of Tafilalet, both situated on the southern border of the "protectorate". In 1925 and 1926, 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 sang- 
gueur of the Rif war, however, which had produced the ex- 
deterioration of the enemy, their camps were 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 
Moors were being used as cat's paws. In this way it was 
concluded that the independence of the natives is not yet sufficiently 
understood. The sousubjects tribes are determined to defend 
their independence, knowing only too well what 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 
ground. They know that the primitive democracy which prevails 
among them will be replaced by the unrestricted autocracy of 
a Calif in the service of the imperialists. They know many 
other things, too, and are therefore determined to fight 
developed for their liberty, their ground, and their belongings. 
Their resistance, moreover, is strengthened by the fact that the 
attack of whi: tribes are fighting against the French offensive in the region of Ued el Abid, 
which is situated at some distance from Ait Yacub. Though they 
have not yet lost their dispossession, since they are not French 
warriors, they are at war fighting in the 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 imperialists, however, are determined to carry 
out their intentions at any price. Nor are they without good 
reasons for this determination.

The first point in the existence of the yet unsatisfied area 
in the centre of Morocco constitutes a great danger for the 
French rule. The tribes already subject pay minute attention to 
all that passes in the independent regions. The heroic 
resistance of the valorous Berbers has awakened an enthusiastic 
feeling throughout Morocco and constitutes a danger to the 
 imperialists. The news of the national movement in the 
North, in Algiers, is freely diffused. The military wealth of the Tafilalet and central Atlas regions is very 
considerable, the occurrences of one 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 circumstances), 
since its rapids would renders possible the artificial 
irrigation and consequently also 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 intensive 
exploitation of the country. The problem, however, is of even 
farther-reaching significance than this, considering that a 
construction 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 will supply Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia with 
and Equatorial Africa with Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia and 
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 
system for the African colonies of France. By means of the 
trans-Sahara Railway, France would be able to move troops 
and war material from one end of its colonial empire to the 
other in five or six days instead of the fifteen or twenty 
days now required by the respective ocean passage, and without 
having to fear the interference of foreign naval Powers. The 
Transport of Great Powers, which the imperialists suggested should give place to a so-called peaceful penetration. 
In the Chamber they enthusiastically welcomed Steeg, the former 
Governor of Morocco, who is alleged to have employed methods of peaceful penetration and who was a few months ago 
pledged by Senet to Mger, peaceful penetration had -- to judge by the bombardments and battles during his administration, 
very little in common with pacifism and has led to such fights 
as that of Ait Yacub. In reality the Socialists, like all other 
bourgeois parties, are faithful and absolute adherents of the 
colonisation of Morocco; it was but recently that the deputy 
Riviere condemned the Communist motion for the withdrawal of 
the French troops. The Socialists, who in 1925 sanctioned the 
credits for the Rif war and thereby incurred the partial respon-
sibility for the death of more than 10,000 soldiers, will no 
longer be able to deceive the proletariat as to their true 
intentions.

The Communist Party is opposed to all forms of colonisation 
by the imperialists. As at the time of the Rif war, it is calling 
upon the workers, peasants, and soldiers both of the mother 
country and of the colonies to oppose the war now in progress 
and to fight for the military evacuation of Morocco by the French 
and for the absolute independence of that country. It is only 
by an alliance between workers in London and colonial workers 
and by a co-operation between the French soldiers and the native 
peasants that the victory of such principles can be ensured.

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 
Dominions — this government has commenced its existence with a 
most repulsive act. It has allowed the secretary of the Indian 
trade-union organisation "Girmi Kangaru" (Red Flag) to be 
arranged in New York.

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 
slightly 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 Kangar", which at present embraces 
about 60,000 members. He is the leader of the big textile 
workers' strike in Bombay, which the reformist union (with scar-
cely 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.

The Indian workers, immediately after the victory of the 
Labour Party the General Council of Syndicates disavowed 
the workers on strike. The Viceroy, who felt 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 Meerut. It was hoped, the law might be violated with impunity. His Majesty's Government declared
that the 31 workers should not be tried by jury but by a court composed of carefully selected officials. The Government of India also selected counsel for the prosecution. The choice fell upon Langford James, a well-known enemy of the Indian people. The trial, which began on the day after the election, was postponed several days in view of the Mahamoodian holidays and resumed on June 24th.

The counsel for the prosecution has already made his debut. His speech, a selection of the most bigoted counter-revolutionary absurdities and anti-Bolshevist incitements, strings together the most amazing contradictions. But the whole of it is characterised by blind hatred of the Soviet Union.

It is the Soviet Union against which the charge is directed. It is against that country that the “empire” of MacDonald is mobilising its judges before sending out its armed cruisers.

In his efforts to please his employers, the counsel for the prosecution has, however, overshot the mark. The anti-Bolshevist specialists in the London editorial departments decided after seeing the “document” from Meerut (which describes Stalin as president of the Comintern) not to publish it.

The 31 prisoners addressed a telegram to MacDonald about a week ago, protesting against the emergency court. The socialist Prime Minister has not replied to their protest.

The socialist Prime Minister is no beginner. Under his first government the year 1924 four Indian workers in Cawnpore were sentenced to 10 years’ imprisonment.

Much has happened since. 1924. The Labour Party has zealously put itself at the service of colonial oppression. It is characteristic of the evolution of Social Democracy that the hangmen of the Indian people can to-day count upon the cooperation of a Lansbury, who but yesterday was president of the League Against Imperialism.

But, while the leaders of the Labour Party have entered into an alliance with the Conservatives, the Indian workers have broken away from the policy of compromise of Gandhi and his supporters. They declare their solidarity with the October revolution, and support the Workers’ and Peasants’ Party. One strike follows upon another. To them it is a question of a fight against those who have oppressed them for hundreds of years. Their fight is being followed with intense interest by the international proletariat, and especially by the proletariat in England and France, which sympathises with the Indian workers in their struggle against Franco-British imperialism.

Those who conquered India by the sword are now calling upon the leaders of the Labour Party for help. They command them to suppress the Indian revolution with the sword. It is, however, too late!

**The Labour Movement**

**The Annual Conference of the South Wales Miners’ Federation.**

By W. Holmes (London).

A good light was put up by the Communist fraction of twelve delegates at the Annual Conference of the South Wales Miners’ Federation, held in Cardiff. The whole line of the Executive Committee could be summed up in the phrase “put your faith in the Labour Government”, and this line was accepted by the majority of the delegates, most of whom are local officials of the Federation. It was true, nevertheless, that a considerable number of delegates were half inclined to accept the Communist estimation of the Labour Government’s role, but they evidently were waiting for the Government’s actions and policy to convince them.

On the question of hours, a cautiously worded resolution for the “early” (not immediate) restoration of the seven-hour day was carried, after the Executive had shown much concern in defending the Labour Government from the “suspicion” that it would not honour its (supposed) pledges in this matter.

The Communist delegates fought for a resolution calling on the Conference to take “every action necessary to secure the nationalisation of the mines and by-products without compensation and with workers’ control”.

This resolution was defeated in favour of one reiterating the pious hopes for “nationalisation”, without any concrete statement of what was meant.

Characteristic of the officials’ attitude was the intervention in this debate of Tom Richards, the aged General Secretary of the S. W. M. F., who made a vicious attack on the Soviet Union declaring that the “policy of confiscation had brought chaos in Russia and had resulted in the starvation of the workers”.

“Orders from Moscow” was also the line taken by the Executive in attacking a resolution (supported by the Communist delegates) which criticised the failure of the M. F. G. B. to resist the coal-owners local and district attacks on the miners, urged an immediate policy of resistance to all such attacks, and demanded a national conference to prevent the renewal of the District agreements and to fight for a national agreement by strike action if necessary. The resolution was rejected in favour of one calling in general terms for a national agreement.

On the question of unemployment, a Communist delegate moved a resolution, 1. condemning the “transference” scheme and the disqualification of unemployed workers from unemployment benefit; 2. “demanding the immediate restoration of the seven-hour day and the cessation of the reparations coal deliveries”; 3. preparing for a struggle to achieve these demands by strike action if necessary, in the event of the Government refusing to act. The demand on unemployment was adopted but the third rejected in favour of an amendment that a national conference should be called to discuss the matter.

A victory was secured by the Communist fraction on the question of the May-Day holiday, which the Conference agreed for the first time, should be observed in the South Wales coalfield.

In regard to pensions for aged miners, where the Executive did not wish to tie down the Labour Government to a definite scale, the conference decided on the scale of £2 a week at the age of 60, and not 55, as the Communist delegates demanded.

In the election for president, Arthur Horner, the well known Communist miners’ leader, received 17 votes against 112 for Morrell, the retiring president. The vote was by show of hands and, contrary to precedent, a “card vote” was refused. Other retiring officials were also re-elected by large majorities.

**Hands off the Soviet Union**

**The Foch-Marty Case and its International Significance.**


The French Court of Appeal has committed the enormity of, sentencing André Marty to an imprisonment of five years and 10 months. This is the most severe sentence ever recorded on a transgression in journalism. This sentence embodies a new threat against the anti-militarist propaganda of the Communists. Its substantiation, which was the outcome of long confabulations, establishes a precedent according to which it is a punishable act to call historic facts of the Foch-Marty case.

Even the history of the Foch-Marty case is written, it will have to be pointed out that the individual phases of this case corresponded to individual international situations and that in a certain sense the case was the utterance of the bellicose anti-Soviet policy of the French imperialists.

Let the reader judge for himself. It was in August 1927, but a few weeks since events of great importance had occurred in China. The revolutionary troops had conquered Shanghai and Nanking. The Foch-Marty case addressed to the French workers an appeal for solidarity with the Chinese proletariat.

Frightened by the increasing revolutionary wave Great Britain induced agents of Chang-Tso-Lin to raid the Soviet consulates. The Foreign Office compiled obviously provocative Notes. The Soviet government replied calmly and coldly. In confusion and at a loss how to act, Chamberlain and Jowit-Hicks, the ministers of the Colonies occupied by the police, and the sales opened by experts. There ensued the breach with the Soviet Union.