number and small in size) gave all the assistance they could to the striking workers.

Similarly in the great lock-out of metal workers in the Ruhr in the same period, the social-democratic co-operative leaders declared their neutrality in the dispute. Under pressure from their members, some very small help was given in principle (e.g., in the form of credit to strikers, on the same terms and after, the private tradesmen and guildsmen, but this was confined to their own members, and was expressly proclaimed as not as an act of charity, not as a measure of class solidarity. On the contrary, a revolutionary co-operative in Merseburg (Saxony), which, in defiance of the prohibition of the Prussian government, for the movement organised demonstrations of support for the local government and the granting of money for their benefit, to the Workers' International Relief, was expelled by the District Co-operative Conference of Central Germany.

The English co-operative (all of which are under reformist control) have a somewhat better record to show, in so far as rank and file pressure has sometimes compelled a measure of practical aid to workers engaged in struggles, chiefly to the miners: nevertheless to a far from satisfactory extent. In 1921, 302 co-operatives gave grants to the striking miners to the amount of £2,000; and credits to the extent of £600,000. In the coal mining districts, co-operatives made gifts to the miners of money, food, etc., many in mining areas gave gifts; in South Wales kitchens were opened to feed the workers and their families. The Co-operative Wholesale Society (the business centre of the movement) however, gave nothing at all; and the Co-operative Union (the social centre) made no protest against the action of the rank and file delegates at its congress voted £1,000, a sum only equal to that given by one large society in London.

In the recent March of Unemployed from all parts of England to London, a number of individual co-operatives along the route gave food and shelter to the marchers; and in other cases (in Czechoslovakia this year, aid again came solely from the co-operatives under revolutionary leadership, which made gifts directly to the strike committees.

This anti-working-class rôle of the co-operative bureaucracy in the class-struggle within each capitalist country is coming more and more to be recognized as the characteristic feature of the co-operative movement. This, thanks to the sharpening of that struggle itself, which leaves ever less possibility for the mis-leaders to play a double rôle. What is not so easy to perceive, is the fact that each group is assisting its “own” bourgeoisie to prepare for war. Yet, apart from the fact that the sabotage of economic struggles in itself strengthens the forces of the bourgeoisie and enables it to forward with greater freedom with its war-measures (and greater ease) there is an ever-closer liaison between the co-operative leaders and the organisations and institutions of the ruling class, an ever-closer identification of the co-operative and social democratic bureaucracy, an ever-growing similarity between the policies of all three.

Professor Emile Pouge, appointed to the post of First Lord of the Admiralty in a Labour-Imperialist cabinet! In less noticeable ways influential co-operative officials are drawn into various advisory bodies of the capitalist states, with the object of using them as vehicles for imperialist policy in the co-operative movement. Thus we see the co-operatives of Belgium and England with the colonial policy of their respective bourgeoisie by exploiting the coloured peoples in the tropical countries on their plantations (for tea, fruit, cotton, etc); and in the case of England appeals for closer unity with the co-operatives of Australia etc., not for purposes of common action against the imperialist workers, but for the purpose of collaboration against the workers of the British Empire. In such manner do they introduce and foster the ideas of imperialism among the workers, and facilitate the preparations of the war-makers. From this there is only a small step to a determined endeavour to place the entire co-operative apparatus at the disposal of the imperialist governments in the event of war, as “specialists” and “labour” parties placed theirs during the last war.

These treacherous services are the more dangerous in that they are masked behind protestations of unity against war, and illusions about its prevention by peaceful means, of which a typical specimen is the "Manitou to the International Co-operative Alliance" issued in connection with July 6th. This manifesto is addressed "To The Co-operators of the World," and proclaims:

"The International Co-operative Alliance hails with satisfaction the steady advance of its principles and the realisation of its aims; it calls upon its constituent members to demonstrate everywhere the unity of our movement, confidence in its programme, and the standard of life and civilisation to a still higher plane, and ultimately, to realise the co-operative Commonwealths."

And the leading body of this International Alliance has admitted Fascist co-operatives to membership, while endeavouring repeatedly to drive out the co-operatives of the U. S. S. R. — the only country where the aims of proletarian co-operative are genuinely realised; the one country which has made a sincere contribution to world peace.

Yes: the proletarian women co-operators must indeed demonstrate on July 6th; but not in support of the lying claims and the anti-working-class policy of the reformist leaders. Let them organise under the leadership of the Communist Party together with the revolutionary trade unions, revolutionary organisations, and all militant organisations of the workers and the peasants, to demonstrate their solid resistance to the capitalist offensive and to the threat of war.

Let them declare for a cleansing from their movement of all collaborators of the capitalist class; for systematic united action with all other organs of class struggle, especially such (strike-committees, etc.) as are set up in times of economic conflict; for systematic connections with militant co-operators abroad, and especially with the co-operatives in Russia; for support of the French socialist workers in the I. C. A.; above all, for energetic participation in the Red Day Against Imperialist War! The July 6th will be a memorable milestone in the history of the international co-operative.

---

**AGAINT COLONIAL OPPRESSION**

**The New War in Morocco.**

By E. C. (Paris).

The "glorious annals" of the conquest of Morocco by the French imperialists has been enriched by a new and extremely sanguinary battle. A strong body of troops, which was composed of Moroccan rifles and soldiers of the Foreign Legion (forming part of the garrison of the newly conquered position of Ait Yacub), proceeded into not yet occupied territory for the purpose of relieving a garrison of the British at El Abid river. On June 8th this troop was attacked by a strong detachment of the tribe of Ait Haddad, almost all the officers being killed and the unit dispersed. The Moorish riflemen, who were but little inclined to fight against their countrymen, threw away their arms and ammunition. On the French side, nearly 100 soldiers and officers were killed. For several days the position of Ait Yacub was besieged by the rebels and could only be held by the reinforcement of the garrison by and recourse to air-planes.

Such a significant occurrence could not but create a great impression throughout France. The Government of the "National Unity" immediately mobilised its apparatus of mendacity and attempted to shift the entire blame onto the responsible officer, who had allegedly acted contrary to his instructions. But the workers are not to be hoodwinked so easily. Both in its press and through the mouth of Comrade Cachin in the Chamber, the Communist Party pointed out the full responsibility of the Government and the Supreme Command and proved that the battle of Ait Yacub was anything but a matter of chance, being, indeed, part of a whole series of military operations which have been long in preparation for the purpose of occupying territory not hitherto subjected.

In Morocco there are, as a matter of fact, very considerable areas which have not yet been subjected by the French imperialists, viz. the Central Atlas Region and the region
of Tafilalet, both situated on the southern border of the “protectorate”. In 1925 and 1929, France, then busily engaged in the Rif war, was obliged to shelve this task, which had long been envisaged. It was only towards the end of 1927 that attention could once more be turned in this direction. After the san- guinary but victorious extermination of the “liberators” the proletariat and the natives more than 10,000 dead, the imperialists hesitated to initiate another great and unmasked operation of the same kind. Their tactics rather tended in the direction of a complete blockade of such areas as had not yet been subjected, on which all the tried methods of corruption were brought to bear. After this phase, selective and effective destruction and moralisation of the enemy, their camp was bombarded by air-planes, and small military operations were undertaken against them. As far as possible, no European soldiers were employed in this connection, the unfortunate Algerians and the Moorish partisans being used as cats’ paws. In this way it was the Tafilalet and Central Atlas region opposition.

However, the unsubjected tribes are determined to defend their independence, knowing only too well what lot awaits them if they bow to foreign rule. They know that immediately after the termination of the Rif war the natives of the area chiefly concerned were deprived of 40,000 hectares of their best grazing. They know that the primary aim of the imperialists which prevails among them will be replaced by the unrestricted autocracy of a Caid in the service of the imperialists. They know many other things, too, and are therefore determined to fight desper-ately for their liberty, their ground, and their belongings.

Their resistance, moreover, is strengthened by the fact that they have now recognised the necessity of uniting against the invaders. The hope that they would simply fight in separate cells, that the attack of the Aïd Haddiide tribe on the outpost of Aït Yacub is intended to divert attention from the struggle of other tribes against the French offensive in the region of Ued el Abid, which is situated at some distance from Aït Yacub. Though they have not at their disposal such first-rate war material as the Rif warriors had, they are at any rate fighting in a mountain region every feature of which is intimately known to them.

The war thus commenced by the French imperialists is likely to call for great sacrifices both in money and in lives. The occupation of the regions of Tafilalet and of the Central Atlas is considered by all military experts as a very serious and difficult matter.

The French imperialism, however, are determined to carry out their intentions at any price. Nor are they without good reasons for this determination.

In the first place the existence of a yet unsubjected area in the centre of Morocco constitutes a great danger for the French rule. The tribes already subjected pay minute attention to all that passes in the independent regions. The heroic re- sistance of the valorous Berbers has awakened an enthusiastic echo throughout Morocco and constitutes a danger to the imperialist rule in that country. On the other hand, the economic wealth of the central Atlas region is very consider- able, the occurrences of ore being particularly promising. In the region of Tafilalet there is hard coal, and in the central Atlas region iron ore. The valley of the Ued el Abid contains extensive areas of extreme fertility, the river alone being a potential source of exceptional wealth (for Moroccan circum- stances), since its rapid would render possible the artificial irrigation and consequently the agricultural exploitation of a great area. Besides this, water-power stations might well be erected on this river.

A conquest of the territory not yet subjected to French rule would thus mean the possibility of a really extensive exploi- tation of the country. The problem, however, is of even farther-reaching significance than this, considering that a con- struction of the Trans-Sahara Railway would be impossible without a previous pacification of the Tafilalet region.

The Trans-Sahara Railway is a great imperialist enterprise which is intended to join up the French possessions in West and East Africa. It would thus also with the mother country. It would in the first place render possible an increased exploitation of the “black” colonies. At the same time it would enable France to effect a rapid transport of large numbers of troops in the case of a war or for the purpose of putting down rebellion either of the French workers or of natives in the colonies. Over and above this, it would represent the backbone of any military defensive

**Persecution of Indian Workers under the MacDonald Government.**

By G. P. (Paris).

The English Government, of which Ramsay MacDonald is Premier, the Socialist Clynes Home Secretary and, finally, the Socialist Sidney Webb Secretary for the Colonies and the Domi- nions — this government has commenced its existence with a most repulsive act. It has allowed the secretary of the Indian trade-union organisation “Girmi Kamgar” (Red Flag) to be arrested in Nagpur.

This latest victim of British repression in India, Leslie Hutchinson, is not, and never was a Communist. He is a young journalist, who came to India to work on the Indian “Daily Mail”, but not for long, as, under the impression made by the mighty revolutionary movement and revolted by the regime of terror of the wire-pullers in London and Delhi, he shortly left the “Daily Mail” and became editor of the “New Spark”, the organ of the Workers’ and Peasants’ Party.

With what “crime” is Hutchinson actually charged? He was elected by the Indian workers’ president of the Red Trade Union, the so-called “Girmi Kamgar”, which at present embraces about 65,000 members. He is the leader of the big textile workers’ strike in Bombay, he is the reformist union (with scarcely 10,000 members) did its best to sabotage and betray. In spite of threats and persecution of all kinds 90,000 textile workers are still fighting for the reinstatement of comrades penalised by the employers and condemned to starvation.

As is well known, immediately after the victory of the Labour Party the General Council of the unions disavowed the workers on strike. The Viceroy, who let his position thereby strengthened, declared the movement in Bombay to be illegal. He had 31 Labour leaders arrested and their trial began a week or two ago in Meerut.

The accused in this monstrous trial were arrested in Bombay and transported to Meerut, where, it was hoped, the law might be violated with impunity. His Majesty’s Government deemed