

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol 7. No. 14.

PRESS

17th February 1927

CORRESPONDENCE

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

N. Bukharin: The International Situation.

Hands off China.

N. Semyonov: The Fight against the Unequal Treaties in China.

Message from the Japanese Workers to the Workers of China.

Politics.

Giulio Aquila: The Military Revolt in Portugal.

Varski-Varszavski: Against the Brutal Policy of Suppression of the Fascist Government in Poland.

S. Yavorsky: Roumania, France and the Soviet Union.

J. B.: The British-Italian Machinations in the East.

R. K.: The Resignation of the Government in Persia.

Fascism.

On the Danger of a Fascist Putsch in Latvia (Appeal of the E. C. C. I.).

Text of the Declaration of D'Aragona and his Colleagues ("Initiative Group").

The Revolutionary Movements in the Colonies.

Against Suppression and Intervention in the Colonial Countries.

Against Imperialist War.

G. Zinoviev: Leninism and the Fight against War (Conclusion).

The White Terror.

Appeal of the Congress of Scientists in the Soviet Union against the Persecution in Polish White Russia.

VII. Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.

Resolution on Chairmanship of the Communist International.

The Youth Movement.

International Week against the Danger of War.

The International Situation.

From the Report of Comrade Bukharin at the XXIV. Party Conference of the Leningrad district.

What is the peculiarity, of, what is original in the present international situation? As is well known, great discussions have taken place in the C. P. S. U. on capitalist stabilisation. It is not less a matter of common knowledge that until the last meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. the questions of stabilisation were formulated and solved in a quite primitive manner. There was talk about a stabilisation of capitalism in general. The singularity of the present international situation — and this has become particularly evident in recent times — lies precisely in the fact that the whole world, the whole world economy, all States taken as a whole, have clearly and distinctly been divided into three vast spheres; the processes which are taking place in each of these big sections of world economy, the tendencies of their development, are so unique, so full of contradiction, and distinguish themselves so much from one another that, at the present time, it would be absolutely incorrect to put the question in a general way. These three great spheres are: The imperialist world, the rising East and the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics.

The Soviet Union may boast of an unquestionable success in socialist construction and the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship.

In the East, above all in China, we witness the process of the civil war which may be compared to a powerful battering-ram smashing the chain of capitalist stabilisation. There can be no doubt that the Chinese revolution is a part of the international revolutionary process. In this eastern portion of the globe, the process of international revolution is developing among the

masses of the Chinese people, which represents a tremendous conglomeration of mankind in the present epoch.

The third big sphere, up to now still the biggest "sphere", is the rest of the world, the world of the imperialist Powers. It would of course be wrong to deny the symptoms of stabilisation which are undoubtedly present in this imperialist sphere. Our characterisation of the individual national capitalisms should be differentiated; the situation, the tendency of development and the possibilities of stabilisation of the individual capitalist States ought to be distinguished most rigidly. What is most characteristic and peculiar in the present stage of international development is the polarisation of the relations even within the imperialist sphere. If, on the one hand, the United States appear as the country which represents the main stronghold of present day capitalism, we see at the other pole of the imperialist world, in Great Britain, definite tendencies to decay — the descending line of the capitalist curve.

Two Blocs.

There are certain connections between the three "big" sections of world economy. Above all there is a perfectly obvious inclination, which is deeply rooted in the nature of things, towards the formation of an anti-imperialist Bloc: the Soviet Union and the Chinese revolution. As a counter-weight to this we see a tendency on the part of the capitalist States to form a bloc against us, a tendency which is in the same way rooted in the nature of things, a tendency which here and there clashes with the necessity which forces the capitalist States to maintain commercial relations with us.

If we contrast these two tendencies with one another, i. e. on the one hand the more and more friendly advances of the East towards us, and on the other hand the tendency of the counter-Bloc of the capitalist States, the whole force of which is directed against the Soviet Union as the outpost of the international revolution, it seems to me that, at the present stage of development, in the present epoch, the first tendency is the more powerful one. What is important, is that there is less friction between us and the Chinese revolution — in any case at the present stage of development — than exists in the countries of our capitalist opponents.

The Prospects of the Chinese Revolution.

In China a revolutionary movement has been developing for a long time; what is now essentially new and peculiar in this movement is that the Chinese revolution already has its national centre of organisation. This fact is of eminent significance. The Chinese revolution has already outgrown that stage of development in which the mass of the people i. e. a definite group of classes is opposed to the ruling regime. The present stage of the Chinese revolution is characterised by the fact that the forces of the revolution are already organised as a State power, with an attribute, such as the regular, disciplined army which fills the imperialist enemies with fear. The advance of this army, its brilliant victories, the systematic dislodgement of foreign imperialism by the Canton troops and by the troops of their allies are a special form of the revolutionary process.

We can now say that the process of the international revolution which, in spite of the idle talk of the Social Reformist parrots, actually exists, already, if we take its most prominent features, possesses two organised centres, and these are state organised. The first is the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union. The second factor is that the process of the revolution in China is advancing and that it now has the apparatus of State in its hands. Thus we see going on a further development and revolutionising of the power and its spread to wider and wider fields.

I will not deal at greater length with the prospects of the Chinese revolution, but I should like to make the following remarks. Needless to say, the revolution is not exhausted. The matter is not restricted and cannot be restricted to the "level" at which its evolution has arrived, at the combination of classes which at present exists in China. The present power of the revolutionary fight is based on a broad bloc of various classes. Within this bloc, the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie still plays a fairly important part. This bourgeoisie will, however, inevitably secede from the revolution, the more the deeper strata of the Chinese people, the petty bourgeoisie and the Chinese working class, enter the great arena of the revolution with ever increasing strength and with more and more influence. The Chinese proletariat, which already takes an important share in the national revolutionary movement, is striving and will strive with still greater energy to take the position of a leader, a ruler, a guide of the Chinese revolution.

For this reason, in its further course, a re-grouping of the class forces within China is quite inevitable, as is also a shifting of the forces in the Government and in the army; it is also inevitable that there should be a certain growth of contradictions in the Kuomintang, a party with a quite peculiar construction, a party which combines various classes into one political bloc. It is a matter of course that this whole process cannot proceed, and indeed will not proceed quite smoothly, without friction and without certain collisions. We however, regard the future of the Chinese revolution with optimism, hope and confidence. It already has such a firm hold on the deep strata of the people; with every hour, with every day, it stirs up more effectually the countless masses of the Chinese people. We have before us such an inexhaustible reservoir of revolutionary energy that we are, to all intents and purposes, sure of the final victory of the red flag on this section of the fighting front. On the other hand, it is perfectly evident that the shifting of class forces in the Chinese revolution, which is already taking place and will continue to take place in its further course — when the curve of the revolution ascends — will bring this enormous section of the globe with its mass of 400 millions of present-day humanity nearer to forming a bloc with us, with the country of the proletarian dictatorship.

The International Revolution — an Epoch in the History of Humanity.

The considerations which I have briefly expounded here are in themselves enough to show quite obviously that it is primitive and wrong to put the question in the form: either stabilisation or international revolution. Our appraisal of the international situation must be much more complicated. It will only gain in this way, because it will correspond with the actual reality which underlies our analysis. Is it possible to draw, from the fact of the Chinese revolution, a conclusion which disproves the existence of the stabilisation of capitalism in Germany? And, vice versa, is it possible to draw the conclusion that the Chinese revolution does not exist as a link in the chain of international revolution from the fact of the stabilisation of capital, let us say in Germany or France? A question of this kind is of course ridiculous.

A complete, instantaneous, "chemically pure" international revolution only exists in the worthless books and in the social democratic lampoons against Communism. The international revolution is an extraordinarily complicated, many-sided and long-drawn-out process. In past times, the question of the international revolution was only put quite approximately. At that time it was possible and necessary to give a certain general "algebraical" formula of the international revolution: international revolution as a process of the revolutionary transformation of the whole of capitalist society as an entity, of all capitalist countries into a socialist society. This formula is still correct, even to-day. But this formula is of course by now inadequate, it is too generalised, it needs to be made more concrete.

Now, in the interest of practical revolutionary action, we must decipher in a concrete way, how, in what forms, in what order, the whole process of the international revolution will develop. Now that we have behind us almost ten years of the power of the proletariat, when, before our very eyes, historical events have been enacted, an imperialist war and civil wars, a whole series of portentous events in Europe and in the East, in the imperialist countries and in the colonies, now we see very well how well justified was Lenin's way of putting the question of the international revolution.

We see clearly that Lenin was absolutely right when he taught us that the international revolution is an extremely complicated process. From the class point of view indeed, this process entirely lacks uniformity. It does not consist only in purely proletarian revolutions in the countries where capitalism is mature — even though these proletarian revolutions form, of course, the main nucleus of the international revolutionary process — it is the process of beating down the imperialist system from all sides. It includes national wars for freedom, colonial insurrections, the great revolutionary movements in semi-colonial countries. To-day it may develop in a single country of mature capitalism; to-morrow it may flare up at the other end of the globe, in the colonies; the next day it may break out in a comparatively backward country, where capitalism has not reached maturity, etc.

The process of the international revolution represents a whole epoch in the history of humanity.

The International and "Spontaneous" Character of the Revolution.

The "internationality" of the revolution by no means consists in its developing simultaneously in the various countries, all on one day. The internationality of the revolution means that the capitalist world as a whole has become entangled in such a network of its own contradictions, that it has begun to collapse, that its defeat by the revolution has become inevitable, that one outbreak of revolution will inevitably be followed by others, even though the intervals between these outbreaks be counted by years.

The "simultaneousness" of the international revolution, to which we referred previously, when we gave the general formulae, is not the simultaneousness of one day, one hour, or one year. This "simultaneousness" is now deciphered as the simultaneousness of an epoch, of a great historical epoch, the current of which is formed by a whole system of various channels and streamlets of water of the world-embracing revolutionary process which includes the victorious proletarian revolutions and the partial defeats of the working class, both the revolution in the East and the first attempts at positive socialist con-

struction, both the national wars for freedom and the colonial insurrections. Only when mankind has passed through the whole cycle of its own transformation, when the victorious working class has established itself throughout the world, only then will it be possible to say that the great historical cycle is completed, that the work of the international revolution has been crowned.

This comrades, is how we must describe the international situation. Not either stabilisation or world revolution, but both partial stabilisation and world revolution in the actual process of development, which systematically undermines the forces of capitalist stabilisation.

A quite peculiar way of putting the question as to what is our part in the process of the international revolution results from such an estimation of the international situation, from such a conception of stabilisation and of international revolution, but at the same time from our views on socialist construction in a single country.

The Construction of Socialism in our Country from the International Point of View.

What results from the way the Opposition puts the question as to the construction of socialism in our country, and what results from our way of putting the question if we regard the problem not from the point of view of our country but from the point of view of the international revolution?

Let us see to what conclusion we come if we take the point of view of the Opposition with regard to the construction of socialism in our country.

The chain of the conclusion of the Opposition is somewhat as follows. Because of our technical backwardness, because of the unfavourable composition of our internal forces, we ourselves cannot arrive at socialism alone, therefore — conclude the comrades of the Opposition — we must appeal to the forces of the international revolution. In this way "real internationalism" is combined with the recognition of the impossibility of attaining to socialism through our own internal forces.

Our way of putting the question is different. We believe that we can construct socialism with our internal forces and indeed complete its construction, if, of course, the imperialist bourgeoisie does not prevent us by armed force.

If the Soviet Union possesses the internal forces for building up socialism, the part played by the Soviet Union in the process of defeating the capitalist order on the earth will be that of a mighty lever, of a chief section of the great organising power of the international revolution. This is what results from our way of putting the question.

If we take the point of view of the Opposition and declare that we cannot attain to victorious socialist construction through our own power, what then is our Soviet Union from the point of view of the international revolution? At the best, it represents only the torch of the international revolution, only the cry for help of our proletariat, a torch which is already beginning to burn out, which is already smouldering in the vapours of "Thermidor". With this way of putting the question, our work of construction is also a positive fact, but within extremely narrow limits. We are calling for international revolution, but only as a torch which is nearly burnt out, we are receding further and further and desperately crying for help. In this way, the Opposition's appeal to the international proletariat to join in the international revolution, is an appeal of despair.

Is it however possible to draw, from the way the Opposition deals with the question, the conclusion that our country is the chief section of the main organising force of the international revolution? Of course not. If we do not regard what happens here from within, from our own country, but put ourselves in the place of a West European, American, Chinese or Japanese worker and at the same time take the Opposition point of view, our attitude to the Soviet Union must inevitably be a fairly indifferent one. "Well yes" — the foreign workers would say — "it is true you carried through the October revolution, that was your heroic deed, but now it has proved that you are nevertheless lacking in power, that some kind of degeneration, something like a "Thermidor", Heaven knows what, is going on in your country; you call for help, we help you a little, but to be quite honest, we are not sure whether it is worth while to save you who are already on the way towards degeneration. In any case it is quite out of the question to regard your country

as the chief section, as the main organising force of the world revolution."

And vice versa. If the German, English, American, Chinese and Japanese workers are of the opinion that our internal forces will be sufficient to construct the socialist order so that we shall be able to defeat our internal enemies over and over again in industrial competition, they will, as a matter of course, side with our country as the chief lever of the organisation of the international revolutionary fermentation. Then the attitude towards the country of the proletarian dictatorship must be quite a different one, then it must be protected to the last drop of blood, then everything must be sacrificed, everything staked in order to protect this country at any price whenever danger threatens it.

In what does Real Internationalism Consist?

These are two completely different valuations. As regards our international position, the Opposition has done us most harm in that it has tried to undermine the faith in the Soviet Union as the organising centre of the international revolution. Regardless of its words about the international revolution, it has only injured the cause of the international revolution in that it has depreciated the part played by the international revolutionary centre.

What is real internationalism? Real internationalism does not consist in sounding, "super-international" phrases, but in supporting the revolutionary process, in supporting everything which welds the international proletarian ranks, everything which consolidates an organising centre of the world revolution such as the Soviet Union seems to us to be.

For this reason the Opposition was entirely wrong in the question of the Comintern also; for this reason its political influence could, from the practical point of view, only be strongly negative, and this is the reason why even the foreign comrades, although perhaps they did not understand all the details, all the complicated questions of our inner-party discussion, our indices and our "cost prices", disapproved of the behaviour of the Opposition with the unanimous determination they showed at the meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.

A number of characteristic remarks were made by foreign comrades at the Enlarged E. C. C. I. "Pardon us" — said, let us say, the Chinese Comrades to our Opposition — "you say that the C. P. S. U. is not international; but we Chinese know well enough what the Soviet Union means to the Chinese people, to the Chinese revolution". The English comrades said the same, for their own historical experience has already taught them how closely they are linked with the country of the Soviets. If we may so express it, the foreign comrades cannot help getting into a revolutionary rage when they see how the Opposition is endeavouring to undermine the international organising revolutionary significance of the Soviet Union. For our foreign comrades this chief question is perfectly clear, even if they do not perhaps know all our details, all the figures, coefficients, indices and the rest of the wisdom of this kind which each of us has to bear as a burden on his shoulders.

The Three Spheres of World Economics.

The most important and peculiar features of the present international situation can be summarized as follows. World economics are at present divided into three chief spheres, which are quite different by nature: the East, the Soviet Union and the capitalist world. Within the imperialist sphere, a peculiar polarisation of conditions is going on. There is the tendency to form a bloc between the Soviet Union and the East. On the other hand, the capitalist States show an inclination to form a bloc against us, which is to some extent complicated by the antagonisms in their own camp. It is impossible in an uncritical way to oppose the stabilisation of capital to the international revolution. The international revolution is proceeding very tempestuously in some parts of the globe, which by no means excludes a partial stabilisation in other parts of the world. Neither the question of stabilisation nor the question of revolution can possibly be generalised; the situation must be differentiated.

In the process of the international revolution, our country is playing the part of the chief founder. Therefore in whatever way the tasks of socialist construction are contrasted with the

tasks of the international revolution, it is wrong from the very beginning, and above all harmful to the international revolution itself.

HANDS OFF CHINA

The Fight against the Unequal Treaties in China.

By N. Semyonov (Moscow).

The gigantic revolutionary struggle in China is at present becoming acute in regard to the question of the unequal treaties, with the help of which the imperialist States exercise their domination in China and rob and plunder the Chinese people.

When and how were these treaties concluded? They were concluded after the military forces of the foreign imperialists had crushed and defeated China. The imperialists have simply enforced their will upon China. Two wars between England and China in the middle of the last century yielded for England and other Powers a number of commercial treaties which, of course, were at the same time political treaties, if one can call a document in which the rights of one party are actually abolished a treaty. The war between Japan and China in the year 1895 led to the "Commercial" treaty between China and Japan, which as regards its contents in no wise differs from the treaties between China and the European countries.

Later on the imperialists — now without waging war but simply by taking advantage of the weakness and the incapacity of China to defend itself — began to enforce all kinds of "concession treaties", by which various territories were torn from China under the form of long-term concession treaties, whereby the Power obtaining the concession received full sovereignty over these territories. Such treaties were concluded between Tsarist Russia and China, between England and China, between Germany and China. The imperialists have officially divided up the whole of China into spheres of influence (of course without any agreement on the part of China) and received various rights to construct railways, establish industrial undertakings, open up mines etc.

A detailed investigation of these unequal treaties immediately reveals their unbounded predatory character. It is interesting in the first place to note for what length of term these treaties have been concluded:

	Date of conclusion of treaty	expires
with Great Britain	1860	24. 10. 1930
„ Belgium	1866	27. 10. 1926
„ Brazil	1882	3. 6. 1932
„ France	1896	7. 8. 1926
„ Italy	1867	12. 11. 1927
„ Japan	1896	20. 10. 1926
„ Spain	1867	10. 5. 1927
„ United States of America	1904	13. 1. 1934

On the basis of these terms of expiration China already has the right, independently of the robber-like unequal character of the treaties, to give notice to terminate three treaties: i. e., with Belgium, France and Japan. In addition to this there are the treaties with Italy and Spain which expire during the present year. China has the right to give this notice even on the basis of the bourgeois conception regarding international law. These treaties contain the provision that either party to the treaty has the right every ten years to grant or to refuse its consent to prolong the treaty for a further ten years. Hitherto China was so weak that it never on any occasion raised the question of the revision or the abolition of these treaties, and therefore these treaties calmly ran on from decade to decade.

Today, however, the national movement is so far advanced that even the Peking government which represents nobody, was compelled, under the pressure of public opinion, to protest against the prolongation of these treaties and to demand their revision. In the question of the revision of the Belgo-Chinese commercial treaty Belgium originally adopted the formal standpoint, according to which, under the provisions of this treaty, the right to terminate it rested solely and singly with Belgium. The

Belgian Foreign Minister, Vandervelde, therefore raised objection to China's right to demand a revision of the treaty and, at the very best, was prepared to submit the question to the International Arbitration Court of the League of Nations. The Chinese government, however, under the pressure of the national freedom movement, declared the treaty to be null as being a one-sided act. The same applies to the Japano-Chinese commercial treaty, with the difference that in this case China has the formal right to demand the revision of the treaty.

The unequal treaties grant the foreigners a jurisdiction according to their own laws without submitting to the Chinese laws. They grant them the right of ex-territoriality, of immunity, even in case of a crime which they may have committed on Chinese territory against Chinese citizens; the foreigners are allowed to have their own courts, their own police etc.; their concessions constitute small states within the State, they pay their customs dues not according to a rate as would be necessary for China, but according to a rate, fixed once and for all, of five per cent, while at the same time this "five per cent" become in fact continually less than 5%, as the revision of the tariff rates takes place once in ten years, whilst the prices of goods in recent times have increased extraordinarily. As a result of these treaties the foreign manufacturers are placed in a specially favourable situation as against the Chinese manufacturers. All this decidedly retards the development of China and converts it in practice into a semi-colony of the foreign imperialists. This leads, further, to a bitter hatred on the part of literally all sections of the Chinese population against the foreign imperialists.

It is therefore only natural that the first slogan of the national fight for freedom in China is the slogan of the abolition of the unequal treaties, and that this slogan leads to all sections of the population supporting the national fight for freedom.

The imperialists, on the other hand, and before all England, are doing their utmost in order to postpone, at least for a time, the realisation of this slogan. The abolition of the unequal treaties would mean a severe blow against the domination of international imperialism in China from which it could never recover. This is specially felt by England, which has already received a number of serve blows on this front of its fight against the national-revolutionary movement. Every victory of the revolutionary government of the South means at the same time a defeat for Great Britain, because as soon as the Canton troops occupy any district the validity of the unequal treaties in this district is de facto abolished. And as the territories occupied by the Southern government belong precisely to the sphere of influence of Great Britain, it is evident that the reaction of these victories on the position of English imperialism in China was by no means unimportant. This is the reason for the furious hatred of English imperialism against the revolutionary movement of the Chinese people. This is the reason for the desperate efforts of England to save its rule in China.

The attempts of England to bring about a united armed intervention in China have at present already met with a certain success: we see how the armed forces of various imperialist States are proceeding to China under the pretext of defending the lives and property of foreigners, although the Canton government has already more than once guaranteed the safety of the lives and possessions of foreigners in the territories under its rule. The only thing which the Canton government cannot agree to in its relations with the foreigners is the existence of unequal predatory treaties, of treaties which convert China into the position of a colony. The abandonment of these treaties would immediately create normal conditions between revolutionary China and every other country.

It is in vain that the English reactionaries seek for bolshevist agents in China, who, it is alleged, incite the Chinese to fight against the imperialists. There are no such agents; it is the English reactionaries themselves who incite the Chinese population to this fight, as they will not realise that revolutionary China can never in any circumstances consent to these unequal treaties, can under no circumstances remain a colony of international imperialism. And no military forces will help here. Neither by warships nor by Indian infantry can China be induced to continue to wear the chains which the imperialists forged for it. It will burst these chains und tear up the unequal treaties.

Message from the Japanese Workers to the Workers of China.

The following resolution appeared in the "Musansha Chimfun" at the end of December 1926. Ed.

At the Extraordinary Conference of the local group of the Hyogikai in Kobe which was held on the 5th December 1926, it was decided to send a message of greeting to the Chinese proletariat. At a meeting of the Permanent Committee there was drawn up the following resolution which it was agreed should be sent to China:

"World imperialism has discovered in China its last field of exploitation. The desperate competition of the imperialist world Powers in China is of necessity creating a crisis which is bound to lead to a second imperialist world war. It is only possible to prevent such a crisis and to establish true peace in the Far East by developing and completing the revolutionary movement in China. The rapid development of the Chinese revolutionary movement, which now, after many years of hard fighting against its enemies and for the firm establishment of its own power under the slogan of anti-imperialism, has obtained an impregnable basis, is a far-illuminating torch to the proletarian movement of the whole world, but quite especially to the Japanese movement. The world proletariat is now awaiting the final victory of the revolutionary movement in China.

The Hyogikai of Kobe, who have on every possible occasion advocated the urgent necessity of linking up our interests with those of the workers of the Far East and forming a firm united front, are of the opinion that there now exists the immediate necessity for forming a close union of the Chinese and Japanese proletariat. We therefore, in the name of the Conference, send this message to the Chinese proletariat. We are glad to be able to demonstrate thereby our determination to the Chinese working class.

Extraordinary Conference of the Hyogikai of Japan, Kobe."

POLITICS

The Military Revolt in Portugal.

By Giulio Aquila.

The following article was written while the revolt in Portugal was still in progress and the issue of the struggle remained uncertain; it is nevertheless of interest as giving details as to the parties to the struggle and the interests involved. Ed.

The military revolt which broke out on the 3rd of February in the Portuguese harbour and garrison town of Oporto, is the twentieth since 1910, since the overthrow of the monarchy, and was aimed at bringing about the downfall of the thirty-fourth government which has been in office since the same date. It is true the majority of these revolts passed off without doing any harm; in the majority of cases it sufficed for the insurgents to show their firm will to drive out the existing government, and to emphasise this by the loading of rifles, in order to induce the government to resign without the insurgents having to fire a single shot. This time the government appears to be more determined and the struggle more sanguinary; in fact artillery has been brought into action by both sides.

The numerous revolts and putches in Portugal since 1910 appear at the first moment to be obscure and confused. Their explanation, however, is more simple than would at first seem.

With the overthrow of the monarchy, which was accomplished with the aid of England in 1910, the previously ruling agrarians were removed from a relatively weak, undeveloped and in the first undifferentiated bourgeoisie which was divided by particularist interests into various hostile groups, the economic basis of which was middle and even small industry.

During and after the war a process of differentiation took place within the bourgeoisie in which foreign, and before all English capital had a considerable share. Simultaneously with this process the situation of the liberal-democratic governments of the parties and leaders who obtained State power after the

overthrow of 1910, with their ideology and policy which still reflected the interests of the "united" bourgeoisie, i. e. in this case practically the middle and lower strata of the bourgeoisie, became more and more untenable.

As result of these economic and political elements a situation arose in which four factors, which are sharply divided from one another, are fighting for the State power:

a) The liberal-democratic groups and parties of the middle and lower strata of the bourgeoisie which seized State power on the occasion of the upheaval in 1910. These parties find support among the petty bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois intelligencia, which latter are fairly closely allied with them.

b) The newly-arisen industrial big capital, for the further development of which the present frame of the constitution had become too narrow and which it tries to burst by means of violence. The most important support of this section of the Portuguese bourgeoisie is foreign, and in particular English industrial and financial capital.

c) The agrarians, who have not become reconciled to their forcible removal from the government and are making constant and strenuous attempts to recapture their lost positions of power. They constitute the main forces of the monarchist movement.

d) The army, which in the struggles has made itself independent of the three groups above mentioned, of whom, however, it is characteristic that while on the one hand it is becoming an independent factor, on the other hand it is splitting into two parts without as yet a clear dividing line, one of which is inclined towards the agrarians and the other towards the bourgeoisie.

One should not imagine, however, that these four factors are sharply divided from one another in the actual acute struggles.

The proletariat, which is not numerically very strong, has not yet developed into an independent political factor. The working class is still to a great extent permeated by petty-bourgeois-anarchist ideology; on the other hand reformist influences make themselves felt in its ranks. These latter have the tendency to keep the workers "neutral" in the fights of the various groups. For example, on the occasion of the military putch of May 1926 the Social Democratic Party issued the following appeal:

"The National Council of the Portuguese Socialist Party recognises in the military action the logical consequence of the errors of the Republican parties, which are divided as a result of purely personal interests and have no ideological content.

The Council desires that the army shall not serve to secure the predominance of one political faction over an equally responsible fraction, and regrets that a portion of the proletariat has mixed itself in the events.

The Council recommends comrades to preserve a waiting attitude so long as fundamental liberties, ideological principles and special interests are not violated." (!)

The petty bourgeois anarchist tendencies content themselves by saying that the workers should to some extent take active part in the acute struggles of the belligerent groups, but not as an independent factor but in the wake of the liberal-democratic and intellectual strata. The Communist Party at present represents but a small minority in the Portuguese proletariat. Consequently the proclamation of a strike by the Party on the occasion of the revolt of May 1926, for instance, did not have any practical results.

In the revolt in May 1926 led by General Gomez da Costa, the last "right-democratic" government of Antonio Maria da Silva, which was a government of the middle bourgeoisie, was overthrown. Gomez da Costa compelled even the President, Bernardino Machado, who was also a representative of the middle bourgeoisie, to abdicate, and dissolved parliament. Gomez da Costa, in addition to a great portion of the army, was supported mainly by the agrarians, which brought the danger of the restoration of the monarchy immediately near. His rule, however, only lasted for three weeks. He was overthrown by General Carmona who made the attempt, under a military dictatorship, to give all possible consideration to the interests of big capital and the agrarians.

The present upheaval, which is favoured by an economic crisis which is becoming more and more acute, seems to have originated among the liberal-democratic groups of the middle

bourgeoisie and a relatively small portion of the army which inclines to these groups. Nevertheless the insurgents may be supported by a portion of the naval forces, whose officers have always been inclined to the Liberals; this could decide the struggle in favour of the insurgents. The sending of warships by England to Portuguese waters is intended to prevent this development.

According to a foreign report, railway workers have gone on strike in support of the insurgents. As regards the extent and the nature and manner of the participation of the proletariat in the movement now proceeding we have at present no information.

Against the Brutal Policy of Suppression of the Fascist Government in Poland.

From the Speech of Comrade A. Varski-Vavszavski in the Sejm on January 27th 1927.

The Communist fraction of the Sejm makes the following statement with regard to the draft Budget presented to the Sejm, which is an expression of the Fascist regime.

In rejecting the Budget of the Fascist Government, the Communist fraction cannot pass over in silence the deeds of violence which have just been committed against the White Russian people and which throw a glaring light on the ruling regime of Fascism. It is a cynical lie when the Government Press maintains that the arrests of the deputies of the White Russian Worker and Peasant party (Hromada), Taraszkiewicz, Voloszin, Raka-Michailovski, Mietla and of the deputy of the Independent Peasant party N. P. Ch. Holevacz, were not directed against the whole working population of White Russia but were only intended as a blow at the Communists. For the Government, trampling underfoot its own bourgeois Constitution, not only ordered the arrest of the Central Committee of the Worker and Peasant party of White Russia as well as of members of the district committees and of the local groups of this organisation, which developed its activities quite openly on the basis of a legally published constitution, but it even had members of the trade unions and of various educational organisations arrested too. Among those arrested were the members of the Society of the White Russian School, the director and the teachers of the White Russian high school in Vilna, further the teachers of the White Russian high-schools in Novogrodek, Radoszkovice etc. The manager of the White Russian cooperative bank and the manager of its branches in Glebokie and Pinsk were also arrested. The banks were closed, the money confiscated. The Government not only organised a pogrom in the educational establishments and co-operative societies, it has thrown itself against the whole mass of the White Russian population, undertaking wholesale domiciliary visits and wholesale arrests among the workers and peasants in the whole territory of West White Russia.

According to Press reports, more than one thousand persons have been arrested.

We call attention to the fact that this attack on the working masses of West White Russia is not the first blow directed against the White Russian people. West White Russia has passed through times of violence, terror and robbery during Pilsudski's invasion of Minsk and Kiev in 1919 and 1920 — when, under the supreme command of the magnates of the border land, the towns and villages were devastated with fire and sword whilst the workers and peasants were shot down by thousands or left to perish in the pestilential prisons and concentration camps. Then began the policy of the barbarous throttling not only of the Communist, but also of the national movement in White Russia and the forcible polonisation of the country. The masses gathered round the White Russian Worker and Peasant party ("Hromada"), round the organisation which defended its cause persistently and unyieldingly. At that time this organisation already numbered 100,000 registered members in almost 2000 groups of local nuclei, the so-called Hurtki.

The "Hromada" is carrying on a campaign for the handing over of the soil without compensation, for a worker and peasant government, for the right of self-determination of the peoples under the yoke of Polish imperialism. It regards a united struggle of the working masses of Poland, without distinction of nationality as the way towards the realisation

of these aims. At the same time the party is carrying on a daily fight against the arbitrary rule and abuses of the Polish occupation by inaugurating trade unions, co-operatives and educational establishments.

This growth of the popular movement has inspired the landed proprietors on the border land with fear, the landed proprietors who, for centuries, have lived as parasites on the White Russian people. For the Fascist Government, their wishes are commands. Consequently all kind of reprisals were hailed down with new vigour: punishments, arrests, dispersal of meetings and demonstrations, sanguinary pogroms, as for instance in the village of Stare-Berthevo, where informers and police severely ill-treated those who were taking part in a district conference of the party (Hromada), amongst them two deputies, Mietla and Voloszyn.

The torturing of the political prisoners became worse and worse, as for instance in Vilna where, during a hunger strike in Lukishki, the prisoners, without exception, were severely ill-treated, thrown out naked into the snow and then driven back into damp, cold dungeons. Demonstrations of protest against these horrible crimes were dispersed by force of arms, as happened for instance in Vilna during the visit of the English Labour members of Parliament.

In connection with this, the Communist fraction considers it its duty to state from the platform of the Sejm that deeds of violence no less ghastly, which recall the worst times of the Russian occupation in Poland, have taken place and are still taking place in the Western Ukraine. We will only call to mind the monster trial of the 150 Ukrainian workers and peasants which came to an end on January 10th this year. In the course of the proceedings, such terrible provocation and such indescribable tortures were revealed, that even the fearful crimes of Czarism against its prisoners were surpassed. The Fascist Government did not stop short of sentencing nine of the accused to imprisonment for life because they were members of the Communist Party on the basis of evidence fabricated by agents provocateurs and of confession extorted by torture; this sentence practically means a slow death in subterranean dungeons. Besides this, 4 of the accused were sentenced to fifteen years, 6 to twelve years, 39 to ten and 60 to four years, thus altogether more than 1000 years of prison, not counting the imprisonment on remand.

The wholesale trials in Lemberg, Luck etc. bear evidence to the fact that, under the Fascist Government, terror and the persecution of the national movement are intensified in West Ukraine also. In the Lemberg district, Sobinski, a curator who was killed, had closed nearly 2000 Ukrainian schools in the course of a year. In 1921 there were about 656 Ukrainian schools in Volhynia and Pelesje; now there is not a single one. This is also true of other districts.

The Communist fraction in the Sejm lays special emphasis on the fact that this policy of exterminating every sign of a national movement, is not only carried on in the interest of the magnates and landed proprietors of the border districts, who are defending their supremacy over the working people of White Russia and the Ukraine, but that it further aims at preparing for war against the Soviet Union. In order to destroy the worker and peasant republics of Soviet White Russia and the Ukraine, the worker and peasant movement in West White Russia and in the Western Ukraine must first be suppressed in order to ensure a cover in the rear for the army which is to invade Minsk and Kiev. This is in the interest of both the landed proprietors of the border districts and of the Polish bourgeoisie, and further of capitalist England, which wishes to use the Polish soldiers as cannon fodder in overthrowing the worker and peasant Governments.

The Communist fraction further states that all these cruel persecutions were approved of by all the landed proprietors, manufacturers and other exploiters and were openly or secretly supported by all the opportunist petty bourgeois leaders from the P. P. S. (Socialist Party of Poland) to the D. P. R. (National Labour Party). This recognition, which all the camps of the bourgeoisie have shown to the Fascist Government of Pilsudski is, amongst others, one of the last ties which binds together more and more all the exploiters and oppressors of the people and unites them in one bourgeois camp under the leadership of Fascism.

The bloc of industrialists and agrarians, which originated under the protection of the Fascist regime, was then concluded on the basis of the plan of capitalist reconstruction. In order

to deceive the workers and the poor peasants, in order to conceal from them the plan directed against the working population, a "Labour Commission" was added to the Industrial Commission, which was formed in the interest of the bloc of industrialists and agrarians. In order to make this deception possible to Fascism, the leaders of the P. P. S. delegated Ziemienski to be chairman of this commission — just as they delegated Holovko and other members of the P. P. S. to be members of the Government Commission which was to offer protection to the national minorities, whilst, at the same time, the same Government is suppressing and throttling the national fight of the subjugated peoples. Just as Moraczewski, a member of the P. P. S. is a Minister in the Fascist Government, the leaders of the P. P. S. have not shrunk from allowing one of their leaders to act as a fig-leaf to conceal the cynical plans of capitalist reconstruction, which are to wrest from the workers once for all, the last remnants of the achievements of the proletariat and to condemn the working masses to starvation, in spite of longer hours of work, and millions of landless workers and poor peasants to unemployment and death by starvation.

This is the balance, up to date, of the Fascist Government of Pilsudski. Oppression and Terror exercised against the White Russian and the Ukrainian population, oppression and colonisation against the other national minorities! In the Polish villages an increase of oppression and exploitation on the part of the landed proprietors, increased distress among the peasants! The Fascist Government has deprived the poor peasant of all hope of obtaining land as long as this government is at the helm. In the towns, moreover, we see an increase of oppression and terror exercised against the workers who are struggling for better conditions of living. Here we have the system of frustrating the wage struggles of the workers, with the support of the leaders of the P. P. S., who, supported by the Government and the industrialists, smooth out every dispute by methods of trickery. And if the leaders of the P. P. S. do not succeed in frustrating the fight by these methods of pacification, the Fascist Government appears on the scenes and turns the soldiers into strikebreakers by sending them to work, as was the case during the strike in the sugar refineries, the printers' strike in Warsaw and the strike in the electricity works in Proszkov. Or else it simply suppresses the strike with bullets and bayonets, as was the case in Dzviniacz and other places.

Finally, the result of Pilsudski's Fascist Government is that unemployment is again increasing, the eight hours' day has been abolished, the prohibition of night work has been suspended, the protection of working women and juveniles has been suspended, and social insurance and the support of the unemployed is steadily decreasing.

The Fascist Government of Pilsudski is a faithful servant of the bloc of the landed proprietors and industrialists. This Government, like every other capitalist government, is a deadly enemy of the workers, of millions of poor peasants and of the peoples oppressed by the Polish bourgeoisie, an enemy from whom they can expect no mercy.

The working masses must oppose the plan of capitalist reconstruction by a fight for the re-introduction of the eight hours' day, a fight for the restoration of the right to strike, which was artfully wrenched from them with the help of the leaders of the P. P. S. and other agents of the bourgeoisie. They must oppose it by a fight for the freedom of the revolutionary movement of the workers, peasants and the peoples subjugated by the Polish bourgeoisie, they must oppose it by a fight for the surrender of the property of the large landowners to the peasants without compensation, for the right of self-determination of the national minorities, they must oppose it by a fight against the threat of war, a fight for a workers' and peasants' government, which will arise on the ruins of Fascism by means of revolution.

Roumania, France and the Soviet Union.

By S. Yavorsky (Moscow).

The publication of the text of the treaty between France and Roumania, which took place about six months after the signatures were affixed, marks a stage in the struggle which has recently been developing between France and Italy for supremacy in the Balkans. Why should the treaty, which was signed in

June, 1926, be published just at the present moment? What has compelled French diplomacy now to remind Roumania of her obligations to France and to point out that France, now as ever, regards herself as one of the deciding factors in the policy of the Balkans? It is impossible to regard this action as having no connection with the latest steps taken by Italy, of which the most prominent are the conclusion of the treaty with Albania and the preparation of a similar treaty with Hungary. The extraordinary activity manifested by British and Italian diplomacy in the Balkans compels imperialist France, too, to have recourse to decisive measures of defence and now and then, even to take the offensive.

Roumania was in an unusually favourable position when two of the most important powers in Europe assured her so pronouncedly of their good-will. Under these circumstances, there remained nothing for the ruling classes of Roumania to do but to manoeuvre skilfully in order to gain advantages out of the competition between France and Italy. It must be recognised, however, that Italy has better prospects than France of winning over the Roumanian bourgeoisie to her side. As the Mussolini government has Great Britain behind it, it can more readily than the French furnish Roumania with financial support, supply it with arms and exercise influence upon Roumania's immediate neighbour, Hungary, in the sense of the development of Roumania's long-standing wish to extend Roumanian influence as far as Budapest. Again, there can be no doubt that in the hands of the Italian diplomats the ideological relationship of Italian Fascism to the feeling of the ruling classes of Roumania is a trump card.

In order to strengthen Italian „friendship“, the Roumanian government has engaged upon considerable deviation from its legislation concerning the crude oil sources. Italian capital has acquired special concessions for the exploitation of Roumanian crude oil sources and for the working up of Roumanian crude oil.

Under these conditions of mutual interest, it is not necessary for the Roumanian government further to insist that in the treaty with Italy a clause should be contained, whereby Italy guarantees the integrity of the present territory of Roumania. The Italian government is too greatly interested in commercial relations with the Soviet Union to risk spoiling them, which would inevitably happen if Italy declared herself prepared to ratify the "Bessarabian protocol" of the year 1920, which constituted Bessarabia an integral portion of the Kingdom of Roumania. On the other hand, as in addition to the published text of the treaty between Italy and Roumania there are doubtlessly secret agreements and also a military convention binding the two States, Roumania has chosen not to insist upon Italy's ratifying the "Bessarabian protocol", for it has rightly assumed that it does not matter so much about the formalities, the more so as, according to a letter from Mussolini to General Averescu, Italy will put the "protocol" into shape just as soon as "suitable conditions" obtain.

France has not at its disposal sufficient possibilities to win Roumania over to its side. It is not in a position to furnish Roumania with loans and it is, moreover, interested in a further isolation of Hungary. Yet, upon Roumania's willingness to act on the instructions of French diplomacy depends the fate of the Little Entente, which is the chief support France possesses in South-East Europe. It is true that during the diplomatic conflict between Italy and Yugoslavia concerning the treaty between Italy and Albania and during the Press dispute in the question of the rapprochement between Italy and Hungary, Roumania displayed openly its rather indifferent attitude towards the destiny of the Little Entente.

France has, however, no other expedient than that of using all its endeavours to prevent Roumania from completely changing its course and steering towards Italy and Great Britain. The only inducement which France possesses consists of promises to defend with all the means in its power, not excepting even armed intervention, the integrity of the territory of present-day Roumania, including Bessarabia. France guarantees Roumania the possession of Bessarabia; that is the sense and purport of the new treaty between France and Roumania signed on June 9th, 1926.

The profit which Roumania derives from this treaty is very clear. On the other hand, it is difficult to grasp what concrete advantages France hopes to gain, if one does not take into consideration the very questionable consolidation of the Little Entente through Roumania's continued adherence thereto.

In his note presented to the French government in June, 1926, Comrade Rakovsky quite rightly characterised the treaty between France and Roumania as "an unfriendly step against the peoples of the Soviet Union". At the same time, he pointed out the political consequences which this treaty would have for France itself. Supported by France's guarantee of the inviolability of its frontiers, Roumania would no longer consider itself under obligation to seek methods for a peaceable settlement of the Bessarabian question. As, however, the peoples and the government of the Soviet Union do not regard themselves as bound by the decision of the Ambassadors' Conference of the year 1920 concerning Bessarabia, and as the population of Bessarabia never will become reconciled to the violent annexation of their country by Roumania, it is clear that France, who is ostensibly working for the peace of Europe, has created with its own hands a source of disturbance and complication at one of the most dangerous points.

The ruling classes of Roumania, who feel under their feet what they suppose to be the firm ground of the treaty with France, will from now on naturally not declare themselves agreed to solve the Bessarabian question voluntarily by the only possible peaceable method, namely, by a referendum of the population of Bessarabia itself. By this means, every hope of establishing peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and Roumania is destroyed, for, no matter how hypocritically the Radical and Socialist Press of France may prate about Roumania's willingness to conclude a treaty with the Soviet Union for mutual neutrality and abstention from attack, it is quite apparent that there can be no question of a treaty of guarantee of any kind, so long as the fact of Roumania's attack upon the Soviet Union subsists and the violent annexation of a territory, which formed a portion of revolutionary Russia, is still upheld by Roumania.

The treaty between France and Roumania, appears in this way to be an incitement to the predatory tendencies of the Roumanian oligarchy.

The British-Italian Machinations in the East.

By J. B., Jerusalem.

In many respects English policy in the Near East is directed towards the same end as that of Italy. First of all, both for Italy and for Great Britain there is the task of finally driving France out of her spheres of influence in Nearer Asia and North Africa (Syria, Tunis). The second common enemy is Turkey, whose independence is regarded by the Fascist not less than by the British Government as a considerable obstacle in their imperialistic path. In the third place there is the penetration of the Arabian Peninsula, and domination over the eastern and western shores of the Red Sea, for which the Italians and the English are striving.

During the last few months Anglo-Italian co-operation with the object of gaining these ends has become more and more apparent. The first step was the Anglo-Italian agreement concerning Abyssinia, which gave rise to so much commotion and to protests from the Abyssinian Government to the League of Nations. Then there was the meeting of Mussolini and Chamberlain in Livorno, which reinforced the common Anglo-Italian policy in the Mediterranean. Finally, one of the objects of Churchill's recent visit to Rome was the solving of this question.

Nevertheless, old contrasts and rivalries still continue to exist between these two imperialist countries. England is by far the richer and stronger partner: it possesses domination over Egypt, the Soudan, an extensive Palestine-Transjordan-Irak mandatory territory, the Gulf of Aden, as well as more or less stable agreements with various princes of the Arabian Peninsula. Italy rules only the colonial district of Tripoli (in which the incessant insurrections of the fanatical Senussi tribes make the Italian situation difficult enough) and Eritrea on the east coast of Central Africa to serve as points of departure for its ambitious policy of expansion.

Italy's effort, therefore, to secure a firm position within the block without detriment to the common fight against competitors and opponents: France, Turkey, Arabs, is quite comprehensible. Great Britain and Italy are fighting shoulder to shoulder for the consolidation and expansion of their influence in the Near East, but at the same time, neither ally ever lets pass an opportunity of enhancing its own influence at the cost of that of the other ally.

This is most clearly shown in the double game played on the Arabian Peninsula. Italy had tried for a long time to get a footing in the territory. When, in 1924, Great Britain ceased to support King Houssein, the Italians endeavoured to step into the breach in favour of his son, Ali, and furnished the latter with loans and munitions, but they were too late to prevent victory on the part of Ibn Saoud, who concluded an agreement with Britain. Italy then approached the traditional enemy of England on the Arabian Peninsula, Imam Jihje, ruler of Yemen. Fear of attack from Ibn Saoud, possibly with British help, facilitated Italy's penetration of internally well organised, naturally wealthy flourishing Yemen, which had previously been immune from every imperialistic influence. An agreement between Imam Jihje and the Italian Governor of Eritrea secured for the Italians not only important commercial advantages but also orders for war munitions shortly after the delivery of which military instructors and technicians were despatched.

The Italians soon used their influence in Yemen to induce Imam to make war upon the conqueror of Northern Arabia, Ibn Saoud. The pretext chosen for the war was the old quarrel between Jihje and Ibn Saoud concerning rule over the small principality of Assir, on the west coast of the Arabian Peninsula. The Emir of this country, Idrisi, had, however, long been under British protection. On account of bad management, Idrisi, was financially crippled, and out of a sense of charity the English bought from him the Island of Farasan, belonging to his territory, with its rich naphtha fields, leased before the world war by Sultan Abdol Hamid to a German company for 200,000 pounds. (The concession was later annulled.) The ridiculously low price paid, namely 25,000 pounds, will be delivered at once to Idrisi in the form of weapons and ammunition, so that he may engage in war with Imam Jihje. At the same time, the British are hinting to Ibn Saoud the necessity of conquering his dangerous rival in the south and annexing Assir.

While on the Arabian Peninsula the danger of war between the South, armed by Italy, and the North, inspired by Great Britain, is becoming more and more imminent, and the Arab Nationalists are making desperate attempts to prevent the fratricide, which would deliver the Arabs completely into the hands of the imperialists, the British specialist for Arabian affairs Sir Gilbert Clayton, has gone to Rome to arrange — "amicably and satisfactorily" — the distribution of British and Italian spheres of influence in Arabia; in other words, he is arranging for the precise performance of the play with divided rôles, which is about to be staged, and seeing to it that each of the governments participating shall get its share of the spoils after the clash of the Arabian rulers.

The Anglo-Italian relations in Egypt are taking on a peculiar form: Two years ago Great Britain rendered Italy an important service here by relinquishing the Oasis of Dsharabub, because the possession of this oasis secures Italy's possessions in Tripoli. This step caused much discontent among Egyptian Nationalists and directed their attention to Italian imperialism, which is the more detested in Egypt, because the Italians are keen opponents of the abolition of the capitulation regime and openly entertain relations with the treacherous "Ittehad" Party, the dictator and adversary of the national movement, Ziwar Pasha, and with the reactionary court clique of King Fuad.

The English are exploiting the detestation in the Arab national movement of Italian imperialistic aspirations in such a manner as to make it appear that Egypt's choice lies between British and Italian supremacy. Colonel Wedgood (strangely enough, a prominent member of the Labour Party), after a visit to Egypt and after exhaustive discussion with the English High Commissioner in Cairo, proposes that Egypt, which, together with the other countries of Western Asia, once formed part of the Roman Empire, should be handed over to the suzerainty of Mussolini.

This attempt at intimidation — the threat to leave the country to Italian Fascism — is designed, in addition to demonstrating fully the value of British friendship and British protection, to serve a secondary concrete purpose, which Wedgood himself disclosed: a fresh attack on the Egyptian Treasury. It was for a long time customary for the Egyptian peasants and town population not only to cater for the British army of occupation in Egypt, they had also to pay for it. A large portion of Great Britain's expenditure in Egypt was debited to the Egyptian tax-payers. In the year 1924, the Egyptian Parliament abolished this humiliating and heavy burden

upon the Egyptian budget. Egypt is now to be compelled once more to assume the whole cost of defence of its independence against Italian imperialism, i. e., to pay the military contribution to Britain, if it does not wish to be delivered into the hands of the Fascists.

Although this British manoeuvre is so crass and transparent (and it was immediately recognised as such in Egypt), it nevertheless shows the manner in which the British whet the appetite of Italian imperialism and raise its hopes, in order, on the other hand, to play the role of protector of the weaker nations.

The Italian method in Syria and Palestine is the exact reverse. Italian diplomacy there does its best to approach the Arabian national movement. The Italians have again and again promised their sympathy to the Syrian insurgents, and the Italian representative of the mandatory commission caused the French serious difficulties. However, this friendship did not last long, because Italy's intention of taking over the French mandate in Syria transpired prematurely and the Syrians fighting for complete independence betrayed no inclination to exchange the yoke of Poincaré for that of Mussolini.

A similar effort is now in progress in Palestine: The newly appointed Italian General Consul in Jerusalem is an ardent supporter of that portion of the Fascist Party which demands active support of the Arab national movement against Great Britain, because the latter has committed herself to an alliance with Zionism. But here again Italy's claims that the interests of the Vatican should be respected and that special privileges should be conceded to Italians, etc., show the real imperialistic intentions, while the sham-fight against British policy is put up for the purpose of strengthening Italy's position in the Anglo-Italian alliance.

Finally, the pioneers of Italian Imperialism have in recent years developed increased activity in Irak: Italian trade has grown markedly at the expense of that of Britain and France. Italy has founded a number of new consulates, one of them being in Mossul. Italian companies are applying for concessions.

The co-operation of Great Britain and Italy and the intrigues of these two imperialist governments against their common opponents and against one another create in North Africa and Asia Minor a more and more intense political atmosphere. Only a consistent and energetic fight against both imperialist powers can secure Syria, Egypt, Turkey and Arabia against enslavement and exploitation and open out to them the possibility of undisturbed development.

The Resignation of the Government in Persia.

By R. K., Teheran.

It might be said of the cabinet of Mustofi el Memalek that it was swilled out of office with crude oil. At least, crude oil was the immediate cause of the Shah's accepting the resignation of the Government.

On January 2nd, a group of members questioned the Government concerning the agreement concluded in October, 1926, with the "Anglo-Persian Company for the Crude Oil of the South." This agreement constituted a big concession by Persia to Great Britain, for the company received thereby great advantages in the organising of new supplies of crude oil in the district of Kassri-Shirin (on the Irak frontier, i. e. near the crude oil of Mossul) and in the importation of crude-oil products from Irak to the Persian markets. All this opened up to the company good prospects of profitable sales of their crude-oil products in the northerly districts of Persia bordering the Transcaucasian Soviet Republic and of forcing the crude-oil products from the Soviet Union out of these districts. The Government postponed under various pretexts the reply to the question; when, however, it proved impossible to delay the matter any longer the Government resigned rather than face Parliament with explanations.

But it was not merely a question of crude oil. The crude oil agreement was only intended by the group, that put the question to the house, as a suitable pretext for bringing about the fall of the Government. The Government which had concluded this crude-oil agreement, so advantageous for Great Britain and so very disadvantageous for Persia, displayed an incomprehensible reluctance to settle commercial relations and several other rela-

tions with the Soviet Union upon terms equally favourable for both parties. The unsettled state of these relations caused in the trade of the rich northern districts of Persia a stop in the traffic with the Soviet Union, entailing loss to merchants and producers of raw materials.

In the sphere of home politics, the Government lived as one might say, upon the interest of old capital and did not pass a single significant reform of all those provided for in the statement made on September 18th, 1926, by the Prime Minister.

During the period of Mustofi el Memalek's last period of office as Prime Minister, the activity of the American financial adviser, with his large and well paid staff, excited great dissatisfaction in wide circles of the public and in Parliament.

The reports of this adviser, published broadcast and invariably optimistic, did not correspond with the real conditions of Persian finances. The Treasury was often short of money to pay the army. The circumstance that a number of economic questions between the Soviet Union and Persia were left unsettled, was in part due to the fact that, as the Persian Press pointed out, the financial adviser steadily opposed the settlement of relations between the Soviet Union and Persia. It was only quite recently that the Government made a single timid effort to limit the work of the financial adviser, and this without success.

Much discontent was also aroused by the action of the representative of Persia, Prince Arfa el Dowle, in the League of Nations, who protested against the interpretation of Article 16 of the regulations of the League of Nations by the Conference of Locarno, an action which was quite intelligible from the standpoint of the interests of Great Britain in the Near East but hardly intelligible from the standpoint of the interests of Persia.

The crude-oil agreement with the above-mentioned company did not, however, come into operation, and the Mustofi Government had the intention of freeing itself of responsibility for the agreement by putting it to the vote in Parliament. It also appears that the Government had determined to settle relations with the Soviet Union, and intended to disavow the action of Prince Arfa in the League of Nations and also to put a curb on the American financial adviser.

But all this also showed that the Government, which had no clear-cut programme and, therefore, took a direct line of action in no direction at all, was exposed to the influence of the various groups fighting among themselves in Persia, each of whom gave itself out to be the only true expression of the national interests of Persia. This made the Government completely incapable of doing its work.

The Prime Minister, Mustofi el Memalek, is an old, "tried", incorruptible nationalist, "a father of the nation". Among the other members of the Cabinet there were several respected people belonging to the "old" nationalists. These are all people of the old school who considered balancing to be the political wisdom of Persia; in foreign politics, a balancing of matters between Great Britain and Czarist Russia; in home affairs, a balance between the interests of the big landowners and those of trade and industry, but they did not appear to take into consideration the fact that we are now living in different times.

The national questions with which Persia is at present confronted cannot be solved by holding the balance between Great Britain and the Soviet Union. Under former conditions, when British and Russian imperialism were competing in Persia, when the monarchy of the Kadshars, supported by the feudal lords, was still in existence, and the bourgeoisie was still a weak and little organised force, the method of balancing accomplished certain positive advantages for Persia. Under present circumstances, however, as the Soviet Union shows a friendly attitude towards all the national freedom movements in the East, as the feudal lords have been shattered and the bourgeoisie has become strong, these methods have become a hindrance to the solution of the tasks of the national regeneration of Persia.

A balancing Government is condemned to gross mistakes and utter helplessness both in home affairs and in foreign affairs. This has been proved magnificently by the Cabinet of Mustofi el Memalek.

In the new condition of home affairs and international affairs other and bolder methods are necessary, new people are necessary, a clearly defined line of action is necessary.

It is no secret that the members who put the question to the house and brought the fall of the Mustofi Government were supported by the group of Wossuga Nossret el Dowle, who have recently been trying unsuccessfully to get into office and who were compromised in 1919 through the treaty with Great Britain, which brought Persia under the actual rule of Great Britain. These politicians represent the western tendency in Persia. They expect a regeneration of their country through close co-operation with Great Britain and the United States. If this group took the place of Mustofi el Memalek, they would not hold the balance but would strike a clear and definite course towards the West; this would, however, inevitably cause dissatisfaction in the country, whose active elements, in view of the experience of 1919, would never submit to fresh experiences of British "blessings".

For this reason, the prospect of having such a Government is not alluring. It is necessary that there should be formed a new, energetic, expert government, containing new and young politicians. If such a government is not formed, it is probable that the policy of helpless balancing will be continued.

FASCISM

On the Danger of a Fascist Putsch in Latvia.

(Appeal of the E. C. C. I.)

A telegraphic summary of the following appeal appeared in our last number. Ed.

To the Workers of the Whole World!

Comrades!

The victory of fascism in May, in Poland was followed by the fascist upheaval in Lithuania. It is now the turn of Latvia. The Latvian fascists are now carrying on a feverish activity. The proceedings in Volmar were only a first trial of strength which will be followed by an attack in the centre. Organisations such as the "Lettish National Club", the "Guardian of the Fatherland", the "League of Patriots" and others are openly preparing for a putsch by arming their members, organising military espionage, penetrating with every means into the governmental and administrative apparatus, and securing one position after another in the army. The commanders of the Latvian army and a whole number of Generals are notorious fascists who are at the head of the conspiracy. In the same way as did Zankow in Bulgaria, they rely upon the support of the officers and the military schools.

This is known to everybody in Latvia; this is also known to the social democratic government, which by its lack of character and cowardice is preparing the way for the success of the fascist movement. Just as in Lithuania, there is proceeding before their eyes the open organisation of the fascist forces; but the Menshevist government which is afraid of every movement of the masses, rains down persecutions and repressions on the Left workers organisations. It permits the fascist robbers to spread with impunity rumours regarding a "communist putsch" which is alleged to be in course of preparation in order to conceal the real aims of the fascist conspirators.

All these assertions of the fascist bandits regarding an attack of the Communists which is alleged to be in course of preparation, are conscious lies and provocation. It is clear even to the blind who in Latvia is playing the part of the aggressor: the best representatives of the working class who are persecuted, hunted down and hundreds of whom are pining in prison, or the insolent clique of officers, students, and sons of wealthy citizens, who enjoy the support of the bankers, house owners, landlords and merchants, and are maintained by the money of West European capitalists. The whole international situation now favours the attack of the Latvian fascists: 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 as well as the whole reaction which is raising its head in the Baltic countries.

There is no doubt that behind the Latvian fascists, as well as behind the Lithuanian fascists there stands imperialist Eng-

land. All its inner and outer difficulties and failures: the unceasing, even if slow decline of industry, the national revolutionary movement in China and the movement for freedom in the colonies which is undermining the power of England, the pertinacity of the working class, which will not willingly submit to the yoke of exploitation by capital which is becoming ever stronger, the growth of a revolutionary wing of the Labour Movement in England — for all this the English imperialists regard as responsible the Communist Movement and especially the Soviet Union. Therefore they are persistently forging plans for the encirclement of the Soviet Union by hostile fascist States and finally to make war on the Soviet Union. The fascist putsch in Latvia, the complete crushing of the advance guard of its working class, is necessary for England, in order afterwards to be able more easily to carry out its plans directed against the Soviet Union. That is the true meaning of those events which have taken place in Lithuania, which are ripening in Latvia and can any day take the form of a fascist putsch.

Comrades! The Communist International summons the workers and peasants of all countries to the fight against the plans of English imperialism, to the fight against the danger of fascism in Latvia and in other countries. It is necessary to follow attentively the refined provocation of imperialist England, which stands at the head of the international counter-revolution, and the attack of capital against the working class and against the enslaved peoples of the whole world.

The Communist International calls upon all workers and peasants and their parties to set up a united front for the fight against fascism. Only the fighting initiative of the fighting proletarian organisations can drag with it the vacillating elements who are at present under the leadership of the social democracy and other petty-bourgeois parties. This was the case at the time of the Kapp Putsch in Germany, this was also the case in the time of the Kornilov days in revolutionary Petrograd.

It is necessary to expose the vacillations and the half-heartedness of the ruling Social Democratic Party in Latvia, to force it to a decisive fight against fascism, to enforce by the pressure of the workers' organisations the dissolution of the fascist organisations and the disarming of their bands, the dismissal of the fascist Generals, the arming of the workers, the freedom of the press, of meetings and organisations for the workers, the cessation of the persecution of the Left labour organisations etc.

Comrades! What is happening in Latvia and in all other countries of the Baltic possesses great significance for the proletariat of the remaining capitalist countries. The bourgeoisie which finds itself in a cul-de-sac, considers the only way out to be the complete enslavement — economic as well as political — of the working masses. For this purpose it requires the open bourgeois dictatorship which fascism gives it. When it has achieved favourable results in the small countries it will begin to act all the more determinedly and insolently in the big countries.

Be on your guard! Revolutionary watchfulness, before all of the workers of Latvia itself, is more necessary than ever. The united front against advancing capitalism and against fascism in all countries is more necessary now than ever. Those leaders of the Social Democracy who, even in the moment of the greatest danger, reject the creation of the united front, must be branded. All forces must now be mobilised for the fight against fascism. The Communist International opposes the sabotage of proletarian unity which is being carried out by Social Democracy from above, by the united front of the workers from below. Fascism in the Baltic countries and in Poland as well as the role of England and of other capitalist countries in this work must be exposed.

Long live the united front against the attack of capital and against fascism in the whole world!

Down with the imperialist robbers who instigate the fascist upheavals in the Baltic countries!

Long live the emancipation of the workers from the yoke of capital!

The Executive Committee of the
Communist International.

Text of the Declaration of D'Aragona and his Colleagues.

("Initiative Group").

We publish below the text of the declaration of D'Aragona and his colleagues as a document of shameful betrayal of the working class, in which acceptance of the principles of Fascism is proclaimed. Ed.

The Italian Trade Union Movement has up to now been almost exclusively directed towards achieving economic and moral improvements for the working classes. It is true it has been orientated in the direction of the socialisation of the means of production and transport; this has not, however prevented it from being in practice a movement with limited and particularist aims. Even its activity in the political field was concentrated on extending and securing by law the gains achieved by means of direct trade union action. There was, it is true, a working class which has become conscious of its worth and rights and which stood opposed to the capitalist class. As a result of its collectivist ideology, it however stood immovably fixed in its positions. That is to say, it was neither for nor against the State; it exercised pressure on the State in its own interests, while it denied it in the name of its own political ideology.

It was to be expected that it could not remain for long in this ambiguous position, and that the moment would come when it must decide "for" or "against". Against the bourgeois State if it believes in absorbing the functions reserved to the State by means of the trade unions; in favour of the State, on the other hand, if it comes to the conclusion, to implant the trade unions into the State. It is certain in any case that the denial of the State — in the sense in which it was understood — is characteristic of the childhood stage of the Labour Movement. In this stage the workers actually do nothing else than demand improvements. The factory belongs to the capitalists and is not the concern of the worker. The State is the State of the bourgeoisie, and the latter alone shall trouble about its defence. Even the temporary political compromise, the alliance between various classes and parties for a common aim, does not essentially alter the attitude of the working class towards the State; the working class only concludes alliances in order to secure advantages for itself.

A hundred years' experience in Europe shows and proves that one can only maintain this attitude so long as the Labour Movement does not constitute any power. The historical process invariably develops in the following manner: At first the State does not recognise the trade union; afterwards the latter finds its justification for existence and develops, it is finally recognised by the State and legally registered. The limits of this recognition differ according to the variety of the criteria which prevail in the State, where the dualism between State and Trade Union is bound up with the policy of the working class.

If the working class voluntarily stands on the spiritual basis of the constitution, then the State can permit itself not to trouble too much with regulating its movements. If, on the other hand, the organisation of the working class constitutes a threat against the State, then the latter sees itself compelled to intervene energetically, as it cannot tolerate the simultaneous existence of a *de jure* and a *de facto* State. In order to escape this logic there would remain nothing else for the working class than to fight for the destruction of the *de jure* State, i. e. the bourgeois State.

It is clear that a conception differing from the one above-mentioned, includes within it the abandonment of the class conception, whereby one does not entirely deny the objective reality of the class struggle and does not narrow the horizon of the working class. What is given up is only the narrow, one-sided, *a priori* class conception. Socialism is thereby not disavowed, it is only interpreted more realistically as an aim, as a tendency of society. The working class obtain a greater freedom of movement if they rid themselves of theoretical prejudices. What is of the greatest importance for them is that the State proclaims the principle of interference in the relations of classes. The various forms of economics are considered from the point of view of their yield and of the interests of the community. Under certain conditions a public undertaking can be regarded as more advantageous than a private undertaking, and vice versa. What a

State which stands really above the classes cannot do is to persist in defending a single system; it must permit all forms of economy and must desire that competition arises between the private and public undertakings, in order that the most efficient shall survive the others.

These ideas were, for the rest, tacitly contained in the old free movement, although this — thanks to its tradition — appeared to be spiritually bound to the purely collectivist formula. But now the moment has arrived in order to give clear expression to these ideas. It is vitally necessary to rid the programmes of weeds and to bring them up to date.

In the first place we again declare that production is not exclusively the result of manual labour, and consequently there exists a solidarity between the various factors of socially useful production, without the struggle for the defence of class interests being thereby prejudiced. This norm is practically solved in the recognition that there must be a limit in the self-defence of the classes, both for the workers as well as for the employers. Now it is necessary that this be expressly stated and that the problem of the working class be represented also as the problem of national responsibility.

This clear presentation is particularly necessary in view of the existing political situation in Italy. The fascist regime is a reality, and reality must be taken into consideration. This reality also arises out of our principles. The trade union policy of Fascism is, for example, viewed from certain angles, identical with ours. We were not in conformity with the liberal State because it would not interfere in economic activity. Now we can make all reservations regarding the means and aims of fascist interference; but as there is an interference we are interested to follow its development close at hand.

The fascist regime has certainly enacted a bold law regarding the regulation of collective labour treaties. In this law we see principles adopted which are also our principles. So long as on the one hand there stood the liberal State and on the other hand the workers held firmly to their denial of the State, such a law was impossible. The fascist revolution has cut through the Gordian knot, and we must take note of this fact. In all countries where the policy of interference has been employed, something has been created which approaches the institution of the legally recognised trade union and the labour arbitration court — in Russia more than anywhere else. Hence there can be no opposition on principle to these reforms.

We would likewise contradict ourselves if we opposed the corporation State (*stato corporativo*) and the Charter of Labour (*carta di lavoro*) which Fascism is planning to realise. It suffices to call to mind our decisions and plans in the past in order to make clear that we are bound to contribute by our activity and our criticism to the good success of this experiment.

But how? The law of 3rd April 1926 (the fascist trade union law Ed.) has solved the question in that clause 12 of that law gave the non-fascists the possibility to form *de facto* trade union organisations. The changes following on this in the general conditions in the country no longer allow this provision to be made use of. And yet everyone knows and feels that there is in Italy a wealth of experience which could be used in the interests of the community; that there are men here who, in long years as fighters in the labour movement, have acquired special capabilities for the understanding of social problems as well as capacities to make these problems accessible to the masses.

The spiritual and concrete orientation of the masses according to the theoretical and programmatic principles here laid down can only be the result of a process of self-education. We wish to accelerate this process by placing our forces in the service of the nation as a whole in forming a "Collective Centre for trade union and cultural work".

The Initiative Group:

Azimonti Carlo, Calda Ludovico, Colombino Emilio, D'Aragona Ludovico, Maglione Battista, Reina Ettore, Rigola Rinaldo.

REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS IN THE COLONIES

Against Suppression and Intervention in the Colonial Countries.

The following Resolution was unanimously adopted at the recent International Congress against Colonial Suppression held in Brussels. Ed.

Brussels, 14th February 1927.

The undersigned members of the English, Indian and Chinese delegations declare that the tasks of the working class in the imperialist countries must be the following: First, to fight side by side with all national movements for the complete liberation of the suppressed countries, in order everywhere where the national forces demand it, to achieve complete independence. Secondly, to oppose all forms of suppression of colonial peoples. Thirdly, to vote against all military, naval and air force credits which are intended to be used to maintain the military power in order to employ it against the suppressed nations. Fourthly, to make clear to the whole population and the soldiers the horrors of imperialism. Fifthly, to stigmatise imperialist policy in order, in accordance with the teaching of the class struggle, to be able to carry out the emancipation of the workers.

As regards the present situation in China we declare the following: firstly, we demand the immediate withdrawal of the land and sea forces from Chinese territory and from Chinese waters. Secondly, we insist on the necessity of a direct action, including the strike and the organising of prevention of transport of arms, munitions and troops both to China and to India as well as from India to China. Thirdly, we demand that all credits connected with preparation for war or war itself be refused. Fourthly, in the event of military intervention and a war, all weapons lying within the reach of labour organisations must be employed in order to prevent and hold up hostilities. Fifthly, we demand the unconditional recognition of the National Government and the annulment of all unequal treaties and extra-territorial privileges, as well as the handing back of the foreign concessions. Sixthly, we pledge ourselves, in the interest of the political and trade union labour movements in England, India and China, to work for the realisation of unity and of common action.

Brockway, Davies, Bridgeman, Pollitt, MacManus,
Wilkinson, Beckett, Liau Han Sin, Jawahar Lal Nehru.

AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR

Leninism and the Fight against War.

By G. Zinoviev.

(Conclusion.)

Now, however, the civil war is at an end. The Soviet State has driven the last soldier of the hostile armies from its territory. The first period of the war is concluded. Lenin writes a new chapter to his teaching regarding war. The first State of the proletarian dictatorship has driven off its enemies. For more than three years it fought on all fronts. Does this then mean that war has come to an end once and for all time?

No, it does not mean this.

History teaches us that no single great question, no single revolution has been solved except through a number of wars. . . . We must be prepared for the imperialist robbers attacking us afresh if there is the least change in the situation. We must be armed for this. For this reason we must above all build up our industry anew, we must place it firmly on its feet. This cannot be effected quickly without equipment, without machines from the capitalist countries". (Lenin: Speech at the 8th Soviet Congress.)

"... The situation is exactly this: A long series of wars has hitherto decided the fate of all great revolutions. Our revolution is also a great revolution. We have finished one period of war, we must arm for a second."

"... Even though we have been able to come out of the first period of war, it will not be so easy for us to get out of the second period of war... This indisputable truth must be grasped by every non-party peasant."

"I have been accused (by the Mensheviks) of having expounded a new theory with regard to the new period of war which is approaching. I need not turn back many pages of history in order to show on what my words are based. We have just settled with Wrangel. . . . Anyone who forgets the danger which constantly threatens us, which will not cease as long as world imperialism exists, forgets our republic of the workers" (ibid).

It is just these words of Lenin which we must recall to the memory of the people at the present moment. These statements are not of transient, but of fundamental significance. Every worker and every "non-party peasant" must know these statements and bear them in mind.

* * *

In 1921, in the epoch of the introduction of the N. E. P., Lenin added new features to his estimate of the international situation.

"... The international situation is at present such that some temporary, labile equilibrium, at any rate, an equilibrium of some kind, has been established." (Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 18, part I, pag. 282).

"... I do not touch on the economic foundations, I believe however, that, in the international situation of our Republic, we must, from the political point of view, reckon with the fact that a certain equilibrium of forces has decidedly been established; only in a very restricted sense it is true, a balance of the forces, which are carrying on a war with mailed fists for the predominance of one or other of the leading classes, — on the one side the representatives of bourgeois society; of the whole international bourgeoisie, and on the other side Soviet Russia. An equilibrium of course only in a restricted sense. It is only in respect of this military struggle that I maintain that a certain equilibrium has been established in the international situation. It should of course be emphasised that in this case we are only speaking of a relative equilibrium, of an extremely labile equilibrium. Much inflammatory material has collected in these capitalist countries, which up to the present have been regarded only as objects of history and not as subjects, i. e. in the colonial and semi-colonial countries; it is extremely possible that revolutionary outbreaks, great struggles and revolutions, may sooner or later flare up in these countries quite unexpectedly."

"We are faced by an extremely labile equilibrium, which however undoubtedly, indisputably exists. Whether for long — that I do not know, and in my opinion, it cannot be known. This is why great caution is demanded of us." (Ibid. pag. 425, December 23rd, 1921.)

These declarations do not in any way emasculate and weaken what Lenin said in 1920 as to the inevitability of a second period of war. As early as in 1921, Lenin foresaw the approaching period of partial "stabilisation", of partial equilibrium. "Whether for long — that I do not know, and in my opinion, it cannot be known". And for this reason the slogan is: "The greatest caution!"

* * *

Lenin once more approached the question of the possibility of a new period of war shortly before his death, in his famous article "Rather less, but better", which is one of the most important parts of Lenin's testament.

Lenin, who was always concerned with the historical fate of the Soviet State, constantly returns to the question of war.

"We are therefore faced at present by the following question: Shall we, with our small, our minute peasant production and with our distress be able to hold out until the capitalist States of Western Europe are ripe for socialism?"

"The issue of the struggle" — writes Lenin — "depends in the long run on the fact that Russia, India, China and the other oppressed countries represent the great majority of the population of the world. In the course of the last few years, this majority of mankind has, with extraordinary determination, entered on a fight for its liberation. There can be no shadow of a doubt as to the final result of

this world struggle; in this sense the final victory of socialism is absolutely and undoubtedly ensured."

"But it is not this final victory of socialism, on which, at the present moment, our interest is centred. What we want to know is the tactics which we are to apply, we the Communist Party of Russia, we the Soviet Power, in order to prevent the counter-revolutionary States of Western Europe annihilating us. In order to ensure our existence until the future collision between the counter-revolutionary imperialism of the Occident and the nationalist and revolutionary Orient, between the civilized States of the West and the States of the East which are in their way backward, but form the majority of the population of the earth, the majority of people should in the meantime understand how to become more civilized. Even in our country, civilisation is not enough advanced to pass over directly to socialism, although the political prerequisites are present." (Lenin, Collected Works vol. XVIII/II, page 136-37.)

The thoughts of the Party should ever again revert to these remarks.

The first breathing space, which our proletarian State achieved in 1918 (the Peace of Brest-Litovsk), turned, after some years of civil war, into a whole period of breathing space. The proletarian State has carried on its policy of peace with courage and skill; to-day it can boast of praiseworthy results. The proletarian State will continue to do everything in its power to prolong this period of breathing space. But the proletarian State, true to Lenin's commands, knows very well that the world revolution represents a whole long drawn-out period of fighting, in the course of which the revolutionary advance will inevitably alternate with counter-revolutionary struggles. The proletarian State must not ignore the fact that before long a second period of war may be upon us, under circumstances which are unfavourable to us.

The political consequences of the present period of the partial stabilisation of capitalism are such "counter-revolutionary spasms", which may end in a new war or new wars. Whereas capitalist expansion in former times led to two imperialist groups of Powers seizing one another by the throat in the struggle for markets and in the struggle for the dividing up of the world, the matter may now, under certain circumstances, proceed in quite a different way. To-day the groups of imperialist States which are competing with one another, have a common opponent; we are that opponent, we, the Socialist Soviet Republics, and with us revolutionary China which is in the process of development and which regards the Soviet Union as its elder brother.

In spite of all the contradictions which disrupt the imperialist world, there are in Europe (and also in America) powerful groups of capitalists, who are deliberately and systematically working at the preparation of an imperialist united front against the Soviet Union.

The unfolding Chinese revolution in its present stage of development merely increases the imperialist hostility to the Soviet Union as the leader of the movement for freedom throughout the world. The success of the Soviet Union on the industrial front is having a similar effect on the imperialists. Conservative England, which defeated the general strike and the miners' struggle and has set in motion a whole system of treaties directed against the Soviet Union, plus the Poland of Pilsudski; plus Fascist Lithuania as a member of the Fascist chain of border States; plus the Germany of Hindenburg which is increasing in strength, which is steering its course more and more towards the West and is longing for its old (or new) colonies; plus the Poincaré Government in France; plus the Roumania of the landed proprietors; plus Fascist Italy and Hungary which are in the sphere of influence of England, — all this creates a situation in which it is perfectly justifiable to recall what Lenin said about the inevitability of a second period of war and also what he bequeathed to us in his political testament.

The English Conservatives will soon (at the end of 1927) have to proceed to a new general election. The prospects of the Labour Party have greatly improved. The Conservatives will not easily consent to let the power pass from their hands. A simple repetition of the MacDonald "substitute for a Labour Government" is hardly possible. English capitalism is rapidly decaying. Just for this reason, however, there arise the pre-

liminary conditions for an adventurous policy of the English bourgeoisie.

Once upon a time Pilsudski earned the "laurels" of the saviour of bourgeois Poland. He seems to imagine that he is directly "destined by history" to try his luck once more. He is egged on to this by the richest imperialist clique in Europe. Pilsudski is openly preparing for a new war. He, the pronounced chauvinist, is playing a rough game with "his" national minorities, with the obvious aim of ensuring cover for himself in the rear in case of a war. The Roumania of the Boyars is being zealously fed and trained, as never before. The Baltic States are being "worked upon" in the most intensive way. At the same time, Scheidemann & Co. are preparing the way for the imperialists by "revelations" about "Soviet shells".

There can be no doubt that at the present time the tendencies to "encircle" the Soviet Union, the tendency towards new attacks against us are gaining the upper hand. There are too many symptoms which point to this.

There can be no doubt that a fresh revolutionary boom will take the place of the counter-revolutionary spasms in which several countries are writhing to-day. This time is not very remote. The Soviet Union and the whole international proletariat, however, have no guarantee that imperialism will not make use of just the next few years for new sanguinary wars. If we take this into consideration and do all that is necessary in good time, imperialism will run its head against a wall, and the Soviet Union will maintain its position and will protect the whole future of the international proletarian revolution.

* * *

The transformation of imperialist war into civil war! — when war has already broken out, that is clear. But we are now faced by a different problem, the prevention of war, before it has begun. The Soviets have conquered a sixth of the globe. For the last ten years the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union has been developing victoriously. Communist Parties have been formed in almost all the countries of the world. On this basis and — what is very important — on the basis of the experiences of hundreds of millions of people who have only recently passed through the terrors of the first imperialist universal slaughter, the Communists must now, above all, do everything in their power to try to prevent a new imperialist war. Only if we do not succeed in preventing it, and an imperialist war breaks out in spite of all our efforts, then we must transform this war into a civil war.

How can we prevent a new war?

The most important means for achieving this is the revolutionary enlightenment of the masses, the organisation of the masses under the leadership of the Communist Party.

The best issue for the whole of humanity would be if the European revolution were to come to pass before a new imperialist war breaks out. Our whole policy should be directed towards this end. That would be the most economical, the "most peaceful" issue (not from the pacifist, but from the revolutionary point of view).

In any case, it is our greatest revolutionary concern to postpone war as long as possible, to try with every means in our power to prevent it. After the imperialist war which exhausted the people, after the civil war in our country, which so seriously hit the industrial life of our country, peace is the most necessary condition both for our socialist growth and for the preparation and consolidation of the Communist Parties in other countries. The later imperialism sets war against us in motion, the stronger shall we be, we, the Soviet Union, and the world proletariat with us.

For this reason, peace, its maintenance and its consolidation is of vital interest to us. For this reason our Party is fighting sincerely for peace. For this reason any military intention is foreign to us — in spite of all the lies of Social Democracy.

The chief interest of the Soviet Union coincides in this question, as in all other questions, with the chief interest of the whole world proletariat. Through our policy of peace we are defending the interests of the whole international proletariat.

It is just this policy of the prevention of war — should war nevertheless break in upon us — which will promote the transformation of the war into a civil war, for, the clearer the

people will perceive that just we are doing everything in our power to prevent a new war, the more successfully shall we transform a new imperialist war into a civil war, if the bourgeoisie succeeds, in spite of all our endeavours, in provoking a new war. The same will be the case, should a group of bourgeois States try to force a new war on the Soviet Union.

In case a new war breaks out, the official Social Democracy — its leading body, its leading functionaries — will no doubt again play a treacherous part. As regards the form of the treachery, it will now have to stoop even lower than in 1914—1918, if it wants to deceive the masses. Some examples of this already exist; 1. the betrayal of the general strike and the miners' fight in England, 2. the famous campaign against the Soviet Union with the so-called "Soviet shells". These are only buds, it is true; the fruit will follow.

The experience of 1914—1918 is still fresh in the memory of hundreds of millions. Should war break out to-day, it would, to a large extent, have to be carried on by the same generation (plus the young, revolutionary one). The leaders of the bourgeoisie and of Social Democracy will not find it easy to deceive this generation once more. This is just a reason for them to resort to even worse infamy.

Knowing this, we must be on our guard.

"We must" — wrote Lenin in December 1922 — "clearly understand the actual fact of how great is the secrecy which surrounds the rise of war, and how helpless is an ordinary labour organisation, even though it calls itself a revolutionary organisation, when it is faced by the approach of an actual war".

We should prepare ourselves for the worst. "Even the Communist Press certainly exposes itself to ridicule in most countries" (Lenin "Instructions to the Hague Delegation"). The sophisms of the bourgeois Press should be analysed beforehand. It is necessary to create an illegal organisation for "permanent action against war" (Lenin *ibid.*).

"We must exert all our efforts to maintain peace and prevent war; but if war is upon us, the phrase of 'a boycott of war' is a silly phrase. The Communists must take part in every reactionary war" (Lenin), in order to transform this war into a war against the bourgeoisie.

* * *

Our task is:

1. The building up of Socialist economy; we must build up without a moment's respite, build up in the teeth of all the difficulties by which we are faced. 2. We must civilise ourselves, we must work at carrying through successfully the "cultural revolution" we must work at our own development and 3. we must, with all our might, promote the cause of the international revolution — such is Lenin's command and this command will be fulfilled.

"Remember the imperialist war! This is the first appeal with which the Communist International calls upon every worker, wherever be his country, whatever be his tongue" —

says the Comintern in its statutes, which was elaborated under Lenin's immediate direction.

The time has come when these words should, with special emphasis, be called, to the memory of all proletarians.

Never forget war!

Fight for peace, but — never forget war!

Close the ranks more than ever before!

THE WHITE TERROR

Appeal of the Congress of Scientists in the Soviet Union against Persecution in Polish White Russia.

Moscow, February 14th, 1927.

The scientists' congress of the Soviet Union adopted the following appeal to the scientists of the whole world, in its concluding session:

The second scientists' congress of the Soviet Union which represents 14,000 scientists, academy members, professors, college teachers, members of scientific investigation institutes,

etc. of Moscow, Leningrad, Charkov, Kiev, Odessa, Tashkent etc., raises its indignant protest against the persecution of the White Russian people, fighting against its social and national suppression by the Polish government.

The congress expresses its confidence, that the development and the enthusiasm of the White Russian toiling masses cannot be crushed by any repressions and appeals to the scientists of the whole world to join in this protest against the persecution of that section of the White Russian people, which, by an imperialist barrier, is separated from the White Russian Soviet Republic, which freely develops and is strengthened in fraternal alliance with the Socialist Soviet Republics.

VII. MEETING OF THE ENLARGED E. C. C. I.

Resolution on Chairmanship of the Communist International.

In addition to the Resolutions and Theses already published the following resolution was adopted at the VII. Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I.

The VII. Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. considers the further existence of the institution of Chairman of the Communist International to be inexpedient and, taking into consideration the decision already passed by the Plenum to free Comrade Zinoviev from the post he occupied as Chairman of the C. I., already now considers necessary the abolition of this post.

This decision, however, must be submitted to the VI. World Congress of the C. I. for ratification, so that the respective paragraphs 9 and 18 of the Statutes of the Communist International be changed accordingly*).

The VII. Plenum instructs the Executive Committee of the Communist International to carry out the reconstruction of the chief organs of the E. C. C. I. necessarily involved in this decision (formation of a Political Bureau, determination of its composition, method of election, etc.)

THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

International Week against the Danger of War.

Moscow, February 12th, 1927.

The Executive Committee of the Young Communist International has decided to carry through in the time from March 10th to 18th an International Week of Struggle of the Working Class Youth against the Danger of War, with the following slogans: For the Chinese revolution! For the immediate withdrawal of the imperialist troops! For the fraternisation of the soldiers of the imperialist armies with the Chinese people! Against the imperialist policy of the United States in Latin America!

The national leagues will have to put up further concrete slogans in accordance with their national conditions.

The Executive Committee of the Y. C. I. appeals to all its leagues to carry through in the course of this campaign shop meetings, public meetings and demonstrations and to issue special numbers of their magazines, leaflets and pamphlets.

The broadest possible masses of the working class youth must be mobilised. For this purpose it is necessary to approach the socialist, trade union, sport, freethinkers and other youth organisations with proposals for a joint struggle in the individual countries in accordance with the national conditions.

The campaign for China and against the danger of war is at present the most important task of the whole Young Communist International.

*) These paragraphs read as follows:

§ 9: The World Congress elects the Chairman of the Communist International.

§ 18: ... The Chairman, both of the E. C. C. I. and of the Presidium, is the Chairman of the Communist International.