May 12th saw the coup of the British Government against the seal of the trade delegation of the Soviet Union in London, only a few weeks after the coup arranged by Chang Tso Liu against the Legation of the Soviet Union in Peking. On May 17th, Briand and Chamberlain had a long interview on the occasion of a trip made by the French President, M. Doumergue. Finally, on May 26th, the commercial relations and the diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union were broken off.

Now it is necessary that the French Government should also follow the lead given by the British Government. The political police in France was therefore instructed to find a pretext and to dress up a "plot", which should compromise at the Soviet Legation in Paris, the Communist Party of France, and the revolutionary trade unions.

The growing influence of the Communist Party of France naturally gave the Government ground for misgivings. The French Communist Party, at the head of the most enlightened majority of the workers and peasants in the country was supported by revolutionary trade unions, which numbered more than half a million workers.

At the same time when Chamberlain had got to work, the French Government sprang its own "mine" on April 9th and confronted the public opinion of France with the great action against the "espionage plot".

Was this supposed to be a purely political plot? Past experience had shown that there was nothing in that direction. The police实际行动 against the security of the State had failed to show the desired result, and therefore it was necessary to enter the realm of national defense and to choose an accusation more liable to excite public opinion. Therefore "espionage" was chosen.

But who could be accused of espionage? Surely, such as work in State enterprises or in the arsenals. There exists a revolutionary trade union of the employees of State enterprises. That was, therefore, the starting point of the accusation against Dada and Menétrier, two leaders of the said trade union.

The next thing was to find a means of implicating the Communist Party as well and compromising some, preferably prominent, members thereof. There exists one Cremet, a municipal councillor and member of the political bureau of the French Communist Party, frequently commissioned to travel to Moscow. Surely the most suitable person to "represent" the Communist Party in this case of espionage. Thus the connection between Paris and Moscow would appear undeniable.

But this is not all. For the purpose of attaining the object the French Government had in view, the rupture of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, the Soviet Legation must be involved. The police knew that one of the female employees of the Legation, a so-called "secretary", was a Russian citizen. That was, therefore, the starting point of the collaboration of the Legation with the French spies. And the result was the impeachment of Abraham Bernstein and also of Stepan Grodnicki, a Lithuanian student, who had had the misfortune to be observed in the Gaumont-Palace cinema in the company of Menétrier.

In going through the police records, it was discovered that there was a trade union review and that one of its collaborators, Pierre Provost, was an active member of a trade union. He had, moreover, been seen entering the secretariat of the Communist Party.

Now all the evidence was cut and dry: revolutionary trade unions, Communist Party, Soviet Legation, Moscow.

The espionage trial is a great political machine, directed, parallel with the action of the British Government, against the Soviet Union. It is intended to deal the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions a serious blow.

No fewer than seven comrades, all excellent fighters of the revolutionary French proletariat, are the victims of this struggle; they have been sent to prison for two, three and even five years, the victims of the Government, of the police, of their paid agents provocateurs, and of one or two unconscious fools who were induced by cowardice to place themselves in the service of the political police.

**Poincaré's Campaign against the Alsatian Autonomists.**

(From the "Humanité" of January 2nd, 1925.)

By Marcel Fourrier.

Poincaré has succeeded in finding his "consistency". True, his police agents had to go rather far afield to find it, all the way to Alsace-Lorraine. In these re-annexed provinces the most pronounced chauvinism is rampant. The average Frenchman, on whom Poincaré cleverly has his hand, will readily believe it if he is told that Germany is ready to "stir up" the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine against their French "fatherland".

Since the occupation of Alsace-Lorraine by France, the sentiments of the population have again gradually but completely turned against imperialist France, and the movement in favour of a complete independence of Alsace-Lorraine, in relation to both Germany and France, has grown prodigiously.

It is an out-and-out calumny to speak of the autonomist movement in Alsace-Lorraine as a separatist pro-German movement. The entire movement is nothing but the natural reaction of the population against the ultra-chauvinism of France.

Since the imperialist Government of France is convinced that the autonomist movement threatens to win the majority of the population it intends to destroy the most active organizations of the autonomists by forbidding their press and by other measures tantamount to the proclamation of a state of emergency.

Thus it is that a number of arrests have taken place and that the separatist movement is being regularly persecuted.

The nationalist press of France speaks of a fight organi- zation of the autonomists and of the preparation of a sanguinary conspiracy in Alsace-Lorraine. This accusation can be proved to be fully unfounded.

What are these so-called "shock troops"? Nothing but an institution to preserve law and order.

In the course of the summer of 1926, the Alsatian autonomists at Colmar were the object of frequent attacks when they desired to demonstrate against the Fascist organisations. So as not to be able to resist attacks of this kind, the authorities met to organise a body of men to keep order at their meetings. On the occasion of a recent raid, the police found a list of these organisations which the Alsatian petty-bourgeois circles had fondly called "shock troops". A number of names were arbitrarily called from the list, and the "consistency" was complete.

Among the twelve names selected on December 30th, there are eight that played no prominent part at all in the autonomist movement; they are all members of the Strasbourg petty-bourgeoisie, three of them being employees, and five artisans and small tradesmen. Two of the prisoners are journalists, connected with an autonomist paper now suppressed. The Abbé Fassion and his companion, finally played a rather important part in the autonomist movement. Dr. Roos, who could not yet be arrested, failed to gain any sympathies among the population.

The Government has thought fit to have all the autonomists arrested at Strasbourg transported to the prison of Mulhouse. Obviously violent demonstrations were apprehended. Shamefully enough, the prisoners were treated like common criminals and not like political suspects.

Barely eight years since the enthusiastically welcomed entrance of the French troops into Strasbourg, the arbitrary rule of French imperialism is creating an atmosphere of hatred for the trial of these Alsatians who desired to live independently and not as the slaves of the French imperialists.

**Egypt on the Eve of a New Crisis.**

By A....m.

The few weeks that have elapsed since the death of Zaghloul have witnessed a number of important changes in the inner-political structure of Egypt. In the first place there has been considerable change in the position of the King of Egypt, since the Wafd leaders have managed to get a closer touch with him. In the same measure in which the Wafd has acquired leading political positions in the country, there has been an increasing political degeneration among its leaders. Though even during the lifetime of Zaghloul the Wafd had undoubtedly the bulk of the population behind it, it was in itself partly of the
masses in the strict sense of the word. The heads of the Wafd and its party apparatus, representing the Egyptian bourgeoisie, feel fairly comfortable in their present positions; they therefore deviate more and more from the masses, and have arrived at a “modus vivendi” with the Royal court on the one hand and the British imperialists on the other.

Negotiations which are being carried on with Great Britain are intended to provide a more stable basis for this civil peace. They are anything but favourable to the Egyptian claims to independence or to the broad masses of the Egyptian people; indeed, so far as is known, the proposals which Chamberlain submitted to the Egyptian Prime Minister Sarvat Pasha exclude the Liberal-constitutional Party is in itself very weak and the continuation of the undisputed rule of Great Britain in the Sudan is confirmed, to the greatest disadvantage of Egypt. The British troops are possibly to be evacuated from the interior of Egypt, but are to be placed in strategic positions, presumably close to the Suez Canal. A treaty of alliance is to be concluded between Egypt and Great Britain, which the latter will be able to cancel quite easily and the former not at all.

The British, however, know very well, why they can now confront the Egyptian Government with such presumptuous demands, which still fall short of the suggestions made three years ago and even, in many respects, of the recently concluded agreement with the Government of France. By a cleverly managed manoeuvring among the various Egyptian parties, each of which would be glad to undertake the execution of the agreement. In the first place this naturally applies to the Itehadists, the party in closest touch with the Court, but it is also true of the Liberal-constitutionalists, represented by the present Prime Minister, Sarvat Pasha, and, last not least, of the Wafd itself. The longer the “bidding” for the agreement with the British Government lasts, the more favourable situation will be for the British policy.

Before all, the British policy can reckon on the increasing friction within the coalition formed by the Liberals and the Wafd. The Liberal-constitutionalists, who have taken part in it and only undertaken the lead in the Government because it acts as intermediary between the Wafd and Great Britain, has, however, the Wafd succeeds (as its leaders and in particular its new President, Mustapha Nenas, aim to do) in arriving, in parallel with the official negotiations, at an understanding with the King and also with the British Resident, the Liberal-constitutionalists can be eliminated and the Wafd will assume power alone.

To anticipate this elimination, Sarvat Pasha is endeavouring to accelerate the outbreak of differences between his own party and the Wafd. If he succeeds in this purpose, he will be safe. If not, the Wafd would again be obliged to accept the conditions of coalition, by which he would take care to safeguard his own interests more than hitherto. The pressure on the part of Great Britain at the negotiations, the efforts of the Wafd to seize the authority, and the counter-manoeuvres of Sarvat Pasha, are the main reasons of the Cabinet crisis at present threatening Egypt.

Both the Liberal-constitutionalists and the Wafd leaders, however, are hampered in the liberty of their movements by a considerable pressure from below. Thus just at the moment when the Liberals began to oppose the Wafd, Mohammed Pasha Mahmoud, a representative of the Liberal-constitutional Party in the Chamber, published a declaration of solidarity with the Wafd in the press of that party, which is looked upon as a signal for the formation of a Left wing among the Liberal-constitutionalists.

A yet more serious matter is the crisis within the Wafd. Here the more radically inclined members (who are among those who occupy good positions in the service of the party) are wholly dissatisfied with the compromising policy of their leaders, and in the students’ clubs the prospects of a split are openly discussed. The radical wing is beginning to rally round the National (Vatania) Party, which, despite of a weakness of numbers, is far away in opposition to the agreement, to say nothing of an agreement with Britain. In the Wafd, too, there are vacillations as regards orientation, towards the “intellectuals” or the peasants and workers but in most questions the radical tendency has the upper hand.

In general the internal changes in the grouping of the parties ensue rapidly enough, and the apparent “peace” and “harmony” of the Coalition in Egypt are likely to be of short duration.

---

AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

Left British Social Democrats as Defenders of Imperialism.

By M. N. Roy (Moscow).

In the December 30 issue, of “The New Leader” Mr. Brailsford makes a review of the past “Year of Perils and Escapes”. Of course he could not do it without touching the Chinese question. After a very curious and remarkably detached review of the happenings in China, he gets terrified by the problem and continues with the following: “The question which may involve India”. The “escape” from this “peril” he finds in “a rare degree of liberal foresight”! So, out of the capitalist ruins and danger of imperialism war the world can only be saved not by Socialism, but by liberalism. This is the remedy prescribed by the “left wing” of the political Labour movement.

How does Mr. Brailsford, who calls himself a Socialist and passes as a “left winger”, arrive at such a flagrantly unsocialist, nay anti-socialist, conclusion? He is driven to this conclusion by the fear of Socialism: by the fear that the oppressed peoples of the East will be completely convinced that their only friend is the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. Mr. Brailsford involves the Chinese in this anti-imperialist line only in order to “catch the sun in India alike which will assure their awakening masses that there is hope for them in quarters other than Russia, and in measures less violent than revolutionary”.

The world is unavoidably heading towards Socialism and the road leads through revolution. This is the consequence of capitalism. But the socialists, Mr. Brailsford represents, see the inevitable logic of events and becomes a wise counsellor of imperialism in distress. The world is in revolt against capitalism. The Russian Revolution as well as the anti-imperialist movement in the colonies are the expressions of this revolt. The place where the revolt has been successful naturally becomes the standard to which the eyes of all rebels turn. Mr. Brailsford advises the imperialist rulers to adopt a liberal policy in order to break this revolutionary unity brought about by community of interests.

“The hope of the awakening masses” of India and China, indeed of all the subject countries is to be free from imperialist domination as a step towards the liberation from capitalist exploitation. But the “hope of the awakening masses” can be realised without breaking the bonds of imperialism? Does he maintain that even the elementary conditions for the realisation of this hope can be created under the benign protection of imperialism? No policy of imperialism, however liberalised, can allow the realisation of this hope. Imperialism and the aspirations of the peoples it oppresses are irreconcilably antagonistic. Obviously Mr. Brailsford has a different notion as regards what he calls the hope of the colonial oppressed masses. He did not say what is it. But judging from the trend of his arguments one could gather that in his opinion the hope of the colonial peoples is not, rather should not, be national and social freedom. In that case they could secure the patronage of the liberal apologists of imperialism. But even this is not possible, as has been proved by the recent refusal of the British labour leaders to support even the very modest hope of the Indian nationalist bourgeoisie. This Mr. Brailsford himself admits when he deprecates that: “the decision over the Indian Commission does not encourage optimism”. So it has become clear that no other than that of revolutionary Socialism can help the oppressed peoples realise their hopes. Nevertheless, Mr. Brailsford’s faith in liberalism is pathetically incorrigible. If it were only Mr. Brailsford’s inability to grasp the situation, he could be left alone in his faith in liberalism and pacifism. But the case, is more serious. He is worried about the perils of pacifism and liberal imperialism and is anxious to show it a way out. The “escape” he suggests is simply to demand social democracy and thereby to weaken the revolution. Nevertheless, it is significant that he is so concerned about the future of imperialism. Imperialism would not accept the advice of its Social Democratic apologists. It refuses to follow any other policy in the colonies than that of the iron hand. In this situation Social Democratic Imperialism stands completely exposed in its native character: it supports unconditionally imperialist absolutism in the colonies. Mr. Brailsford’s party has