Proletarian Planks for the International Co-operative Day.

By ALGO (Berlin).

Once again the International of the Co-operatives summons us to its festive day, which has been fixed for July 2nd, 1927. The experience of the last few years has shown that this International Co-operative Day has been celebrated the world over by thousands of co-operative associations with mass meetings, popular festivals, pageants, women's and children's festivals, exhibitions, and the like. It is "the economic achievements and the extraordinary power of the co-operative principle" which call for celebration.

It cannot be denied that, so far as figures are concerned, the international co-operative organisation is the most powerful institution of the present day, numbering, as it does, 50,000,000 co-operative members in 85,000 local and district co-operatives in 34 different States. These gigantic figures, however, by no means represent a corresponding degree of power or influence. True, these 5 million members in Great Britain, 4½ millions in Germany, 2½ millions in France, and so forth, are essentially proletarian elements, but the class force of these tremendous organisations with their exemplary technical and economic apparatus which is possibly unrivalled within the workers' movement, is at present by no means at the disposal of proletarian class warfare.

If therefore, on the occasion of the annual International Co-operative Day, we again allow ourselves to be impressed by the big figures set forth, the class-conscious working masses must ask themselves the important question as to the manner and degree in which this great international co-operative movement serves as a factor in class warfare. This is the decisive question which must be raised throughout the world in connection with the celebrations of July 2nd.

The co-operative movement, which originated in the proletarian militant organisation of the "Equitable Pioneers of Rochdale", has developed out of the most primitive of workers' organisations. At present, however, it is in almost all countries completely separated from the labour movement. The official co-operative policy is for the most part that of the reformists and opportunists pure and simple and practically makers for bourgeois interests. The leadership of the co-operatives has slipped out of the hands of the proletariat into those of a co-operative bureaucracy which is merely out to do business, while at the head of the organisation there are Social Democrats of the ex-

trene Right wing, business men, bourgeois, and even — as in England — Conservatives.

The broad masses of co-operative members are indifferent and content themselves with a purely commercial participation in the co-operative movement, so that the opposition of class-conscious members has a hard fight to wage against the authorities. The more active the masses of members become, however, the more they take a personal interest in co-operative affairs, and the more a co-operative democracy takes the place of the dictatorship bureaucracy, the more success the proletarian opposition can record.

We Communists, as the vanguard of the proletarian opposition, are in a position to confront the treacherous capitalistic policy of the co-operatives, as practised to-day by the official leaders, with a lucid programme of proletarian co-operative policy. The events of each successive year confirm the correctness and popularity of our demands, which find the approbation of the masses in so far as the latter have begun to pay any personal attention to the question of the co-operatives.

Let us regard the events since the last International Co-operative Day in July 1926. At that time the Communist International had called upon the proletarian co-operative members of all lands to make the Co-operative Day into a demonstration of the fighting proletariat. To-day, a twelvemonth later, the planks in the Communist platform can be examined as to their pertinency.

We pointed out that in these times of economic trusts and cartels, the co-operatives could by virtue of their mere commercial activity contribute but little to an improvement in the standard of living of the working masses. To-day their traditional task of a fight for lower prices and a better standard of living can only be fulfilled if they wage struggle against rising prices, against the dictatorship of the trusts and cartels, and against the customs and taxation policy of the capitalist Governments in the sense of a proletarian class fight in unison with the trade unions and the other class organisations. The tasks of the present day demand of the co-operatives that they should place their entire organisatory and economic apparatus, their whole power as an organisation of the broad masses, the ideological influence of their press and their meetings completely at the disposal of the class of the proletariat.

The offensive prepared by the capitalists also affects the co-operatives. Unemployment, short-time work, and wage curtailment all impair consumptive forces. The great commercial concerns and cartels also dictate prices to the co-operatives. Heavy taxation hits both the consumers and the co-operatives. The exploitation of the masses by means of customs greatly oppresses the standard of living. Fascism also militates against the co-operatives. If it is to fight successfully against these forces, the co-operative system must not stand alone; it needs the fraternity of the trade unions and other proletarian organisations. On the other hand, the working class requires to have complete control of its economic organisation, of the co-operatives, if it is to succeed in its struggle. It is not the commercial side of the co-operatives that is essential to-day, but rather their political adaptability as an organisation of the masses. The co-operative system must therefore emerge from the isolation into which it has been driven by the stupid talk of "political neutrality", and become an important link in the class warfare, of the proletariat.

Co-operative solidarity in the workers' struggles was the second point we had emphasised. The complete breakdown of the co-operatives in the British General Strike and the lack of help on the part of the entire international co-operative movement in the British coal-mining struggle undoubtedly contributed to the failure of that heroic struggle. We then called upon international co-operative aid. The defeat of the British miners resulted in serious attacks of capital on the workers of other countries. The fight waged in the English strike was a fight in the vital interests of the workers of all the world. It was up to the co-operative movement to do its share in this struggle. We could not succeed in rousing the passive members of the co-operatives for the purpose of breaking the resistance of their reactionary co-operative bureaucracy. To-day we see that the central administration of the British co-operative association is forced itself to call upon the co-operatives to lend energetic ideological and material support in the fight against the reactionary trade union law. A proletarian solidarity of the

co-operatives in all the struggles of the workers remains an essential condition, which must be put through against the will of the co-operative authorities.

At the present moment all other questions are overshadowed by the sanguinary threat of a new imperialist war. In view of this great danger, all forces must be mobilised against the war, which is directed primarily against the emancipatory movements in the colonial countries and against the Soviet Union, the bulwark of the international proletariat. True, we hear both the co-operative leaders and especially the International of Co-operatives itself speaking of the "safeguarding of peace through the power of the co-operatives." But at the present juncture there is no greater danger than treacherous talk of pacifism. The co-operatives, indeed, betrayed the cause of the working class in the world war. Neither during the Ruhr troubles nor on the occasion of the intervention against the Soviet Union, neither in Morocco nor in Syria or Mexico, neither in the massacres instituted by the imperialists against the national attempts at emancipation in China nor even in connection with the destruction of co-operatives by the Fascists, has the great international co-operative movement proved a useful weapon against war. Its members allowed themselves to be lulled into inaction with empty protests and the sentimental talk of peace. In reality, they were acting in the service of the imperialists and the armed reactionaries.

The Communist International has called up the masses to fight against war and has at the same time shown them the only way leading to this end, viz., an inexorable fight and mobilisation against the system which produces wars and allows them to continue. "Any fight for peace which does not involve a revolutionary fight against the capitalist regime is nothing but a treacherous illusion and will but yield a sanguinary morrow. Close your ranks for a bitter and unscrupulous fight against the robbers who are arming for war; you will be victorious if you join in uniting all the oppressed against the oppressors." This is the revolutionary slogan with which to meet the growing threat of war: it is the slogan which we would carry into the co-operatives so as to overcome their fruitless pacifism. Join the masses, attend the great meetings of protest, help to organise gigantic demonstrations, support the protest strikes, and we are certain that an energetic struggle of the masses will force the capitalist offensive to subside.

Then and then only, after the class victory of the proletariat, will the co-operatives be able to help building up a socialist economy. The tremendous achievements of the co-operatives in the Soviet Union, now recording the balance of ten years' activity, point the way the co-operatives will have to go. It was only the dictatorship of the proletariat that made the construction of a socialist co-operative system possible. An official co-operative delegation from Czecho-Slovakia has just been visiting the Soviet Union. "The great dimensions and undreamt-of development of the co-operative movement and its administrative adaptability have surprised us and convinced us anew that it is only by the collaboration of the entire working class that it is possible to construct a new economic system on a new social basis" says an official declaration of this delegations, whose Social-Democrat chairman Jirasek (President of the Czech Co-operative Union) personally added that that was "the result of proletarian dictatorship." Again and again the shining example of the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union appears before the working masses of the whole world, calling upon them to follow the same path to freedom.

In view of the advance of reaction and of the growing menace of war, the International Co-operative Day must this year represent a public review of the militant class forces of the co-operative movement. Our guiding principles remain the same: May the co-operative movement become an instrument of the organised will of the proletarian masses! May the co-operatives unite with the trade unions in a united proletarian front against capitalism! Unite against the threat of war by organising a revolutionary struggle! Congratulations to the Soviet Union on the tenth anniversary of its victory, and an oath of solidarity with its victorious peasants and workers! May your mass organisations protect and promote a victorious revolution! Long live the proletarian co-operative movement, one of the most essential instruments in the class struggle of the proletariat!

## WORKERS' DELEGATIONS IN THE SOVIET UNION

### The Czechoslovakian Co-operative Delegation at Moscow.

On May 16th, 1927, the delegation of Czechoslovakian co-operatives arrived at Moscow for the purpose of studying the co-operative system of the Soviet Union. The delegation consists of 13 members of the Czech, and 2 members of the German, association; of the 13 Czech representatives 9 are Social Democrats and 4 Communists. Of the two German delegates, one is a Communist and one a Social Democrat. Among the Social Democratic delegates there are various well-known leaders, such as Vesely (member of the C. C. of the Czech Social Democratic Party), Jirasek (chairman of the Czechoslovakian Association of Co-operatives), Shkatula (editor of the central organ of the Czech association), and Breuner (head of the district association of Ostrava).

The delegation remained for a week at Moscow, where visits were paid to the various co-operative institutions. Besides this, the delegation held sessions together with the leading functionaries of the Centrosojus and the Moscow Co-operative Organisation, in which connection the status and character of the co-operative movement in the Soviet Union was explained to the visitors in detail. The delegates, and particularly the Social Democrats among them, were not only surprised at the gigantic dimensions of co-operative development, but also deeply impressed by the methodical and far-seeing tactics of the leading functionaries and by the unreserved candour with which still existing difficulties and deficiencies were shown them alongside prodigious achievements.

On May 24th, the delegation proceeded to Leningrad. Before their departure, the delegates published a declaration in the "Kooperativnaya Shisn", pointing out in particular that they had been supplied with "full and unreserved information":

"The powerful and unexpected development of the co-operative movement in the Soviet Union and its administrative precision have greatly impressed us, while its penetration of all sections of economic life have once more convinced us that it is only through the collaboration of the entire body of workers that the co-operative enterprises can succeed in building up a new economic system on a new social basis.

We are happy to recognise the intense and successful work which is being done in the interest of an economic and cultural progress of the working classes."

The declaration furthermore points out that for its undisturbed economic development the Soviet Union requires peace, and that the Czechoslovakian Co-operative Delegation will do its utmost to see that such peace is maintained. The declaration closes with a resolution in favour of the international solidarity of the proletariat.

While this declaration is couched in prudent diplomatic terms so as to avoid any open abandonment of the reformist standpoint, certain Social Democratic members of the delegation far exceeded its tenor on certain occasions. Thus the Social Democrat Strnad spoke as follows in an interview with the representatives of the trade co-operatives on May 21st:

"Your work is systematic. That is what we lack, Such system is the best guarantee of success. We admire your progress, which is a result of the proletarian revolution. We are convinced that you will also attain in economy what you have achieved in the direction of politics."

At a meeting of the Moscow Co-operative Archives on May 20th, the chairman of the delegation Jirasek made the following utterance:

"It has been convincingly proved to us how great the achievements of the workers of the Soviet Union as a result of proletarian dictatorship really are. In our country many derogatory reports are still spread with regard to the Soviet Union; these it will now be our endeavour to unmask and refute."

Before leaving for Leningrad, Jirasek was interviewed by a reporter of the "Kooperativnaya Shisn", to whom he remarked that not only the dimensions of the co-operative movement in the Soviet Union were astounding, but that he had also found many traits in the administrative and organisatory structure, especially as regards the educational work of the co-operative system, highly instructive. Far from being shown surface results, the Czechoslovakian delegation had found a surprising tendency towards candid self-criticism. He had particular praise for the systematic support afforded the co-operatives by the Soviet Government and for the mutual intimate hand-in-hand work of co-operatives and trade unions, in which regard there was still much to be desired in Czechoslovakia.

"All the delegates have gained the conviction that the wide development of the co-operative movement can only be attained under the present Socialist Government.

The broad basis on which the co-operatives of the Soviet Union are constructed, is the best means of maintaining the revolutionary achievements of Socialism in economy."

The delegates are likewise visiting Rostov, Kharkov, and other towns.

## OBITUARY

### Comrade Rafik Jabbour.

Comrade Rafik Jabbour died in Jaffa on June 6th, after an operation.

Born in Syria, Comrade Jabbour was a member of that group of Arabian intellectuals Egypt which, in 1920, founded the Socialist Party of Egypt, out of which the Communist Party of Egypt developed later. At the Conference of the latter, he was elected a member of the Central Committee and, in 1924 and 1925 he was editor of "El Hissab", the Communist organ in Cairo. He was arrested in 1925 and, after a long period of imprisonment under remand, he was sentenced to one year's imprisonment together with other members of the Central Committee and, having served his sentence, he was banished from Egypt to Syria, his native country. There he most zealously continued his activities in the service of the Communist Parties of Syria and Palestine.

His sufferings in prison and the constant persecution to which he was exposed, had indeed completely undermined Comrade Jabbour's health. Just at the time, when he had again received an order of expulsion from the British Government, the sudden illness to which Comrade Jabbour's weakened constitution could offer no resistance, facilitated the work of the British police...

Hundreds of Arabian and Jewish workers attended Jabbour's funeral. The severe loss which the Communist movement in the Arabian countries has suffered in the death of Comrade Jabbour is only second to that of Comrade Anton Maroun who was tortured to death in an Egyptian prison in 1925. The loss is all the more serious, because personalities of the importance and with the capability of Comrade Jabbour are extremely rare in the revolutionary movement of the Near East.

## TEN YEARS AGO

### The Government Decides on a Military Offensive.

Amsterdam, June 22nd. (W. T. B.) The Stockholm correspondent of the "Allgemeen Handelsblad" learns from a well-informed Russian source that, on June 21st, the Provisional Government and the Soviet of Worker' and Soldiers' Deputies decided to resume the offensive along the whole Russian front.

The Bolsheviki Proclaim a Mass Demonstration Against the Government.

St. Petersburg, June 21st. At the beginning of June, the war organisation of the Bolsheviki brought up before the Central demonstration of proletarians and soldiers. The Party leaders,

Committee of the party the question of the necessity of a great war organisation, shared the point of view of the war organisation. Preparations for the demonstration were begun; the date and the arrangements were fixed at a general meeting of proletarian organisations in which the war organisations took part. The demonstration was fixed for Sunday, June 23rd. In the course of three weeks, the members of the organisations were mobilised, a few hundred sailors from Kronstadt were summoned to St. Petersburg, and the regiments of the St. Petersburg garrison were united under the flag of the Party which preached the significance of propaganda.

**St. Petersburg, June 23rd.** (Report of the St. Petersburg Telegraph Agency). On June 21st a large meeting of Maximalist soldiers passed a resolution to the effect that a demonstration of the army against the Provisional Government be organised for June 23rd. On the following day the Maximalists posted the following proclamation in the streets (the Bolshevik proclamation is what is meant. — Editor):

"The capitalists who are continuing the war and who are constantly increasing the distress and the rise in prices, are conjuring up a counter-revolution. The Provisional Government openly supports the power of the imperialists and the bourgeoisie. Our patience is becoming exhausted. We must make known our wishes and complaints by a peaceful demonstration and therefore call upon the soldiers and workers to march through the streets with the slogan: 'Down with the Duma!' 'Down with the ten capitalist Ministers!' 'Down with anarchy!' 'Down with the war!' 'We want bread and peace!'"

In consequence of these proceedings, the Provisional Government, after an all-night sitting, had an urgent appeal to the population posted in the streets of the capital, early this morning, begging it to remain quiet and stating that any attempt at deeds of violence would be relentlessly suppressed.

The Congress of all the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets in the whole of Russia, the Executive Committee of the St. Petersburg Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet, the Executive Committee of the Peasant Congress and the executive committees of the Socialist and Labour parties, on their part, have posted a common appeal calling upon the soldiers and workers not to show themselves in the streets and to refrain from joining in any demonstration on June 23rd, 24th and 25th.

#### The St. Petersburg Soviet Prohibits the Demonstration.

**St. Petersburg, June 22nd.** In respect of the demonstration fixed by the Bolsheviks for to-morrow, the Executive Committee of the St. Petersburg Soviet has resolved:

- a) Permission to hold the demonstration will not be granted.
- b) This resolution shall be laid before the Soviet Congress.
- c) A commission consisting of seven members together with the presiding body of the Soviet Congress will work out a plan as to how the manifestation can be counteracted, and shall draw up an appeal to the population.

#### The Attitude Taken by the Bolsheviks.

**St. Petersburg, June 22nd.** The Central Committee of the Bolsheviks learnt in the evening that the C. C. of the St. Petersburg Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and the presiding body of the Soviet Congress had prohibited the demonstration planned for June 23rd.

At 9 p. m., a consultation took place between the Central Committee, the Government Committee and the military organisation, at which it was resolved to defend the right of any Opposition party to organise a peaceful demonstration. After a long discussion, it was further resolved to postpone the demonstration. The Executive Committee of the St. Petersburg Soviet was immediately informed of this resolution.

The members of the C. C. hurried to the printing works of the "Pravda", the proclamation of the demonstration was withdrawn and was replaced by the news of the postponement of the demonstration. The whole apparatus of organisation and agitation was put in motion in order to prevent the demonstration taking place. The sudden decision to call off the demonstration was largely used as food for agitation against the Bolsheviks. Among the masses, the calling off of the demonstration gave rise to great excitement and annoyance; many accused the Bolsheviks of want of resolution; but in all the regiments it was resolved to submit to the demands of the C. C., even though they did not agree with them, in order to show the enemy how firmly the revolutionary forces are organised. The

war organisation and the Party thus became convinced that they could absolutely rely on the masses of soldiers.

#### Victory of the Bolsheviks at the Conference of the Works' Committees.

**St. Petersburg, June 17th.** The final session of the Conference of the Works' Committees of St. Petersburg took place yesterday. The resolution advocated by the Bolsheviks was passed by 297 votes to 21, 44 abstaining from voting.

#### The Mutiny of the Sebastopol Garrison.

**St. Petersburg, June 19th.** Koltchak, the Commander of the Black Sea fleet, sent the Government reports of disturbances in the garrison. The soldiers have disarmed some of the officers and demand that Koltchak should retire from the command. Thereupon, the Provisional Government despatched the following telegram to Sebastopol:

"The Provisional Government demands: 1. That the Black Sea Fleet should immediately submit to the legal authority. 2. That Admiral Koltchak and Captain Smirnov come to St. Petersburg immediately in order to report in person. 3. That Admiral Lukin should provisionally take over the command of the Black Sea Fleet. 4. That Admiral Lukin should at once carry out the will of the Provisional Government by restoring order in the garrison."

**St. Petersburg, June 20th.** The St. Petersburg Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and the Black Sea delegation of the All-Russian Soviet Congress has received the following telegram from the Sebastopol Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet:

"The story of the mutiny in Sebastopol has been greatly exaggerated. The differences arose through the arrest of three officers. A meeting resolved to search all the officers. In order to avoid this, a delegation and the C. C. requested Koltchak to issue a regulation that all the officers should hand over their weapons. This was done. The search was thus avoided. In his report to the Government, Koltchak gave the affair political colouring, which was the cause of the disagreement with Koltchak. A meeting demanded Koltchak's arrest. The C. C. did not wish to bear the responsibility for this, and brought the question before the regimental committee. The latter expressed its disapproval of the proposal."

On the receipt of this telegram, the St. Petersburg Soviet asked Kerensky to take no steps until the incident had been investigated.

#### The Question of the Military Offensive at the Congress of the Works' Committees.

**St. Petersburg, June 17th.** The question of the offensive was dealt with to-day by the Conference of the Works' Committees of St. Petersburg.

Zeretelli, in his report on the activities of the Provisional Government, made the following statement with regard to this point:

"We give the Provisional Government and the War Minister only one authority, only one instruction: revolutionary democracy wishes that our army should be brought up to a standard of perfect readiness to fight, that our army should be able, if necessary, to take up the offensive. This is the only political guiding line we can lay down." With regard to the same point, Lenin said:

"The offensive means a turning point for the whole Russian revolution, not in the strategical sense of the offensive, but in the political and economic sense. The further development of the revolution alone can put an end to the war... The Soviets must seize the power; then the workers of the other countries will have confidence in us. And if circumstances should yet force us into a revolutionary war, we shall say: We are no pacifists... and we shall defend our revolutionary democracy against the capitalists of Germany, France etc."

**The Ukrainian Soviet against the Provisional Government.** Kiev, June 17th. At a private session, the Ukrainian Soviet framed the following resolution:

"After discussing the answer of the Provisional Government to the demands of the Ukrainian Soviet, the latter, con-

vinced that the recognition of the autonomy of the Ukraine is in the interest of the Ukrainian people, considers it necessary:

1. That it should call on the whole Ukrainian people with an appeal demanding that it should organise and should begin immediately to lay the foundations of the autonomous construction of the Ukraine.

2. That the Ukrainian Soviet should publish a manifesto addressed to the Ukrainian people, in which it throws light on the nature of the demands of Ukrainian democracy and on those tasks with which it is faced in respect of the creation of an autonomous Ukraine.

3. That the Ukrainian Soviet should undertake everything possible to convince the Provisional Government of the necessity of recognising the autonomy of the Ukraine. As this has not taken place, it regards it as its duty, in order to preserve the revolutionary achievements and to protect the country from anarchy, to place itself at the head of this movement, to organise it and to guide it."

## The Effect of the Russian Revolution Abroad.

The French Zimmerwalders opposed to war credits. —  
Granted by the Socialists.

Geneva, June 16th. Yesterday, the French Chamber passed the war credits for the months of July, August and September.

Before the voting took place, the Socialist Renaudel read a declaration of his Party in which the latter declared itself in favour of the well-known war aims of the Party and especially for a re-arrangement of the question of Alsace-Lorraine.

Deputy Roux-Costadeau gave his reasons for refusing the credits. Stormy scenes occurred in the house when he protested against the murderous offensive of the French army and demanded that the Allies should relieve the French at the front so that the country could have at its disposal the 500,000 men necessary for maintaining existence.

Only four deputies, the small group of the Zimmerwalders, voted against the credits. A few other socialists abstained from voting.

The Chamber then adjourned until next Tuesday.

The French Miners Opposed to Military Control.

Berne, June 21st. The "Progrès de Lyon" reports from Paris that the Extraordinary National Congress of the coal miners insisted upon its demands with regard to the suspension of military control and its replacement by a mixed control, the revocation of all the exceptional regulations in the individual mines, the introduction of three eight hour shifts and a 50% increase of wages in view of the rise in prices. In their resolution, the miners declare that the Government is alone responsible for the lack of fuel because of its failure to fulfil the miners' demands.

## Chronicle of Events.

June 17th.

Second day of the All-Russian Soviet Congress. The Bolsheviks, the Social Democrats united by the C. C., the Internationalists and the Left S. R. move that the Congress should deal, above all, with the question of the offensive. The Congress rejects the motion. Liber, who defends the policy of the Provisional Government in every respect, speaks on the next point on the agenda: The attitude towards the Provisional Government. Lenin expounds the nature of the Soviets which ought to take over the power. Other speakers were Kerensky, Lunacharsky and Skobeliev.

Great meeting in the interests of the Third International.

The Ukrainian Soviet passes a stiff resolution against the Provisional Government which refuses to recognise the independence of the Ukraine.

June 18th.

The Anarchists occupy the printing works of the "Russkaya Volya".

The All-Russian Soviet Congress continues the debate about the Provisional Government. Tchernov speaks against breaking with the bourgeoisie, against the whole power being seized by the Soviet. Martov says that the time has not yet come for the Soviets to take over the power but that the Soviets should exercise pressure on the Government to drive it forward. Dan and Skobeliev speak against taking over the power, Trotsky in favour of it.

Arrest of Comrade Kharitonov who is accused of having, by his passivity, prevented the authorities from interfering, when the Lichtenberg Palace was occupied by the anarchists.

June 19th.

Mutiny of the soldiers in the Black Sea Fleet.

At its final session, the extraordinary Party Conference of Finnish Social Democracy expresses itself in favour of the formation of a Third International.

Continuation of the discussion at the All-Russian Soviet Congress.

June 20th.

All-Russian Soviet Congress. Skobeliev speaks on the economic and financial policy of the Provisional Government.

Mutiny of the soldiers of the Sebastopol Garrison against Admiral Koltschak.

Comrade Khartinov who is under arrest, enters on a hunger-strike.

June 21st.

The Soviet Congress concerns itself with the re-occupation of the Durnovo Palace by the Anarchists.

June 22nd.

The soldiers of the Ismailovsky Regiment resolve to arrange a demonstration for June 23rd under Bolshevik slogans.

The Central Council of the Works Committees associated itself with the Bolshevik appeal for the demonstration on June 23rd.

The Executive Committee of the St. Petersburg Soviet prohibits the Bolshevik demonstration which has been summoned for June 23rd. The C. C. of the Bolsheviks, after long discussion, decides to postpone the demonstration.

Lenin's speech about the war at the All-Russian Soviet Congress. (The text of the speech will be published in the next number of the Inprecorr. Ed.)

June 23rd.

The Government instructs the Minister of Foreign Affairs to enter into negotiations with the English Ambassador with regard to further financial support of Russia by England.

Admiral Koltschak reports to the Government on the Sebastopol Mutiny. He declares that it is to be attributed to "the agitation of the German General Staff".

The Ukrainian Rada declares in a proclamation that, since the Provisional Government has not fulfilled the Ukrainian National demands, the Ukrainians will, from now onwards, take their fate into their own hands.

June 24th.

At the Conference of the Fractions' Executives of all the Parties which are taking part in the Soviet Congress, the attack of the Social Patriots and the Opportunists against the Bolsheviks is continued.

A mass meeting of women workers passes a Bolshevik resolution against the war and the increase of prices.

June 25th.

At the Soviet Congress Kalinin presents a report of the Commission for investigating the mandates. 1090 were present, 822 of whom had the right to vote. 777 delegates gave information as to the Parties to which they belong. The results were as follows: 285 Social Revolutionaries; 248 Mensheviks, 105 Bolsheviks, 32 Internationalists, 73 non-fractional Socialists etc.

The Soviet Congress rejects the Bolshevik resolution with regard to the war.

June 26th.

Comrade Kharitonov is released.