Class Forces in Mexico.

By Janet Cork.

In the last ten years there has arisen in Mexico a loosely organised working class, but this working class is divided. On the one hand the **Mexican Federation of Labour (CROM)** led by **Morones** and his satellites, on the other a number of independent unions.

The **CROM** is a class collaboration organisation par excellence. Not only does it make alliances with its own bourgeoisie but also with **American** finance capital. Morones has repeatedly refused to organise the workers employed by American interests. Therefore most of the oil workers, a majority of the textile workers, all the miners, and the railway confederation belong to independent unions. In the recent struggle of the **Jalisco** miners the **CROM** made an alliance with the **Catholic** unions to break the strike of the independent miners. **"El Machete"**, the organ of the **Mexican Communist Party**, published a series of sensational documents exposing the relations between the **CROM** and the Catholic rebels in Jalisco and proving that the **CROM** had furnished arms to the Catholics against the miners.

Opposed to the ideology of the **CROM** leadership are the **independent unions** of Railway Workers, Oil Workers, Textile Workers and Miners. These base themselves on the class struggle. They have had a difficult uphill fight against foreign interests in Mexico. Everytime they declared a strike President **Calles** would use Morones to break it.

On the Agrarian field. — The last eighteen years of revolution and suffering have produced a partially armed **peasantry**. For a long time they were militant in a sort of hit-and-miss way. During the last five years, however, over a million have been organised into the **National Peasants League**, under the direction of Communists and affiliated with the **Peasants International**. This makes them a powerful force in Mexican politics and considerably lessens the importance of the army and reduces its capacity for irresponsible mischief.

The Agrarian field, however, is also divided. There is a **National Agrarista Party**, a political organisation, under the direction of **Soto y Gama**, which although it really represents the well-to-do farmers — nonetheless — in its programme and official statements uses revolutionary phraseology to confuse the peasants and divide them, and by this means it has acquired a peasant following controlled by the well-to-do farmers. This party stands against the programme of land distribution to the peasants.

In close relation to the above economic groups stand the **foreign interests.** They often provoke the militant workers and peasants to strike or fight. This is where the yellow labour and peasant leaders come in. A Mexican president, if he is to remain president, must know how to jockey between the demands of the militant workers and peasants on one hand and the ruthless pressure of foreign capital on the other. The president alone is incapable of such a fete. So he constructs a cabinet to assist him. In his cabinet he must have someone — identified with labour — who can keep labour docile — someone who can put the breaks on the militants. That is why Calles chose Luis Morones as his minister of Commerce and Labour. Morones has acquitted himself with honours as strikebreaker and traitor to his own class.

As for the peasantry, the presence of **Adelberto Tejeda** in the Calles cabinet was a sort of sop to the poor peasants. In case of militancy Calles could count on him "to attempt to keep them in check".

After the assassination of **Obregon**, Calles had to reconstruct his Cabinet. Why has he protected the labour leaders? The foregoing facts answer the question. He still needs Morones, he still finds him essential to the development and consolidation of the national bourgeoisie and to help keep the peace with foreign interests. And although Calles accepted Morones' resignation, it is an open secret that the Labour Department of the Government, Munitions and Printing are still run by labour men under the guidance of Morones and his friends.

There are some who contend that American imperialism is trying to build a **coalition between the petty bourgeoisie, the Catholic Church and the remnants of feudalism** in Mexico. There are others who maintain that the remnants of feudalism are so small and politically so unimportant that they are not worth wooing, that representatives of the Church would be the upsetting element in the government, for the workers and peasants could less easily be fooled then; that such a coalition would be extremely unstable and incapable of insuring peace. And since "peace" permits of more intensive exploitation and greater profits, it seems logical for foreign interests to maintain the **present** combination — a **petty-bourgeois "labour", "agrarian" coalition.**

Statements that **Morrow** has supported Calles in his defense of Morones against the extreme right of the Obregon group bear out this contention. The present reconstruction of the Calles cabinet along these same lines, further strengthens this view.

AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

British War Policy in Arabia.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The breaking off of the conference between **Ibn Saud** and the British representative, **Sir Gilbert Clayton**, makes the situation in **North Arabia** extremely serious. It is only a few months since British aeroplanes and military forces, in violation of the frontiers agreed upon between Great Britain and Ibn Saud, decimated the Wahabite tribes and bombarded women and children. At that time the whole European press published a report intended as exculpation for these shameful actions, to the effect that Ibn Saud had proclaimed a "holy war", and it was Great Britain's duty to protect the civilisation thereby threatened. Shortly afterwards British negotiators journeyed to **Dscheddah**, to ascertain whether Ibn Saud had been rendered sufficiently pliable to the British demands.

In May negotiations were broken off before any result had been arrieved at. Meanwhile — contrary to British expectations — Ibn Saud's position had rather improved than otherwise. The hopes of the British, that Ibn Saud would become entangled in a war with his mighty neighbour in the South, **Imam Jihje of Yemen**, were not fulfilled. At the same time the hostility of this same Imam against the British increased to a point culminating in open war between **Great Britain** and **Yemen.**

Once more — this time in **South** Arabia — British air squadrons had the opportunity of proving their valour against the defenceless women and children of the Yemenite Arabians; once more highly satisfactory reports on these successful fights pervaded the European press; and once more the threadbare pretext of the necessity of protecting civilisation (symbolised this time in the British protectorate on the Gulf of Aden) against savagery has been employed in justification of this war sport. In reply to a question put in the British parliament, whether no other means could be found for settling matters in South Arabia except bombs and war aeroplanes, the minister answered with a chuckle that: "This was the best argument under the given circumstances", a retort which aroused much amusement in the Conservative benches.

It was now Britain's concern to create these same "given circumstances" in **North Arabia** as well. Numerous plans of the British capitalists cannot be realised unless the obstinate Ibn Saud submits to British wishes with respect to the oasis of **El Dschof**, the British frontier security to the north of his territory. So long as the Wahabite tribes can move freely and unpunished as far as the **Syrian** frontier, there is not sufficient substantiation for the arguments of the British shareholders in favour of conducting the **Mosul** petroleum through British mandatory territory to the port of **Haifa**, and the arguments put forward by the imperialists of France and the United States, proposing the laying of the pipeline over **French** mandatory territory to the port of **Alexandrette**, are more plausible.