

V. b. b.

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 5 No. 61

PRESS

30th July 1925

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.

Towards a New World Slaughter!

On the Eleventh Anniversary of the Outbreak of the Imperialist World War 1914—1918.

The Morocco War — a Prelude to a New World War.

By **J. Jacob.**

** Seven years have barely elapsed since the end of the great carnage which cost France 1,700,000 dead and 25,821,782,000 dollars, and now French imperialism is already engaged in a new military adventure in Morocco.

This is a demonstration of the complete bankruptcy of the Pacifist ideology of the Bloc des Gauches. (Left Block.) They have promised peace to the world and are now making war in Morocco. We have always vigorously denounced the demagoguery of Herriot and Socialists who pretend they were able to present a pacifist solution for the serious post-war problems.

Statements and symbolic gestures in favour of peace could not solve these problems.

The outbreak of the Moroccan war is the first result of the imperialist policy that Herriot and Painlevé have pursued since the 1914—1918 war as faithful successors to the Clemenceau and Poincaré Governments.

Could it be otherwise? No.

During the 52 months duration of the long and terrible butchery that brought Europe into such an anomalous morass, the politicians of the Right, radical and Socialist Parties, did all they could to continue the war to the bitter end.

The conclusion of the war led to the framing of the shameful Versailles Treaty which, in spite of the fact that it contained the germs of new war in every one of its articles, was approved by the Left democrats and the Social patriotic leaders. It was unable to assure world equilibrium, dictated as it was, by the victorious imperialists. Now imperialism has changed sides.

Having taken part in the war and in the preparation of the Versailles Treaty the radicals and socialists had inevitably to bear the consequences.

Clemenceau's sinister document had hardly been signed when the most serious complications arose and the allies of yesterday were no longer in agreement as to its interpretation.

The incidents which took place in connection with the Ruhr occupation have disclosed the antagonisms between French and British imperialism in all their nakedness.

They have reached perfect agreement for the plunder and sharing out of conquered Germany. But once this had been done, the struggle commenced for the conquest of the world market. This situation often caused sharp conflicts between France and Great Britain both of which needed new outlets. None of the internal contradictions of capitalism and imperialism which made the world war inevitable in 1914 have disappeared; the men of the Left Block know this very well. Why then do they continue these pacifist statements if not to lull the working class to sleep and to lead them towards new fields of battle where once more there will be a struggle for the capture of the world market?

Since 1918 there have been serious threats of war on several occasions. Now France has rushed headlong into a war in Morocco. The pacifists of the Bloc des Gauches are bringing home civilisation to the Rifis by means of gun fire, rifles and aerial bombardment.

The first Moroccan adventure in 1907, which was so forcibly resisted by Jaurès, was the prelude to the world war.

In 1911 the Algeiras affair almost started a war between France and Germany. At the present moment the fear of the national revolution becoming extended, outweighs the international complications which might arise from a Franco-Moroccan conflict, Great Britain casts an unfriendly glance towards France in view of Gibraltar being on the Mediterranean Coast. The Moroccan war has resuscitated Italian designs on Tunis.

As a matter of fact the present conflict which confronts French imperialism with the Riffs fighting for the independence, is a disturbing influence to capitalists of all countries. The national revolution started by Abd-el-Krim has aroused the enthusiasm of the whole of Islam; it started in Morocco, and if it was victorious, it would extend to Algeria, Tunis, Sudan, Senegal, Indochina, Egypt and India and all the colonial or semi-colonial countries. The loss of the Colonies would be a terrible blow for France and Great Britain and would shake their entire regime. Therefore this must be prevented at all costs.

Realising this danger, the entire press including both the Right and the Left is shouting for a war to a finish. Herriot and Painlevé are mere playthings in the hands of the directors of the Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas, and are playing their role admirably: They continue to talk about peace and to proclaim the pacifist intentions of France in order to pacify disturbed public opinion, while at the same time they continue the war.

In any case a world war might break out. If Abd-el-Krim is beaten, the various designs of the imperialist powers will become clear. French, Spanish and British imperialists will commence quarreling over the domination of Morocco.

If the national revolution develops, the powers will not fail to throw the responsibility on to the Soviet Union which they are already doing, and will declare war against the Soviet Union. The attacks against the Soviets on the part of the entire

press and of the British government for the formation of an anti-Soviet front, prove that public opinion is being prepared for this possibility.

What are the Socialist leaders doing in the face of this situation? As in 1914, they have entered into a *Union Sacrée*; they are deceiving the workers by lies and hiding the seriousness of the situation by pacifist statements. Just as during the war they are also playing the rôle after the war of a windscreen behind which imperialism is hiding to carry out its sinister designs.

Fortunately today there is a party which is rising up against rampant imperialism with all its forces; this is the Communist Party.

From the very commencement of the Moroccan conflict the Communist Party has taken up a clear and definite position, issuing precise slogans capable of rallying wide masses against the Moroccan war. Everyday the activity of the Party is becoming more intense, and is continuing in spite of all repression; the Party has already been able to rally millions of workers round its slogans. The Paris and Lille Workers' Congresses are a proof of this.

The French imperialists now feel that they are not only confronted with a Party, but that they are faced with a mass of workers who are ready to demand peace with Morocco. They realise that if they perpetrate the folly of wanting to attack the Soviet Union they will not only be confronted with the soldiers of the Red Army, and the entire Russian people standing shoulder to shoulder to defend their revolution; but within France itself they will also be faced with the working class masses mobilised by the Communist Party in order to prevent by all means at their disposal an onslaught against the hearth of the world revolution.

White Terror — a Weapon of Warlike Imperialism.

By **V. Kolarow** (Moscow).

White Terror is gradually becoming the dominating system of government in capitalist countries.

This is not only the case in the Balkans, where "Democracy" was always the screen behind which the ruling classes from time to time accomplished their usual villainy. In contra-distinction to the past this screen has now been removed and the bourgeoisie publicly shoots down and erects gallows for all those who infringe their rule, fabricates false documents, burns and shamelessly provokes, and organises wholesale destruction of their victims.

It is not only in the countries which have experienced revolutionary upheavals during post-war periods, where the triumphant bourgeoisie becomes frantic at any sign of discontent of the people — here capitalist "civilisation" is saved with the greatest difficulty from the storm of "destructive forces" and is guarded by legions of spies and provocateurs, with the aid of expulsion laws, courts, mass arrests and shootings. The same methods find their echo in the countries of classical "democracy" and of age-long tradition of "freedom loving", and not only in such countries as these. The great European "Democracies" which only considered terror useful as a means of paving the way to "civilisation" among the "low" races of the colonies, is no longer ashamed of trying the same methods also on the backs of their own peoples.

"Pacifist" and "Generous" France of Painlevé and the "left bloc" now engaged in the bloody African adventure, are becoming more and more impudent in their mockery and violence against the Communist Party, which is striving to hinder French imperialism from suppressing the freedom of a small nation. The Government is taking stock in the arsenal of repression of the capitalist powers and is taking down from dusty shelves ancient "laws of exception" (*les lois scélérates*), prepared now once more adapted to its aims, carries out arrests, searches and sentences... At the same time the capitalist agents, by means of slander, mud throwing and false documents are trying to create an atmosphere of hooliganism.

The cradle of "political freedom" and the country of all "civil benefactors", Great Britain does not lag behind other coun-

tries under the Conservative government. The "Zinoviev letter" with which the imperialists fooled the petty-bourgeoisie, was the first cowardly step. Fascist attacks on representatives of the revolutionary movement, now becoming more frequent, are also becoming systematic. The speedy revolutionising of the British proletariat also gives free play to British Imperialism which has such extensive practice in India and other colonies.

Prior to the war the bourgeoisie had no need of terrorist methods for maintaining its authority and carrying out its policy. It felt itself strong, and force, energy and self-assurance were all that were needed in those days. The bourgeoisie was convinced of the stability of the fundament of capitalist society; it was therefore "democratic" and "pacifist". Its "humane doctrines" defended it from the masses of the people. Social Democracy stood in the first ranks of the fighters for brotherhood and "international peace". International Socialist Congresses passed high sounding resolutions against war, but the governments were sure that these threats would remain on paper, and thus convincingly and calmly began preparing for a world onslaught.

After the war and the upheavals that followed it, the world bourgeoisie already had lost its "innocence". It no longer hid its aggressive aims. Pacifism was transformed into an out-of-date doctrine of whining old women. The capitalists were openly preparing for new robbery and adventure. The Imperialist thieves prepared for new bandit attacks and compelled their vassals to submit to their conductors' baton. These vassals are the little thieves who cynically hawk the only goods that are left in their hands — the blood and flesh of their robbed and ruined peoples. In Morocco, the French imperialists are oppressing the Riff peasants. In China an imperialist team of the whole world headed by the British Lion is tearing into shreds the living body of a 400 million people. In India and Egypt they want to silence the savage wails of the revolting slaves by blows of the capitalist whip.

But the most intense hatred is being concentrated against the Union of Soviet Republics. Under the trade mark of "the

anti-Bolshevik bloc", a blockade of the great Workers' and Peasants' State is being effected and a general attack against it is being prepared on the part of all forces of capital and reaction.

However, these adventures of the imperialists from which they will gain but one compensation, are being met with the open opposition of the masses. The revolutionary convulsions, which the whole capitalist world has experienced, and the victory of the revolution in Russia in particular, have left deep traces on the consciousness of all toilers. The latter are on the watch everywhere, and are everywhere becoming restless; the Social patriots no longer remain the unlimited inspirers of their thought. And although the masses, by dint of custom, continue to fill their ranks to this very day, these masses, as has been showed by the events in France, are by no means displaying any readiness to follow them in their treachery. Moreover, in every country, a front line detachment of the revolutionary movement — the Communist Party — has been formed, and its influence on the workers and peasants is becoming more and more extensive and profound.

The ruling classes can no longer carry on their predatory policy in peace and quietness, firmly guarding the traditions

of "liberalism" and "democracy". They feel the necessity to adopt **new principles in their methods of Government** more appropriate to the times, and are therefore willingly adopting **Fascism**. I am of the opinion that in the event of extreme necessity they will not renounce even **Tsankovism**... The brutalisation of the Balkans is one of the stages of degeneration of capitalist culture after the world war.

White Terror aims at terrifying the masses of the people, breaking down their resistance, reinforcing the wavering power of the predatory bourgeoisie and **facilitating the realisation of their plans of conquest**.

Will the bourgeoisie succeed?

It might meet with certain **partial and temporary successes**. It might even set alight once more a world conflagration. But it will never succeed in finally suppressing the revolutionary movement and in saving its own rule. The hellish tortures to which White Terror is subjecting the proletarian masses, and the innumerable victims which it is claiming from them will have but one result: it will drum into the consciousness of the toiling masses that their historic role is not only to bury **Capitalism** but also to be **revenged on the hangmen**.

The Anti-Militarist Struggle of the Workers.

By **Günther**.

In the course of the struggle against the imperialist war the attitude of the soldiers is of the utmost importance. Great significance should be attached to winning them over to the workers cause and drawing them into the struggle against imperialist war.

During the World War 1914—18, thousands of soldiers refused to carry out war services and many found their way into prisons because of their agitation against militarism. It is not however this refusal of service on the part of individuals which will transform the bourgeois army into a weapon of the working class, but untiring work in the army itself. Very little is known about this work, or those who carry it out, except when they are persecuted by bourgeois governments, and their activity becomes known when they are under trial.

One of the most brilliant pages in the anti-militarist struggle of the Communist International, and especially of the Communist Youth International was the occasion when the French troops in the Ruhr districts threatened to become the suppressors of the awakened German revolution. Posters in the French national colours were pasted up in all towns (both in the French and German languages) on the day of the occupation of the Ruhr for fraternisation with the German workers. Soldiers' newspapers were issued, a special edition of "Humanité" for French soldiers, "Le Drapeau Rouge" for Belgian troops in the French and Flemish languages; further the French Communist Youth League published its permanent soldiers newspaper "La Caserne" more frequently and a special paper "La Caserne Coloniale" was issued in Arabian. In addition numerous leaflets and sticky backs were issued in French, Arabian and German languages.

This activity was not confined to the publication and distribution of papers and leaflets. In the majority of regiments of the French occupation army there were Communist nuclei. This work did not remain without results. Soldiers refused to tear down Communist circulars in Gelsenkirchen. On July 14, 1923, (the National Festival) French soldiers fraternised with the Germans; also in other localities they entered into contact with workers and even took part in demonstrations. On October 13th, 1923, Moroccan troops in Neustadt (Pfalz) refused to shoot on the workers. These are but a few results of anti-militarist activities in the Ruhr army; but they did not keep us waiting long for an answer.

The Commandant of the 47th Division issued the order "For an active but secret watch to be kept over those soldiers who were suspected of propaganda". Similar orders came from other sections. On April 2nd, 1924, Poincaré declared in the Chamber that French Communists together with the German Communists were demoralising the troops in the Ruhr and that it is only natural to find ways and means to protect oneself against this criminal manoeuvre.

The overthrow of the German revolution did not interfere with this work, although it may have changed its character. For these reasons the French military authorities and the German police organised an attack against the anti-militarist activities in the Ruhr; 120 French and German Young Communists and 15 soldiers were taken prisoners. It was against these that the Mayence Military Trial was held and the French Comrade Lozeray and the Yugoslav Konstantinovitch were condemned to 10 years imprisonment; 18 comrades, mainly members of the German Youth League, were sentenced to 5 years, and 13 soldiers received sentences of from one to 3 years imprisonment. Amongst those who were indicted was Ben Lekhal, a Moroccan who was sentenced to 5 years imprisonment. Even the bourgeois press remarked on the extraordinary methods of torture which were applied during the trial and which also caused a partial revision of the verdict to be made.

Work however in the Ruhr army was not prevented through these facts, it still went on. Since that time new events have happened in which again the workers turned to the soldiers and have understood to develop successful work in the army.

Some reports of arrests among young French Communists in connection with the anti-militarist propaganda in the Moroccan army show that there too work is being carried on. Further proof of this is the agitation of the French and bourgeois press and Deputies against Comrade Doriot. British and French seamen who were sent to France for intervention purposes, were received with leaflets which explained to them the true meaning of events in Shanghai. Everywhere where imperialism sends its troops, it finds the same spirit of opposition and agitators who work among the soldiers and disclose to them the truth. Anti-militarist work is not merely agitation, just where an imperialist war is threatening, but it is constant work in the army.

In France, Sweden and Great Britain the Young Communist Leagues approached the soldiers, took upon themselves the duty of advocating their daily demands and agitating for the improvement of legal and economic position of the soldiers generally. Soldiers rally to these demands, for they understand that they are just as much oppressed and exploited as the workers themselves; this is a good means to transform by degrees the bourgeois army into class-conscious fighters.

In France for example a general demand for an increase in wages was linked up with a demand for the improvement of soldiers pay, and for the first time extensive mass action was taken simultaneously for workers and soldiers.

Thus we see that the anti-militarist struggle of the workers has two tendencies; on the one hand extensive agitation against war in moments of immediate danger of war, and on the other hand the slow and laborious method of struggle for partial demands on behalf of the soldiers.

British Imperialism and the Soviet Union.

By **E. H. Brown.**

The 1914—1918 European War, and the economic and political consequences thereof, left three great contending forces for world supremacy. First there was Great Britain, a tremendous factor yet, despite a gradual weakening since pre-war days. Secondly, the U. S. A., the greatest imperialist rival of Britain and which, after the war, is perhaps the most powerful of all imperialist powers. And last but not least, and deeply feared by both America and Britain, is the Soviet Union.

There are two great struggles taking place before our eyes: the fight for world supremacy between Great Britain and America and the fight for world supremacy between these countries and the Soviet Union. It is of the struggle between Britain and the Soviet Union I wish to treat in this article.

Great Britain is the centre of a world Empire a centre of vast colonial exploitation. British imperialism is the forerunner of all other imperialisms. Whilst half the present capitalist world was still sleeping in its feudal bed, British capitalism was rapidly at work annexing for its own sole use vast areas containing almost unlimited sources of raw materials and cheap labour power. At the outbreak of the world war in 1914, she had largely developed these areas, and a most formidable world imperialist force was the result.

The Soviet Union is also a world centre. Not for colonial exploitation and oppression, but for those forces which fight against world imperialism. It is also a growing factor in the world economic battle. In both these activities, economic and political, it is brought into conflict with British imperialism.

We have not far to seek to find expression of this conflict which on examination reveals that it is a life and death struggle.

Take first of all the period immediately after the Russian Revolution — the intervention period. During the days when the revolution was menaced by successive military counter-revolutionary attacks, we find that the British Government made direct attacks and supported Kolchak, Denikin and Wrangel to the extent of 100 million pounds of ready money. In addition all the surplus stores from the European battlefield was handed over to these brigands. That was deemed to be a fair price to keep the keys of the Kyber Pass out of the hands of a Communist Government. Quite early the British bourgeoisie anticipated what would be the result if the peasant masses near the northern frontier of India saw the contrast between Soviet policy to the peasants and the policy of British imperialism.

Then later we see the conflict expressing itself in the refusal of the British bourgeoisie to agree to the opening of normal trade relations with Russia.

Baldwin and Chamberlain take a hand.

Ever since the Baldwin administration in Britain assumed executive power, the keynote of its foreign policy has been to create a bloc of Western and Central European States against the Soviet Union.

The reason for this is not far to seek. British imperialism weakened by the tremendous material loss during the European war; faced with more serious competition and loss of markets in all parts of the world; burdened by an over-capitalised and worn-out industrial system at home; is reeling under an economic crisis never before equalled in its intensity and fraught with such grave dangers of a complete break-up of the whole system.

In order to wage successful economic warfare against its formidable world competitors, and to save its privileges and profits at the same time, the British capitalist class must subject the masses of workers and peasants; both at home and in the colonies, to an ever greater measure of exploitation. The workers and peasants reply with increasing organisation and vigour in fighting against this exploitation. The fight takes many forms: strikes, boycotts, national independence campaigns, and even open armed struggle.

In these fights the toiling masses of the British Empire find common ground with the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union. The British bourgeoisie knows this quite well and clearly realises that the ever advancing economic and political prestige of the Soviet Union is a direct menace to its own future.

The recent Campaign.

Therefore, the recent campaign against the Soviet Union was launched. The initial steps were taken at the moment when MacDonal — under pressure from the masses — was negotiating a Trade Treaty with the Soviet Union. His weak minority Government, which had been used to ratify the Dawes Plan, was swept from office and prevented from obtaining a majority at the polls by the issue of the infamous forged letter purporting to come from Zinoviev. With this the British Yellow Press received its cue. It followed the above-mentioned forged letter stunt with fearful slanders against Russia at the time of the Esthonian rising. Then came a greater volume of lies and forgeries following the lamentable Sofia explosion. Until right up to the present moment, this press attack has continued. For sheer unmitigated lying it has far surpassed, even the anti-German press campaign of 1914—1918 — a campaign dictated then by the exigencies of the war period. The right wing Labour and Trade Union press has ably assisted its bourgeois colleagues.

But underneath this open press hostility there has been governmental action. Refusal to appoint an ambassador to Moscow, curtailment of visas to trade representatives, refusal to extend trade facilities act to Russia, the financial blockade; all these were preparatory steps to the complete break of diplomatic relations at the opportune moment.

The Campaign widespread and serious.

And so the offensive continued with ever more ominous actions. Intrigues for an Anti-Soviet Bloc, pouring of munitions into Esthonia, British fleet in the Baltic, etc., all show the serious end which the British Cabinet had in mind.*

Then it next became necessary to test the effect of all these efforts upon the other Western European Capitalist States and also to ascertain what would be the effect of a break of diplomatic relations upon Russia, upon the "leaders" of the British workers and upon the British working class generally.

China afforded a pretext. Once again it was discovered that "Bolshevik Plots" were at the root of the trouble in China. Britain was represented as a civilising force with great interests in China all of which was threatened by the influence of Zinoviev. A Soviet Trade Representative in China was arrested to give "local colour" to the story. Chicherin (the Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs) then wrote drawing attention to the seriousness of the step contemplated by the British Government, and the Baldwin Cabinet met to consider the next and final move.

Birkenhead or Baldwin?

In the British Conservative Government — the executive officers of British imperialist policy — one can distinctly detect two tendencies. The first is the arrogant sword rattling tendency of the Curzon school which is led by Birkenhead. The second is the more subtle and realistic school which is under the domination of Baldwin and Chamberlain.

Baldwin and Chamberlain would like to declare open war on Soviet Union but they are restrained by a knowledge of the internal situation at home.

Not being strong enough themselves to wage this warfare, they pursue a policy of trying to persuade other countries to undertake the task. This is in line with traditional British foreign policy.

The Birkenhead Group of die-hards — the future Fascist leaders — saw their opportunity. They tried hard to drive the British Government to a complete diplomatic rupture with the Soviet Union. It suited the policy of the Baldwin-Chamberlain Group to give them plenty of rope. Indeed, they went so far as to declare at one time that Birkenhead was voicing the policy of the British Government.

If that is so, why was the policy of Birkenhead not carried to its logical conclusion? Especially when MacDonal, Thomas Clynes and Co. had shown they would support this policy. First because the Soviet Government showed no weakness. It quite

clearly knew its own strength and the strength (or weakness) of its opponents and second, because the British workers — once again made it quite clear that they would resolutely resist any intervention against the Soviets. Again the rest of the European States showed openly that they were not prepared to accept suicide to further the interests of British imperialism.

This explains the "climb down" of Chamberlain. The British imperialists once again — as in Chinese affairs recently — recognised their impotency and weakness.

The last attack.

But sufficient has been written to convince readers that whilst the attempt has failed this time, no effort will be spared

The New Campaign Against the Soviet Union.

By **A. Stetzky.**

Many things lead us to suppose that the "breathing space" which was granted to the Soviet Union at the end of 1920, when Wrangel's army, the last army of the counter-revolution, was defeated and the Russo-Polish war was terminated, is approaching its end, and that the working class of the Soviet Union is faced by a new period of new trials. The question of the formation of a united front of the capitalist countries and of the organisation of a new campaign against the Soviet Union is once more the centre-point of international events. This question is now being discussed in the columns of the capitalist Press, in the Parliaments and in the secret sittings of the Ministries. It is the object of diplomatic negotiations. Public opinion is being prepared and a soil created for hostile action against the Soviet Republics with the help of lies and calumnies and horrible inventions about "Bolshevist agents" who are roaming throughout the world with bombs and poison in their hands, and with the help of forged documents. The initiative in this respect has been taken by the Conservative Government of "His Royal Highness" of England.

What is prompting the capitalist countries to pass over from a policy of business agreements with the Soviet Union to one of open attack?

Two cases are obviously of decisive importance. The first is the internal "stabilisation" of the Soviet Union and the growth of its influence on the working class in the West and on the colonial peoples.

The hopes of the bourgeoisie that the Russian working class would not be equal to the tasks of the economic reconstruction of their country and that Bolshevism would succumb to internal disintegration, have been cruelly shattered. The five years' "breathing space" has been used to excellent advantage by the Russian workers; industrial and agricultural production is approaching the pre-war level, railway transport has been regulated, the budget has been balanced, the reform of the currency realised. The excellent harvests of this year which, in the districts which are chiefly grain-producing, as for instance the Ukraine, exceed the average harvests of pre-war years, give us reason to hope that, in the coming economic year 1925/1926, we shall have reached the pre-war level both in industry and in agriculture. Moreover this growth of economic prosperity is accompanied by an increased predominance of the socialist elements.

The Russian workers have thus proved in practice that they are capable not only of defending their power against the attacks of the counter-revolution, but that they are capable of raising their country out of unfathomable misery and desolation and leading it towards socialism. This inevitably makes a deep impression on the proletariat of Western Europe, as is proved by the report of the English trade unions and the statements of the Franco-Belgian, German and Swedish workers' delegations. The Soviet Union, by the mere fact of its existence, the development of its economic prosperity and the increase in the well-being of its population, is making more and more successful propaganda for socialism and the revolution, and is rousing the will to fight in the hearts of the workers. This is why hatred towards the Soviet Union wins the day against considerations of advantageous business agreements in the heads of the capitalists; this is why the capitalists are beginning to make use

to create the necessary opportunity for striking a blow at the Soviet Union. It seems certain that the British imperialists are out for open war if at all possible.

Up to now the British workers have consistently demonstrated their friendliness to the Soviet Union. But in the future the "demonstrative friendliness" of the past will not be enough.

We shall have to show to the British imperialists that we learned the lesson of the Russian Revolution. In 1917 the workers and peasants changed an imperialist war into a victorious social upheaval. Our watchword from now on must be: "When British Imperialism declares war on the Soviet Union it signs its own death warrant, and the British and colonial workers and peasants must play the part of the hangmen".

of means — as for instance the refusal of credits to the economic authorities of the Soviet Union — which might have a detrimental influence on the reconstruction of our economic conditions.

In proportion as the Soviet Union grows in strength, its influence over the colonial peoples, especially over our Asiatic neighbours, increases. For the colonial peoples, the Soviet Union is a living evidence of the fact that the power of imperialism is not boundless, and that an oppressed people can throw off the iron yoke of imperialist slavery. The national policy of the Soviet Union on the other hand, which stands out in glaring contrast to the policy of force of the imperialist countries, awakens feelings of sympathy and friendship in the oppressed peoples towards the first proletarian republic. Here also the Soviet Union inspires and strengthens the colonial peoples in their struggle against imperialism by the mere fact of its existence.

All these factors find expression in the wide-spread Chinese movement for freedom. The Chinese people which has been exposed for decades to the most ruthless imperialist exploitation, has roused itself from its lethargy and begun a struggle for freedom. The Chinese are inspired by the "Russian example" and are endeavouring in their fight, to make use of the "Russian experience". In their fight against the oppressors, they regard the Soviet Union as their friend and ally.

This movement in one of the largest colonial countries, in which all the great powers are interested, is undermining the foundations of imperialism and above all shaking the British Empire to its very foundations. The Asiatic colonies form the ground-work of the colonial power of England, and the Chinese movement threatens the English rule not only in China but also in India, Afghanistan and Persia, for the events in China, especially if they meet with success, may find a loud echo in other English colonies. This is why England is resorting to energetic measures against the Chinese movement for freedom, this is why England is at the same time bringing opposition to bear against Soviet Union the very existence of which fires the colonial peoples with enthusiasm for the fight.

English imperialism can no longer "stand", can no longer "permit" the existence of the first workers' republic. This has of course nothing to do with the "Soviet agents". How could England, the oppressor of India, Egypt, China and dozens of peoples and tribes in Asia and Africa, tolerate the existence of a workers' State, which is built up on a voluntary alliance and equal rights of nationalities? The only lesson which England imperialism has learnt from the events in China, from the movement for freedom of the oppressed Chinese people, which has gained the sympathy of the workers of all countries and even of the honest representatives of the bourgeoisie, is: the only way calmly to exploit the Chinese and to protect them from the "bad example of Russia", is to put an end to the existence of the Soviet Union, to fetter the Russian workers. The fact of the existence of the Soviet Union undermines the power of imperialism, therefore imperialism is again placing on the agenda the question of "the removal of this fact".

* * *

The whole capitalist Press confirms the fact that relations between England and the Soviet Union have arrived at a decisive phase. The "Temps" of July 13th 1925 writes straight out that:

"the Conservatives are working for a break with the Soviet Union and that Lord Birkenhead's statement shows the zeal with which this policy is being pursued".

Truly, the statements of Birkenhead, Hogg and Chamberlain as to the relations with the Soviet Union were of so dangerous a character, that Chicherin had every right to say that the next step in this direction could be nothing less than declaration of war.

There are very weighty reasons for the fact that the English Conservatives did not after all make up their minds to an open breach. Above all, the economic depression in England compels the English industrialists to maintain their connection with the Soviet Union which gives large orders to English industry. To this must be added the pressure of the English working class which has strong sympathies with the Soviet Union and anticipates a decrease of unemployment as the result of the intensification of economic relations between the two countries. Chamberlain would have to "invent or manufacture" some really extraordinary pretext which would have the desired effect on English public opinion, if he wanted in these circumstances to draw England into a senseless adventure against the Soviet Union. A pretext of this kind is obviously not yet at Chamberlain's disposal. Finally, there is the not less important circumstance that the support of other capitalist countries in this step cannot as yet be sufficiently relied on. These facts explain why the English Government could not make up its mind to break off relations with Soviet Russia in the beginning of July, as was generally expected.

The "Daily Herald" of July 10th exposes the whole mechanism.

"The previously discussed plan to send a collective note demanding the removal of the Communist International from Moscow, was wrecked by Italy's refusal. Furthermore Germany does not wish to join in any action against the Soviet Union until the negotiations with regard to the Guarantee Pact have led to an issue favourable to Germany. At the beginning of July, Chamberlain appealed to France; Briand and other members of the French Government however were not friendly disposed towards new diplomatic adventures in Europe and in the Far East at a time when France's difficulties in Morocco were not yet settled... This situation, added to the energetic declaration of the General Council of the Trade Unions... compelled the Government to give up its plan for the time being... The Government sees that it cannot proceed alone, but is doubling its efforts to ensure the co-operation of other powers". (Re-translated from Russian. Ed.)

Thus, for want of sufficient preparation, the attack on the Soviet Union was postponed but not abandoned. This briefly sums up the situation.

* * *

The last sentence of the above quotation, according to which the Conservative Government is "re-doubling its efforts" to create an anti-Bolshevist bloc, is no empty form of speech. A whole number of facts and the open discussion of this question by the capitalist Press of other countries, proves that the English Government really is working systematically in this direction.

As regards France, according to reliable information, the Conservative Government has approached the French Government with concrete proposals. It invited the French Government to take part in a common action against the Soviet Union, the first stage of which was to have been the breaking off of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and the organisation of an economic blockade supported by the border States and by the operations of the English fleet in the Baltic and the Black Sea.

The evening edition of the "Vossische Zeitung" of July 8th, publishes a communication from its correspondent, according to which:

"The words of Painlevé and Briand (in the Senate of July 2nd, A. St.) are, to a large extent, regarded in political circles here (Paris. A. St.) as evidence that the Paris Govern-

ment takes a sympathetic attitude towards the London plan of a united front against Molcow."

The fact however that the French Government cannot make up its mind to proceed openly in this question, does not in the least imply any lack of zeal on Painlevé's part, but only that the Morocco adventure weighs heavily on the shoulders of the Government and that it therefore dreads increasing its difficulties, of which it already has enough, by an open fight against the Soviet Union.

The capitalist Press is now quite cynically revealing the significance of the bargaining between Germany and the allies with regard to the Guarantee Pact. In this case also, the object of the negotiations is to draw Germany into the anti-Soviet bloc and to ensure its support in case of open hostile action against the Soviet Union. Recognising this fact, the German Government is determined to sell as dearly as possible its entrance into the League of Nations and its signature to the Guarantee Pact which doubtless involves joining an anti-Soviet alliance. Both the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" and "Vorwärts", the socialist Barmat paper are letting this cat out of the bag.

The most telling evidence however is given by England's efforts to form an anti-Bolshevist bloc in the border States. In this we see most plainly how far English policy goes in its attack on the Soviet Union and what are the consequences which threaten. Not a soul doubts to-day that England, which relies on the financial dependence of the border States, each of whom (Latvia, Finland, Poland, Esthonia, Lithuania) owes the English banks more than ten million pounds sterling, is using every effort to turn these countries into instruments against the Soviet Union.

The "Vossische Zeitung" of July 10th points out that England is now trying to carry out her plan which consists in

"casting a ring round Moscow, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and beyond. Enquiries have been made from London to each of the border States, as to whether it is prepared to join in an action on a large scale against, not the Russian Government, but the Third International. England has thus for the first time come out into the open."

Can it be doubted that the phrase "not against the Soviet Government, but against the Third International", is mere empty words and that in reality the action is to be directed against the Soviet Union? The visit of the Foreign Ministers of Esthonia and Latvia to London, where, according to reliable information, they discussed with the Foreign Office the question of the organisation of an action against the Soviet Union, is very instructive.

England however regards the border States not only as an instrument for political action but, above all, as a field of operations from which to organise military action against the Soviet Union. England is devoting unusual attention to the military preparation of the border States. In this case its object is to organise the armed forces of the border, especially of the Baltic States, their equipment and strategic preparations for a war on the basis of a uniform plan which is to be built up on common military action of these States against the Soviet Union. The English system of equipment, the organisation and tactics of the English army are being introduced throughout the armies of the Baltic States..

At the end of last year, General Corn's commission was engaged for several months in Finland organising the Finnish army in order to bring the plans of the Finnish army into harmony with the plans of the neighbouring States. The Conservatives are good business men, they do not limit themselves to Parliamentary declarations, but organise and equip armies for a campaign against the working class of the Soviet Union.

The whole character of the intentions of the Conservatives is brought clearly to light by the handing over of the Esthonian islands Oesel und Dagö to England. The strategic situation of these islands is such that a fleet using them as its base, would have control over the entrance to the Bight of Finland and over the whole Baltic Sea. England wishes to get possession of them in order to establish on them a base for her navy and to have in her hands the strategic key to the Baltic Sea. The negotiations with regard to the handing over of these islands lasted for some months and are said to have been concluded recently by Esthonia consenting to the English proposal. England has thus gained

the possibility of directly threatening the safety of the Soviet Union.

Thus, in cordial agreement with the bourgeoisie of other countries the Conservative Government is step by step systematically preparing in the Baltic border States in Poland, Roumania, Persia, Afghanistan and Manchuria, its infernal plan for a new campaign against the Soviet Union. The means it employs, are corruption, economic pressure, threats and promises. There are no means which she would not stoop to use. She is using for her purpose both the social traitors of the "Vorwärts", who howl

about the horrors of Bolshevism and the sanguinary Generals of the Koltchak army whom she provides with money to raise troops in Manchuria; she makes use of the Democratic Governments of Esthonia and Latvia, of the despot of Manchuria, General Chan Tso Lin, whom she incites to and equips for the fight against the Soviet Union.

The working class must be prepared to rend asunder this network of devilish machinations which bring in its wake new decimating conflicts between the peoples and threaten the safety, the peace and the peaceful work of the first Workers' Republic.

War, Peace, and the Second International.

By **Walecki.**

In Chapter A, § 4 of the Statutes adopted by the Hamburg Congress of "The Labour and Socialist International" held in 1923, we read the following:

"The Labour and Socialist International is not only an instrument on behalf of peace, but an indispensable instrument during every war. During conflicts between nations, the L. S. I. is recognised by the affiliated parties as the highest instance."

The gentlemen of the Two and a Half International prided themselves greatly on the inclusion of this paragraph in the statutes — in the statutes themselves! — for it signified a "victory" over the famous Kautsky formula of 1914, (the International is an instrument for peace, it is no instrument of war), it was the dowry which it brought into the marriage union. Friedrich Adler in his address to the Congress with special solemnity stressed the importance of the paragraph which we quote above:

"The entire Congress will agree that we have gained experience from the war that the L. S. I. is not only an instrument for tasks in peace time, but is an indispensable instrument in times of war. (Loud applause.) That signifies above all, that, what we once experienced must never be repeated (renewed loud applause)."

It is true, Adler added rather dejectedly that people are not all of the same opinion about what has happened and that the "problems such as national defence must be discussed further", this "problem" can "not be immediately solved, however much we may wish to do so". But, the "instrument" for peace and war has been forged, it will be regarded "during conflicts between nations" by the parties as "the highest instance".

Two years have passed since the Hamburg celebrations and the Morocco war has broken out. A typical colonial predatory war. The war is being waged by France supported by a government which has the help of the French Socialist Party generally and especially in regard to carrying on this war.

Twice, since the outbreak of the Franco-Moroccan War, the Second International — the instrument for war and peace — has met in conference. The Executive of the L. S. I. met in Paris in the beginning of May, and the Bureau met in London at the beginning of June. No word was mentioned of Morocco during the Paris Session. Probably, for serious reasons. Firstly, as is well-known, Abd-el-Krim attacked peaceful France, and the "problem of national defence" has with the best will in the world not been "solved". Secondly, it is not a question of a "conflict between nations" in the sense of the paragraph of the L. S. I. Is this clan chief Abd-el-Krim the legitimate representative of a nation? And thirdly, is there a Social Democratic party affiliated to the L. S. I. under the Rifis for whom the war and peace instrument is the "highest instance"?

At the London Conference (July 4th), the question of the war in Morocco was on the agenda, or rather, as the official communique says, the question of the "situation in Morocco was discussed". Renaudel, the most faithful supporter of the French Government, explained the "various conceptions", which exist concerning this question within the French Party. The Bureau, however, was not in a position "to define its attitude". The reasons were ponderous: "In view of the fact" — the official

statement runs, "that the Spanish Party has not been able to send a representative to this meeting of the Bureau".

There was, however, a minority in the Bureau which was not quite contented with this elegant disposal of the question, and made a declaration which ran as follows:

"The question of the attitude of the French Socialist Party to the Moroccan War contains in embryo (!) all the problems which caused the split of Socialist Parties during the world war. We will refrain at the present juncture from a discussion (!) of this question only because we have full confidence in the French Socialist Party, that it itself will find the correct solution to this question."

This gem of an "opposition" declaration bears three signatures: Otto Bauer (Austria), Dan (Russian Menshevik) and Czech (German Social Democrat in Czechoslovakia).

Bauer is the man who in 1919 as Austrian Foreign Minister supported the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution and the Polish White Army against Soviet Russia by supplying arms, and who was removed from power at the behest of the French, because he secretly intrigued with the Italian Government to re-establish the Triple Alliance — Italy-Germany-Austria. Dan, with his clique, is the individual who for years has been fostering every agitation against Soviet Russia, but who advocates "peaceful" intervention only; and Czech, a German nationalist, is a faithful reflex of the Czech Government Socialists.

The "declaration" itself is priceless. "In embryo all problems of the world war", and "full confidence" in the French Socialist Party, hence "at the moment refrain from a discussion". Apparently, these three heroes wish to say that they are not quite contented with the official attitude of the French Party, but plank on a victory within the Party of the semi-pacifist tendencies, which are fairly well represented in it, but are in fact absolutely helpless against the actual support of the war on the part of the Party leaders. Of course, no one thought of securing the support of the increasing number of Socialist workers who are joining the anti-war campaign of the Communists.

Even "Het Volk", the organ of the Dutch Social Democrats, is very discontented with the attitude of the London Bureau, both majority and minority. The success within the ranks of the workers under the leadership of the Communists in the struggle against war, disquiets the observers from Amsterdam; especially the demonstration on the Workers' Conference that was celebrated in Paris July 4th and 5th. "Why do the Socialists let the Communists have such demonstrations, those workers will ask who make a difference between both Parties? The majority will probably be indifferent as to who originated the movement, they accept the leadership of the Communists since the Socialists do not take part in the movement. ("Het Volk", July 13th, 1925.)

Yes, indeed, why do the Socialists "leave" the struggle against the war to the Communists? Simply because a section of the Socialist leaders, the avowed colonialists, carry on the struggle for a war to victory, and another section, the pacifists of different shades, are fighting for a war for peace; because all no dot wish to desert their threatened fatherland in the hour of danger.

In the statutes of the Labour and Socialist International we read: "Not only an instrument in peace, but it is an indispensable instrument in times of war".

The Spanish delegation is absent... all problems in embryo... full confidence...

China: The discussion on these mighty revolutionary events ensued at the London Session of the Bureau of the Second International and of the RILU: to organise common action in favour of the Chinese revolution. The Bureau proceeded straight after dealing with this document to the ordinary agenda. In a special decision it records that here is another "United Front manoeuvre" with a view to "exposing" and "destroying" the Socialist Parties.

But they want neither to be exposed nor destroyed.

As regards the Chinese revolution (there is a modest mention made of "the awakening of the working masses of China") itself, a decision was adopted the first part of which was a Platonic greeting of the movement. The entire second part, however, is devoted to the struggle against Chinese nationalism, against the "nationalist race struggle"; hence, it is a question of forming a front against European-American imperialism, and against Asiatic nationalism.

A splendid supplement to this resolution, a fitting commentary to this "greeting" is found in the short address which the twin brother of the LSI — the International Trade Union Centre in Amsterdam — sent to the Workers' International Relief. Having been invited to help the struggling Chinese workers, the Amsterdam Trade Union replied on July 6th: "The Presidium of the IFTU, considered the question whether it is necessary (!) and possible to give the Chinese workers material help. The decision was arrived at that the Presidium should ask for information from known Chinese Trade Unions whether help is possible (?) and to what extent it is required."

It is necessary first to ask for information. The Spanish — oh, no, the Chinese delegate is not present. Perhaps the Chinese workers do not require any material help. Perhaps they have plenty of everything. Perhaps they are so much under the influence of "Asiatic nationalism" that they do not want to take any assistance from Europeans. Who is to know?

European governments ply their agents in China with gold, munitions, warships, etc. The LSI and the IFTU, issue a warning against "Asiatic nationalism" and ask for information.

But the International is a peace and war instrument.

The greatest attention was devoted both at the London Bureau meeting and previously at the meetings of the Executive in Brussels January 1925, and in Paris (May) to the questions of the Security Pact and the Geneva Protocol. In the resolution which was adopted after excited discussion between the British and the Continental comrades, we read amongst other items:

"It (the LSI.) considered the Geneva Protocol to be the execution and realisation of the League of Nations and of the principles of the general Court of Arbitration, which alone is able to bring security to the people and disarmament to the world."

Thus agitation is made on behalf of the Geneva Protocol which "alone" etc., is dead and buried, and for the Security Pact, i.e. for the special alliance with the proviso that no "false equilibrium of the powers" should arise.

And in fact the Security Pact, as it is at present understood in England, directs its arrows against the Soviet Union, and is being used in a most cynical manner by the entire Social Democracy, with the Germans at their head, a vile agitational measure against Soviet Russia. Thomas in Great Britain uses the Railwaymen's Conference to make a most violent attack, at a time when the Conservative Government is threatening to break off political connections with Soviet Russia. The "Vorwärts" on account of the sentence on the three Fascist juvenile murderers invites the German Government to break off relations with Soviet Russia.

In a leading article on the occasion of the dispatch of the new German Note to Paris the "Vorwärts", July 19th, formulates the foreign policy of Social Democrats as follows:

"In Germany today there is properly speaking, only two foreign policy programmes: the Communist and the Social Democratic. The Communists at least do not preach like the worn-out nationalists, about aimless force, but are seeking the solution in a German alliance with a strong military power: Russia. The Social Democratic Party seeks the solution in conjunction with the peoples of Western culture and high capitalist development."

It cannot be stated more clearly. The Communists are with the great Workers' and Peasants' Republic, with all oppressed nations on the globe against imperialism, the Social Democrats are working with the highly developed capitalism of imperialist powers against — whom? Against the Soviet Union, China and Morocco.

For some weeks, already, Vandervelde holds the office of Foreign Minister to the Belgian King. In a programme which he issued to the Belgian Chamber on June 30th, he stated, that he "would continue the Belgian foreign policy on the lines of his predecessors". These predecessors, amongst other things, occupied the Ruhr together with Poincaré. For his own part Vandervelde declared that "as long as Germany had not fulfilled her obligations, we will remain in the Cologne zone. The entire Government is in agreement on this point".

According to Vandervelde's statement, the Soviet Union, however, despite the promises which were made to the Belgian workers during the elections, will not be recognised. First of all, the Belgian capitalists, who once possessed factories now nationalised in Russia, must be fully indemnified, and then "independence" must be restored to the Republic of Georgia as was demanded by Belgium.

In all other matters Vandervelde takes the same road as Great Britain (China) and France (Morocco).

However, barely two years ago at the Hamburg Congress, this greatest of present-day hypocrites and swindlers declared in a loud voice in the meeting hall: "We are collecting our forces against this imperial peace, which in reality is nothing but a fossilised state of war, against this war in the form of imperialist peace and we place on record: capitalism will be eternally damned in history, because with recurring regularity it has driven the masses to butchery and warfare."

The Armies of Capitalist Governments after the World War.

By A. Svetchin.

The most important conclusion drawn from the World War with regard to armed forces is that a State can only attain the maximum exertion of its fighting forces by expending all the material resources it possesses, however considerable these may be, and not merely a part of them. Even such arch-military countries as Poland who expend half of the State budget on military needs, cannot regard themselves as being materially prepared for the development of a maximum military activity within three weeks of the commencement of mobilisation. The modern field of battle has an unquenchable thirst for swallowing up material resources; there is no limit to satisfying it by means of the production of technique.

Not one State economy is sufficiently strong to support all military equipment even in peace time which must be adorned from the very commencement of the war. It would be suicide for any government already to start turning plough-shares into swords in peace time. Under the new state of affairs the old aphorism again cropped up: "War must nourish War". This must now be understood in the sense that the main masses of fighters and the war munitions demanded, must be prepared and produced during the course of the war itself.

It thereby follows that the epoch of the military art of a Moltke, who carried on warfare exclusively on the basis of peace-time preparation and who had an army at his disposal in 20 days after mobilisation with maximum fighting strength — such an epoch as this has ended; during the 20th century we have entered into a new period of military art, when mobilisation is no longer just one point in war operations, but becomes a permanent factor. Throughout the whole length of the war until it has finally subsided capitalist States will be moving forward echelon after echelon of newly formed troops.

The second fundamental conclusion from the World War is that conscription will also remain a means of drawing masses having a national character, into the war in bourgeois countries. It forms an armed force not sufficiently flexible to respond to all the tasks presented by imperialism. Conscription creates an armed force which during the present epoch of socialist revolutions is no too serviceable a weapon in the hands of the ruling classes and which, under certain conditions might even rise up against the capitalist states.

Conscription was able to flourish in the Prussia of the 18th century which had no fleet, no colonies, and whose entire military interests were connected with uniting various German lands into one political whole. Great Britain and France, old cradles of Imperialism, were always opposed to conscription and for a long time talked of the advantages of long service soldiers. It was only Sedan which compelled France to pass a law on conscription, while with Great Britain it was the experience of the world war; when these war demands had ceased to exist, Great Britain returned to its beloved recruiting system. The

German renunciation of conscription was signed with the Versailles peace: but the British army may be distinguished from the organisations of the conquered, the Reichswehr, only by the existence of the remarkable military technique which is denied to Germany.

Of course under these conditions conscription as a basis for forming armed forces in Europe still holds sway. It would be erroneous to assert that conscription was a brief and already completed episode in the development of capitalist Europe. The bourgeoisie purveyors of cannon fodder place exceedingly great value on the masses whom they may obtain from conscription in cases of large scale wars. But nevertheless conscription in the 20th century is already beginning to have quite a different physiognomy as compared with that of the 19th century. It is the fund with which modern capitalist armies are built up. It still represents the main weapon of a great war on a par with the material resources gained from economic mobilisation.

But just as there exists a certain independent military industry, independent of the economic whole of the industry of the State, so also independent of the millions of masses who might be mobilised by conscriptions, modern imperialism strives to form a select and absolutely reliable and serviceable front line army. It is essential for them when finding and subjugating allies and also to bring violence to bear during internal struggles with the workers, and in order to mask general mobilisation in case of a great war.

In the 19th century, a stubborn fight was put up against special select troops and for uniting the whole army into one entity. Modern actuality compels imperialism to abandon this point of view. Spontaneous action of the toiling masses represents for imperialism a bill of exchange that cannot be realised at any minute while convoy armies and expeditionary corps and permanent coloured regiments, are regarded as good money. There is a deep cleft in the military organisations of the imperialist States dividing the permanent forces — the favourite and technically well equipped children — from the mass of armed people which actually in peace-time has practically no ready frame-work, but whose rapid formation is guaranteed in secret mobilisation plans.

The escort armies are the first echelon always ready to commence the war in strict obedience of the command of the ruling classes. But the continuation and ending of the war will not be done by the first but by the following echelons, who will be formed of considerably varying elements. These need both a different political approach and different methods of preparation and command. The dual nature of the complete preparation of all large imperialist States is the most characteristic feature in the modern evolution of the armies of the imperialist West.

The Red Army and the Armies of Imperialism.

The bourgeoisie and their lackeys of the Second International, hypocritically and falsely shout about "Red Militarism", "Red Imperialism", "The Red Danger", etc., and hence allege that the Soviet Union has an army.

It would be superfluous to prove that the proletarian power is not carrying on an imperialist policy and that it is of its very nature an irreconcilable enemy of any kind of imperialist aspirations. The whole structure of the Soviet regime, the very form of political training of the army in itself differs sharply from that of the armies of capitalist countries — this is sufficient to prove that the demagogical slogan "Red Imperialism" is absolutely senseless.

As far as the numerical strength of the Red Army is concerned, this is an absolute minimum. The Red Army is composed of 563,000 men, i. e. one Red Army man to every 231 members of the population of the Soviet Union and for every verst of the frontier there are only 11 men, while in Poland, which has an army of 203,000 there is one soldier for every 107 members of the population, i. e. the military force of Poland in so-called peace time is more than twice than that of the Soviet Union. For Roumania, which has an army of 163,929, the figures work out at one soldier to 103 inhabitants, i. e. the military strength of Roumania is even greater than that

of Poland. For France whose army amounts to 685,459, i. e. the proportion is 57 soldiers per inhabitant, France's military strength as compared with the Soviet Union, is simply monstrous.

They also like to retort that in actual numbers our army is bigger than that of any other country. Firstly this is untrue: France for instance has a much larger army than we have, and secondly, if we take into consideration the fact that it is not simply some one state which will fight against the Soviet Union but also the Little Entente, and possibly Japan, we then see that in peace time there are 843,529 men on the side of the "coalition", a figure far in excess of our army. These are sufficient reasons for saying that the Red Army, with its negligible quantity of men, is far from occupying the first place, and it will be truer to say, that it takes the last place. What do these figures signify? They signify that with an army of such dimensions there could not be even any thought of "imperialist attacks" on the part of the Soviet Union. Former Russia did have imperialist tendencies and it had an army nearly three times as big as the present one.

But malicious people generally reply to this saying: "All right, let us assume that the Bolsheviks really have a small army. But to make up for that", they say, "they spend crazy sums in preparing for war and in this manner", they say, "they redeem the insufficiency of their numerical strength", and at the same time they usually refer to the fact that we are introducing a territorial system. Let us examine these two arguments.

What does the existence of a territorial-militia system in the Soviet Union signify? This system permits us to keep under arms the smallest number of men possible leaving the largest possible number free to be employed in productive labour. This alone goes to show that a State adopting such a system cares more about raising the standard of its economy than about warfare. Secondly, if we remember the numbers of railways in the Soviet Union and approximately the time necessary for rallying all the people occupied on the economic front throughout the whole extent of mother-Russia, it will be quite clear to all that the "campaigns" which give Mr. Chamberlain no rest, cannot even be thought of by the Red Army. The introduction of a territorial system is the best proof of the fact that the State is only preparing for defense and not for attack.

Now with regard to finance. We will base our conclusions not on the information of "our own correspondents" but on the basis of official State records of the Soviet Union and other States. The war budget of the Soviet Union in 1924—25 amounts to 406 millions, plus 6 millions roubles released subsequently, i. e. a total of 412 million roubles which includes expenditure on the fleet and war industry. This figure represents 15% of the total State expenditure, while in Great Britain war budget for 1925—1926 (from March 1st 1925) amounts to 120,513,000 sterling, which in Soviet roubles amounts to 1,070,191,230 r. !!!

We therefore see from this that there are some who are spending much more than the Soviet Union on armaments. Poland has a war budget of 680,500,000 zloti (540 millions according to the estimate, plus 40 millions already received on account of the 70 millions demanded by Sikorski), or 34% of the total State expenditure. In this manner Poland is squandering more than one-third of its budget on preparation for war, while the Soviet Union is spending only one-sixth, or in other words Poland is preparing for war twice as intensively as the Soviet Union. In Soviet money Poland is spending approximately 255 million roubles. At first glance this might seem less than the Soviet Union. If we speak in absolute figures, then Poland is of course spending less, but if we take the comparative size of the States, the correlation becomes quite different. If we take these figures in relation to the population, we find that in the Soviet Union war expenditure amounts to 3 r. 16 k. per head of the population, while in Poland 9 r. 10 k. Where and by whom the greater preparations are being carried on, one may judge for oneself.

For France the latter figure (war expenditure per member of the population) amounts to 154 francs or approximately 38—39 roubles, i. e. the war preparations of the State which cries loudest about the "Red Danger" and about "Red Imperialism" leaves no doubt. In this manner "mad sums" may

also be relegated to the domain of the usual gossip of "our own" correspondents. They also make a very poor show about "imperialism". Resources are spent on the Army just in so far as is necessary for preparing for the defense of the conquests of the working class.

All that we have shown quite sufficiently confirms that the Red Army is an army of the Workers' and Peasants' State and of the conquests of the working class. It is only because the Soviet Union is surrounded on all sides by bourgeois sharks with gaping mouths ready to swallow up the Soviet Union, it is only because there is not yet such a power of Soviets anywhere in the world, for this reason only is there such a stern necessity for a Workers' and Peasants' Red Army.

What is the cause of these hypocritical wails in the bourgeois (and Second International) camp about the Red danger? This is because, they (the bourgeois states) are all themselves partly preparing and partly already conducting a war. The budget figures (constant increase of budget for military expenditure) show this in an illuminating fashion as also measures taken of late in China and Morocco. Polish attacks on the frontiers of the Soviet Union, a frantic increase in the air fleet, the construction of new war ships, new naval bases, etc. etc. all go to show that the imperialists are too strong and too evident to allow the slightest doubt as to this.

The policy of the Soviet Union is a policy of peace; the Red Army is the guardian of the policy of the Soviet Union, the Red Army is the guardian of the policy of Peace. What arises from this? The imperialists are preparing and are ready for war. Already several times after the "Peace Conferences" there have been moments when war has seemed inevitable. But it has not happened. Why is this? This is because the imperialists very well understand the existence of the Soviet Union and the Red Army which are decisive and real guardians of peace and attentively follow all these preparations, and at the right moment will give a reminder that they are "against the war". The imperialists are perfectly aware of this and know that the Red Army, which guards the peace of the Union of Soviet Republics, will in general not allow this peace to be disturbed. One reminder about the existence of the Red Army in a moment of intense preparation for war drives the imperialists frantic, for it partially (and to no small extent) cools their war fever.

But one might reply to this that the Red Army is not so strong that the mere fact of its existence would influence the decision of world questions. That is so. From a numerical and technical point of view the Red Army is relatively weak, but the strength taken at one with the masses, and in its international nature, its striving to preserve peace, guarantees it the sympathy of tremendous masses of toilers throughout the whole world. This force is already threatening and has not only to be considered, but has even sometimes to be listened to. And the remaining reason of the violent cries about the "Red Danger" is of course the growth of the revolutionary movement throughout the whole world. The bourgeoisie has become temporarily "stabilised", but it knows very well that its rule is coming to an end.

This of course enrages the bourgeoisie. Therein lies the real reason for the cry about danger. The imperialists fear that the Red Army will not allow them to disturb peace, drag the masses into war and take the vengeance on the revolution just when they want to. And after all the whole of their policy and all their measures are based on warfare and struggle against revolution and it is obvious that when this basis is undermined — they begin to yell. They scream and try to save their skins!!!

The cries about the Red danger will probably increase as the Anniversary of the Commencement of the World War draws nearer. The aim of our article is to show the masses that the root of the evil is not to be found in the Red Army, but in those who are shouting about Red imperialism, for the Red Army, as has been shown already, by its very nature cannot have imperialist tendencies. But, defending the conquests of the working class, the Soviet Union guards peace and is ready to meet the peace-breakers with an insuperable resistance. In the struggle for peace and on behalf of the conquests of the working class the Red Army is always ready for action.

Naval Armaments after the World War.

The economic ruin in Europe after the war and the desire on the part of the various Admiralties to take stock of their war experience before undertaking the construction of new armaments has, during the first years following the war, caused a certain stoppage in the work of Naval shipyards. Only America and Japan (which hardly suffered at all from the war) commenced to carry out their colossal ship-building programmes vying with each other for the first place in the Pacific Ocean naval forces.

In 1921 the Washington Congress took a decision to bring the American fleet up to a strength equal to that of the strongest fleet in the world, i. e. the British Fleet. Great Britain in reply published its new programme which included the construction of four new super-dreadnoughts. The Japanese Government drew up the famous programme known as the "8-8" according to which the fleet should include 8 first line battleships and 8 super-dreadnoughts not more than 8 years old. This tremendous programme was to have given Japan almost the second place among the fleets of the world. The Japanese cruiser "Takao" appeared as an unprecedented giant of 45,000 tons with a speed of 34 knots and fitted with eight 17 inch guns. Such is an example of the naval construction activities that began to take place almost directly after the peaceful declarations of Versailles.

In 1921, America considering the correlation of forces of the different powers at that time to be very advantageous for her, convened the Washington Conference in order to "fix naval armaments at definite and stable dimensions". Great Britain, the U. S. A., France, Japan and Italy sent their representatives to this conference. At the opening of the Conference, President Harding delivered a remarkable speech in which he declared that "Our Conference bears witness to the awakened conscience of the civilisation of the XXth Century. The wearied world is thirsting for new relations, and Humanity demands a stable peace..."

The results of the work of this "awakened conscience" at the Washington Conference were that it was decided that Great Britain and the United States might possess 525,000 tons in large battleships, Japan 315,000 tons, and France and Italy 175,000 tons. With regard to cruisers, torpedo-boats and submarines, here the "awakened conscience" already placed no limit to the total sum permitted for displacements, although the representatives of Great Britain tried to come to an agreement for the complete curtailment of submarine construction which for the British themselves are a dangerous weapon against trade.

There have been two more conferences on the question of limiting naval armaments since the Washington Conference: in 1923 the conference of South American Republics in Los Angeles, and in 1924 the conference of the minor naval powers at Rome. Neither of these conferences arrived at any result.

Meanwhile, Great Britain, no longer threatened by Germany, and no longer faced with the new rivals with whom agreement had been arrived at in Washington, set about carrying out colossal naval construction. The imperialist interests of British capital in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean compel British strategy to concentrate all its attention just on the Mediterranean Basin, the key to all the most important traffic routes: Gibraltar—Malta—Suez—Perim—Aden—Singapore—Hongkong.

For this, further construction of large battleships was necessary. Great Britain, having already at its disposal 22 battleships (i. e. battle-cruisers and dreadnoughts) with 15 inch and 13.5 inch guns, at the commencement of 1923 laid down the keels of 2 new super-dreadnoughts in the shipyards of Armstrong-Whitworth and Cammel Laird, — the "Rodney" and "Nelson", with a tonnage of 35,000 with 16 inch artillery (9 guns each); in addition Great Britain has begun the construction of 11 cruisers and a number of torpedo-boats, aircraft-carriers and submarines. Already at the commencement of 1925 she has the following warships ready:

Battleships	22	(not including 2 under construction)
Cruisers	52	(in addition to those being constructed, the new programme — July 1925 — provides for 18 additional cruisers)

Aircraft-carriers	8	
Torpedo-boats and destroyers	207	
Submarines	66	(beside those under construction and included in a new programme)

It is necessary to remark that all figures and data in these tables concern the most powerful and up-to-date warships, for, between November 1918 up to 1923 the British have sold for scrap 35 battleships, 82 cruisers, 375 torpedo-boats, 101 submarines and 240 other boats with a total displacement of 1,600,000 tons. In this manner, the present British fleet is absolutely free of any out-of-date warships. All those which have been accumulated during the years of the war and preceding the war, have now been discarded.

France, threatening and threatened by Great Britain in the Mediterranean, which connects her up with the French colonies, is here threatened also by Italy and Spain who in 1923 concluded a "naval agreement directed against France aiming at protecting the freedom of the Mediterranean". The French imperialists are not lagging behind the continued naval armaments of their rivals. In this connection we have the absolutely categorical statement of Doumergue himself (in his Cherbourg speech in 1925) where he said: "The desire for peace has induced France to conserve naval strength in a condition corresponding to the world position of the Republic and the necessity for safeguarding the tremendous coast line and the colonial dependencies."

In addition to 6 battleships, 5 cruisers, 58 torpedo-boats and 46 submarines, France has fixed a ship-building programme for 6 cruisers at 10,000 tons each, 3 cruisers at 7,880 tons, 21 destroyers at 2,326 tons and 36 torpedo-boats at 1,430 tons and also 52 submarines.

The USA, no longer constructing her pre-Washington giants, has now at her disposal 18 battleships (of which 3 were launched in 1920—21, armed with 16 inch guns) 31 cruisers, 267 torpedo-boats and 56 submarines have been launched since the war). Not content with this, the government has presented a draft Bill to Congress for the construction of 8 more 10,000 tons cruisers.

Japan has at its disposal 10 battleships (of which two were launched in 1919—20 with 16 inch guns), 8 cruisers, 21 light cruisers, 84 torpedo-boats and the same number of submarines. She is continuing to increase the fleet, by adding new cruisers and torpedo-boats. By 1928, the Japanese fleet should include 25 large new cruisers as against 10 new cruisers (launched since the war) of the USA.

Italy, which economically considers herself almost as an island State, completely dependent upon sea communications*) declares quite openly as to the necessity for occupying "a corresponding position on the Mediterranean paths essential to her". Possessing already 5 battleships, 9 cruisers, 61 torpedo-boats destroyers and 41 submarines, she is putting through a new construction programme for 1923—28 during which period the government should construct 5 cruisers of 10,000 tons each, 20 large destroyers and 20 large submarines.

Spain which has friendly naval relations with Italy and which already possesses 2 battle-ships, 3 cruisers, 3 light cruisers, 10 torpedo-boats and 10 submarines is building 2 more cruisers, 3 destroyers and 6 submarines.

We will not trouble to consider the naval armaments of the minor states, since the picture becomes quite clear without this. Naval armaments after Versailles are being carried out at just the same rate, as they were during the preparation for the 1914 war.

*) The tasks prescribed for the recent manoeuvres of the Italian fleet are characteristic: a group of transports from the carrying Russian wheat and oil proceeding from the Black Sea to Italy has to be met by the fighting squadron which endeavours to escort them safely under the threats of the hostile French fleet.

Page 852
of

1925 Inprecor July 30 Vol. 5 No. 61

is

BLANK

MND sept 2021