The “Pravda“ on the Edinburgh Trades Union Congress.

Moscow, 7th September, 1927.

The “Pravda“ points out that even before its opening, the congress of the British Trade Unions in Edinburgh justified the expectations of Baldwin. The first day of the Congress showed that despite the disagreement of the working masses, the Congress did not intend to go beyond the bounds laid down by Baldwin. The speech of Hicks was that of a strike-breaker from beginning to end.

The “Pravda“ points out two factors, first that compared with the time of the congress at Bournemouth, the membership of the unions has sunk by 20,000. This is the first result of the new Trades Union Bill and the strike-breaking activities of the General Council, and secondly, that this blackleg spirit of the Congress leaders does not represent the spirit of the masses. The blacklegs have settled down in the leading circles of the British trades union movement for good, as was shown by the first day of the congress. Whilst the masses are becoming more and more discontent and angry and are seeking a way to save from the jaws of unionism, the trades union leaders have already found this way out to the Right. The circle is closed. The General Council is Americanising itself, and in these circumstances it would not be at all surprising if the Congress decides to break with the labour unions of the U.S.R. In order to please the British bourgeoisie.

Hicks who made a terrible left-wing speech in Moscow has now shown the working class of Great Britain and of the whole world his foul face. One must give the reformist leaders of the German trade union movement their due; they were right when they supposed Hicks would make a worthy chairman for the Amsterdam International. There is ground for the assumption that he will show himself to be just such another goad for nothing as the former chairman of the Amsterdam International, Thomas. Hicks has not yet said the last word, but the British working class has also not yet said its last word.

CHINA

On the Eve of Chiang Kai-Shek’s Return.

By M. N. Roy.

Moscow, 3rd September, 1927.

To save one's face is a very important consideration in the political life of China. Chiang Kai-Shek's dramatic resignation just at the moment, when the Wuhan “left“ capitulated before Nanking perhaps the world. There was doubt as regards who won. Chiang Kai-Shek's resignation was interpreted by many as indicating the victory of Wuhan over Nanking — not vice versa, as was really the case. As a matter of fact, Chiang Kai-Shek's resignation was a carefully calculated act to make it easier for Wuhan to capitulate — to make it possible for Wang Chin-Wei to betray the revolution without losing face before his followers.

The reconciliation between the two factions of the Kuomintang signifies more than the formation of a feudal-bourgeois bloc against the workers and peasants. It also signifies the bankruptcy of the petty bourgeois democratic radicalism represented by the “left“ Kuomintang led by Wang Chin-Wei. The essentially reactionary nature of petty bourgeois radicalism was exposed by the radical wing of the revolution. As soon as the class struggle became fierce, the “left“ leaders hastened to join hands with the feudal-bourgeoisie in the struggle against the revolutionary masses. The right reactionaries would welcome the left leaders, particularly Wang Chin-Wei, in order to swell their ranks by so many individuals, but to win over the entire upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie to the side of counter-revolution. Wang Chin-Wei would be a valuable asset to counter-revolution only if he could bring with him a considerable section of his petty bourgeoisie following. Should it be necessary for him to go to Nanking as the vanquished, then Wang Chin-Wei could not be expected to do that. In that case the petty bourgeois masses would desert him as the traitor that he is.

For the petty bourgeois “left“ politicians the vital class-issues involved in the Nanchang split were of no importance. The political significance of this split was explained to the petty bourgeois masses. To them it was more a question of party democracy and personality. Therefore, Wang Chin-Wei could not lead his bloc out of the bankruptcy of Wuhan “leftism“ to be the camp followers of the feudal-bourgeois bloc, should this insist on having the hated Chiang Kai-Shek as its head. Chiang Kai-Shek had his own reserves, services to the counter-revolution, for the further strengthening of which the services of Wang Chin-Wei is now necessary. The doors of the temple of counter-revolution should be so thrown open to him that he could enter without losing face. As an act of staunch loyalty to counter-revolution Chiang Kai-Shek resigned.

The comic character of this resignation was evident from the very beginning. Immediately after his resignation there began the obviously inspired movement demanding his return. When Wang Chin-Wei went abroad to make room for Chiang Kai-Shek, the petty bourgeois left clamoured for his return. The reason of the Kuomintang for this return to the head of the nationalist army is demanded by the bourgeois right. The services of both are needed for the counter-revolutionary bloc from the feudal militarists to the petty bourgeois democrats. Chiang resigned only to return as a sacrifice to the capitalist needs of the bourgeoisie.

According to the latest news, Tan Yen-Kai and Sun Fo, two outstanding leaders of the ex-left Wuhan group, have gone to Nampo, where Chiang Kai-Shek is resting from his counter-revolutionary activities, to persuade him to resume the command of the united nationalist armies. It is very significant that Tan Yen-Kai and Sun Fo are chosen to carry the olive branch. In spite of their compromising association with the Wuhan “left“, these two are the typical representatives of the classes that supported Chiang Kai-Shek and in whose interests he split the Kuomintang. Tan Yen-Kai is a feudal militarist of the classical type. He had been a Tapan for 15 years. He consciously represents the landlords and gentry. While, in June last, the agrarian question was sitting on the troubled breast of the Wuhan “left“ as a dreadful nightmare, Tan Yen-Kai declared in a meeting of the Kuomintang Political Council: “I am prepared to give away my lands, but I cannot betray my own class“. Sun Fo represents the com- munist bourgeoisie of Kweilin. The mayor of Canton he bought up a number of large cinema theatres and several thousand mos of homestead land in the suburbs. Previously he belonged to the extreme right of the Kuomintang. He politically fought his father Sun Yat-Sen when the latter was alive.

These two and more were inside the Wuhan group as agents of the feudal-bourgeois right wing after it had split the nationalist front and turned against revolution. The existence of such elements prevented the development of the Wuhan government in the direction of democratic dictatorship. The petty bourgeois left did not carry on a struggle to drive these elements away, thus completing the split of the Kuomintang along the ever-sharpening line of class differentiation. Finally, the petty bourgeois democrats headed by Wang Chip-Wei capitulated before the agents of the feudal-bourgeois right wing, and the way to reconciliation between Wuhan and Nanking was clear.

Now Tan Yen-Kai and Sun Fo go to Chiang Kai-Shek to say: look, comrade, how successfully we have accomplished our mission. We have persuaded the Wuhan left from within, though you could not do that from without; we have prevented the petty bourgeoisie from travelling on the road to revolution with the proletariat; and we have won Wang Chin-Wei for the counter-revolution. When invited by two such illustrious representatives of the Chiang Kai-Shek clique, who have so successfully combated the growth of a revolutionary left Kuomintang, Chiang Kai-Shek will certainly return to his post and grasp the hand of his ex-enemy Wang Chin-Wei, nearly as soiled as his own with the blood of the working class.

*) Tapan — military governor of a province.
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To save one’s face is a very important consideration in the political life of China. Chiang Kai-Shek’s dramatic resignation just at the moment, when the Wuhan “left” capitulated before Nanking pleased the world. There was doubt as regards who would succeed Chiang Kai-Shek. His resignation was interpreted by many as indicating the victory of Wuhan over Nanking — not vice versa, as was really the case. As a matter of fact, Chiang Kai-Shek’s resignation was a carefully calculated act to make it easier for Wuhan to capitulate — to make it possible for Wang Chi-Wei to betray the revolution without losing face before his followers.
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According to the latest news, Tan Yen-Kai and Sun Fo, two outstanding leaders of the ex-left Wuhan group, have gone to Nampo, where Chiang Kai-Shek is resting from his counter-revolutionary activities, to persuade him to resume the command of the united nationalist armies. It is very significant that Tan Yen-Kai and Sun Fo are chosen to carry the olive branch. In the midst of their compromising association with the Wuhan “left”, these two are the typical representatives of the classes that supported Chiang Kai-Shek and in whose interests he split the Kuomintang. Tan Yen-Kai is a feudal militarist of the classical type. He had been a Tapani) for 15 years. He consciously represents the landlords and gentry. While, in June last, the agrarian question was sitting on the troubled breast of the Wuhan “left” as a dreadful nightmare, Tan Yen-Kai declared in a meeting of the Kuomintang Political Council: “I am prepared to give away my lands, but I cannot betray my own class”. Sun Fo represents the petty bourgeois interests. Mayor of Canton he bought up a number of large cinema theatres and several thousand mos of homestead land in the suburbs. Previously he belonged to the extreme right of the Kuomintang. He politically fought his father Sun Yat-Sen when the latter was alive.

These two and more were inside the Wuhan group as agents of the feudal-bourgeois right wing after it had split the nationalist front and turned against revolution. The existence of such elements prevented the development of the Wuhan government in the direction of democratic dictatorship. The petty bourgeois left did not carry on a struggle to drive these elements away, thus completing the split of the Kuomintang along the ever-sharpening line of class differentiation. Finally, the petty bourgeois democrats headed by Wang Chi-Wei capitulated before the agents of the feudal-bourgeois right wing, and the way to reconciliation between Wuhan and Nanking was clear.

Now Tan Yen-Kai and Sun Fo go to Chiang Kai-Shek to say: look, comrade, how successfully we have accomplished our tasks. We have retrieved the Wuhan left from within, though you could not do that from without; we have prevented the petty bourgeoisie from travelling on the road to revolution with the proletariat; and we have won Wang Chin-Wei for the counter-revolution. When invited by two such illustrious representatives of the Chiang Kai-Shek clique, the petty bourgeois democrats have so successfully combated the growth of a revolutionary faction in the Kuomintang, Chiang Kai-Shek will certainly return to his post and grasp the hand of his ex-enemy Wang Chin-Wei, nearly as soiled as his own with the blood of the working class.
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The bourgeoisie, however, is playing the game too cleverly. All these stage-managements will only defeat their own end. Wang Ch'in-Wei and Li-Feng are only the face of the nationalist petty bourgeoisie. He had a big influence upon the masses. The decade of the most faithful follower of Sun Yat-Sen frees the masses from the lingering influence of petty bourgeoisie radicalism. It frees the Chinese revolution from the fetters of the fetters of the “three peoples, five principles”. Counter-revolution, led jointly by Wang Ch'in-Wei and Chiang Kai-Shek, will only quicken the development of the revolution.

HANDS OFF THE SOVIET UNION

Chamberlain's Spies in the Soviet Union.
By L. Nikolayev (Moscow).

On the 3rd September there commenced before the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of Justice of the Soviet Union the trial of a band of English spies and their Russian co-conspirators. We publish below a brief summary of the activity of these emmissaries of Sir Austen Chamberlain, which throws a vivid light on the preparations for war being made by the English conservatives, Ed.

While Chamberlain and Baldwin are assuring "public opinion" that they do not think of provoking a war against the Soviet Union and that "the danger of war exists only in the imagination of the Bolsheviks", a large body of spies is engaged in the Soviet Union in collecting information as to the condition of the Red Army and Air Fleet, the armament factories etc.

One of the organisers of British espionage in the Soviet Union was Captain Boyle, a prominent representative of the British Intelligence Service in London. Captain Boyle has a long period of service behind him. In view of his past services he was entrusted by the British Intelligence Service in the year 1919 with the important commission of reorganising the English spy service in the Scandinavian and Baltic countries.

The idea of this "reorganising" consisted of course in extending and systematising the activity of British spies on the territory of the Soviet Union. The best indication of the principle underlying the commission given to Captain Boyle is to be found in the choice of the leading persons in the various spy centres. As the representative of English espionage in Helsinki, in charge of the "Boyce" espionage group, was the former Russian Hussar officer, Colonel Sumsky. As head of the group of English spies in Turku (Finland), there was likewise appointed a Russian white officer named P. P. Sokolov, who had fled to Finland after having taken part in a counter-revolutionary conspiracy at the end of 1918.

Finally, it was not a mere chance that Boyle selected for the purpose of carrying out special commissions the former Tsarist spy, Ivanovich Goyer, who in 1916 was a secret collaborator with the Russian naval attaché in Copenhagen. During the English intervention in the north of Soviet Russia Goyer also worked in the English spy service in Murmansk and Archangel; and when the English were compelled to leave Bolshevik north Russia Goyer wandered in disguise as a spy of the English in Norway, Sweden and Finland. After a few years interruption in his connection with the espionage service, Goyer met his old friend Captain Boyle at the beginning of 1924 in Reval and accepted the latter's proposal to take up espionage work in the Soviet Union. Boyle brought Goyer into contact with the representative of the British military mission at Reval, from whom Goyer received immediate direct instructions as to espionage work.

The information that Goyer had to obtain in the Soviet Union was of a very definite nature: What results were yielded by the experiments with gas clouds in our manoeuvres? In what condition is the hydroplane service and the air service generally in the Soviet Union? These are the chief instructions that the agent of the English Secret Service received from the English Military Mission. Goyer was given these instructions in the house of Captain Boyle in Reval. It was here that the cipher to be employed in the correspondence was agreed upon, as well as the technical regarding the sending of letters, the use of pass-words etc.

This technique is of special interest to us as showing the role played by Finland in the English spy service in the Soviet Union. Captain Boyle came to an arrangement with his chief agent according to which the letters should be sent from Leningrad to other towns through the mediation of the Finnish Commercial Refrigeration, which also handled the two envelopes. On the outer envelope of this "diplomatic post" there should appear a perfectly harmless and unsuspicuous address: "Finnish Foreign Ministry, To the Finnish Ambassador, Dr. Holsti, Reval.

On the inside envelope there was written another address: "To Ernest T. Boyce,

It was the task of the Finnish Consul not only to act as mediator in the "diplomatic correspondence" between the English spy Goyer and the English Secret Service official Boyle, but also to use his influence to obtain the release of the spy if he should be arrested in the Soviet Union.

Provided with all the necessary documents, Albert Goyer went on 11th March, 1925 to Moscow, from whence he moved to Leningrad and there obtained a position in the merchant fleet. Goyer, as arranged, immediately informed his successor through the Finnish General Consul in Leningrad.

In September, 1925 there called at the Goyer's residence an envoy from Captain Boyle. The envoy gave the pass-word agreed upon and handed over to Goyer a packet of letters with the necessary accessories. From this time there develops between Goyer and Boyle a "diplomatic correspondence". Goyer reports in his letters chiefly on the state of the Red Fleet and the naval harbours of the Soviet Union.

Already in February 1926 Goyer's activity appeared suspicious to the organs of the G. P. U. He was arrested on suspicion of having sold the model of a submarine to the English Consul in Leningrad, Preston, but was released owing to lack of evidence. This little "unpleasantness" induced Goyer to move from Leningrad to Odessa. On the way he enlisted in Moscow the services of a certain Vladimir Valitzky, through whom from now onwards he receives the letters from Captain Boyle etc.

Goyer and his assistant Valitzky are not the only agents of Captain Boyle in the Soviet Union. The representative of the English spy service in Turkiot, Sokolov, since 1920, crosses the Soviet frontiers with the active assistance of the Finnish espionage service and eagerly collects the material and information of interest to England.

A particularly active role among the spies of the Sokolov group was played by Anton Chlopukhin, who fled from Leningrad to Finland in 1921. This Chlopukhin, thanks to his extensive circle of acquaintances among the commanders of the army and the fleet, as well as among the employees in various undertakings and also by means of his relatives in Leningrad, succeeded in creating a highly developed system of espionage. He had a whole number of houses at his disposal for the purpose of maintaining connections.

At the beginning of July last the activity of the whole band of spies was completely discovered by the organs of the G. P. U. On the arrest of Valitzky and Goyer letters were found written with a special chemical ink. Anything written with this ink remained absolutely indelible even after a period of time in a tincture consisting of a special chemical composition. These letters show beyond all doubt what Captain Boyle and the other English spies were specially interested in and what kind of work their agents have carried out in the Soviet Union. In the letter of 13th July continual reference is made to our submarines, our cruisers, the repair of our ships; they contain instructions to ascertain the names of the existing light cruisers and those in course of construction etc. etc. At the same time the letters from the English agents continually insist that information must be "thoroughly reliable" and obtained from "documentary sources". The representatives of the English secret service imperatively demand that their functionaries in the territory of the Soviet Union shall establish connection as soon as possible with the "airship factories", with "bodies of troops", with units of the active fleet". The representatives of the English spy service are not modest in their demands. One of the letters states: "so long as you have not collected