

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol 7. No. 13.

10th February 1927

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX.
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

CONTENTS

Tang Shin She: Before the Fall of Shanghai.
Hands off China.
The Events in Hankow on January 3rd 1927.
H. P. Rathbone: Ramsay MacDonald, British Social Democracy and Counter-Revolution in China.
Manifesto of the Communist Party of China.
Politics.
M. G—bach: Great Britain, the Baltic States and Social Democracy.
L. St.: Sweden, an English Naval Base in the Baltic?
James Shields: Hertzog's Legislation to Enslave South African Natives.
Karl Radek: Is the Soviet Union Threatened by Intervention?
Down with American Imperialism in Nicaragua!
The Balkans.
Vasile Spiru: Normalisation in Bessarabia and Bukovina.

The Labour Movement.

Compagno: The Dissolution of the Trade Union Confederation of Italy.
Union of Soviet Republics.
A. Mikoyan: Commercial Traffic in the Hands of the Proletariat.
Against Imperialist War.
G. Zinoviev: Leninism and the Fight against War Fascism.
Appeal of the E. C. C. I. against the Preparation of a Fascist Putsch in Latvia.
The Women's Movement.
Erna Halbe: The First Meetings of Women Delegates in Germany.

Before the Fall of Shanghai.

By Tang Shin She.

The united front in Shanghai, from the proletariat to the bourgeoisie, which is directed against the imperialists and their tool, Sun Chuan-Fang, dates from the defeat of Sun Chuan-Fang in Kiukiang in November 1926. At that time the inhabitants of Shanghai, under the leadership of the trade unions, formed a Shanghai Citizens' League with the slogan, "Shanghai for the Shanghaiers!". This league constitutes a democratic movement for the abolition of foreign rule and the dictatorship of the feudalistic military rulers. The League numbers many prominent bourgeois personalities among its members. After the dissolution of the Chekiang autonomous government as a result of the treachery of a Chekiang general and the threats of Sun Chuan-Fang, the latter commenced to attack the Shanghai movement for autonomy. All the organisations of this movement were prohibited; the leaders of the Citizens' League were threatened with the death penalty.

Sun Chuan-Fang issued a programmatic declaration against the "Reds". At the same time he expressed in hypocritical form his agreement with the teachings of Sun-Yat-Sen; he claimed to be in favour of the convocation of a National Assembly. Now, at the time of the fight against the Reds, he asserts there can only be two fronts: the Red front and the anti-Red Front. He declares in conclusion:

"If you agree with my views then help me. If not, then ally yourselves openly with the Reds and do not fight against me under pretexts!"

He regards the movement for autonomy merely as a pretext to fight against him.

Sun Chuan-Fang demands a clear front: for or against the Reds. Then it would be possible for him to fight energetically against all who are not for him. But in spite of his brutal measures against the population of Shanghai, there is no end to the great protest strikes of the workers against him. A great portion of the textile workers and the street car and omnibus workers are on strike, as well as the clerks and the artisans. A general strike and a revolt can break out at any moment. The workers are only waiting for a decision on the Chekiang front. According to the latest telegraphic reports, the Canton troops on the Chekiang front are already threatening Hangchow, the capital of Chekiang. If the revolutionary army is victorious here, then the remaining troops of Sun Chuan-Fang will be annihilated.

The Shanghai proletariat and also the bourgeois elements are staunch opponents of the imperialists. This is proved by the general strike in 1925 which lasted for several months, and the strike last year in the Japanese spinning mills. Now the imperialists, and in the first place the English, are sending numerous warships and aircraft and large bodies of troops, including many Indian troops, to China. The population of Shanghai is tremendously excited. The situation is extremely critical. The fact that the British troops are unable to obtain any quarters in Shanghai, that even other imperialist States are opposed to their entry out of fear of the unrest which it may call forth, shows what degree the revolutionary ferment has reached. If a revolution breaks out in Shanghai, or if the Canton troops march into the town they will take care first to seize

power in the Chinese quarter; for the railway junction of the Ningpo-Hangchow-Shanghai Line and of the Nanking-Shanghai railway line and also the arsenal in the Chinese part of the town. In addition to this they will refrain from responding to the provocations of the imperialists, in order thereby to prevent the blood bath long planned by the latter. Only when the revolutionary troops will have the Chinese quarter in their hands will the revolutionaries proceed against the imperialists.

Shanghai is not only the greatest harbour town but also the greatest industrial town of China. The number of factory workers amounts to half a million. Since 1925 these 500,000 workers have stood firmly behind the Red Trades Council. Among them there are 17,000 organised Communists. It is certain that under such circumstances a revolution in Shanghai will have a quite different character than a revolution in any other Chinese town.

HANDS OFF CHINA

The Events at Hankow on January 3rd, 1927.

The following report was received by the "Inprecorr." from the H. Q. of the Canton Army. Ed.

In the three towns of Wuchang, Hankow, and Hanyang, united under the name of Wu-Han (with an aggregate population of about 2½ millions), the birth of the new year was to have been celebrated as a triple festival. Since the adoption of the Western calendar in China after the revolution of 1911, the first three days of the year have been set aside for a New Year celebration. At the same time, it had this time been decided, both officially and on the part of various associations, that the transference of the People's Government into the heart of China and the victory of the national-revolutionary army should be celebrated on the same occasion, and that in a manner which should enable the people fully to appreciate the significance of the festival. Processions and inscriptions were arranged for this purpose, while the various divisions of the National People's Party (the Kuomintang) and the propaganda department of the Central Political School had undertaken to send forth speakers to address the populace at various public places in the three towns.

On January 2nd, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, some speakers thus stood on improvised platforms on Chinese territory in front of the Chinese custom-house, which is located between the Chinese quarter of Hankow and the British settlement, and addressed a constantly growing crowd of people, who listened to them in festive mood and exemplary good order.

Here the British Consul thought he had found a particularly propitious opportunity to provoke, irritate, and attack the peaceful Chinese people. Soldiers, fully equipped, with rifles, bayonets, and trench helmets, were ordered out, trenches and barricades were formed, and more than 10 machine-guns were put into position. Yet the well-disciplined listeners remained inactive. The British now began to hustle the Chinese, many of whom were standing on a riparian road forming part of the British settlement. The Chinese, however, were not slow to recognise that they were merely being provoked by the hostile attitude of the British, and they therefore retired altogether onto Chinese ground. Nevertheless, they were followed thither by the British soldiers, who were cowardly enough to prod the unarmed people with their bayonets. In this manner, a member of the Seamen's Union was killed outright, while two of the audience, Li Tasasun and Fang Hanshan, were mortally wounded and more than thirty others received serious injuries.

Happily, two members of the People's Government, representatives of the Hankow party administration, and the President of Police soon appeared on the scene, calmed their countrymen by the promise to enter into negotiations with the British, and succeeded in persuading them to restrain themselves so that further casualties might be avoided. The crowd then retired in good order.

It is no more than natural that these bloody occurrences should have excited the entire population of Wu-Han to an extraordinary degree. The very same evening numerous meetings were held there for the purpose of discussing the events and debating as to the steps to be taken in face of the renewed provocation and cruelty on the part of the British.

For the morning of January 3rd, the Hankow party administration summoned a special session, which was attended by more than 500 representatives of upwards of 200 associations. The assembly resolved to present an appeal to the Government, embodying the following eight demands:

1. An energetic protest to be addressed at once to the British Government.
2. The British Government to be made liable for payment of an indemnity to the wounded and to the families of such as were killed or died of their injuries.
3. The culprits to be delivered up by the British to the Chinese authorities for punishment according to Chinese law.
4. The British Government immediately to withdraw its warships from Hankow.
5. A formal apology to be made by the British to the Chinese Government with expressions of regret.
6. The Chinese to be accorded the unrestricted right of holding meetings and arranging processions, forming associations, and speaking in public within the limits of the British settlement.
7. The British settlement police-force and the British volunteer forces to be withdrawn.
8. The British settlement to be placed under Chinese administration. It was further resolved that an answer to these demands be required of the British Government within a period of 72 hours, in default of which the Chinese Government could no longer undertake to guarantee the maintenance of peace and order in the British settlement.

In order to exclude all possibility of a repetition of encounters in the future, the Chinese Government, was called upon to transmit to the British Government the following formal announcements:

1. Demand for the immediate surrender of the British settlement.
2. Demand for the immediate restoration of Chinese customs autonomy.
3. Demand for the immediate repeal of the rights of navigation accorded British steamers on Chinese inland waters.
4. Demand for the immediate abolition of British Consular jurisdiction.
5. Announcement that in case of non-compliance with the above demands, the British settlement would be cut off from traffic with the outer world and a general boycott against Great Britain would ensue.

6. Announcement that in such an event all communication with the British would be suspended by order of the Hankow General Chamber of Commerce, while the sale or purchase of British goods would be prohibited.

It was further resolved that:

7. On January 5th, in the afternoon, a popular demonstration should take place on the Tchi-Sun street in connection with a memorial celebration for such as were killed by the British on January 3rd; on this occasion the further attitude of the Chinese towards the British should be discussed and determined.

8. The occurrences and the reasons which led up to them should be made known by telegraph to all the world.

9. Further measures in this connection should be entrusted to a committee to be specially formed and to comprise representatives of 15 bodies, including the provincial party administration, the Hankow party administration, the labour federation, the provincial peasants' association, the Chamber of Advocates, and the press association.

The results of the session of January 3rd was transmitted orally to the Government.

Upon hearing of the occurrences, the executive committee of the chief party administration and the members of the People's Government had immediately assembled at a special session, at which the following resolution was passed:

"The news that one of our countrymen has been killed and that so many others have been injured, has affected us most grievously. We shall see to it that within 24 hours the Government takes all necessary steps for safeguarding our people and preventing the recurrence of such cruelty once and for all. In the meantime we trust that our people will refrain from holding any assemblies in the British settlement, so that undesirable complications may be avoided. On January 4th, at 7 o'clock in the evening, the Government will publicly announce what steps it has taken in this connection".

On the said day and hour, a meeting was held under the chairmanship of two members of the People's Government and attended by representatives from all quarters. Here it was made known that the eight demands as above formulated by the assembly of associations had been accepted by the central party administration. On the basis of these demands the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had already entered into negotiations with the British authorities since in this matter the views of the Government were completely in accordance with the desires of the population. At the same time, an order was issued by resolution of the Government that General Tcheng Mingtchi should maintain order in the British settlement by means of reliable Chinese troops. Finally, the Government representatives called upon the people to maintain good discipline and to avoid all excesses, so that the success of the just cause of the Chinese people might not be lessened or delayed in any way.

The peaceable development which events have taken, thanks to the prudent conduct of affairs by the Chinese leaders and to the peaceful character of the Chinese people despite British provocation and the fact that the blood of innocent Chinese, had been shed, is a full guarantee for the safety of all foreign guests of China within the territory of the National Government. It is not against the foreigners as such that popular feeling is directed on such occasions, nor yet against the individual citizen or subject of a foreign power. According to law, all must be treated equally and enjoy the equal rights. The fight which the national revolution is waging is rather directed against oppression and against the representatives of imperialism.

Ramsay MacDonald, British Social Democracy and Counter-Revolution in China.

By H. P. Rathbone.

The attack of MacDonald and the British Labour Party on the Chinese revolution has developed so rapidly and has become so serious that in view of present events very special attention should be paid to it; for it contains every despicable feature of active counter-revolution such as could only be practiced by the most debased of Social Democrats.

On his return from the Sahara in December MacDonald in an interview with the "Daily Herald" at once completely identified the Social Democratic policy on China with that of capitalism.

In the "Socialist Review" for January, MacDonald gently chides the British Government for their delay in putting forward a "reasonable" policy: for meanwhile he says "we have suffered both in trade and in consequence... our foreign interests are suffering terribly for lack of intelligent anticipation" (our emphasis H. P. R.). But of course he disclaims: "A mere scuffle (from China H. P. R.) will certainly not" put ourselves right with the Canton revolutionary government. For of course Mr. MacDonald "we" would lose all those super-profits, wouldn't we? Therefore we must negotiate. But now he turns to the Canton Government. If the Canton Government refuses to negotiate "it will have to share the blame for any untoward happenings". You damned scoundrel, MacDonald. What do you mean by that except that if the Canton government refuses to hear from British capitalists their decision as to how much China must pay in profits to buy them out of the territory which former British capitalists wrested from them after long and bloody struggles, then you, MacDonald, agree that British capitalists can with full "justice" and free from all blame proceed to murder untold numbers of Chinese?

But MacDonald presumes to put forward the policy of the British workers!

Secondly, so that our capitalist highwaymen may feel quite secure in their policy of "your money or your life", Mr. MacDonald lays down that "what forces remain in Chinese waters are there solely for the defence of British lives and will be withdrawn immediately the menace is removed".

Until in fact the Canton revolutionary government has agreed to the terms dictated by British capitalists — or as you put it "the menace is removed", you Mr. MacDonald assert that the lives of the British capitalists who have for decades practised murder and robbery on hundreds of thousands of the Chinese people, must be protected by armed force.

But this is not one only indictment against MacDonald. He has not only condoned the policy of the murder in the past of the Chinese people in order that the robbery may be safely effected but openly advocates its continuance. But there is more.

For there is a further count against him and one that makes his position as a true Social Democrat completely clear. In an article in the Glasgow "Forward", 15. 1. 27, he says "the Canton Government is responsible for the crowd that packed itself onto the barriers of the British concession at Hankow and if there was any bloodshed in consequence... the authority that failed to control the crowd is to blame."

Now this "crowd" as he contemptuously calls it, was a workers' demonstration, and the British forces who prevented it from freely circulating in the streets of the so-called British concessions caused the death of at least one who took part in it. But MacDonald washes his hands of this death. He has more to say of these crowds. He says no one should have any delusion "about the danger of crowds. A passionate crowd either in Great Britain or in China is an awkwardly irresponsible thing". Yes, when by mass demonstration they realise their power the workers are inclined to throw aside those leaders who taught them that they had no power, who dictated their wants, who helped to murder and rob them and to keep them bound to the capitalists. To be sure "they become awkward" Mr. MacDonald. As you have done all that in Britain as well as in China, the following comes "naturally" as the revelation of your Social Democratic heart; but look well at its grossness.

"It is good neither for China nor for us that the liquidation (of the treaties H. P. R.) should be done by riotous crowds. If it is, conflict is as inevitable as tomorrow's sunrise and we shall not be to blame."

Let us away with this bland smug two-faced language and put it in plain short words so that all may realise its true infamy. "In the name of the British workers I declare that if British capitalism fails to force the capitalists of China into an alliance in order to "save" China from its own working class, then British capitalism has our complete permission to go in and do the job itself.

Beginning with the support of British capitalism in his "Daily Herald" interview, MacDonald, with all the logic of which he is capable, has now gone full cycle into active opposition to the whole working class — to open counter-revolution.

In this cycle let us investigate the character of this logic. He does not ask himself why the Chinese consider the English as "the devil of the peace" if he did, this reputation of his for logic would be most seriously damaged. For, he would have found that of all capitalists the British have the greatest accumulated profits invested in China, and therefore draw the largest profits from the labour of the Chinese workers, that right from the dawn of intervention in China it was the British who were the main advocates of this intervention. British capitalism instigated the wars to enforce the import of opium on an unwilling Chinese people, and British capitalists got most of the plunder from those wars: it was a British representative at the League of Nations opium conference who successfully opposed the Chinese plea for the prevention of the import of opium into China from India; for to British capitalists opium growing is as profitable as rum running to the United States and a thousand times safer when permitted by warship-backed treaties. It was the British capitalists who tried to prevent an investigation into the Shanghai murders. It was the British capitalist government who massacred the defenceless town of Wanhsien and who caused the murder of the striking Chinese workers on a British-owned Chinese railway. Finally, it is the British capitalists who, after subsidising the counter-revolutionary forces of Chang and Wu with their own money, have conceived the diabolical plan of subsidising them with the money of the Chinese themselves. This was done by giving both Chang and Sun, in the recent Memorandum, free permission to levy the Washington surtaxes.

It is therefore not surprising that MacDonald did not ask the question why, or he might not have been able to reach the same conclusion and yet retain his reputation for logic.

Again when asserting in the "Socialist Review" that "the old conditions have imposed certain obligations on us" he did not ask how those obligations were "imposed". For his

reputation for logic would have received another severe blow, as he would have been compelled to answer, only after invasion and decimation, war and plunder.

In the "Socialist Review" also he did not ask whose were the lives that British forces should remain in Chinese waters to "defend" and why they so gladly wanted to remain there, and why he, in full agreement with the bourgeoisie, considered that they were "menaced". To maintain his reputation as a logical man he would have been compelled to ignore such questions as "impudent". These British lives are the lives of British capitalists, British merchants and the whole apparatus of British colonial exploitation. The lives of those few British workers who are there are not "menaced" for they are not responsible for this apparatus of colonial exploitation. They themselves are exploited. Now in Shanghai alone these British capitalists have invested some 63 million pounds in its industries, land and building, and on most of this capital they draw huge dividends. For instance the British-American Tobacco Co. which has three factories in Shanghai have drawn dividends of at least 24% for the last 27 years and in some of those years it rose to 30%. These capitalists naturally want to remain there.

But why are they "menaced". Firstly because these huge sums are annually extorted from the Chinese workers by capitalists; but in addition they are British capitalists who have exported it out of the country. Therefore the Chinese workers in their protest get a certain support also from the Chinese merchants also. Secondly, and more immediately, to obtain these huge profits English capitalists practice the most brutal exploitation. It is reported for instance that the same British-American Tobacco Co. which pays 24% dividends employs 800 children under 12 years of age. The British in a report on an investigation into labour conditions in Shanghai made great parade of the assertion that the British employed less child labour than any other nationality in Shanghai. But they did not mention that the British own directly or through mortgages large parts of the land in Shanghai, that the British owned banks dominate in Shanghai, that in fact British interests are the "preponderating interests" in Shanghai ("Times", 13. 1. 27). Therefore it is mere hypocrisy to declare that the British capitalists derive the least interest from the exploitation of child labour, for indirectly British capitalism, through its "preponderating interests", derives immense profit from the exploitation of the workers' children, 14% of the entire number of workers in Shanghai were children, according to the British Labour Commissioner, reporting to the British House of Commons in 1925.

The British capitalists and their hangers on, who have a "preponderating interest" in such a rate of exploitation, are therefore in fear of being "menaced" by the rising nationalist forces in China who derive their strength from the workers and peasants.

Mr. MacDonald, further to save his reputation for logic, says in the "Forward" article 15. 1. 27, from which we have already quoted, in speaking of the treaties, that "the past (in China H. P. R.) should be liquidated because it is past". Now if instead of making such an epigrammatic and clever remark he had really investigated why the treaties should be liquidated and why again their days were numbered, he would have again been compelled to do violence to his logic (for he could never break his alliance with capitalism) by showing that the treaties were imposed upon the Chinese people by the force of an alien capitalism — a capitalism which he is supporting — and that their days were numbered precisely because of the revolt of the Chinese people against them, a revolt which found its inspiration in the Chinese workers.

Finally, he strains to the utmost the capacity of his readers to absorb the most revolting confusionism, again only in order to maintain his logical standpoint. When he puts forward the following:

"They (the short-sighted business men' H. P. R.) also say that we are damaging our prestige. The question however is, how are we, to keep it. Certainly not by Wanshien and Shanghai affairs... I must express my view that at the moment the issues are less in our hands than in those of the Canton government" (our emphasis H. P. R.).

To maintain his logical standpoint of support of capitalism MacDonald first admits that there is such a question as prestige and that it must be kept. But how? For, so he says, the method of massacring the Wanshien population won't do. Canton has the answer. It must agree to share the plunder with British

capitalism. If it doesn't agree, well the consequences are not "in our hands"; the inexorable logic of events, however, will compel us to adopt the Wanshien method. But "we" don't agree with it. Still the inexorable logic of events cannot be gainsaid.

Out with you MacDonald. Your logic has shown you a flunkey of capitalism — a counter-revolutionary — and a hypocritical liar.

And your fear of a "passionate crowd" — "an awkwardly irresponsible thing" has shown you up as a coward.

The manifesto of the National Labour Party, which likewise expresses willingness to withdraw "British warships from Chinese territorial waters upon an agreement as to the security of the lives of British residents", shows that in the essential point of your whole argument the leaders of the Labour Party support you.

British Social Democracy then stands convicted of your crimes and thus seeks to involve the whole of the Labour Movement in this counter-revolutionary attack on the Chinese revolution.

Manifesto of the Communist Party of China

Shanghai, 4th February 1927.

The Communist Party of China has published a manifesto in connection with the events in Hankow accusing the British of deliberately provoking the bloody conflict with the Chinese masses as an excuse for demanding reprisals from the national government against the masses.

The manifesto points out that the national government abolished the conflict by taking over the administration of the British concession and demanding the withdrawal of the British troops. The British government declared itself prepared to hand over its territory to the national government, but considered this action only as a temporary concession. The British are conducting negotiations with the national government without giving up their plans for an intervention for one moment. At the same time they are encouraging Chiang Tsö Lih to attack the Southerners, promising him material and political support.

The British bourgeois press and the semi-official reports are carefully preparing public opinion for an intervention by false reports concerning the events in Hankow, declaring that the lives of British and other foreign residents in China are threatened and that the Chinese people have been stirred up against the white by a handful of extremists, as at the time of the Boxer rising.

The conspiracy organised by the British is transparent. In order to be able to carry out their plans for intervention they wish to form a united front in their own country and if possible to unite all the imperialists against the Chinese revolution. The present negotiations conducted by the British with the national government are only a blind in order to gain time to mobilise their forces.

The manifesto concludes by appealing to the workers and peasants of China to support the demands of the national government for the abolition of the extra-territorial privileges of the foreigners, the handing back of the concessions and the withdrawal of all armed forces. The revolution is only then certain when the masses rely upon themselves and support the national government which must remain firm in face of the British attack.

POLITICS

Great Britain, the Baltic States and Social Democracy.

By M. G. — b a c h (Moscow).

Day by day more light is thrown on the interventionary intentions of the British Foreign Office in its relations to the Baltic Border States. The Great Britain of Chamberlain no longer regards these States as a rampart protecting Europe against the roads of the "Red Monster", but rather as a basis of operations against the Soviet Union.

Great Britain employs various means to make the policy of the Baltic countries subservient to its own ends. Last year it succeeded in completely subjugating Estonia; for upon receipt

of a loan of £1,350,000 and by virtue of its foreign debts to Great Britain to the extent of £2,000,000. Estonia has actually become more or less a semi-colony of British capital, which now plays a predominant rôle in Estonian economy, seeing that the British investments (both capital investments and foreign enterprises) have penetrated into the banks and into the railway and industrial enterprises of the country.

By similar means, Great Britain has also exercised a pressure on Latvia and Finland. British influence on the economy of these two countries is likewise very considerable, since Great Britain is the chief importer of Latvian and Finnish timber and paper, Finnish matches, Latvian flax, oil, etc. In the first nine months of 1926, 38.5 per cent. of the exports from Finland and 38 per cent. of those from Latvia went to Great Britain. The joint-stock companies and banks in both these countries are greatly dependent on British capital. According to official Latvian sources ("Economists", organ of the Latvian Ministry of Finance, in its issue of December 15th, 1926), 69.9 per cent. of the bank share-capital and 50 per cent. of the share-capital of the industrial enterprises are in the hands of foreigners, among whom the British are prominent. The dependence of Latvia on British capital is likewise illustrated by the enormous foreign debt of £2,300,000, which, without even counting interest, Latvia is bound to re-pay to Great Britain in the course of 30 years.

It is perfectly obvious that these countries, being economically so greatly dependent on British capital, should be obliged to fashion their foreign policy in keeping with British combinations against Soviet Russia, which explains the futility of our guarantee negotiations with Latvia and Finland.

It would, however, be wrong to believe, that British policy in the Border States is limited to work of a passive nature and directed exclusively towards preventing guarantee agreements or the economic approach to Soviet Russia planned by the business circles in the Baltic countries.

On the contrary, Great Britain has also its active programme in regard to the border States, namely that of creating at any price an anti-Soviet bloc out of the Baltic States and Poland and of realising those plans which the former arbiter in the Baltic countries, the France of Poincaré, did not succeed in carrying out. In a contribution to the Vienna "Neue Freie Presse" of December 30th, 1926, Count Coudenhove-Calergi, head of the "Pan-Europe" movement, describes a highly characteristic "scheme for the pacification of Eastern Europe" the gist of which is as follows:

"In the first place, Poland and Lithuania are to revive the union which existed between these two countries in past centuries. Within the limits of Poland, which, with 30 million inhabitants, would thus become a Great Power, Lithuania would be accorded an autonomy after the pattern of that granted to Ireland.

Secondly: Vilna is to be restored to Lithuania under a mutual guarantee of the rights of national minorities.

Thirdly: Poland, thus enlarged and with access to the sea at Memel, to restore the Danzig corridor to Germany.

Fourthly: Germany to accord Poland a free harbour, after the style of the Czechoslovak harbour at Hamburg, to join the alliance between France and Poland on an equal footing with those Powers, and to secure, together with France, the eastern frontier of Poland against all attacks, the alliance between France and Germany, automatically reinforced by Poland (obviously a misprint; instead of 'Poland', read 'Roumania' M. G.) and Czechoslovakia, forming the basis of Pan-Europe.

Fifthly: Russia to receive a free harbour (Libau) in the ice-free portion of the Baltic, in consideration of its consent to all these innovations."

Eliminating the fifth stipulation in regard to Libau being opened for the use of the Soviet Union — since this clause is merely a blind — this plan for the "pacification of Eastern Europe" may be summed up as follows: destruction of Lithuania, extension of the borders of Poland, reconciliation of Poland and Germany, and formation of a Pan-European bloc against the Soviet Union. The Pan-European movement certainly never revealed itself so brazenly in all its imperialistic and anti-Soviet tendencies.

What, then, is the attitude of the countries concerned towards this plan, which so obviously bears the hall-mark "Made in England"? As regards Lithuania, the "Tautos Volia", the organ of the Fascist Party, welcomed this plan even prior to the upheaval and called upon the Slashevitch Government to come to an understanding with the "great" Powers, since "otherwise Vilna would remain a forlorn hope for Lithuania".

In the political circles of Germany, the British plan of a transformation of the map of Eastern Europe has met with open sympathy, which was especially apparent after the Fascist revolt in Lithuania, when the official and semi-official press of Germany started discussing the question of Lithuania in the name of "Europe".

Thus, the "Börsen-Courier", e. g. writes that the plans for dividing up Lithuania are gaining more and more adherents in the political salons of Europe. If in the very near future Lithuania should fail to find new directives, it would surely be ruined. Similar opinions are expressed by Stresemann's organ, the "Tägliche Rundschau" and by the semi-official Government organ, the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung".

This political activity in the Baltic on the part of Germany which coincides with the general growth of the specific weight of Germany in world politics, is also to be explained by the predominant position occupied by Germany in the economy of the Border States. In 1925, Germany provided 50.7 per cent. of the total imports, and consumed 58.8 per cent. of the total exports of Lithuania. In regard to Latvia, the respective figures were 22.7 and 41.5 per cent., with reference to Estonia, 31 per cent. and 29.5 per cent., and in respect of Finland, 13.4 and 31 per cent.

Finally, if we inquire into Poland's attitude towards this combination of "Memel—Vilna—Danzig", it can hardly be presumed that Poland, whose economy is even now very considerably determined by the Exchanges of London and New York, and whose foreign policy is closely allied to that of the British Foreign Office, will offer any resistance to the British project of an imperialistic re-distribution in Eastern Europe, a project which purports the realisation at any price of the idea of an anti-Soviet bloc of the Border States.

As regards the Social Democrats, we merely desire to establish three outstanding facts.

1. Early in January, Tadeusz Holówko, a member of the P. P. S., paid a visit to Latvia as a special envoy of Pilsudski's. In contradiction to the utterances of the Latvian Prime Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Social Democrat Zeelens, the Polish press declares this mission of Holówko's to have been a complete success.

The Lithuanian Social Democrats themselves are beginning to incline towards the necessity of an approach between Poland and Lithuania. This "new orientation" was especially apparent on the occasion of the budget debates in the Lithuanian Parliament shortly before the upheaval. When, speaking in the name of his fraction, the Social Democratic leader Kajris criticised the "petrified" attitude of Lithuania in regard to the question of Vilna, demanding that some agreement or other be attained with Poland.

3. On January 2nd and 3rd, a discussion took place at Reval between the Latvian, Estonian, and Finnish Foreign Ministers, two of whom were newly-appointed Social Democratic Ministers, viz. Voynmaa, acting for Finland, and Zeelens, for Latvia. One of the main items among the agenda of these discussions, was naturally the question of the guarantee agreements with the Soviet Union. According to official announcements, the Reval negotiations showed "complete unanimity of the three Foreign Ministers in all points", which in fact means the disinclination of the Social Democratic Cabinets to conclude guarantee treaties with the Soviet Union.

The facts above enumerated show most clearly the immediate help afforded by the Social Democrats of the Baltic countries to the undermining of the guarantee treaties and the realisation of the anti-Soviet intentions of Polish-British imperialists in the Baltic regions. Meanwhile the anti-Soviet nature of the intentions of Great Britain in these territories is openly avowed by ideologists of British imperialism. Suffice it to quote a characteristically frank passage from the article by Robert Machrai which appeared in the last (January) issue of the Conservative "Fortnightly Review". In speaking of the British attitude towards the Baltic countries, Machrai says:

"The Soviets make out, that British policy supports the Baltic countries. This is indeed the case, at any rate morally, but it is also a fact politically speaking, in the sense that Great Britain is the main prop of the League of Nations, to which the Baltic border States turn naturally for aid and to the principles of which they adhere, as they have proved by their attitude in the matter of the guarantee proposals of the Soviet Union. The League of Nations, meanwhile, is undoubtedly stronger now than it formerly was."

Sweden an English Naval Base in the Baltic?

By L. St. (Stockholm).

Swedish Social Democracy has always been adept in disguising its positive attitude towards "the defence of the fatherland" with pacifist phrases about neutrality. During the world war, several activists, who desired to range the Swedish army corps, on the side of Germany, were removed from the party, whereas Papa Branting with his francophile tendency was on this score by no means turned out of the party. During discussions of the army estimates under previous governments, the Social Democrats were always in the "opposition". But as soon as they themselves took over the reins of government they disclosed their true character. When they were last in office, they made much ado about submitting an estimate providing for a "reduction" of the army and the navy. As a matter of fact, however, the estimate constituted a reinforcement of the military forces by means of certain modernisation and technical modification of the weapons in use.

At present, as the Social Democrats are again an "opposition party" in Parliament, they have suddenly discarded their pacifist garb and have taken the lead in advocating a bill providing for the expenditure of 106 million crowns for the building of certain fresh units for the navy! In the parliamentary committee for naval affairs, comprising members of the various parties, with the exclusion of the Communist Party of Sweden, and including two Social Democrats and a chairman in the person of the Social-Democratic former Minister of War, Per Albin Hansson, the estimate was accepted unanimously and passed over to the Government and to Parliament. It seems likely that this estimate will, therefore, be accepted in Parliament by a large majority.

The whole of the bourgeois Press from right to left is jubilant over the patriotic reasonableness of these committee members and praises Per Albin Hansson as a true patriot. Indeed, an important newspaper apologises to this Social Democrat for attacks made upon him in leaders while he was Minister of War.

The project provides especially for the construction of battleships of the so-called "F" type. These are small dreadnaughts with high-speed and heavy armament making them strong battle units. Furthermore, mother ships for aeroplanes are to be built, also other units.

In the first place, the Bill, therefore, appears to correspond exactly with the wishes of the Swedish bourgeoisie. It is clear that the estimate will be exceeded by the cost of constructing the cruisers, submarines and torpedo-boat destroyers. And why should Sweden in particular require such a "coastal defence"? Is the country threatened by Finland? Finland hardly has any seaworthy warships, and, moreover, between these two states there were last year in progress unofficial and semi-official negotiations concerning alliances of friendship and defence. Again, the King of Sweden and the President of Finland exchanged visits of friendship. Are the other allies of the League of Nations and the neighbouring States along the Baltic coast to be feared? Surely not, for it was just the chief actors in the League of Nations upon whom this year were conferred the Peace Prizes from the Scandinavian Nobel Fund. It is clear that these armaments are a link in the chain of Britain's endeavours to create an armoured ring around the Soviet Union.

The Communist Party of Sweden is developing an extensive campaign against these armaments and against the monstrous bluff on the part of Swedish Social Democracy. The principal work of the party will lie in this direction for the immediate future. The truth about Social-Democratic procedure will be spread in every work-shop and at every meeting of workers to enforce reflection and decision there.

The same Social-Democratic leaders and Parliamentarians who cut down the maintenance received by tens of thousands of unemployed, but who want to pour hundreds of millions into the maw of that Moloch, militarism, for the suppression of the only Workers' and Peasants' State in the world, will now bring into play more intensively than ever their innumerable demagogic tricks and dodges. But these will not be so successful as they used to be. A fairly strong opposition is already being formed among Social-Democratic workers against the leadership. This has become so lively that even some of the leaders are influenced by it to the extent of "criticising" the Bill.

It is here that the Communist Party is concentrating all its means of agitation and propaganda. The opposition should be crystallised and won over to Communism. The disgraceful plans of attack being developed by British Imperialism must be nipped in the bud.

Herzog's Legislation to Enslave South African Natives.

By James Shields (Johannesburg).

The proposed new native legislation of the South African Pact Government which will shortly be brought before Parliament is thoroughly anti-working class in every respect. Not only does it aim at increasing the burden of capitalist exploitation on the back of the vast native population, and clears the way for an onslaught on the existing standards of the white workers. The new legislation which will be dealt with at the forthcoming Parliamentary session is made up of the four so-called native bills which were outlined last year by General Hertzog. These bills comprise — Native Disfranchisement and Representation in Parliament Bill, Union Native Council Bill, Coloured Persons' Rights Bill, and the Native Land Bill.

It has been stated by the Premier and others that these four bills are to be considered solely as one piece of legislation, and that no particular bill can be passed by itself but must be taken in conjunction with the other three. What is the aim of this new legislative policy? A brief examination of the various measures is very illustrative.

First of all the proposals contained in the Native Disfranchisement and Representation in Parliament Bill lay it down that the Cape native vote is to be abolished. Up to the present time this vote is the right of some fifteen thousand natives in the Cape Province who form approximately a little less than 8 per cent of the total voters' list in that area. In return for the taking away of the Cape franchise the native population throughout S. Africa is to be permitted to elect seven Europeans, M. L. A's to the House of Assembly. It is significant to note, however, that the said seven M. L. A's will only be elected by Chiefs, Headmen, and "other prominent natives" designated as electors by the Governor General. The seven so elected will have no vote on questions of confidence.

Secondly, there is the Union Native Council Bill which provides for the election of a National Council of Natives comprising fifty members. Of these fifty members fifteen are to be Government nominees the remaining thirty five being elected by the same "electors" who will vote for the seven M. L. A's. They will have no power to decide on serious questions affecting the native masses, but will merely be (owing to the nature of their selection) a coterie of Government supporters to assist in carrying out official Government policy.

Thirdly, there is the Coloured Persons' Rights Bill which is supposed to provide the opportunity for the Cape coloured people (Eur-Africans) to attain an equal status in every respect to that of the Europeans. In the first place however this Bill lays it down that only coloured persons who conform to a European standard of life will come within the scope of the Act. If a coloured man is descended from parents one of whom happens to be an aborigine he will be classed under the heading of "Native". And what will be the rights of those coloured people who come under the scope of the Bill? There is mention made, but no details stated, of the coloured people being given social, economic and political rights the same as the Europeans. If the Bill becomes law they will be allowed to vote for the return of one white M. L. A. for the whole of the country, but will not be permitted to vote along with Europeans for Parliamentary representatives. This state of affairs is to remain in force for seven years after which time it may be revised.

Last of all comes the Native Land Bill, the real crux of the whole scheme. To understand the new Land Bill it is necessary to know the gist of the Smuts' Land Act of 1913, for it is precisely upon that Act that the present Bill is founded. The Smuts' Land Act of 1913 was drawn up in the interests of the big white land monopolists who had become alarmed at native encroachment in various areas. The 1913

Act was introduced in order to prohibit and discourage native land acquisition, and to relegate the natives to the so-called reserved areas. To these areas the 1913 Act added nothing but merely, as it were, stabilised their existence. It is significant to note that the native reserves are dotted about the various Provinces, presumably with a view to preventing native unity and autonomy.

Now comes the Hertzog Land Bill which contains provisions even more drastic than its predecessor of 1913. Not only does it grant no more land to natives but rather the reverse, seeks to take away some of the land they already have. It lays stress on the fact that "released areas" will be thrown open for competition between Europeans and natives. What does this actually mean? It means that the opportunity is given to the big white land monopolists to buy out those natives who have succeeded in establishing themselves in these so-called released areas. Put into other words it means the commencement of a wholesale driving of natives from the land altogether, for the natives will never be able to compete successfully with the whites for the purchase of land.

According to the 1916 Year Book, there were over 1,600,000 natives living in European areas, and that number must have considerably increased since that period. Most of these elements will undoubtedly be bought out, and the question therefore arises where can they possibly turn to? Certainly not to the crowded native locations which have continually shrunk and most of which are already supporting something like 80 or 90 inhabitants to the square mile (in some cases 200 to the square mile), and consequently are congested to the utmost. In any case the Government has fixed a maximum acreage for each tribe and laid it down that land can only be acquired by tribes or kindred groups and not by individuals. This procedure serves a dual purpose, for it not only prevents individual acquisition of land, but it relegates particular tribes to specific areas and so puts a heavy obstacle in the way of tribal fusion. Again we ask the question, to where can these landless elements turn?

In part two of the Land Bill the answer is provided to this question. According to part 2 of the Bill every native who cannot find a foothold on the land or on the crowded reserves, must become a servant on any terms he can get. "For a native to be unemployed and homeless is a criminal offence" punishable by law. From this ruling also it likewise follows that should a native landworker become dissatisfied with his employment and throw it up, he is liable to be thrown into gaol. So well calculated is the purpose of the Government with regard to flooding the land with landless natives that it has included a clause whereby Government machinery is to be set up to "provide for a fair distribution of the labour force amongst employers". This same machinery will also function in wiping out any possibility of one employer outbidding the other for native labour. In conjunction with these measures however, it is definitely laid down in the Act that each farmer is entitled to employ a certain number of native Labour Tenants, the Labour Tenant in such case being required to render to his employer a yearly period of labour amounting to 180 days. Truly the introduction of serfdom with a vengeance. Again, these Labour Tenants will be bound by contract (his contract making it necessary for the tenant's dependents — wife, children — contributing their quota of work) and registered as servants for the purposes of the Masters and Servants Act. The latter item means that breach of contract renders the Labour Tenant liable to prosecution.

What is likely to be the effect of the legislation as a whole? And what will its practical consequences be? It can only work out in one way, and that is by intensifying cheap labour competition both on the land and in the industrial centres. With a huge native labour supply let loose on the land the by-owners and landless whites will be driven into the towns in search of work, and consequently will be used as a lever for depressing existing standards. Labour conditions of labour tenants and their dependents (child labour) will likewise render thousands of natives superfluous in the domain of agriculture, and force them also into the towns, forming a dangerous competition to the workers in industry.

Such is the policy of the Labour-Nationalist Government (the Pact), a policy which aims at flooding the labour market with cheap native labour and further concentrating the ownership of land in the hands of a few. This is the menace which hangs over the heads of the South African masses. How are

they preparing to combat it? Unfortunately the most important sections of the labour movement, the Trade Unions, appear to be still fast asleep. Not so the Labour Party, however, which definitely takes up the cudgels on the master class' behalf by spreading the illusion that the proposed legislation is a scheme for giving land to the natives and segregating them apart from the whites to develop on their own lines. This falsehood has been repudiated by no less than the Government Secretary for Native Affairs, Major Herbst, who openly declared that "territorial segregation is a dead question... segregation is not a principle of the Land Bill".

The native masses, however, are beginning to be brought to a realisation that all is not well by the authoritative declarations of a number of important bodies which have grasped the real meaning of things. The Joint Council for natives, a Liberal humanitarian body composed of European and non-Europeans, has issued a manifesto in which it roundly condemns the Bills in its uncertain fashion. The African National Congress has declared that "the Bills contain no good points for natives". The I. C. U. (Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union) whilst not knowing too much about the Bills has also raised its voice against them. The Coloured Peoples' Welfare Association has decided to fight the Bills tooth and nail. The Government Native Conference at Pretoria recently consisting of select Government nominees revolted against the proposed legislation to the great surprise of its sponsors, the Government itself. Whilst last but not least the Communist Party is preparing to publish a true analysis of the Bills for distribution among the working masses.

The chief task confronting the militant working class elements at the moment is the securing of a united front of all these oppositional elements in conjunction with the organised trade union movement in order to conduct an intense campaign for the withdrawal and defeat of the proposal anti-working-class measures.

Is the Soviet Union Threatened by Intervention?

By Karl Radek.

The answer to this question has already been given by the resolution of the 14th Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.; the clause with regard to this point reads as follows:

"The relative stabilisation and the so-called "pacification" of Europe — under the hegemony of Anglo-American capital — have led to a whole system of economic and political blocs, the last of which are the Conference at Locarno and the so-called "guarantee treaties", the spearhead of which is pointed at the Soviet Union. These blocs and conspiracies which are screened by the League of Nations, which professes to be pacifist, and the hypocritical clamour of the 2nd International about disarmament, are in essentials nothing more nor less than a summoning of forces for a new war. As a counterweight to this Bloc of the capitalist States under the Anglo-American hegemony, which is accompanied by a terrific growth of armaments, and which therefore contains in embryo the danger of new wars including the danger of intervention, we see the development of friendly relations between the proletariat of the countries, and the proletariat of the Soviet Union under the slogan of fight for peace, fight against new imperialist wars and against armed attacks on the Soviet Union."

This common danger, the essence of which is that the process of the restoration of capitalist economy to the pre-war level is bringing up with elemental force the question of new markets and, in its further course, the question of the destruction of the Socialist State system in the Soviet Union which came into being in 1917 and has since gained in strength — this common danger has been intensified in the last few years thanks to two events of vast importance: The fight of the British miners and the victorious advance of the Chinese revolution.

Both events which have rained heavy blows on Great Britain, the leading capitalist State of Europe, have rendered the relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union

more acute and called forth a mad outbreak of hatred against the Soviet Union in Great Britain, thus creating the possibility of a threatened conflict between Great Britain and the Soviet Union. The alarm sounded by the Moscow Party Conference and the appeal for the mobilisation of public opinion in the Soviet Union, are completely justified. The intensification of the danger, however, demands not only the most alert attention, not only military preparations so that we may not be taken by surprise, it also demands political preparations, i. e. a number of well thought out political measures for the fight against the approaching danger, with the object of averting it.

This makes it necessary not to confine ourselves to general allusions to the growing danger, but to give a concrete picture of the world situation with all the contradictory tendencies arising from it. Needless to say, in attempting to present such a picture, we shall not make it our object to offer a photographic reproduction. We shall only give a survey of the situation, placing in the foreground those factors which allow us to throw light on the question of intervention.

Great Britain alone can be the organiser of an imperialist campaign against the Soviet Union. The United States of America, although they are trying to represent the Soviet Union as their rival in ... Nicaragua, have still too little interest in the capitalist penetration of the Soviet Union to force the opening up of the markets of the Soviet Union; as things stand, however, any participation of the United States in a possible European coalition against the Soviet Union would mean nothing more nor less than the breaking open of a safe, the contents of which would fall to the share of the competitors.

The United States of America have not yet thought out to a conclusion any policy in the Far East. They vacillate between the desire of the bourgeois circles of New York and Washington, who have a wider outlook, to help China to achieve unity, so that they may take possession of this vast united market, and the instinctive fear with which the revolutionary "mob" in China inspires the American merchants in Shanghai and Hankow. This vacillation in itself is a sufficient reason for the United States not bursting with rage at the fact that the mere existence of the Soviet Union is a support to the Chinese freedom movement.

The natural result of this is that the United States do not yet form any reliable cover in the rear for Great Britain. Further, the absence of any determined, active, anti-Soviet policy of the United States means that the European countries in which the United States have invested enormous sums of money and which still gaze with rapture on the coffers of Wall Street, look to America, trying to find an answer to the questions: Are the United States prepared to stake their capital invested in Europe on the imperialist attack of Britain against the Soviet Union?

Great Britain has not yet a reliable cover in the rear in the United States. What is the position with regard to cover in Asia?

In view of the present financial and economic situation of Great Britain, a simultaneous attack against China and the Soviet Union must be regarded as out of the question; as, however, British imperialism cannot hope to conclude a bargain with the Soviet Union with regard to China, its policy must be directed towards causing a split between China and the Soviet Union, towards aiming a powerful blow at the revolutionary forces of China, towards concluding a bargain with the Chinese bourgeoisie, only to withdraw the concessions made to China at some future date, when it has defeated the Soviet Union.

We will not enter too closely into the prospects of this policy, from the point of view of the internal forces of the Chinese revolution. We will only say that the chief difficulty for the British bourgeoisie is a fact which it takes but little into consideration, the fact that the motive force of the Chinese revolution is not so much the endeavour of the Chinese bourgeoisie to achieve national unity, to liberate China from the yoke of foreign capitalism, — it is rather the increasing distress of the masses of peasants which renders any stabilisation of a bourgeois regime in China impossible for a long time to come.

In China, Great Britain has to deal not only with the Chinese but also with numerous imperialist rivals. Can it rely on their support in its endeavours? The behaviour of France, Japan and even of the United States towards the British note

to China on December 16th 1926, is evidence that the Asiatic Bloc of the imperialist Powers has, at any rate, not yet crystallised. Some of the imperialist Powers regarded Great Britain's proposals as an attempt to appropriate the part of a "friend to China" which is being played by the United States; others, such as Japan and China, were of the opinion that Great Britain was attempting to take the leadership in the East into her own hands and to make it an appendage of British policy. The fact that the British Imperial Conference approved of the construction of the naval base at Singapore, shows how little Great Britain is convinced that she can rely on the support of the imperialist Powers in the Far East.

In Asia Minor and in Central Asia it has not been possible to encircle the Soviet Union. The best evidence that Great Britain has not succeeded in buying the Turkey of Mustapha Kemal is the fact that Great Britain is supporting Italy's anti-Turkish tendencies. The greatest success of which Great Britain can boast is in Persia. In Afghanistan, the policy of Great Britain was not crowned with success.

Even in Arabia, where it seemed as though the bargain struck with Ibn Saud and the policy of the mailed fist in Mesopotamia would guarantee complete peace for Great Britain, whilst the defeat of France in Syria would be a sure protection for Great Britain against French intrigues, even in Arabia we find Italy suddenly appearing on the scenes in Yemen with an independent colonial policy. Even though this policy can be explained as being solely due to Italy's efforts to find objects of compensation for negotiations in the Mediterranean, it is in any case a fact that even Italy's considerable dependence on Great Britain does not shield the latter from surprises.

As regards the question of the Mediterranean, the significance of which has greatly increased in recent times, the situation is not yet such that Great Britain can afford to disregard it. On the contrary, the characteristic feature of the situation in the Mediterranean is the increasing unrest caused by the appearance of Italian imperialism which, feeling itself strengthened by the growing industrialisation of Italy, is striving for a "place in the sun". Italian imperialism does not yet know itself what it should demand, South Anatolia, Syria or Tunis; whether it should engage in a fight with Yugoslavia for supremacy in the Adriatic. It is in that stage of putting out feelers, through which German imperialism passed in the last decade of the nineteenth century.

Great Britain is supporting Italy in order to ensure for herself the support of the latter against France; as soon however as she has succeeded through this manoeuvre in exercising pressure on France, she will try to play the part of a mediator between France and Italy, as she has already tried to play this part between France and Germany since the war. All this implies that British policy cannot at present turn its back on the questions of the Mediterranean and concentrate its efforts on aiming a blow at the Soviet Union.

One of the chief sections of the front of British diplomacy is of course in Western and Central Europe. British imperialism is carrying on an incessant struggle against two tendencies. On the one hand it is trying to diminish the conflicting interests between Germany and France which, in the intensified form in which they existed from 1919 to 1923, bound it to the Rhine. Without the intervention of British imperialism, France would have become master of Europe. Thanks to the help of the United States, British policy was crowned with success.

Great Britain however, must say: Alas, the victory is ours! The steel trust, which unites the German steel industry with that of France and Belgium, the political negotiations in Thoiry, have revealed to Great Britain the danger of an approach of this kind between the two continental Powers. This would considerably have increased their independence with regard to Great Britain. The very haste with which Germany endeavoured at Romsey to testify that it was aiming at an economic agreement with Great Britain also and that, if the metal industry in Germany had formed a trust with that of France, Germany's chemical industry was aiming at striking a bargain with that of Britain — this haste in itself shows how the uneasiness in Britain must be taken into account. All this proves that Great Britain cannot simply, at her own sweet will, order the forces of France and Germany to attack the Soviet Union.

Let us now see how things are on the Western frontier of the Soviet Union, with its immediate neighbours, who would be the first destined to carry out the British attack against

the Soviet Union. The centre-point of this attack would of course be Poland. Her attitude towards the Soviet Union is the least known factor, and that for the simple reason that her internal forces have not yet crystallised.

If we take the Polish bourgeoisie, we find that it has no obvious economic aims which would prompt it to embark on a war against the Soviet Union. It is too weak to skim off the cream in the event of a British victory over the Soviet Union. It can only gain economic advantages by the establishment of independent economic relations with the Soviet Union. Only one section of the Polish landed proprietors is interested in a war against the Soviet Union. These are the landed proprietors of the border districts who are sitting on the volcano of the White Russian and the Ukrainian peasants, and might speculate that a victory over the Soviet Union would give them the possibility of finally settling with the White Russian and Ukrainian peasantry. The most far-seeing elements among the Polish landowning class grasp the fact that it is impossible to annihilate the millions of White Russian and Ukrainian peasants, that every territorial acquisition in the East implies an increase and an intensification of the national question and the peasant question in Poland.

Nevertheless it would be a mistake to rely on the soothing voice of the Polish Press, which is at present expressing itself in peaceful terms with regard to relations with the Soviet Union. The dictatorship of the soldatesca in the person of Pilsudski is the element which prevents a more or less exact political estimate being made. The internal difficulties of Poland, the impossibility of continuing for long to spend 45% of the Budget on the army, all this may create a situation which will drive Pilsudski to risk an adventure. It is, however, certain that even Pilsudski cannot make up his mind to such an adventure without being sure of having a cover in the rear.

The central question in the danger with which the Soviet Union is threatened by Poland, is the question of the relations between Poland and Germany. The stabilisation of German capital has led to a strengthening of Germany in its foreign policy. By joining the League of Nations and signing the Treaty of Locarno, for which she paid by recognising her Western frontiers as something finally settled for good and all, Germany has been forced to adopt the line of the supposed least resistance, which means that the question of the revision of her frontiers with Poland has been brought into the foreground. Germany has of course vowed three times a week that she does not dream of setting this frontier right by force of arms, but even the Treaty of Versailles recognised the theory of evolution and said with Heraclitus that "everything is in a state of flux". Germany is said to be doing nothing except helping this tendency a little by bringing up the question of the Corridor.

The negotiations which Germany is now carrying on in Paris with Great Britain and France with regard to the so-called "remaining questions" of disarmament, have shown that Germany is not only making propaganda, but is even consolidating her strategic positions on the borders between Poland and Germany by strengthening the fortresses which were left to her by the Treaty of Versailles for fighting purposes in case the Bolshevik Huns should attack. The French Press accuses Germany of constructing 54 concrete defences, 20 kilometers long and 3 kilometers broad to the South and East of Königsberg; it maintains that Germany has succeeded in building 20 such defences in the district of the Masurian Lakes South of Lötzén. At the same time, according to the assertions of the French Press, similar constructions have been built to the East of the line Kustrin to Frankfort and round Glogau, five kilometers from the Polish frontier; they are said to be 1.5 to 6 meters high and are intended to form a base in the case of war against Poland. The French maintain that these constructions were started after Locarno.

Poland accuses Germany of having thus violated the Treaty of Versailles, which only conceded to Germany the right to maintain the old system of fortresses. General Pawels, the German military plenipotentiary, answers quite reasonably and logically that, if the old system is to be maintained, it must be developed, as otherwise it would lose its value.

The Germans are right when they point to the fact of the defensive character of these constructions, and there can be as little doubt that, if Germany were given the Corridor with the fortresses of Graudenz and Thorn, which would place in her hands the means of crossing the Vistula, it would greatly streng-

then her strategic position in the East. For this reason there is great opposition in Poland to the so-called Martini idea, which was proposed in 1919 and brought up again in 1925, suggesting that Poland be given an outlet to the sea through the Lithuanian Corridor with Memel in exchange for the surrender to Germany of the Corridor with Danzig. In the so-called Danzig Corridor more than 80% of the population is Polish, but the Lithuanian Corridor would pass through an exclusively Lithuanian peasant population, which hates Poland and the Polish landowners.

Furthermore, in order to gain Lithuania's consent to a bargain of this kind, it would be necessary to consent to a union with Lithuania and to hand Vilna over to her, i. e. to put on the order of the day, the question of the transformation of the whole of Poland into a federation; for neither the White Russians nor the Ukrainians would be reconciled to a situation which would grant autonomy to Lithuania and leave them in complete subjugation to the Polish Voivods.

For a long time, rumours were in circulation to the effect that Pilsudski was not disinclined to enter into this bargain so as to have Germany as a rear cover should it come to a reckoning with the Soviet Union. An end was put to these rumours by the declaration of Zaleski, the Polish Foreign Minister, that any step taken towards changing the frontiers between Poland and Germany would lead to war. Thus, it cannot be said that British diplomacy has yet succeeded in forming a bloc between Poland and Germany. The point of Polish policy is at present directed against Germany.

In the same way, Great Britain has not yet succeeded in bringing about friendly relations between Poland and Lithuania although she has worked hard towards this end. The seizure of power in Lithuania by the clerical Fascist Government which, from the social point of view, is of the same breed as the Polish one, facilitates an understanding; for it is clear that the Catholic priests can more easily come to an agreement with the Polish large landowners than could the parties which express the hatred of the Lithuanian peasantry for the Polish landed proprietors. The fact that the Fascist Government relies on the army, i. e. on the support of the peasant and nationalist tendencies, does not lessen the danger of this chaffering, for peasant masses who are not led by the workers, are not capable of giving active expression to their attitude of mind, whilst a numerically small corps of officers is easily bought for a mess of pottage.

Poland and Lithuania have so far not come to an agreement; and if we carefully follow events in Lithuania, we can assure ourselves that they are not so much the result of Poland's influence or of a tendency of Lithuania to lean towards Poland, as of Great Britain's interference and of an inclination on the part of the Lithuanian Fascists to favour the British attack on the Soviet Union.

By way of concluding our survey of the situation on the Western frontiers of the Soviet Union, we will say a few words about Roumania and the Baltic neighbours of the Soviet Union. The latter have not yet definitely formed an alliance with Poland, nor are they a party to any attack on the Soviet Union. As long as peace lasts or, to put it more exactly, as long as there is any hope of its being maintained, they reckon with the fact that the Russian market is for them an economic outlet to their economic blind alley. As however they are on the sea and within the reach of the guns of British warships, they will, in the decisive moment, submit to Great Britain's wishes, with the possible exception of Finland. As regards Roumania, her position is not only determined by her fear of losing Bessarabia, but also by the fear of being isolated should Poland be defeated. This means that there is a certain connection between the relations of the Soviet Union to Poland on the one hand and to Roumania on the other hand.

These are the main features of the picture of the international situation, as we see it. What conclusions are to be drawn from this picture?

The first conclusion is that, in spite of the sharpening of the relations between Great Britain and the Soviet Union, the diplomatic preparations for the British attack are not yet completed. The international picture is still extremely variegated, the international contradictions are not yet sufficiently polarized, they are not yet sufficiently grouped round a single axis as was the case in 1914. The central point of dissension in the future, within the camp of the imperialists, will be the con-

lict of interests between Great Britain and the United States. This conflict of interests has not yet matured either objectively or in the consciousness of the bourgeoisie of the two countries. It is just this which makes such combinations possible as the plan proposed by Hearst (the American journalist and well-known publisher, who owns a number of newspapers in the United States), a plan for an alliance between Great Britain and the United States as the central axis of the international situation.

Thanks to the immaturity of the contradictions between Great Britain and the United States, the imperialist contradictions of second magnitude in Europe — the conflicting interests between Great Britain and France and between France and Italy — have not yet grouped themselves round this axis. For the time being, the friendly relations between France and Germany are directed both against Great Britain and against America. This muddle, the economic causes of which are very deep-rooted, does not yet permit of the enmity against the Soviet Union being regarded as the central question of world politics. This justifies our hoping that the policy of the Soviet Union still has the time and the opportunity to counteract the formation of an anti-Soviet Bloc.

It would, however, be quite wrong to imagine that Great Britain will only decide to attack the Soviet Union when preparations have been made to a hundred per cent. She may try to drive Poland into war, calculating that, if she succeeds in provoking this war, no alternative will be left to the Baltic States and to Roumania, that the fact of the war will compel Germany and France to come to a decision, and that this decision might be brought to a head by fanning their imperialist lusts. Should this come off, British diplomacy will succeed in forcing Poland to come to an agreement with Germany in respect of her Western frontiers.

For this reason, the fight against the British war policy must proceed simultaneously with the attempt to frustrate Great Britain's plans of forming blocs in the East and in the West, while the greatest attention must be paid to the question of our relations with the nearest neighbours of the Soviet Union, of preparations for defence and of the political mobilisation of the masses for defence. These two tasks not only do not contradict one another, on the contrary, they are closely related to one another. The will of the masses to resist with the greatest determination any attack on the Soviet Union will grow in the measure that we succeed in showing the masses that the Soviet Union has neglected nothing which is necessary to ensure peace. The policy of the Soviet Union, Lenin's policy, has never had anything in common with the policy of sabre rattling. Lenin knew that for the masses of the people war is such an evil, demands such sacrifices, that it can only be demanded of them after every means of preserving peace has been tried.

A policy of this kind is at the same time the best way of mobilising the proletariat of Western Europe. The demand for peace and the hostility to war are both equally characteristic of the proletariat in post-war times. By showing the proletariat that no one is so decided a defender of peace as the Republic of the Workers which, while defending peace defends also not only the lives of the masses of workers and peasants, but also socialist construction, we are creating the foundation for the broadest application of the tactics of the united front in the struggle for peace. The attitude of mind of these working masses will be of paramount importance in deciding the question of intervention or — should the proletariat of Western Europe not prove strong enough to prevent intervention — in deciding its issue.

Down with American Imperialism in Nicaragua!

A telegraphic extract from the following appeal has already been published in our last regular number. Ed.

To the Workers and Peasants!
To the Oppressed Peoples!

The United States Army occupies Nicaragua, disarms and oppresses a people unable to defend itself. Powerful American imperialism, the greatest profitor of the world war which is forcing all peoples to pay a heavy tribute, is now throwing off

the mask of democracy which so badly veiled its rapacity. It is cynically affirming its intention to subject the small countries of Central America and to make Latin America part of the dominion of the United States. The military forces of this colossus are strangling a small people who are struggling valiantly for their independence. But the blockade and military occupation of Nicaragua by the powerful navy of the United States is only an episode of the Progressive colonisation of entire Latin America.

For a long time American capitalism systematically combatting British influence in the Latin American countries, has been seizing all the natural wealth, the industries and the means of transportation in the countries of South and Central America, placing their governments in a state of absolute economic and financial dependence, always supporting the most reactionary governments devoted to American capitalism and at the same time endeavouring to maintain among the privileged peoples an illusion of "independence" and of formal political "liberty".

This conquest of the South American republics by United States capital under the hypocritical mask of liberalism and democracy, has met with the resistance of the masses of the people doubly exploited by American capitalism and by their own national bourgeoisie, which is at the service and in the pay of the North American capitalists.

The workers and peasants of Mexico were the first to revolt against North American pillage and exploitation and against the puppet governments that were "democratically" imposed by Washington. Following a revolutionary movement for independence they formed a national popular government and incessantly urged it to resist the pretentious of North American capitalism. This government under the pressure of the masses had just established the right of Mexico to dispose of its oil resources which in the majority of cases are in the hands of North American companies. The Washington government, at the behest of the oil magnates of the United States immediately threatened Mexico with military intervention.

The effort of the Mexican people to escape from the clutches of imperialism has brought other peoples of Central America into the struggle against subjection and exploitation. The people of Nicaragua in turn have revolted against "President" Diaz, a puppet of America capital. But the United States does not want to have a second Mexico, which would soon extend the anti-imperialist struggle to all the countries of Central America. They intend making a second Panama canal through Nicaragua. It is necessary that the country should be completely subjected. The Americans therefore throw off the mask and under the pretext of guaranteeing the life and property of American citizens, they effect a military occupation of the country, drive out the liberal army and endeavour to re-establish their own prison-warder Diaz. By this military action, the United States is attempting to intimidate Mexico and seize her oil fields, and is at the same time preparing military intervention.

In the face of ever-growing protests on the part of Latin America and of large sections of the population of North America, Kellogg found no better means to disguise the crimes and the rapacity of American imperialism than to borrow from the Fascist bandits of Lithuania, Bulgaria, and elsewhere the miserable and ridiculous pretext which is to legitimise in the eyes of the international bourgeoisie the most criminal actions: Struggle against Bolshevism, against the III International in order to save civilisation which is in danger. The whole world has laughed at the expense of the absurd figure who uses the Bolshevik scarecrow in order to make people forget that only the interests of the American oil kinds and bankers and their insatiable rapacity are the cause of the military intervention of the United States in Central America, that only the exploitation and the pillaging of these small peoples by Yankee imperialism provoke them to resistance and risings which threaten only the scandalous profits and the safes of the greedy capitalists which Kellogg will not be able to represent to the world as civilisation.

It is of course true that the Communist International has since its establishment proclaimed its determination to struggle against imperialism and the capitalist regime. It never made an exception for the most insolent and the strongest imperialism, that of the United States. Every struggle of an exploited people against any imperialism whatsoever will be certain of its active solidarity and its support. The C.I. calls upon all the anti-imperialist forces to support the small people of Nicaragua against the cowardly strangle-hold of American imperialism. Kellogg has discovered this constant policy of the Communist International just at the moment when the oil and finance kings

need a screen to hide their crime. His clumsy manoeuvre borders on the ridiculous.

At the same time, her plans for the colonisation of the whole of Latin America are developing and the method of colonisation becoming more and more tyrannical. By a recent treaty, Panama has lost all, even formal independence. It is obliged to declare war with and to conduct it side by side with the United States. The U. S. A., with the assent of a government which it has bought, recently established its control over the Peru customs in order to pay the arrears of interest for loans granted to the government. Chosen by Chile and Peru to act as arbitrator in the dispute between these two countries concerning the zone of Tacna and Arica, the U. S. A. simply forms the zone which is the outlet from Bolivia into the Pacific, into an American protectorate.

Comrades! The rapacious policy of the United States in regard to the nations of Latin America, its threats of war against Mexico, the strangling of Nicaragua, the pressure on Panama and a part of the South coast of the Pacific, is arousing the resistance of the masses of people in the threatened countries. A wave of indignation and protest is rousing the whole Latin America against the vile aggression of the United States towards the little republic of Nicaragua.

The League of Nations is once more betraying the interests of small peoples for the advantage of the great imperialist powers and remaining silent; but the struggle for independence of the Latin American nations, their resistance to United States imperialism, must everywhere be given the most active support of the International revolutionary proletariat.

Comrades! The same active solidarity which animates you for the independent struggle of China and of the Indies, must also animate you against the brutal oppression of the peoples of Latin America by North American imperialism. Their struggle for independence is but a part of the great world struggle of the peoples oppressed by imperialism against their oppressors. China, the Indies, and Central America are now the hearths of this great struggle. The people in revolt are the allies of the proletariat and the peasants. They must be actively supported. Let the people of Latin America from the Rio Grande to Terra del Fuogo rise in protest against the exploitation and the rapacity of the United States, let all the towns of the United States raise the vehement protest of the North American proletariat and the peasantry of the world express their solidarity with the small people of Nicaragua.

Down with the rapacious and murderous imperialism of the United States!

Down with the vile suppression of the little Nicaraguan people by the American colossus!

Long live the struggle for independence of the oppressed peoples against imperialism!

Long live the international solidarity of the workers and peasants and the enslaved peoples against their common enemy!

The E. C. of the Communist International.

THE BALKANS

"Normalisation" in Bessarabia and in Bukovina.

By Vasile Spiru (Kishinev).

"Normal conditions must be re-established in Bessarabia and Bukovina", announced Avarescu, the Prime Minister, the well-tried slaughterers of workers and peasants a short time ago to representatives of the press. And he added "in order to prove that the strict measures of a military authority are not necessary in the Dniestr district, I have appointed a Civil Commissary to whom the military authorities will hand over the exercise of power".

The words of the Roumanian Prime Minister were immediately followed by deeds, General Rascanu, the former War Minister, was appointed by royal decree and a special resolution of the Cabinet of January 11th 1927 as "Supreme Commissary of the Government in Bessarabia and Bukovina", thus as the "Civil Commissary" promised.

His competence is as follows:

"The Supreme Commissary for Bessarabia and Bukovina is the authorised representative of the Government with absolute power and it is his duty to exercise constant

control of all branches of public life, which he is to promote as required in order to ensure the development in keeping with normal and local conditions.

By the nature of his competence, the activities of the Supreme Commissary of the Government will extend to all military and civil official posts...

Only (!) in questions regarding local order and the protection of the frontiers will the local higher military commands depend on the Supreme Commissary of the Government.

The local administrative authorities, the police, the Siguranta, the customs authorities and the public prosecutors shall, in accordance with the regulations of the Supreme Commissary, bring their activities into harmony with those of the military authorities in three respects:

1. With regard to the protection of the frontiers. 2. With regard to the centralisation of internal information from abroad (this means in plain language military espionage) and 3. With regard to the urban and rural police lines of traffic, railway stations, harbours and finally the protection of the air service."

In this way a kind of Roumanian "Supreme Command of the East" has been established. It is a measure of war, of acute war against the "internal enemy" and of war against the Soviet Union — which is only in preparation.

The whole civil and military power is united in the hands of a single commanding general. Not only is the condition of emergency, which prevails in Bessarabia, being seriously intensified, but Bukovina is being treated as Bessarabia and being drawn into the zone of the merciless war against the "internal" enemy. This is the "normalisation".

To crown all this, it has at its head a general who, during the war, had hundreds of Jewish soldiers shot, merely because they were Jews, and who, as War Minister, bloodily suppressed the general strike of 1920, imprisoning thousands of workers and who, as agent of the ruling oligarchy, inaugurated the regime of White Terror in Roumania in its present form. At the heart of this "normalisation" is a man who, as a high military dignitary, was in the centre of a whole caucus of cases of corruption of the worst kind, a man whose hands are still stained with the blood of Dr. Aroneanu, the Moldavian Labour leader and of so many other victims from the Roumanian proletariat. We may thus expect an exacerbation of the regime of terror and corruption.

The rule of the Boyars, which has lasted for eight years, has turned Bessarabia into a cemetery. The agrarian regime, which at present prevails in Bessarabia, binds the peasant by force — more than 80% of the population belonging to the peasantry — to the soil of which he has been robbed, and turns him into a kind of serf, such as did not exist even under Czarism. Requisitions, the burden of taxation and unfathomable corruption suck the very marrow from the bones of the Bessarabian peasant and leave him to perish in chronic starvation (pellagra) and misery. Robbed of their natural markets on the other side of the Dniestr, the trade and industry of Bessarabia are going to pieces, indeed, in many places, industrial life is ceasing altogether.

A close network of members of the Siguranta and gendarmerie is spread over the whole country, enveloping the population in the gruesome atmosphere of permanent White Terror. Any movement for freedom on the part of the workers and peasants, any effort for culture of the national minorities in Bessarabia is drowned in blood. The dungeons and prisons of Bessarabia, as those of the old kingdom, are filled with the best sons and daughters of the province, and all the roads between the Pruth and the Dniestr are stained with the blood of the intrepid fighters for the freedom of the workers of Bessarabia.

In Bukovina things are not much better. Normalisation here, especially with the help of a General Rascanu, means stabilising these conditions and aggravating and deepening the ruling terror. In the end, the internal front is to be turned into a suitable hinterland for the external front directed towards the East.

That this is planned, is proved by the inclusion of Bukovina in Rascanu's sphere of power; for this province represents the connection with the Pilsudski front and, according to the unanimous opinion of the Government Press, Bukovina has been "sadly neglected from the national point of view". This is also proved by the fact that all the bourgeois parties, even

including the "National Peasant Party" of the opposition which professes to be democratic, are united with regard to the question of the nomination of the Governor for Bessarabia and Bukovina, and that all the bourgeois papers welcomed his nomination with unusual unanimity.

It is no mere coincidence that this nomination is contemporary with the announcement of the 37 milliard credit for Roumanian armaments, with the appearance in the Roumanian Press of all kinds of scare news as to plans of war and armaments on the part of the Soviet Union, with the discovery of a new "Communist conspiracy" in Bessarabia and of the artificially inflated frontier incident near Bugaz on the Dniestr, which is now represented, even by Roumania, as an insignificant smuggling affair and which has given the pretext for increasing the frontier troops of Roumania.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Dissolution of the Trade Union Confederation of Italy.

By Compagno (Rome).

At its meeting on January 4th in Milan, the Central Committee of the *Confederazione General del Lavoro* (the Free Trade Union Confederation of Italy) passed a resolution, which runs as follows:

"After hearing the informative report on the conditions in the trade union organisations, the situation in the provinces and the views of the leaders and functionaries, and after recording that the attempt to form a trade union federation on the basis of article 12 of the law of April 3rd 1926 and the other police and control laws has proved a failure, and that it appears impossible to carry out the enrolment of the members for 1927, the committee declares its function to be extinct and commissions the Executive Committee to proceed with the liquidation and settlement of the remaining interests of the *Confederazione Generale del Lavoro*."

With this supreme piece of rascality, the Reformist clique, which in the last few years was at the head of the Trade Union Federation of Italy, crowns its own policy of passivity and surrender to Fascism.

The Reformist leaders recognise the complete shipwreck of their tactics of "passive resistance" which was applied towards the Fascist dictatorship, and refuse to adopt the lines of active fighting which is demanded by the majority of the organised workers. They prefer to dissolve the *Confederazione* and to retire to private life.

But is it possible for the working class to retire to private life?

The Reformist leaders cede the field to the Fascists, they run away from the weak positions which they occupied hitherto, and liquidate the united organisation of the trade unions of the Italian proletariat, using as a pretext the Fascist exceptional laws and the deeds of illegality constantly committed against the organisers and their offices. As a matter of fact, the terrible conditions which Fascism has created for the working class, demand tremendous sacrifices of those who do not relent in their opposition against the Fascist dictatorship. The last regulations which forced on all workers the payment of contributions to the Fascist corporations, confirm the Government's plan to leave the Fascist trade union monopoly unrestricted and to prevent the other trade union organisations from exercising those friendly society functions which even the Fascist law conceded them. All this, however, does not improve in any way the shameful and defeatist character of the measures taken by the Reformists.

In recent times, differences of opinion with regard to the dissolution of the *Confederazione* became evident among the Reformist leaders themselves. The Reformists Buozzi, Turati, Modigliani and their comrades, who are in emigration, represented the view that the *Confederazione* should reject the pseudo-legality granted it by the Fascist Government for reasons of Foreign Policy, and should appeal to the International Labour Office which is to concern itself at its next meeting with carrying through trade union freedom in the various countries. In contrast to this thesis, some organisers who had remained in Italy, among them Maglione, D'Aragona, Reina and others,

maintained that a compromise with the Fascist corporations and the enrolment of the members of the *Confederazione* in the Fascist corporations would be more to the purpose. The only real proletarian and anti-Fascist tactics, the tactics of a fight at all costs, of a fight to the utmost limit, of a fight against the Fascist dictatorship even though the fight be organised in an illegal form, found no adherents in the Reformist camp.

In 1920, the time of the advance of the Italian proletariat, the Reformist leaders of the *Confederazione* placed their confidence in the Reformist virtues of Nitti's Democratic Government; in 1921 and 1922 they expected the Bourgeois Parliament to defend the Labour Chambers which were attacked by the Black Shirts and threatened with burning; in 1923, they entered into negotiations with D'Annunzio in order to persuade Fascism to grant them freedom of organisation; in 1924, they allowed themselves to be taken in tow by the *Aventino* (Opposition with the exception of the Communists), they expected that Fascism would be liquidated by the intervention of the Crown and the General Staff of the army and were opposed to any agitation on the part of the workers which might cause disturbances and retard a peaceful return to normal conditions; since 1925, they have set their hopes in the League of Nations and the International Labour Office affiliated to the latter.

These leaders are at the end of their career. Their behaviour is a worthy counterpart to that of the Reformist Socialist Party and the Maximalist Party which, after their dissolution, pitched their tents in foreign countries, declaring that nothing could be done in Italy and that the Fascist dictatorship would be forced to the ground "from outside". It hardly needs many words to condemn an attitude of this kind and to prove how absolutely unfounded it is. Facts speak an imperative language. In spite of dissolution, in spite of deportations, in spite of the special tribunal, in spite of the suppression of the Press, the Communist Party of Italy remains firmly at its post, not in an attitude of "passive resistance", but fighting with all the more vigour against the Fascist dictatorship.

The desertion of the Reformist leaders is all the more to be condemned as it takes place at a moment which is extremely grave for the proletariat of Italy.

The serious consequences of the economic crisis are already making themselves felt by the working class of Italy. According to official statistics, there were in Italy 148,821 unemployed and 6618 short time workers on November 30th 1926; but these figures are far exceeded by the actual ones. In any case, unemployment has further increased in December and January.

The crisis has become more serious than was to be foreseen. The Association of the Textile Industrialists resolved to restrict the working week to five days for the whole of Italy: in Legnano, Schio, Biella, Prato, etc. however, the industrialists were not satisfied with this restriction of the days of work and began to dismiss hundreds and hundreds of workers.

As regards the metal industry, the crisis is particularly severe in Trieste, Milan, Turin, etc. In Palermo the factories are already closed down; in Milan whole troops of workers are dismissed every week (the great motor car factory "Itala" alone reduced the number of its workers from 700 to 76). Even the "Ansaldo" Company (which may be compared to the firm of Armstrong in Great Britain), in spite of its big national credit dismissed hundreds of workers.

The foodstuff industry in South Italy has radically reduced its production: in Torre Annunziata 57 out of 67 macaroni factories are closed while the other 10 reduced their hour of work; 33 out of 37 mills are closed and the remaining 4 have also restricted their hours of work.

In many districts the crisis is intensified by the wage cutting policy of the employers. In Montalcone 300 workers who had been dismissed were re-engaged after a week with lower wages: the hour's wage of workers who previously received 3.65 lire, now amounts to 1.60 lire, so that they are earning 16 lire per day (1 lire corresponds to about 2 pennies). The wages of masons in Rome have been reduced to 2.20 lire. The greatest cutting down of wages has taken place in Venetia.

Simultaneously with the industrial crisis a severe housing crisis is seen in towns with a fairly large population, resulting from the Fascist law by which the tenants' protection is abolished. The Fascist papers publish the news that in Naples alone there are more than 30,000 inhabitants who have been

given notice for the coming Spring; they further publish resolutions passed by Fascist unions of employees and retail traders, appealing to the Government for intervention against the landlords. We see almost the same situation in Turin, Milan and Rome. The Fascist tenants and the Fascist landlords are at daggers drawn.

The Communist Party of Italy has made it its task to place itself at the head of the proletarian movements against the industrial crisis, unemployment, cutting down of wages, against notice being given to tenants and the increase of rents. By means of the illegal newspaper "L'Unità" with its many issues in the provinces, by means of small factory papers and pamphlets, the Communists have taken up a definite stand and propagated among the masses the immediate demands for repelling the capitalist offensive and connected this fight with its political action against the dictatorship of Fascism.

In Rome two popular demonstrations arranged exclusively by women, took place against the landlords; several women were sentenced by the Courts. In Legnano and Turin, the workers of various factories replied to the cutting down of wages with passive resistance. In Cremona the cement workers refused to accept the weekly wages because the employers had reduced them.

The fermentation among the workers in the factories, which among other things finds expression in the sudden appearance of the emblems of the sickle and hammer on the walls, in illegal Communist printing matters being posted up on them etc. made an alarming impression on Mussolini. The Ministry for the Interior sent a sharp circular note to the prefects, admonishing them to observe more closely the happenings in the factories and to exterminate at all costs the organisation of the illegal Press.

This is the situation in which the Reformist leaders refuse to fulfil their duties, in which they desert the colours! The workers will, however, choose new leaders for themselves. The Communists place themselves at the disposal of the proletariat in its opposition to Fascist dictatorship, to the defeatism of the former functionaries of the Confederazione, for leading and organising the fight for emancipation.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

Commercial Traffic in the Hands of the Proletariat.

By A. Mikoyan.

The following remarks are taken from a speech delivered by Comrade Mikoyan, People's Commissary for Trade, at the XVth Moscow Government Conference of the C. P. S. U.

In our economic policy, our economic situation, and our economic system, a comparison between the present day and the early days of the "Nep" reveals a series of alterations, all of which have tended to place the "Nep" on a higher stage of development.

Last year, the newly-formed Opposition labelled our Party by affirming that we intended to proceed to the formation of a "Neo-Nep" and were working in the direction of an extension of the "Nep", which would represent a further retreat.

For the purpose of examining the actual state of affairs, we may investigate the situation as it was at the time of the inception of the "Nep". I believe that in the concentration of economic administration, in systematic economy, and in the extension of the State and co-operative organs, we can record a measure of success which will justify us in the assertion that the "Nep" is to-day some steps higher up than it was at the start.

Take the textile industry, as an example. All its products, to the value of thousands of millions, are distributed by means of a uniform centralised apparatus.

Or, again, take retail trade. At the beginning of the "Nep" our State Co-operatives played quite an insignificant rôle in retail trade. The same was the case in wholesale trade. Now 65 per cent. of the retail trade in industrial goods is in the hands of the State and the co-operatives. This not only means an increase in the percentage, but also that this percentage places the Co-operatives and the State in a position in which they can lead and command.

As regards the provision of agricultural products, as much as 85 per cent. is in this case in the hands of the Co-operatives and the State. The private trader is ceasing to act as a mediator between the State and the peasantry. Raw material traffic is to the extent of 70 per cent. in the hands of the State, while in certain branches, such as cotton, beet, and flax, the proportion in favour of the State is fully 100 per cent.

These are alterations of a nature which does not lead either to the Neo-Nep or to the extension of the "Nep", but to the confirmation of the economic power of the proletarian dictatorship. We are not retreating, but are rather systematically pushing forward to new positions. This must be most emphatically pointed out. At the May Conference of 1921, Lenin only conceived of the "Nep" as a facility for local commercial traffic. Later on we passed over to complete free trade.

The sale of a number of commodities in the market is so constituted that we do not possess any free traffic in these commodities on a national scale, but only a local free commercial traffic, that is to say, we are approaching in the course of our organic development to that position of May 1921 which could not be maintained at the time. Three or four years ago we should not have ventured to take such steps, but to-day these measures have a fruitful influence not only on the Socialist work of construction but also on the speed of the development of our national economy. These are symptoms of the growing power of the Socialist element in Soviet economy.

I must point out, however, that our achievements possess a quantitative character; for, though the quality of our work has in many respects improved, we are still faced with some very difficult and important tasks in the direction of goods traffic and goods exchange. We have united commerce and directed it, so far as the most important types of commodities are concerned, into the channels of State and co-operative organs. The simple form of trade is being conducted by us with important elements of systematic distribution. The basis of our work, however, has remained primitive, Asiatic. Our apparatus is so constructed that, despite the correctness of the principles of its organisatory structure, the costs of commercial traffic are still tremendous and heavily encumber economy.

Comrade Bucharin is perfectly right in saying that the problem of price policy is at present one of the most important political and economic questions. Price policy and price formation will in the first place decide the consumptive capacity of the market and the elasticity of the development of industrialisation, secondly they will influence the rapidity and direction of the progress of agriculture with its various branches, and thirdly they will affect that class-relationship between workers and peasants, seeing that it is only on the market that the economic relationships of the classes find their baldest expression; fourthly, the problems of price policy and price formation constitute half, or even more than half, the question of wages. The policy of price reduction is at the same time a policy of increased wages. And finally these questions are intimately related to the most important problem, that of Socialist accumulation.

Already for some months past we have been faced with the burning question of price reduction. This question formed one of the difficulties we had to contend with last year. The latter consisted of the following factors: firstly the danger of a depreciation of the tchervonetz; secondly, collapse of our export and import programme; thirdly, collapse of the grain provisioning; fourthly, by reason of all these things, restriction of the productive programme of industry and diminution of the new capital investments, etc.; and, as a result of the foregoing, a rise of prices and a reduction of wages.

Some of these difficulties have now already been overcome. In regard to the provisioning of grain, we can record quite satisfactory results; the tchervonetz has been stabilised and its devaluation arrested; order has been established in importation and exportation. During the last few months we have proved that the forces of the Soviet State, the force of all economic resources at the disposal of the state, fully suffice for regulating the supply and price of grain. The rise or fall of the latter now depends on the State. On us alone it depends, only we are competent, only we have sufficient means at our disposal to attain a result in any direction.

Last year the Opposition tried to make out that the dictatorship of the working class was encountering the growing resistance of the village in general and of the kulaks in particular, that the kulaks were tying our hands. We have given proof of the fundamental incorrectness of the standpoint of the

Opposition. We have shown how strong we are and how greatly the Opposition underestimates the influence we can bring to bear on the market. From the point of view of principle, our victory in the grain question is of more significance than any other of our victories. What was at stake was in this case the question of the relation between the classes — the workers and peasants — and practice has shown that our Party was in the right.

On the other hand, our success in regard to the reduction of the prices of industrial products has been insignificant. We managed to arrest the tendency of the market towards an inflation of prices, but we have thus far not succeeded in essentially reducing price levels.

The insufficient reduction of retail prices may in the first place be explained by the fact, that on this front we did not manage to bring all the necessary influence to bear on the object in view; secondly, our business people spoke much of price reduction but failed to put it sufficiently into practice; and thirdly, and this is the most important point, our Party organisations, trade unions, and working masses did not take so active a part in the matter as would have been necessary. These broad masses, including the most backward workers, the female workers, and the workers' wives, must be drawn into this work; all of them must participate actively in the control of co-operative stores, of the State stores, their overhead charges, commercial price-accretion, standards of accumulation, the quality of the goods, etc. With a view to establishing maximum commercial profits, we were perfectly right in first taking in hand the most important commodities. A control of the execution of such regulations is only possible with the aid of the masses themselves. At every place of sale a store committee of active workers must be appointed.

A few words in regard to our foreign trade. The primary question in this respect is that of our trade balance. Last year our imports amounted to 680 million roubles, and in the current year, according to the main plan, to just the same figure, though if we take into consideration such imports as were effected by virtue of the long termed German credits, our imports in the present year will be found to exceed these imports has altogether changed, since we now only 800 million roubles. We see, however, that the composition of import what is requisite for the productive needs of our industry and agriculture. This year we are importing in the way of raw materials and industrial equipment many times as much as was the case last year. Then our imports of machinery figured at a value of 50 million roubles; this year we have ordered machinery worth more than 200 millions. And with the help of these foreign machines we shall develop our own industry. That is the most important and fundamental achievement.

During the years which have elapsed since the introduction of the "Nep", our trade balance has figured as follows: In the economic years 1922/23 and 1923/24, the balance was favourable, exports exceeding imports by 106 million roubles; in 1924/25 and 1925/26, there was a deficit, for both years together, of 256 millions. In the current year we have again the prospect of a favourable trade balance. The last three months have already given us an accumulation of foreign valuta to a total value of 35 million roubles, a figure which may subsequently prove larger, since these are but provisional results. I must point out that we shall this year receive long-termed credits abroad, possibly to an extent of 200 million roubles. We shall receive machinery for the naphtha, metal, coal, and timber industries, for which we shall only be called upon to pay in two, three, or even four years. We shall pay for this machinery out of the means which we acquire by our own work. Foreign funds to a value of about 200 million roubles will thus be invested this year in our industry for repayment at a later time. This is a very great achievement if we take into consideration that we are not receiving any State loans.

We are still handicapped by many gigantic difficulties and shortcomings. Our exports are still far too small, and it must be admitted that we are still poor hands at trading. At the same time, foreign capitalists, who are dissatisfied with our foreign trade monopoly, often set obstacles in our way and impede our progress. Nor can we, by reason of our poverty, make full use of price fluctuations on the world market for the benefit of our proletarian economy, although we are certainly the largest "concern" in the market, since no firm can compete in size with our Soviet State. By means of a

proper commercial policy, we could enforce our policy on the world market and gain extraordinarily great advantages for the Soviet State. This is a most important task, a task of fundamental significance also by reason of the fact that we thereby also collect experience for other labour parties, which will come into power later on, experience in regard to the relations between the proletarian State and its capitalist environment. It is our task to gain the greatest possible results in this direction too, which we have not been able to do so far. I believe, however, that we shall be able to manage it, if the broad masses of the workers are drawn into the work of solving this task.

AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

Leninism and the Fight against War.

By G. ZINOVIEV.

The Bolsheviks are the only opponents of imperialism and imperialist war who are consistent to the end. The Bolsheviks alone will fight consistently for peace.

It was said long ago: Let him who wishes for peace, prepare for war. For proletarian revolutionaries this means among other things: If you would fight for peace, you must first of all clearly understand the historical, the class character of war, you must first know how to combat war when it has already broken out.

The task of fighting for peace — in the interest of socialism and of international revolution — has now become a particularly urgent one for us. It is therefore extremely important that we should at the present moment think over the teachings of Lenin with regard to war.

The teaching with regard to war is one of the most important doctrines of Leninism.

"The greatest difficulty is that of overcoming the prejudice which looks upon it as a simple, clear and comparatively easy question,"

wrote Lenin in December 1922.

Lenin's teaching regarding war is complicated, not only for the reason that it throws light on firstly, the tasks of the proletariat in those countries in which the bourgeoisie is still in power, secondly the task of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples and thirdly, the tasks of the proletariat of those countries in which the proletarian dictatorship already exists. Apart from this, Lenin distinguishes special periods of the proletarian dictatorship within this epoch.

Lenin's doctrine regarding war is deeply rooted in the general doctrines of Marx and Engels.

"Anyone who bases his argument on Marx' relation to the wars of the epoch of the progressive bourgeoisie and forgets Marx' words 'The workers have no fatherland', words which apply exactly to the epoch of the reactionary bourgeoisie in its decline, to the epoch of the socialist revolution, shamelessly misrepresents Marx and replaces the socialist conception by a petty bourgeois one."

Thus wrote Lenin in his brochure "Socialism and the War", which appeared in 1915.

At the beginning of the war, in 1914, the social chauvinists in all countries, not excepting "our" Plechanov and Tchernov, asseverated that they were acting "in the spirit of Marx" when they defended "their" fatherland, i. e., in reality, "their" bourgeoisie. The whole Second International, which had split into two camps according to the two great imperialist Coalitions which were opposed to the one another, declared right and left that in clamouring for the "defence of the fatherland" by the imperialist war, they were merely carrying out the commands of Marx and Engels.

It needed very hard preparatory work on the part of Lenin to re-establish the real standpoint of Marx and Engels in this domain and thus, to cleanse Marxism from the greasy pawing and slobbery kisses of the social chauvinists. Lenin had, first of all, to put everything in its right place.

With what pride did Lenin in 1918, after the victory of the October revolution, point out that the "scientific prophecies" of Engels had come true, of Engels who, as early as in 1887, had foretold in many respects the circumstances of the first imperialist world war.

In his introduction to Sigismund Borkheim's brochure "In Memory of the German Patriot Murderers 1806/07", Friedrich Engels in 1887 drew a picture of the future world war in the following words:

"Eight to ten million soldiers will throttle one another, and in doing so will devastate Europe as was never done by a swarm of locusts. The devastations of the Thirty Years' War, crowded together into three or four years and spread over the whole continent; starvation, plagues, the general demoralisation of the armies and of the masses of people as a result of the acute distress; hopeless confusion in our artificial machinery of trade, industry and credit... in such a way that dozens of crowns will roll about the streets and no one be found to pick them up; the absolute impossibility of foreseeing how it will all end and who will come out victor in the fight; only one result absolutely certain, general exhaustion and the establishment of the conditions leading to the final victory of the working class. The war may, for the moment, force us into the background and wrest from us some positions we have already conquered; but if they (the princes and statesmen, Ed.) unloose the forces, which they cannot then bind again, things may happen as they will; at the end of the tragedy they will be ruined and the victory of the proletariat will either be accomplished already or will at least be inevitable."

"What inspired prophecy" — said Lenin in 1918, with enthusiasm — "and how infinitely rich in ideas is every sentence of this exact, clear, concise and scientific analysis of classes!"

Lenin's doctrine regarding war is firmly planted on the fundamentals of Marxism. But with what genius did Lenin understand how to apply the general teachings of Marx and Engels in the question of war to a new period of human history, when the historical scenes were shifted, when life advanced with such giddy celerity.

"There was a time about 1871 to 1914" — wrote Lenin — "when the general franchise, without revolution (plus strikes etc.) had to be used to develop those who were backward. Then came the time of the revolutions (1917), and now the development is ensured by the progress of the revolution of the proletariat, by its civil war". (Lenin: "Unpublished Manuscripts on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", No. 3 of Lenin's collected works, Russian.)

But even in a comparatively peaceful time, Lenin indefatigably worked up the theories of Marx and Engels, developed and enriched them, especially their teachings regarding war. And, when in 1917, the world proletariat entered on a new period of stormy development, Lenin gave us a doctrine of war, worked out almost to the last detail which, in the period of storm which had begun, served as the best compass.

The question of our relation to the Russo-Japanese war of 1904 and 1905 seems comparatively simple.

It was by no means a new tendency in the Russian revolutionary movement to work towards the defeat of our own country (defeatism). We need only recall the fact that at the Zurich Congress of the Second International (1892), G. W. Plechanov — at that time generally recognised as the leader of Russian Marxism — made a speech which did not conceal his defeatism. Whilst completely identifying himself with the contemporary writings of Friedrich Engels ("Socialism in Germany" and "The Foreign Policy of Czarism"), Plechanov denounced the Franco-Russian alliance and openly expressed his desire for the defeat of the old Russia. At the International Congress in Amsterdam (1904), after the Russo-Japanese war had begun, Plechanov also spoke in a more or less revolutionary spirit. At that time, defeatism was not unknown even in bourgeois-democratic and even in liberal circles of Russian society, in so far as, first of all, the bourgeoisie was still weighed down by the Czarist policy of favouring the landed proprietors, and secondly the Russian proletariat had not yet quite raised its head nor had it yet become a direct danger to private property.

Bolshevism alone, under the leadership of Lenin understood how to maintain a firm, consistent, defeatist attitude in the Russo-Japanese war; not simply the point of view of a revolutionary democrat who desires the defeat of Czarism and of the demoralised landowners, but the point of view of proletarian internationalism, which endeavours in every way to seize the opportunity of the war crisis to shake capitalism to its very foundations.

It is a remarkable fact that, the nearer the epoch of the socialist revolution approached, the more did the leaders of the Second International (amongst them especially the Russian Mensheviks and Plechanov) shed their skin of defeatism until, in 1914, they appeared as "defenders of the fatherland" in the imperialist war. With Lenin we see exactly the opposite; the nearer the period of the proletarian revolution approached, the more ardently the flame of the fight against the capitalist order of society burnt, the more complete and consistent did Lenin's "defeatism" become.

It is easy to understand why, in a reactionary war, a revolutionary class must desire the defeat of its "own" Government. — That is one of the chief axioms of the Leninist doctrine of war.

Now, however, the war of 1914 approached. The collapse of the Second International, the crisis of socialism became perfectly evident. And it was just at this moment that Lenin began a specially concentrated and specially fruitful piece of work on the problems of war. It was just in the years 1914 to 1917 that Lenin worked out his doctrines as to war most intensively.

Lenin, who at that time was living in exile, did not work for the Russian proletariat alone; but gathered the Zimmerwald Left round him, entered into connections with individual proletarian revolutionaries and with groups of proletarian revolutionaries who had remained faithful to internationalism.

"The transformation of imperialist war into civil war", that is the first practical slogan with which Lenin called to the proletariat in 1914, as soon as the imperialist war broke out. The greatness of this slogan can only be compared to the Marxist slogan "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

At the same time Lenin began to work at his famous book "Imperialism, the Last Stage of Capitalism". This is one of Lenin's greatest scientific works; it is actually the skeleton for a new volume of "Capital"; this work gives an exhaustive analysis of the last stage of capitalism in all the essential questions.

Lenin's doctrine of war is of course closely bound up with his general doctrine of imperialism. In his "Imperialism" he gives a predominantly economic, strictly scientific aspect of the problem and, in parts, his language is intentionally dry, as the book was intended for legal publication under the Czarist censorship. The elaboration of his doctrine of war is given in Lenin's other works of the same period (which are compiled in the collection "Against the Current"). Lenin's chief works which contain his doctrine of war are: "Imperialism" plus those works which appeared in the collection "Against the Current".

Socialists have always condemned war between the peoples as something barbarian and brutal. Our attitude towards war, however, is fundamentally different from the point of view of the bourgeois pacifists and anarchists. We are distinguished from the first in that we realise the inevitable connection between war and the class struggle within the country, that we realise the impossibility of doing away with war without doing away with classes, without establishing socialism, and also in that we fully recognise the justification, the progressiveness and the necessity of civil wars, i. e. of wars of the oppressed classes against their oppressors, of slaves against slave-owners, of serfs against feudal lords, of wage-workers against the bourgeoisie. We, Marxists, are distinguished from the pacifists as well as from the anarchists in that we recognise the necessity of a historical study of the special character of each war.

We must distinguish between the historical types of wars in recent times. From 1789 to 1871, there were progressive, bourgeois, national wars for freedom. The essential character and the historical significance of these wars was the undermining and overthrow of absolutism and feudalism and the throwing off of the foreign yoke. In the wars of the French revolution for instance, there were indeed elements of robbery and of the conquest of foreign territory by the French; this

however alters nothing in the fundamental historical significance of these wars which shattered and destroyed the feudalism and the absolutism of the whole of the Europe of the past which was based on serfdom. In the Franco-Prussian war, Germany plundered France; this however does not alter anything in the historical fundamental significance of that war which liberated many millions of Germans from feudal dismemberment and from the yoke of two despots — the Russian Czar and Napoleon III. (cf. Lenin: "Socialism and War").

For this reason Lenin made quite a different approach to the question as to whether a war is a war of attack or defence from that made by the leaders of the Second International. He rejects and scorns the ordinary way of answering the question: "The guilty party is the one who began".

"If, for instance, Morocco were to declare war on France to-morrow, India were to declare war on England or Persia and China on Russia etc. it would be a "just" war of defence", independently of who began the war."

* * *

The basic features of Lenin's doctrine concerning war can be summarized as follows:

1. The "rehabilitation" of Marx and Engels, the restoration of their real views as to war as against the anarchists (Guillaume & Co.), as against the Mensheviks (Plechanov, David, Kautsky; all leaders of the Second International) as against the Narodniki (Tchernov & Co.).

2. We cannot simply divide wars into wars of aggression and wars of defence according to the criterion of who was the "first" to declare war, who was the "first" to attack. We must be able to determine the concrete historical significance of every single war or every single period of war.

3. Every external war is connected with the relation of class forces within the countries which are at war.

4. A concrete estimate of the world war from 1914 to 1918 as an imperialist war.

5. The connection between the first imperialist world war of 1914 to 1918 and imperialism as the last stage of capitalism.

6. The slogan of "the defence of the fatherland" "as such", i. e. without taking into consideration the concrete historical significance of the war in question, is a deviation from Marxism. Everything depends on what classes are carrying on the war in question, what is the objective character of the particular war.

7. The defence of the fatherland in an imperialist war is a direct betrayal of the interests of the proletariat and a desertion to the side of the bourgeoisie.

8. In a reactionary war, a revolutionary class must desire the defeat of its "own" government.

9. The epoch of imperialism is an epoch of reactionary imperialist wars. It does not, however, exclude national wars for freedom or "just" historical progressive wars of "defence" of oppressed nationalities, colonial and semi-colonial countries.

10. Hence the slogan of the right of self-determination of nationalities in the sense of the right to secede;

11. New imperialist wars are inevitable.

12. The theory of super-imperialism, of peaceful imperialism (Kautsky) is reactionary nonsense.

13. The slogan of disarmament is a reactionary Utopia as long as capitalism exists. He who takes arms in his hands will, at the decisive moment, have to turn them against his "own" bourgeoisie. There is still much too much in the world which can only be destroyed by force of arms.

14. The imperialist war must be turned into civil war.

15. The proletarian world revolution develops in the following manner:

"The social revolution cannot proceed except in the form of an epoch which combines the civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the advanced countries with a whole number of democratic and revolutionary national movements for freedom in the undeveloped, backward and oppressed countries. Why? Because capitalism develops unequally, and the objective reality shows us many peoples which are economically very feebly developed,

or even quite undeveloped, side by side with highly developed capitalist peoples."

These are the most important theories of Lenin's teaching regarding war.

Lenin's doctrine of war is on its part connected with many other sides of Leninism as a whole. The problem of war is closely bound up with the problems of revolution in general. These are often two sides of the same problem. **War and revolution. — War and the national question. — War and the collapse of the Second International. — War and the degeneration of social reformism into social chauvinism.** — (In connection with this is the question of the aristocracy of labour and the corruption of the privileged stratum of the workers with the extra profits of the ruling, imperialist bourgeoisie). — **The question of the fighting alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry. — The slogan of the right of self-determination of the peoples. — The slogan "Clear out of the colonies!" — The slogan "Without annexations and contributions!"** All these are highly important problems which Lenin worked out in connection with his doctrine of war.

As early as in 1915, Lenin put the question quite concretely as to what our Party would do if it came into power during the war:

"We should offer to make peace with all those at war on the condition that they liberate the colonies and all dependent and oppressed nations and those deprived of their rights. Neither England, France nor Germany would, under their present Governments, accept these conditions. We should then have to prepare for and carry out the revolutionary war, that is to say, we should not only carry out our whole minimum programme in the most determined way, we should stir up all the peoples now oppressed by the White Russians, all colonies and dependent countries of Asia (India, China, Persia etc.), and above all we should induce the socialist proletariat of Europe to revolt against its Governments — in spite of its social chauvinists. There is no doubt that a victory of the proletariat in Russia would produce unusually favourable conditions for the development of revolution both in Asia and Europe. This was even proved by the year 1905." (Lenin: "Some Theses" — October 1915.)

At the April Conference in 1917, i. e. after the overthrow of Czarism, this same idea of Lenin found more definite expression:

"Having taken over the power of the State in Russia, the revolutionary class would take a number of measures which would undermine the economic rule of the capitalists and render them entirely innocuous; it would immediately and publicly offer all peoples a democratic peace on the basis of an absolute renunciation of any kind of annexations or contributions. These measures and this open offer of peace would inspire the workers of the countries at war with absolute confidence in each other and would inevitably lead to revolts of the proletariat against the imperialist Governments which would offer resistance to this proposal of peace." (Resolution of the April Conference 1917 with regard to war.)

Having worked out the question of the imperialist war, Lenin worked out in every detail the question of "imperialist peace" also; he showed the international proletariat in good time that a peace concluded by the imperialists would be pregnant with new wars. In contrast to an imperialist peace, Lenin advocates the idea of the conclusion of peace over the heads of the imperialist Governments.

It is well known what an important part was played by the Bolshevik agitation for peace in the period between the February and October revolutions in 1917. As every one knows, one of the first acts of the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat was the decree with regard to peace. In the preparations for the revolution, the peace slogan played no less a part than the slogan "land", than the slogan "bread".

From that moment onwards, Lenin's teaching regarding war was enriched by a new chapter: **The proletariat in power and its attitude to war.**

Since October 25th 1917 we have become defenders of the

fatherland*) — says Lenin — now that we are defending the socialist fatherland.

Engels foresaw a similar situation in 1891, when he wrote that the power would be in our hands in ten years and that we should then show that we were not unworthy of the Sansculottes. (cf. "Political Testament", pag. 20/21.)

Since October 25th 1917, we have been defending the socialist fatherland, and in doing so we are defending the interests both of the Russian and of the whole world proletariat.

"We have the right to expect help from our allies, the proletariat of all countries, who must understand that we have now become "defenders of the fatherland", but defenders of the fatherland who defend the positions of socialism". (Lenin, volume 15, pag. 169.)

Since October 25th 1917 the Leninist doctrine of war has placed new problems and their solution into the foreground.

1. Is it permissible for us to make territorial concessions in order to gain time? Yes, it is permissible! We not only may, but we must — answers Lenin. And he defends the tactics of the Peace of Brest-Litovsk, he brings forward the "theory of the breathing space" and defends it against anyone who did not immediately grasp the fact that, in the situation which arose at that time, it was the only way to save the proletarian revolution in Russia.

2. Is it permissible, for a newly born socialist State to take advantage of the contradictions which exist between the two groups of the international robber imperialists? Is it permissible for it to tuck and to make concessions, to enter this or that "understanding" with one country against another? Yes, it can and must do so — answers Lenin.

"I vote for making use of the help of the Anglo-French imperialist robbers" against the German robbers. The first country of the proletarian dictatorship which found itself in so difficult a situation as was Russia, on whose borders stood the imperialist armies, ready to throttle it at once, not only has the right, but it is its bounden duty to make use of the differences between two imperialist groups; in doing so, it must of course remain true to its own aims, to its own banner of international socialism.

3. Is it permissible, under certain conditions, for the proletarian dictatorship to give armed help to the proletarians of other countries who are still oppressed by capitalism or to the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonial countries who are hard-pressed by the imperialists? Is it permissible for the proletarian dictatorship to carry freedom and socialism into other countries "at the point of the bayonet"? Yes, it may and must!

"If, in the face of the constantly active enemy forces, we were to pledge ourselves, as is suggested to us, never to undertake certain actions, which might be regarded as offensive action from the military strategic point of view, we should not only be idiots but criminals", said Lenin at the Eighth Soviet Congress in his polemics against Martov.

It is only possible, of course, to carry freedom and socialism into another country "at the point of the bayonet", if one is in close alliance with the revolutionary class of the country in question, if one proceeds hand in hand with it, i. e. under the condition that the workers and the oppressed masses in both countries regard the "interference" as real fraternal help. In these questions, the policy of the international proletariat must be thought out all the more precisely, must be all the more alert, because history — especially the history of the imperialist war of 1914/18 — teems with attempts to carry out a policy of violence, conquest and subjugation under the mask of "liberation".

*) "We were defeatists under the Czar, but under Zeretelli and Tchernov we were not defeatists... We did not demoralise the army, we said: Hold the front, the sooner conquer power, the sooner you will be able to assert it" — said Lenin. (Collected works, vol. 15, pag. 180, Russian edition.) This referred to the extremely peculiar, unique situation, when Russia was approaching with rapid steps the 25th of October (November 7th), when the bourgeois democratic revolution was "growing more and more into" a socialist revolution, not day by day, but hour by hour, when it was clearly evident that the fatherland of to-morrow would be a socialist fatherland.

(Conclusion to follow.)

FASCISM

Appeal of the E. C. C. I. against the Preparation of a Fascist Putsch in Latvia.

Moscow, February 6th 1927.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International has published an appeal regarding the preparation of a fascist putsch in Latvia, in which it points out that the proceedings of the fascists in Volmar were only a first attempt which will be followed by an attack in the centre. Various fascist organisations are obviously preparing for a putsch, are arming their members, organising military espionage, securing one position after another in the army. The commanders of the Latvian army and a number of Generals are notorious fascists who are at the head of the conspiracy. The social democratic government, owing to its lack of character and cowardice, is unable to cripple the advance of the fascist movement. Its persecutions and repressions, on the other hand, only apply to the Left labour organisations. They permit the fascist robbers to spread with impunity rumours of a prepared „Communist" revolution in order to conceal the real aims of the fascist conspirators. All this talk of the fascist bandits concerning the preparation of an attack on the part of the Communists is conscious lies and provocations.

The latest intrigues of English imperialism against the Soviet Union, the outspokenly monarchist government in Germany, the aggressive plans of Pilsudski with regard to the Soviet Union, the reaction which is raising its head in the Baltic States — all this at present favours the attack of the Latvian fascists. Behind the Latvian fascists, as well as behind the Lithuanian fascists, there stands imperialist England. The English imperialists are persistently forging plans for the encirclement of the Soviet Union by hostile fascist States, in order then to be able the more easily to carry out their plans against the Soviet Union.

The Communist International calls upon all workers and peasants and their parties to set up the united front for the fight against fascism.

The proceedings in Latvia and in the other small Baltic States are of great significance for the proletariat of other capitalist countries. As soon as favourable results are achieved in the small countries, the bourgeoisie of the great States will proceed all the more determinedly and insolently.

Revolutionary watchfulness, in the first place on the part of the workers of Latvia itself, is more necessary than ever.

The united front against advancing capitalism and fascism in all countries is more necessary now than ever!

THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

The First Meetings of Women Delegates in Germany.

By Erna Halbe (Berlin).

During the period of capitalistic rationalisation the absorption of women into the productive system is proceeding at high speed, especially in the decisive industries, in which men are being supplanted by women workers. There is, therefore, a double necessity for bringing these women into a common battle front with the men. For this reason the Communist Party of Germany, two years ago, took upon itself the task of carrying on in the factories intensive propaganda for enlistment in the trade unions and winning over the working women in the individual trade unions to the Opposition.

But such means must be employed as will, in the first place, make it clear to the women that unity is necessary, and will wake them up to a realisation of the misery of their actual situation. At the present moment there are thousands of women in the rationalised factories, who cannot look up from their work, dare not speak a word to one another and have not a minute to spare. A discussion concerning questions of wages and working hours is impossible and an alliance with other factories is not practicable. If, however, these women workers are not to sink into dullness and indifference, a way must be found whereby this alliance can be effected. We believe that in

holding meetings of women delegates we have made the first attempt in this direction in Germany.

We had to spend a very long time upon the preparation of these meetings, for there cannot be a meeting of delegates without connection with the factories, and influence in the factories is only to be gained at the cost of innumerable, systematic detail work. This has been done incessantly for the last two years. At every central or district conference we have constantly placed in the foreground of our work the winning over of the women workers in the factories and the trade unions. In conjunction with the functioning of our nuclei there grew up in the Party a comprehension of this work and our influence in the factories increased proportionately.

It was extraordinarily slow work; as soon as we had established a connection, the working woman was dismissed or transferred or she severed the connection for fear of dismissal. Here and there we called public meetings of women workers, with which we had some little success, especially on the occasion of International Women's Day. Only in the rarest of cases was it possible to form circles of working women for the accomplishment of really specific tasks. In several localities we were successful through the trade union fraction (textiles, shoes, metal) in establishing connection with the women workers and thereby with their factories.

In the course of these two years a small but reliable nucleus of women workers was formed under the care, influence and control of our women's sections, and this small beginning furnished a good foundation for the work of the meeting of delegates.

The movement for the organising of the Congress of Workers in Germany appeared to us to be a suitable opportunity for exploiting our loose connections with the women workers and, at the same time, of binding them by means of a delegation system. Naturally, it was not possible to call such meetings in all the towns of Germany. We, therefore, selected the localities in which circumstances were most favourable. Our comrades' proposal to hold such delegate meetings of working women was everywhere welcomed by the women workers. Many of the women declared themselves ready to accept mandates.

At the meetings of women workers and unemployed, one delegate was elected from every 100 women; at public meetings of housewives, one delegate to every 100 persons attending. In addition, proletarian organisations sent female representatives (Red Women's and Girls' League, International League, Red Aid, Workers' International Relief, Free Thinkers, etc.). All of these women were not elected at big mass meetings; from some factories there came only a very small portion of the female hands; several mistakes were also made during the preparations; real working circles hardly existed; but, despite all this, a beginning has been made, and, indeed, a beginning with good success. This linking up of women workers of various activities (of factory hands and unemployed women, of workwomen and housewives) gave fresh courage and renewed strength to all the delegates.

At all meetings of delegates reports were submitted concerning the position and the tasks of women workers, and demands were put forward to be submitted to the Congress of Workers. Everywhere the discussion was lively and on a high level. The women thoroughly recognised their serious position and the necessity of supporting with their active work the fight of all workers.

Meetings of delegates were held in seven towns. In Berlin 259 delegates attended, 119 being women workers, 173 non-party, 80 from the Communist Party of Germany,

3 from the German Social Democratic Party; in Hamburg there were 40 delegates, including 24 women workers, of which 18 non-party, 20 from the German Communist Party, 2 Democrats; Barmen, 37 delegates, including 8 women workers, 13 non-party, 15 of the C.P. of Germany, 9 of other organisations; Essen 71 delegates, 26 non-party, 45 of the C.P. of Germany; Chemnitz 70 delegates, including 24 working women, 24 non-party, 18 from the C.P. of Germany, 1 from the S.P. of Germany; Stuttgart 94 delegates, including 43 women workers, 50 non-party, 34 from the C.P. of Germany, 10 from other organisations; Cologne 50 delegates, including 10 women workers, 26 non-party, 24 from the C.P. of Germany.

The most important task at present lies in preserving the connections thus made, of keeping in touch with the delegates and calling meetings periodically. It is only the constant, systematic work of the delegates that can serve the purpose which has to be accomplished, to win the women workers over to the Left Wing of the Labour Movement, for the fight of the workers for their emancipation.

In some localities the meetings have been held for a second time, for instance, in Hamburg on the occasion of the dock-labourers' strike; in Chemnitz, on account of the anticipated attack of the employers in the textile industry. In January and February, meetings of delegates will again be held in the other districts.

The most important thing now is the creation of circles in the factories and in the labour-exchanges so that the delegates may have an opportunity of getting into touch with other women workers. The women delegate is to-day not in a position to work a big factory by herself, if she has not reliable functionaries in every department to give her a hand. The delegate must, therefore, immediately gather this group of colleagues with whom she can discuss all the duties imposed by the meeting of delegates.

Now that we have gained so much valuable experience from the first meetings of delegates, it will be more easily possible for us to hold meetings of women delegates in other towns and especially in those places where female labour plays an important role in industry. This extraordinarily good method of winning over the women workers will serve us as a further means towards ranging working women in the class front of the proletariat.

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	1,50 marks
Austria	2 (Austrian) Schillings
Norway	1,50 crowns
Sweden	1,50 crowns
Denmark	1,50 crowns
U. S. S. R.	1 rouble.

The subscription rate for other countries is three dollars (or equivalent in local currency) for six months.

These subscriptions include all Special Numbers besides the Regular Number.

Proprietor, Publisher and responsible Editor: Dr. Johannes Wertheim, Vienna, VIII., Alibertgasse 26. Printers: "Elbenithl", Vienna, IX., Berggasse 31.