

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

---

Official Organ of the Executive Committee of the Communist International



## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

### The Parting of the Ways in China

An Editorial and an article by  
Nikolai Bukharin on the  
latest developments in the  
Chinese Revolution.

### The "Reform" of the House of Lords.

A. J. Bennett

### Germany and the Coming War.

30th July, 1927

Vol iv No. 11

3d.

# THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

English Edition Published at 16 King Street, London, WC2

## C O N T E N T S

THE PARTING OF THE WAYS Editorial ...	210	THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE CHINESE REVOLUTION N. Bukharin ... ..	219
REFORM OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS A. J. Bennett ... ..	214	KEMALISM ON THE ROAD TO CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT ... ..	223
GERMANY AND THE COMING WAR Heinz Neumann ... ..	216	THE SOURCE OF THE ZINOVIEV LETTER F. G. ... ..	227

## The Parting of the Ways

**T**HE coup of Chiang Kai Shek meant the desertion of the revolution by the bourgeoisie, but did not bring about a final division between the camp of the democratic revolution and that of the bourgeois counter-revolution. On the territory of the Nanking Government, there are to be found such influential right wing Kuomintangists as Bai Shin Chi, Li Ti Sin and Yu Han Min, who are even more right and more closely related to feudalism than Chiang Kai Shek, but we also have on the territory of the Hankow Government, in the Central Committee of the Kuomintang and in the General Staff groups that are in close connection with Chiang Kai Shek. The May Plenum of the E.C.C.I. was perfectly correct in stating in its resolution on the Chinese question that "the Hankow Government, the Government of the left Kuomintang, is not yet the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, but it is on the road to such dictatorship, and in the event of a victorious class struggle of the proletariat leaving behind the radical bourgeois camp-followers and effecting certain changes, will develop into such dictatorship." The resolution of the Plenum of the E.C.C.I. thus definitely predicted the inevitability of new changes in the camp of the Hankow government and new desertions on the part of the bourgeois camp followers in accordance with the development of the revolution.

If we take full account of the causes which brought about the Chiang Kai Shek "putsch" and of the situation in which this putsch took place, we shall see that at that moment it could not yet have been a question of the final regrouping of forces on the ground of the agrarian revolution which was recognised by the May Plenum of the E.C.C.I. as the "fundamental internal social and economic content of the new phase of the Chinese revolution." When the relations between the left wing and Chiang Kai Shek became strained in the Nationalist government, the first tidings of the agrarian revolution on the territory of the Nationalist government had already been received. But on the whole, the demands of the peasant leagues were still very moderate. They amounted to the following: (1) reduction of rent; (2) reduction of interest and credits; (3) exchange of land; (4) annulment of tenancy agreements; (5) aboli-

tion of tax payments to the landlords; (6) against high taxes; (7) expulsion of the gentry, the disarmament of the Mingtuan (bourgeois militia) and arming of the peasants. Slogans calling for the confiscation and distribution of the land of the nobility were very rare.

These moderate demands met with the support of the General Committee of the Kuomintang and the Nationalist government, if not in deeds, at least in words. The agrarian commission of the C.C. of the Kuomintang, appointed after its Third Plenum, gave the following reasons to show the necessity of agrarian reform at the time of the Chiang Kai Shek coup: (1) by these reforms the victory of the Nationalist revolution would be secured, as they will free the peasants from the oppression of the landlords and the gentry, strengthen the financial position of the Nationalist government, overthrow the feudal elements, and make it certain that the peasants join in the anti-imperialist struggle. (2) Agrarian reforms will raise the fighting capacity of the Nationalist army, as the soldiers are interested in the solution of the agrarian problem. (3) They will help in the development of the agricultural industry and finally (4) Agrarian reforms will promote the cultural development of China.

**T**HE Third Plenum of the Kuomintang adopted a resolution on the agrarian question proposing that the government should take steps to organise peasant self government under the leadership of the Peasant Leagues to establish agricultural committees to carry out the agrarian reforms, and to subordinate all armed forces in the villages which do not form part of the regular army to the peasant administration. In reality, the Hankow government hesitated to put these agrarian reforms into effect and did not help to arm the peasants against the landlords and the gentry; but the issuing of such a declaration showed that the present Hankow government can tolerate such demands. As far as the Communist Party is concerned, it made a more decisive stand in favour of these demands than did the C.C. of the Kuomintang, but it must be admitted that some Communists have not yet overcome their fear of the developing agrarian revolution, the fear that the contradictions in

**The Parting of the Ways—continued**

the Kuomintang will become more acute. They do not clearly understand the instructions issued on the subject by the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I. in December of last year.

The Hankow district committee of the Communist Party of China spoke in its report at the beginning of April, 1927 of the necessity of arming tens of thousands of peasants through disarming the Mingtuan or by the distribution of arms by the government. It also spoke of the necessity of starting a campaign for the recruiting of workers and peasants to the Nationalist revolutionary army, for the intensification of political work among the soldiers, etc. But as to the concrete question of agrarian reforms, the Hankow Committee did not venture to go any further than the official declaration of the Central Committee of the Kuomintang. The report said: "At the present time the Party must concentrate all its attention on the support of the left Kuomintang in order to solve the agrarian problems. All Party forces must be mobilised for that purpose. . . . The masses of the various districts must rouse the Kuomintang and the government to carry into effect the decision of the March Plenum of the C.C. of the Kuomintang." Thus it was not a question of making the demands more radical in accordance with the requirements of the agrarian revolution, which was already beginning, but merely a question of fighting for the carrying out of the government's promises.

The dimensions which the agrarian and Labour movements had assumed, the attitude then adopted by the left wing majority of the Kuomintang towards those movements, and the struggle to get the government's promises put into effect, sufficed to frighten a considerable section of the industrial bourgeoisie and to drive Chiang Kai Shek to perpetrate his counter revolutionary coup d'etat. But this could not yet definitely draw the lines between those who favoured the agrarian revolution and their opponents in the Kuomintang, in so far as this issue had not at that time been considered in the centre of the Kuomintang, and the peasantry had only given the first signs of revolutionary struggle for land.

**C**HIANG KAI SHEK'S "putsch," therefore, was met in Hankow with unanimous indignation. The Hankow government unanimously declared Chiang Kai Shek a traitor and an enemy of the revolution, and the generals who were on the side of the Hankow government also condemned him. The weekly paper of the Nationalist army in Sinanfu publishes the following declaration of Feng Yu Hs'ian: "The revolutionary forces can gradually concentrate only in the process of the struggle between the rights and lefts. We recognise the decisions of the C.C. as correct. We have no doubts on this score. If the victory of the revolution belongs to one or two military leaders and not to the people it will be of no use. It were better without such a victory."

The same issue of the paper advanced the following slogans:

- (1) Strengthen the left wing camp.
- (2) Work energetically to raise the authority of the Party.
- (3) Victory for the people.

- (4) Support only those military leaders who belong to the Party.
- (5) Eradicate the counter-revolutionary traitor."

In the programme of political work in the Nationalist army, the following points were included:

- (10) Party agitation must be so organised that the Party members may clearly understand that not individuals, nor the military forces, but the Party is the principal thing.
- (12) The good side of the Communists is their iron discipline, their fearlessness in the face of death or imprisonment, their disinterestedness about wages. They can carry on active mass work in the mass movement. . . .
- (14) In the event of any counter-revolutionary activity every Party member must consider the Party principles as his supreme command and fight against the counter-revolution.
- (15) For a victorious revolution a united front is necessary; the Chinese Nationalist revolution must, therefore, maintain an alliance with the proletariat. Disunited action will not result in victory. . . .
- (16) The bourgeoisie are against the imperialists in words, but in reality they are against a united front with the Communists. They actually help the imperialists and are counter-revolutionary."

**S**UCH was the state of affairs on the territory of the Hankow Government at the time of Chiang Kai Shek's coup. It is not so very long since that time, but the agrarian revolution (owing to favourable political developments) has since made rapid progress on the territory of the Hankow Government. The most popular slogans of the peasant movement have recently become: (1) confiscation of the landowners' land; (2) establishment of peasant self government in the villages; (3) disarmament of the gentry and landlords and transfer of arms to the peasant leagues; (4) participation of peasants in the sub-district administrative organs. In some districts of Hunan and Hupeh provinces the peasant leagues have gone even still further; they are proceeding with the distribution of land. One of the leaders of the peasant leagues of the Hupeh province says on this question:

"The struggle against the gentry and the 'Fuk-hao' (nobility) is assuming an ever sharper political character in the villages. Cases of lynch law and executions of gentry are becoming more frequent. In the Yangtsen district, 45 of the gentry have been executed, some of them by the peasants themselves, and some by the district authorities under the pressure of the peasantry. 2,165 gentry have recently passed through the provincial committee of the peasant league, arrested by the peasants for various anti-peasant misdemeanours. In the central and eastern districts of the province, power is actually in the hands of peasant leagues.

"Apart from that, in many districts (Yangtsen, Huangwan, Huanmei and others), the district administration is actually under the control of the peasant league committees, which formally effect their control through united committees of different organisations. Almost all judicial affairs which were formerly settled by the district magistrate are now settled right in the

**The Parting of the Ways**—continued

villages, and the district judicial authorities complain of having nothing to do. The petty gentry, landlords and "Tukhao" who exploit the countryside, emigrate to the towns en masse. The property, including land, of the most reactionary elements is being expropriated by the peasants. In Yangtsen such property was confiscated to the value of one million dollars. The value of the confiscated property throughout the Hupeh province (including land) amounts to 20 million dollars, according to the figures of the provincial peasant league committee.

"The peasant conferences are now more frequently demanding the expropriation of the big landlords (in the districts Lotien and Kuwangwan, for instance). Facts are recorded of landlords coming voluntarily to the peasant leagues and offering their land. This is explained on the one hand by the fear of the landlords in the face of the peasant offensive which, in the event of expropriation by force, might take not only the land, but all property, and, on the other hand, by the hope of the landlords that in the subsequent partition of the confiscated land they will also receive their share."

This intensification of the agrarian revolution and this "plebeian" method of settling the agrarian question has resulted in serious vacillations in the Central Committee of the Kuomintang, in the Hankow Government and in the General Staff of the Nationalist army. The vacillations and the compromising attitude of some of the leaders of the Kuomintang and the General Staff of the Nationalist army were also due to the fact that Chiang Kai Shek was still continuing his expedition against the Northern militarists, that the bourgeois revolution in China has not yet been completed and the Hankow army is marching on Peking parallel with Chiang Kai Shek's armies. These vacillations found their glaring expression in the "putsch" of Syao Du Yin in a town situated between Changsha and Hankow and later in the "putsch" of Su Kei Sen in Changsha.

**W**HEN Yan Sen revolted against the Hankow Government (immediately after Chiang Kai Shek's defection) the latter promptly liquidated the insurrection. But the Hankow Government was not as determined in dealing with Syao Du Yin or the "putsch" in Changsha, since these insurrections were not immediately directed against the Hankow Government, but against the new sharp struggles of the workers and peasants and especially against the agrarian revolution. A part of the 35th Division in Changsha surrounded the headquarters of the peasant organisations and workers' trade unions and dispersed them. They disarmed about 500 pickets and killed 12 people.

The Communist Party fought energetically against these actions. The Fifth Congress of the Communist Party in the early part of May passed a resolution in which the following demands were formulated:

"(a) The confiscation of all public, tribal, Buddhist and Christian church lands, and land belonging to companies, for distribution among the peasants who till that land. The management of the confiscated lands should be handed over to the land committees to decide how it is to be distributed among the peasants.

"(b) Confiscation without compensation of the landowners' land, handing it over to the tenants through the

land committees. The land belonging to the well-to-do peasants should not be subject to confiscation. The land belonging to the officers of the revolutionary army should not be confiscated either; landless soldiers of the revolutionary army should receive their share on the termination of the revolutionary war.

"(c) Confiscated land should be freed from assessments with the exception of the progressive ground tax, payable to the government. Rent for confiscated lands should be reduced to a degree corresponding with the tax on confiscated land. Peasants retaining their tenancy on confiscated lands should have a fixed rate of rent and an unlimited right to the land without having to pay any assessments.

"(d) The landlords and gentry should be deprived of all political rights; a peoples' government should be established in the villages formed by a general meeting of the peasants representing the oppressed classes of the villages.

"(e) Disarmament of the rural reactionary military forces and the organisation of a peasant militia for the defence of the peasant government and the victory of the revolution."

The Communist Party in taking a clear position on the agrarian question came out decisively against the counter-revolutionary activities of the officers, directed against the agrarian revolution. Under the pressure of the Communist Party, reliable forces were dispatched from Hankow to liquidate the Syao Du Yin insurrection. Syao Du Yin was smashed and 900 rifles were captured.

**T**HE Central Committee of the Communist Party appealed also to the C.C. of the Kuomintang in an open letter concerning the Changsha rebellion. This letter contained the statement that:

"The future of the revolution depends on the determined actions of the Kuomintang. The beginning of the agrarian revolution has prompted the reactionary elements to resort to counter-revolutionary deeds. . . . The aggressiveness of the reactionary circles has caused a certain hesitation in leading revolutionary circles. The fear is expressed in these circles that the whole Nationalist army will become hostile if agrarian reforms are enforced. This is not true. The soldiers are landless peasants and they cannot be opposed to the peasant movement; most of the non-commissioned officers belong to the middle peasants, who will gain great advantages from the agrarian reforms. Only the reactionary minority is opposed to the agrarian reforms. . . .

"The Kuomintang is now at the parting of the ways. The path of agrarian reform is the revolutionary path, and the path of the reactionary militarists is the path of counter-revolution. . . . The Nationalist Government must issue a decree declaring the insurgent committee of Changsha counter-revolutionary, and calling up the soldiers to overthrow that committee, to discharge it and appoint a legal provincial government; it must appoint immediately a punitive expedition to suppress the rising and authorise Tan Shen Chi to send forces to crush the counter-revolutionaries; it must disperse the usurping local committee of the Kuomintang and appoint a new one in its stead; it must issue a decree legalising the workers' and peasants' organisations, and the Communist Party of the Hunan province. The Nationalist

**The Parting of the Ways**—continued

Government should command the return of arms to the workers' and peasants' guard. It should arm the peasants so as to be guaranteed against reactionary skirmishes in the future."

The open letter of the Communist Party was supported by the trade union delegate conference of Hunan, which forwarded to the Hankow Government a demand that it should arrest and execute Su Kei Sen and punish all his accomplices in the Changsha insurrection. It also demanded the restoration of the workers' and peasants' organisations, the return of the arms taken away from them, and the issue of a decree guaranteeing freedom to the workers' organisations and the peasant leagues. At the same time a general strike was declared, hailing the forces returning from the Honan front and demanding that a military expedition be despatched to Hunan to establish revolutionary order.

This time the demands formulated by the Communist Party and the trade unions found no echo in the Central Committee of the Kuomintang. The position of the Hankow Government towards the officers responsible for the Changsha insurrection was a vacillating and compromising position, and the insurrection has not yet been liquidated.

It is highly characteristic that not only the Communist Party and the trade union conference, but also the representatives of the provincial Kuomintang organisations protested against the Changsha insurrection. A delegation of 80 members of the Kuomintang organisation of Hunan forwarded to the Central Committee of the Kuomintang a demand that it should send immediately to Hunan province a punitive expedition to punish Su Kei Sen, to restore all workers' and peasants' organisations, to disperse the "committee of public safety" and the military council, to assist those who had suffered from the insurrection, their families, etc.

From the fact that the present Central Committee of the Kuomintang hesitates, fearing the agrarian revo-

lution, it does not yet at all follow that the Communist Party of China must break with the Kuomintang. Side by side with the relentless struggle against the wavering elements it is necessary to carry on energetic work in transforming the Kuomintang into a mass organisation and transforming its Central Committee accordingly. It should become an organ elected by the revolutionary masses of workers, peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie—as formulated in the resolution of the May Plenum of the E.C.C.I.

**T**HE same is true of the army. The unreliability of different representatives of the officers shows that colossal energy must be exerted in arming the workers and peasants, in filling the ranks of the army with workers and peasants who are joining in the revolutionary movement, and in reorganising the army as pointed out in the instructions of the Seventh Plenum of the E.C.C.I. and more concretely specified by the May Plenum of the E.C.C.I.

Of course, these changes will not take place smoothly or without sharp internal conflicts, without betrayals and partial defeats. But ultimately these changes, under the conditions of the growing agrarian revolution and the consolidation of the working class, will be effected, especially considering that at the other pole the consolidation of the reactionary forces headed by Chang Tso Lin, the dictator of North China, and the support given to him by the imperialists, make the sharpening of the war against feudalism inevitable. These forces cannot be finally defeated under the banner of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie without the active participation of the workers and peasants, and without the realisation of their demands.

P.S.—After this article was sent to press news was received that an agreement had been arrived at between Feng Yu Hsian and Chiang Kai Shek. This new betrayal created a new situation in China. This situation will be thoroughly dealt with in an article by comrade Bukharin.

## Books YOU Must Read!

### On The Road To Insurrection *N. Lenin*

140 pages  
Paper covers, 1/6 [post free, 1/8]

**I**N the pages of this brilliant book we follow the mighty genius of Lenin through that intense period in Russia following the "July Days" until the final seizure of power by the Bolsheviks in November, 1917. The problems that the Russian working class met with, and, under the guidance of Lenin, solved during these months, are akin to the problems that the working class in every other country has also to prepare to face.

### The Political Meaning of The Great Strike

*J. T. Murphy*

138 pages  
Paper covers, 1/6 [post free 1/8]

**T**HE only book on the General Strike. A convincing explanation of the reasons for the Strike, of its "failure" and of the changes it must bring in the whole of the Labour Movement in this country.

### Ten Days That Shook The World *John Reed*

368 pages  
Paper covers, 2/6 [post free, 2/9½]  
Cloth covers, 4/6 [post free, 4/10½]

**T**HE book which Lenin read three times and of which he said: "Unreservedly do I recommend 'Ten Days That Shook the World' to the workers of the

world. Here is a book which I should like to see published in millions of copies and translated into all languages . . ."

### The State and Revolution *N. Lenin*

Second Edition  
Paper covers, 1/6 [post free 1/7½]

**T**HE book that more than any other gives the essence of Lenin's theory of the transition to Socialism. Lenin finished the book a few weeks before the October Revolution of 1917 confirmed the correctness of his analysis.

Order your copies from the  
**Communist Bookshop**  
16 King Street WC2

# Reform of the House of Lords

A. J. Bennett

**T**HE last Plenum of the Communist International characterised the economic situation of Great Britain in the following words: "The insignificant and temporary revival in industry and trade, subsequent to the termination of the lock-out, was a result of the rehabilitation of industry which had suffered during the heroic miners' struggle. This revival is now coming to an end, leaving the main branches of industry without any prospects of real revival."

While the Plenum of the Communist International was formulating this thesis about Great Britain, the "Economist" of May 28th recorded with alarm the fact that the problem of securing new orders might become hopeless. The characteristic of the economic situation in Great Britain given by the Plenum has been fully corroborated by Günther Stein, the London correspondent of the "Berliner Tageblatt" (June 8th). This correspondent records the fact that "the situation in the British mining industry during the last few months is becoming continuously worse." The author comes to the conclusion that "Great Britain is again on the threshold of a serious coal crisis."

Rumours about a new coal crisis in Great Britain become louder and more persistent. The bourgeois press, however, prefers to give as little space and as little attention as possible to the problems of the coal industry. It realises the fact that the hopes which were based on the frantic struggle against the miners have failed to be realised. The lengthening of the working day has only increased the number of accidents in the mines and augmented unemployment among the miners. The lock-out did not solve the coal crisis.

## Declining Industry

If we turn to the other branches of industry, we also see a similar picture; the revival is coming to an end and the rising curve which began in December of last year is now already on the decline.

Naturally, the ruling classes have to resort to extraordinary measures to save Britain from the process of deterioration and decline. The May Plenum of the Comintern characterised the policy of the ruling classes in the following words: "The bourgeoisie is making desperate efforts to find a way out from the situation, and for this purpose it is organising a new offensive on the working class, strengthening the intervention in China and preparing a war against the U.S.S.R." We shall hardly be mistaken in saying that the new "reform" advanced by the Tory Government in favour of the House of Lords is a link in the general chain of desperate attempts, with the help of which the Baldwin Government wants to find an outlet from a critical and extremely complicated situation.

The reform of the House of Lords is dictated by the economic failures and political defeats of the dominant Conservative Party. Since Baldwin took the reins of government into his hands, two and a half years have already elapsed. Baldwin promised the country a strong

government, peace and an economic revival. But the Tories were impotent and could not fulfil their promises. The whole history of the existing Conservative Government is marked by disturbances and crises in all spheres of economic and political life. The Diehards make the country new promises all the time. The Government is unable to live up to these promises.

The bourgeois press assured the population during the last few months that with the formation of the Nanking Government in China the situation there was undergoing a definite change. Just as at the time of the miners' lock-out the papers maintained in chorus that with the end of the miners' struggle a period of economic prosperity would set in, so also at the time of Chiang-Kai Shek's coup d'état the bourgeois press declared that Chiang was again entering into the orbit of the direct influence of British imperialism, and that new prospects are opening for British industry. But these predictions also have failed to be realised. This failure is clearly shown in the boycott of the British goods, despite the bourgeois counter-revolutionary episodes.

## Government Loses Ground

These deceptions have disillusioned the general public in Great Britain, and the results of the bye-elections express this attitude. Since Baldwin came into power 30 bye-elections have taken place in Great Britain. Over 800,000 electors participated in those elections. The Conservatives received a total of 36 per cent. of all votes, which is only a little more than one-third. It is extremely characteristic that the votes lost by the Tories are given not only to the Labour Party, but also to the Liberals, who are wise enough to make political capital for themselves out of the discontent with the Baldwin Government prevailing in bourgeois circles which do not want to give their votes to the Labour Party.

Baldwin and his consorts see clearly enough that power is slipping out of their hands, and that the fog produced by the "Zinoviev letter," which helped them to secure such a singular victory at the 1924 elections, is being dissipated. They want to take advantage now of their majority in the House of Commons in order to ensure themselves against the coming inevitable defeat. This is precisely why they have advanced the proposed reform of the House of Lords.

The new reform is an attempt to guarantee on the one hand a permanent and unchangeable Conservative majority in the House of Lords, and on the other to increase the rights of the House of Lords, and thus make the House of Commons impotent. In other words, the purpose of the reform is to make the Conservative Party independent of the universal franchise.

During those months when MacDonald was at the head of His Majesty's Government the British Communists made every endeavour to raise the question, claiming that MacDonald should at least put forward a programme for the democratisation of the country. For this purpose, the MacDonald Government would have

**House of Lords Reform**—continued

had to attempt to liquidate the archaic House of Lords, which is a faithful instrument in the hands of the ruling class. But the "Labour" Prime Minister, MacDonald, attired in his clownish garb, in full accordance with the ceremonies of the Royal Court, proudly declared that it is better to let "sleeping dogs" lie. At the same time he promised to deal ruthlessly with the sleeping dogs if ever they showed the slightest signs of life.

The sleeping dogs are now awakening. Not only do they show signs of life but they lay claims to real power. The Executive Committee of the Labour Party hastened to meet in conference with the General Council, to declare that they would fight against the proposed House of Lords reform and reject any compromise on this question. Only now has it become clear to the leaders of the Labour Party and the General Council that they must express themselves for the abolition of the Upper House.

**Plenty of Resolutions**

This heroic resolution will hardly scare the Diehards. A similar resolution, in even more pompous form, was adopted also against the Trade Union Bill. Birkenhead cynically laughed at the organisers of the campaign, reminding them that the Conservative battlements can withstand not only the trumpets of Jericho, but also the eloquence of the most brilliant speakers. Birkenhead was right. The discussion of the Trade Union Bill was already ended, and it will soon become law. The Conservatives even managed to deliver many other harsh blows at the British working class while passing this law.

The history of the reformists' "struggle" against the Trade Union Bill is highly instructive. The reform-

ists, as a matter of fact, did nothing but lull the consciousness of the broad proletarian masses. The session of June 14th deserves special attention. The Conservative, Scott, made an amendment to the Bill to the effect that a special machine be set up with the power of compulsory arbitration boards. It would seem that there is nothing encouraging for the trade unions in that amendment. The Clyneses and Thomases, however, hastened to welcome this proposal about "industrial peace." The "Manchester Guardian," the "Daily Telegraph," and the "Times," devoted to this "historical" session jubilant leaders. The "Times" said: "From first to last the debate showed a common desire for industrial peace and some means of reconciling the claims of workmen and shareholders by a just and proper distribution of the proceeds of industry. Everywhere there is general agreement that strikes and lock-outs are irrational and barbarous methods of deciding the issues that arise from time to time between employers and workers." ("Times," 16-6-27.) The Conservatives were thus able to utilise the passing of this harsh and penal trade union law against the Labour movement to play the farce of class collaboration. Under these conditions, the Conservatives can, of course, calmly proceed with the reorganisation of the House of Lords and the consolidation of their power, even if it is not in keeping with bourgeois democracy.

Lloyd George declared in connection with the new reform concocted by the Diehards that the present government infringes upon the constitutional liberties of the House of Commons more than was ever done since Charles I. This is a fitting and timely reminder. The Conservative Government is steadily enacting a policy which leads to its own destruction. This rapid race towards the precipice is causing consternation even in the ranks of the Conservative Party itself. Even Garvin has sounded the alarm about the stone wall against which the Baldwin Government will come to grief.

**BUILDING UP  
SOCIALISM**

By N. Bukharin

Obtainable from  
The Communist Bookshop, 16 King Street,  
Covent Garden, London, W.C.2

**N**IKOLAI BUKHARIN  
is now acknowledged as  
the most outstanding  
theorist of the Communist  
International. His latest  
book, just published in a  
shape uniform with our  
"Lenin Library," deals  
with the problem of how  
to build up Socialism in  
Russia in spite of all the  
difficulties & dangers  
that surround the  
Soviet State.

Price 1s.  
Post free  
1/1½d.

# Germany and the Coming War

Heinz Neumann

ON the eve of a new imperialist war, whose outbreak is approaching with extraordinary rapidity, it is essential for every Communist Party to take into account the peculiarities of the situation in its own country. In the following general investigation of the historical role which German imperialism plays in regard to the coming war of intervention against the Soviet Union, it has been impossible to avoid quoting, for the sake of clarity, a number of documents from Leninist literature and also some of the declarations of the international bourgeoisie.

## The Holy Alliance of the Imperialists

The Fascist coup d'état in Lithuania, Chamberlain's February Note, a series of agreements for alliances and military conventions, events in Peking and Shanghai, London, Warsaw, Leningrad and Minsk, and finally the June session of the League of Nations in Geneva, show with the utmost clearness the magnitude, acuteness and proximity of the war menace. Only those who have ears so as not to hear and eyes so as not to see can deny the existence of this menace.

The semi-official political writer of the British Conservative Government, "Augur," has expounded in his book, "Soviet versus Civilisation," with extraordinary outspokenness and cynical recklessness the theoretical foundations for the British attack on the Soviet Union. This book bears as a motto the historical words with which Sir Eyre Crowe justified on July 31st, 1914, Great Britain's entry into the first world war: "The theory that England cannot engage in a big war means her abdication as an independent State." From beginning to end, "Augur's" book is nothing but the application of this principle to the present world situation. The spokesman of the British Conservatives develops in this connection three main political ideas:

(1) The existence of the Soviet Union threatens the life interests of the British Empire. This conflict cannot be settled by compromise. Therefore, a war of intervention against the State of proletarian dictatorship is absolutely necessary. In two special chapters, "Augur" analyses the development of the Chinese Revolution and the British General Strike as two very dangerous movements which undermine the existence of the British Empire and which are fostered by "Moscow." The conclusion he arrives at is as follows: "The British side is free to . . . draw its conclusions from the fact that a state of war exists between the two countries." (p. 94.)

## Britain must Lead

(2) Not only Great Britain but the whole of capitalist Europe is in danger through the existence of the Soviet Union. "The attack against Great Britain is an attack against Europe as a whole. It must, therefore, be met by a united front of all the peoples who claim the European connexion." (p. 83.)

Conclusion: Great Britain must take upon itself the

leadership of a coalition of all European Powers against Bolshevism. "It is the rigidity of the present British Government which builds up the walls of a united Europe against them." (p. 89.)

(3) The inclusion of Germany is of decisive importance to the formation of the alliance for war against the U.S.S.R. Great Britain must do its utmost to enlist the German bourgeoisie for the united front of the Powers determined on intervention. For this purpose, it should engineer the revisions of the Versailles Treaty. "Otherwise Germany will be tempted inevitably from time to time by the idea of revenge." (p. 88.)

"Augur's" book, which will be considered in future as a historical document of the utmost importance, outlines a definite scheme for the formation of a "Holy Alliance" of the European imperialists against the Soviet Republic. The avowed aim of this alliance is the realisation of war, of another anti-Jacobin campaign against the proletarian revolution. To begin with a coalition of four Powers (Great Britain, Italy, Germany and France), is to be formed. All actions of the Baldwin-Chamberlain Government from the day it came into power in the autumn of 1924, down to the latest events show that "Augur's" declarations are more than the literary efforts of a private person. His diplomatic and military arguments are entirely in keeping with the practice of the Tories and with the Realpolitik of British imperialism.

## A Hope Disappointed

The causes of the British war policy are as clear as its aims. Sir Robert Horne, a member of the Coalition Cabinet, who six years ago concluded, at the instruction of Lloyd George the trade agreement of March 16th, 1921, with the Soviet Government, is at present one of the main advocates of war. What is the explanation for this volte face? Horne declared in one of his recent parliamentary speeches: "I took it for granted that no Communistic organisation could for any length of time escape the effects of entering into trade relations with individualistic nations." (Translated from a German version.) Here we have the veiled hope that the Soviet State will "degenerate," that it will "peacefully revert to capitalism," that N.E.P. will do its work of disintegration.

This was the great hope of the British imperialists from the moment of the de facto recognition of the R.S.F.S.R. throughout the Genoa and Hague conferences up to about the end of 1922. But it became evident that the Soviet Power did not go through the expected process of "evolution" towards capitalism, but contrary to the expectations of its enemies and in spite of the gloomy prophecies of some of our opposition friends, proceeded on the basis of the New Economic Policy to raise its national economic life to a higher level, begun to industrialise the country, to consolidate outwardly and inwardly the proletarian dictatorship, to move towards the construction of Socialism. This was the first reason for the change in the British policy.

**Germany and Coming War**—continued

The second reason was the rapid and powerful development of the Chinese revolution, which since May, 1925, has brought millions into motion under the slogan of struggle against imperialism, first and foremost against British imperialism; this is objectively a powerful ally of the Soviet Union.

The third reason was the fact that in Great Britain itself the working class adopted such methods of "Bolshevik propaganda" as the General Strike and the coal strike. This is what "Augur" says about the strikes: "The first general attack had failed. But British people will do well to take warning and to look out for the new waves of attack, which even now are being prepared. . . The economic decline of this country is in a considerable measure due to Communist influences." (p. 74.)

**German Competition**

Another reason for the formation of the Holy Alliance was the stabilisation of German capitalism, its new orientation in regard to foreign policy and the remarkable increase of its international importance both politically and economically. With this question we will deal more fully later on.

The international kings of finance capital, the new Bourbons of export capital, are allying themselves in order to overthrow the proletarian dictatorship by a military attack, to "open up" the gigantic economic sphere which Russia constitutes, and to destroy the organising centre of all the revolutionary movements of the world. This was the main aim of the policy of intervention. This is the war aim.

There is no doubt whatever that all the decisive sections of the British bourgeoisie have come to an understanding in regard to this programme of action. The time-honoured double game between the moderate and the ultra-Conservative wing of the Baldwin Government is commensurate with the group differences between certain sections of the industrial and trade bourgeoisie on the one hand, and ruling finance capital, with its export and colonial interests, on the other. These differences are gradually losing their importance. Formerly they constituted a serious obstacle to any war policy, but at present they are kept up because a semblance of "love of peace" has to be maintained for the sake of the masses.

**Is it Possible?**

There is also the question whether and to what extent the formation of an alliance for intervention of all the European powers under the leadership of Great Britain is possible. Do not the increasing differences between the various imperialist States and groups of States, which are certainly becoming more and more acute, preclude such a development? Is the formation of a general alliance of all or nearly all imperialist countries for a definite purpose thinkable? Lenin\* discusses in his polemics against Kautsky's theory of ultra-imperialism the possibility of an imperialist world

coalition for the oppression and exploitation of India, Indo-China and China:

"Admitting that all the imperialist Powers conclude an alliance for the 'peaceful' sharing out of these parts of Asia. This would then be an 'international unification' of finance-capital. (Such alliances have been produced in the 20th century, notably with regard to China)."

Thus Lenin recognises in principle the possibility of a bloc of "all imperialist Powers." That such a coalition can be of long duration or that it can, as it is asserted by Kautsky, become the substance of a whole historical epoch, is an utterly different matter:

"We ask, is it permissible to suppose, granted the permanence of the capitalist regime, and it is just this that Kautsky takes for granted, that such alliances would be more than temporary, that they would do away with frictions, conflicts and struggle in every possible form?"\*

Lenin dealt with the same question in his polemics with Trotsky on the "United States of Europe."†

"Temporary agreements between the Powers and the capitalists are, of course, quite possible. In the same sense the United States of Europe is also possible in the form of an agreement between European countries—what for? To crush by united efforts Socialism in Europe, and to defend the colonies annexed against Japan and America."

**"Temporary" Agreement**

The establishment of a "temporary agreement," the formation of an alliance of powers in this sense, of an imperialist alliance of the United States of Europe for war against Socialism and its expression in State form, the Soviet Union—such is the essence of the present phase of international politics, and the nature of the conferences from Locarno to Geneva, of the League of Nations sessions and of all the recent diplomatic actions of Great Britain.

Needless to say the existence of such a coalition does not by any means do away with the growing conflicts and frictions within the imperialist camp. The antagonisms between all the participant powers go on developing in new and more acute forms. The "common" war aim is fraught with enormously serious contradictions: the opening up, by the use of violence, of the Soviet Union and China in order to give free play to finance capital (in the event of the overthrow of the proletarian dictatorship and of the revolutionary liberation movement) would immediately raise the question of the distribution of the new conquered spheres of influence, thereby raising the whole problem of a new imperialist partition of the world by means of new wars. And these antagonisms will be brought to the fore not only in the event of a victorious imperialist intervention (a practically improbable contingency); they exist already and in a very acute form. They put their indelible imprint on the coming war and on every single phase of the preparations for it.

The intervention against the Soviet Union will be a class war, a direct collision of two hostile social sys-

\* Lenin, *Ibid.*

† Lenin, "The Slogan of the United States of Europe," August, 1915. ["Against the Stream," French edition, Paris, 1927.]

\* Lenin, "Imperialism: the Last Stage of Capitalism." C.P.G.B., 1927, second ed., p. 132.

**Germany and Coming War—continued**

tems of a kind hitherto unknown in modern history. This war is not being carried on between two imperialist Power groups, as that of 1914-1918, but between the bourgeoisie with their allies and the proletariat organised as a State with its allies. The Soviet Union, as the centre of all revolutionary anti-imperialist movements, carries on this war as a just, historically progressive, revolutionary fight for freedom. Bourgeois Great Britain, as the centre of capitalist exploitation and oppression, undertakes a predatory, reactionary imperialist offensive war, i.e., a war of capitalists for the domination of the world, for the conquest of more power for finance capital, for the distribution and redistribution of profits, for the subjugation of foreign peoples, for relentless oppression of the working class. All other differences are subordinate, not only "in general" but also in the concrete and practical sense of the word, to this decisive struggle between two opposite world orders. Far from being eliminated or diminished, they are coordinated and concentrated through the joint attack on the Soviet Union, which attack is nothing but a new form for the development and settlement of these differences.

In her brilliant investigation into the causes of the war of 1914, Rosa Luxemburg\* wrote as follows:

"It was clear that the European world war would break out as soon as the partial and varying antagonisms between the imperialist States found a central axis, a predominating strong antagonism around which they could group themselves for the time being."

**The Mechanism**

We think that this sentence does not only give a completely correct Marxist explanation for the outbreak of war in 1914, but that it can also be generally applied to the mechanism which causes the "outbreak" of any imperialist war, particularly of the war which is now pending. Nothing is more erroneous than the underestimation of the war danger on the plea of "antagonisms between the imperialists," which no one of course, denies. Such antagonisms existed also prior to 1914, and certainly not only between the two hostile camps, but also within these camps. Lenin said, for instance, in regard to the possibility of a separate peace between Russia and Germany in November, 1916,† that the clash of interests between the "allies" Russia and Great Britain "is certainly not smaller and probably even greater than the enmity between Germany and Russia. How was it that Great Britain succeeded in bringing Tsarism, the antagonism between which and Great Britain was certainly as great as the antagonism between Russia and Germany, into the Entente against the Triple Alliance, and even in preventing the danger of a separate peace? It succeeded (1) because the Anglo-German conflict constituted the central axis, the pivot of the imperialist war of 1914 around which all other antagonisms, including also the Russo-German, the Russo-Austrian, etc., revolved; (2) because initiative and leadership in the Entente coalition was certainly in the hands of Great Britain and not of Russia."

\* Rosa Luxemburg, "The Social-Democratic Crisis" (Junius pamphlet, in German).

† Lenin, "On a Separate Peace" ["Against the Stream," French edition, Paris, 1927].

The fact that all the varying and partial differences between the imperialists are grouped around the one predominating central problem of war against the Soviet Union is an unmistakable sign that the new war danger is not of the far future, but imminent, and that it has reached its most acute state.

Of course, there is a series of isolated conflicts between the European powers; the Franco-Italian, the Franco-German, the German-Polish—to mention only the most important present conflicts. Even British policy is antagonistic on a world scale to the interests of France in Europe and of America. The new German imperialism is preparing for the certainly far distant prospect of a gigantic contest with Great Britain and America for the redistribution of the world. The rationalised German industry is already competing with Great Britain in the economic sphere with ever increasing success. The imperialist world as a whole would not be imperialistic if it were not a chaotic sea, a continuous fluctuation of acute antagonisms and temporary alliances, of strained relations alternating with reconciliations.

But war, too, has its own dialectics consisting in the fact that an imperialist world war does not arise out of the sum total of "isolated phenomena" but out of imperialist relations—on a world scale—among the great powers and between them and the fundamental forces of the revolutionary revolt against the old social order. The result of these world relations is the fact "that in the present world situation, after the imperialist war, the relations between peoples, the world State system are determined by the struggle of a small number of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet Powers with Soviet Russia at the head."\*

**The Moment is On Us**

This fact by itself does not determine the moment of the transformation of the general irreconcilable antagonism on principle between the imperialists and the Soviet State into concrete war. And it certainly does not preclude wars among the imperialist States themselves.

A war of the imperialists against the Soviet Power cannot actually break until we are face to face with a conflict and a grouping of forces which overshadow all other world problems. This concrete moment is now upon us. Politically it is expressed in Great Britain's struggle against the U.S.S.R. and in the Holy Alliance now being formed, of the European imperialists under the leadership of British finance capital.

(To be continued.)

\* Cf. Lenin's speech on "The National and Colonial Question" at the Second World Congress of the C.I., 1920.

*The Weekly Paper for All  
Communists*

**WORKERS' LIFE**

24, High Holborn, London,  
W.C.1

# Developments in the Chinese Revolution

N. Bukharin

THE Chinese revolution is passing through the most difficult phase of its development. The armed forces of the nationalist bourgeoisie are more and more being consolidated, are carrying away with them fragments from the Hankow army and turning their sharp edge against the mass movement of the lower social levels, against the workers and peasants, against the "plebeians" who have taken hold of the axe of the great agrarian revolution and are violently entering the struggle against the "illustrious," "reputed," and "enlightened" petty autocrats of the towns and villages. With the help of fantastic, shrewd and zig-zag political groupings, personal conflicts, generalissimo combinations, civil and military diplomacy, mixture of pompous declarations and equally pompous parades of the executioners, high-flown phrases about the "three principles" and the hangman's noose, "Chinese ceremonies" and orders to shoot—with the help of this variegated mosaic of combinations we can clearly hear the clash of steel chains in the tense class conflicts, the entire brutal force of which is not as yet fully clear to many.

The alliance of Feng Yu Hsian and Chiang Kai Shek reflects the further parting of the ways of the class forces of the country. The special peculiarity of the situation lies in the fact that three social classes (analysing the events roughly) have their three organised government centres. True, hasty observers like comrade Radek have denied the existence of feudalism in China. They have drawn their conclusion on the basis of this "analysis." It is true that other Opposition friends of Radek have never said a word (and this they call "conscientious Marxist investigation!") about Radek's mistake. But facts remain facts: the camp of the "Ankuochun" ("army for the pacification of the country") with Chang Tso Lin heading towards the imperial chair, is a camp of feudal reaction, a camp entirely on the side of the imperialists, a camp which considers no "reforms" but one, namely, the foundation of a new dynasty and the coronation of the "Marshal." This camp is now definitely inclined in that direction.

## Liberals on Top

The second camp is the camp of the liberal bourgeois counter-revolution.

It is also a characteristic feature of the present moment that at the present stage of development in China, this camp represents, so far, the victorious factor and occupies an absolutely unique position in the class struggle.

The class background of the counter-revolutions carried out by the generals against the people is clear enough: it is the going over of the liberal bourgeoisie to the counter-revolution. Here it must be added that the agrarian revolution started by the Chinese peasants, which has frightened the life out of the liberal bourgeoisie and exasperated them to the highest degree, must also be understood in its specific Chinese aspect. Whereas in Russia the seizure of the land at first united almost all layers of the peasantry against the landlords and set the whole mass of the peasantry up against the sharply distinguished class of Russian landlords, in the

Chinese village the land is limited, and the number of landlords is small, but there are many small landowners or well-to-do peasants. Here the civil war in the countryside is much fiercer, because considerably broader sections are injured by the revolution and they are consequently more widely connected with the urban liberal bourgeoisie.

The class division gave rise to Chiang Kai Shek. Chiang Kai Shek "begot" Feng Yu Hsian. Feng in his turn will undoubtedly give rise to betrayals by other generals which will become a great menace to Hankow. Chiang Kai Shek plus Feng, plus other generals, plus (perhaps) left "Mukdenites"—such is the military expression of the bourgeois bloc. This bloc is so far the most powerful of the contending forces; its forces will inevitably continue to grow in the near future.

We must analyse the situation coolly. It would be pure shortsightedness to underestimate the power of our adversary, who is already acting as the executioner of the workers and peasants.

The strength of this liberal counter-revolutionary camp consists, first, in the numerical superiority of its armed military detachments; second, in its political policy as compared with the political policy of the feudal camp. We must first of all deal in greater length with this second item.

## The Liberal Programme

We have already pointed out time and again that the bourgeois camp is already shooting down workers and peasants, but has not as yet merged with feudal reaction and imperialism. It has a tendency to merge into that camp, and the greater the danger of a workers' and peasants' rising becomes, the clearer this tendency will become. But nevertheless it has not yet merged, it has a certain amount of independence; it still has much seeming independence. And this is what adds to its political strength in the country.

This is mostly clearly expressed in the programme put forward by the leaders of the bourgeois counter-revolution in so far as "ideology" is concerned—and in the encounters with the Mukden forces in so far as it is a question of the "facts" of civil war.

The tenth thesis of the declaration of Chiang Kai Shek ("the programme of action" of the Nanking Government) reads:

"There are three roads open to China:

- (1) To submit to militarism and imperialism;
- (2) To follow the path of Communism;
- (3) To enforce actually the three principles of the Kuomintang and build a strong government."

The liberals shrewdly utilise this position. They pose as the real liberators of China, in contra-distinction to the Communists, whom they treat as agents of the "Russian Government," employing thereby the lies invented by Poincaré, Chamberlain and "international" Social Democracy. One of the articles of the fourth thesis of the same declaration formulates this position very shrewdly, cunningly and at the same time—from the point of view of fooling the masses—wisely as follows:

**Chinese Revolution**—continued

“The Kuomintang” (read “the right clique of Chiang Kai Shek and Co.”) “stands for the self-determination of the peoples and for joining up with the world revolution” (no joke!—N.B.) “on the basis of equality between the nations, whilst the Communists submit to the manipulations of Russia.”

Of course, the falseness of this will become clearer to the masses every day. This lie will betray itself and is already betraying itself in the language of steel and lead—the shooting of Chinese workers and peasants by the liberal “liberators,” which is continually becoming more frequent. Its falseness will be revealed by the repressions with which the agrarian movement and the majority of the Chinese nation are being visited by these extremely queer adepts of “world revolution.” Finally, this lie will not be rescued by the fiery speeches of our Opposition, which in criminally slandering the policy of our Party, calls it a policy of “national limitation,” and the embodiment of “national conservatism,” and so adds grist to the mill of the bitterest opponents to the revolutionary activities of the U.S.S.R. (because if the Opposition is right, then Chiang Kai Shek is also right on the question of the “manipulations of Russia”). But it must be admitted that the combination of a real struggle against the North with exploitation of the tradition of the national fight for freedom constitutes a definite amount of political capital which is so far still bringing in its political interest.

We shall not deal with the other points of the Nanking “programme”; we shall not deal with the cunning reference to the unemployment in Hankow (from whence the capitalists have run away, closing down the factories); we shall not deal with the promises of a “future” eight-hour day, etc. We want to emphasise here another strong side of the liberal counter-revolution, namely the fact that it has its agents in the third camp, in the Hankow camp, whilst the contrary is not the case.

**Weakness of Hankow**

Now we come to the third camp, the Hankow camp. Wherein lies its weakness?

Its weakness lies, in the first place in the fact that it and its government centre have no adequate reliable armed forces. Its army is dwindling. With the betrayal of Feng it has lost its best section (in a military respect). The remaining section under Tang Chen Chi is unreliable. To rely on the personal animosity between Chiang Kai Shek and Tang Chen Chi would be wrong. The voice of class “consanguinity” is stronger than the voice of personal animosity, and the logic of the class struggle is stronger than the logic of individual conflicts. The small really reliable sections are absolutely insufficient.

A second weakness of Hankow consists in the fact that in its camp (both in the C.C. of the Kuomintang and in the Government) there are direct agents of Chiang Kai Shek and vacillating typical petty bourgeois politicians of a low calibre, who, at a moment of crisis, are sure to go with the liberals. Their fear of the agrarian revolution makes them tremble. If the danger becomes ten times greater it will throw them into the arms of the Chiang Kai Shek liberals. When we remember that even leading Communists have made opportunist errors,

it will be easy to understand that the weakness and vacillations in the political leadership of Hankow, in absolute contradiction to the progress of the masses, is the most vulnerable spot in the Hankow camp.

**Hankow's Failures**

If the instructions of the Comintern had been actually followed; if the agrarian revolution had not been checked; if the workers and peasants had been energetically armed; if reliable divisions of troops had been gathered; if a clear political policy understood by the masses had been followed; if the lead on making the Kuomintang more democratic had been properly carried out, and so forth, and so on, then the situation would not be as dangerous for Hankow as it is to-day. The discrepancies and certain contradictions between the leading section of the Kuomintang and the mass of its members, between the leaders and the actual movement, this is the main flaw in the Hankow camp.

The strength of this third camp as a whole consists in the powerful movement of the workers and peasants. The revolution will cast aside the vacillating phrasemongers, the agents of the enemy camp and the wavering, scared “leaders.” It will make its selection, casting aside the chaff through the mill of great suffering. The mass movement is so powerful, such a gigantic multitude has been drawn into the movement, such colossal human masses have been roused, such a powerful human “plebeian” elements have been roused, that in the final analysis nothing can hold out before them.

Such is the main array of the class forces.

**The Two Paths**

It is not difficult to see now that the present phase has raised in all its intensity the question of the two roads of development of the Chinese revolution. This question we raised theoretically from the very start. As always happens life has proved richer, more significant, more ramified, and “shrewder” than “pure theory.” But the practical value of this formulation of the question has been proved.

The camp of the bourgeois counter-revolution is for the time being fighting, paradoxically as it may seem, against the feudalists and partly against the imperialists (although it is making compromises, agreements, etc.). By doing this “work” it still holds to the traditions of the struggle for freedom. But at the same time it is making furious assaults on the workers and peasants of its own nation, becoming their worst executors, and by this (which counteracts in full measure everything else) it became the worst counter-revolutionary hangman.

This is precisely the concrete form of the class forces and their struggle, of the question of the two paths of development. A liberal and compromising solution of the question, and the unification of China on the basis of a “stable” bourgeois government under an economic protectorate of imperialism (with corresponding concessions on the part of the latter) and a compromise with the feudalists at home—that is the first path. The second path is a “plebeian” solution of the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution, a determined eradication of all feudal survivals, a determined struggle against imperialism, the dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry, the prospect of a

**Chinese Revolution**—continued

Socialist path for further development. To put it differently: it is the struggle between the working class and the liberal bourgeoisie for leadership and control in the bourgeois democratic revolution. This struggle for leadership, or, what amounts to the same, for the liberal or plebeian path of development of the Chinese revolution, is the very kernel of the present class battles.

The more dangerous the situation, the more energetic must be the support of the third camp, the more energetic must the mobilisation of the workers and peasants and petty bourgeois masses proceed. The "plebs" must be organised and raised to their feet in this great historic battle against the forces of imperialism, feudalism and the bourgeois counter-revolution which, all in line, are shooting and hanging workers and peasants, burning down villages and workers' quarters and shouting chorus against the Communist Party of the Chinese proletariat, against the agrarian revolution and against the "terror" of the working class.

**Policy of the International**

The policy of the Communist International is absolutely clear. It must mobilise the masses, let loose the agrarian revolution, give an impetus to the Labour movement, undertake a determined struggle against the traitors. One of the most important slogans must be: "Workers and peasants, rely on your own forces only! Do not trust the generals and officers! Organise your own armed detachments!"

The struggle is now extending all along the line. Absolute clarity is necessary. All compromising tendencies of the semi-agents of Chiang Kai Shek and Feng must be resisted. The leadership of the Kuomintang must be purged of its vacillating elements. The real Jacobin and "plebeian" ranks must be consolidated so that they may be able to fight to the end, regardless of dangers and losses. Feng has gone over to the enemy camp and a ruthless struggle must be declared against them.

It would be absurdly naive to think that the Communists and the workers and peasants must now compromise with Feng and Co. Such tactics could be based only on an absolutely liquidatory attitude to the agrarian revolution and the struggle for a plebeian development of China.

But there is no reason why one should think in these terms. Even in the event of Hankow being surrounded and taken, even then the struggle would proceed only in new forms. It would not be an easy matter to effect a military occupation of the whole of China, the China of workers and peasants. The desperate nature of the struggle may be seen from the fact that in Hupeh province over 3,000 peasants were killed in May and June, and in the territory of the Nationalist Government, landlord detachments have killed about 2,000 active members of the peasant leagues.

But no matter how furiously the officers and the rabble of rural noblemen may rage, even large armies could not occupy such an enormous territory in which the flame of peasant revolt will undoubtedly flare up. By shooting hundreds and thousands, or even tens of thousands of peasants, the real objective problems to be faced by the revolution will not be solved. The liberal

counter-revolutionaries are incapable even of a half-hearted solution of the agrarian problem, and this will eventually lead them to grief, no matter what may be their partial victories over the revolutionary people.

Here it is also necessary to state another fact: the more ruthless the bourgeoisie are in the struggle against the masses, the sooner will they fall into the arms of the imperialists and appeal to them for help. But the more rapidly this happens, the more rapidly will they squander away the remains of their political capital, the sooner will they meet with defeat, the clearer will it become that a consistent Nationalist liberation struggle in China is possible only if carried on against the bourgeoisie.

**Policy of the Soviet Government**

Another question may arise, namely the question of the policy of the Soviet Government. The question may be raised: should the Soviet Government refuse to have any relations with the Nanking Government?

The answer to this question must be in the negative. Only very inexperienced politicians and very "naive" people think that the essence of a proletarian State consists in having no connection whatever with its capitalist environment. On the contrary certain connections are desirable. No rational human being would propose to abolish Soviet diplomacy and foreign trade in the name of the so-called principle of "purity." When the Soviet Government has its representatives in the bourgeois countries of the West and the East, when it enters into relations with the feudal government of Marshal Chang Tso Lin, when it has its representatives in the Fascist paradise of Signor Mussolini, there are no reasons whatever why it should not establish relations with the Nanking Government. These usual forms of contact must be preserved. Furthermore, if Soviet diplomacy is obliged to take into account in a definite manner the relative differences in the interests of the imperialist Powers, it is obliged—in a still greater degree—to take into account the antagonisms between the liberal protagonists of a united China and their imperialist partners who rob China somehow or other, regardless of the "form of administration."

**Even Chamberlain can See It**

The practical difference between the Comintern and the Soviet Government is in this respect absolutely clear, and it seems to us that we have explained it in such a simple way that even Chamberlain might be expected to understand it. The proletarian government establishes diplomatic and commercial relations, not because it "approves" of the policies of the capitalist or feudal exploiters. The Communist International, however, has no commercial or diplomatic relations with "other Powers." It is directly engaged in organising the revolution.

To return to the policy of the Comintern. Our oppositionists were always "indignant" and "protested," maintaining that it was false, when the slogan of withdrawing from the Kuomintang was "ascribed" to them; now they openly demand this withdrawal.

The question arises: Why? Is it because the leaders of the Kuomintang are vacillating? But are the masses of the Kuomintang mere "cattle"? Since when

**Chinese Revolution**—continued

does our attitude to a mass organisation depend on what happens at the "very top"?

All forces of the liberal counter-revolution are now directed towards throwing out the Communists from the Kuomintang, to isolate and surround them. All reactionary forces sing the same tune. It is a well-known fact that the influence of the Communist Party in the Kuomintang is rising continuously. It is a well-known fact that the lower units of the Kuomintang organisation, particularly those of the workers and peasants are under Communist leadership. It is a well-known fact that the Chiang Kai Shek clique is attacking Hankow because it regards the left Kuomintang as a Communist "agency." It is a well-known fact, also, that Chiang Kai Shek proposes to arrest and execute Borodin.

And in the face of this we are told that from a "revolutionary" point of view we ourselves must play into the hands of these gentlemen!

We cannot let ourselves in for such tactics. We must intensify our work in the Kuomintang still further, purging it from the bourgeois hangers-on and traitors of every description. But that we should leave voluntarily, precisely at the moment when all our opponents demand it, would indeed be wonderful tactics.

At the Suchow conference between Chiang Kai Shek and Feng something like the following platform was adopted: (1) Hankow admits its "mistakes"; (2) the Communists are excluded from the Kuomintang; (3) Borodin is discharged; (4) the "high contracting parties" organise a joint and united attack on Peking.

Chiang Kai Shek's "informers" are ready to accept this plan (not Wong Chin Wei, who is firmer than the

others), and our "oppositionists" want to carry this "platform" into effect!

Instead of such naivety we must strengthen our positions in the Kuomintang.

**Fight even if Weak**

And what if this does not succeed? What if the enemy is at the present time too strong? This is possible. It is also possible that Hankow will be destroyed. It is possible that the government centre will be torn asunder through its own inner contradictions; it may be impossible to organise a real Jacobin "left" government, i.e., a kind of Hankow "revolutionary committee." But we must fight all the same along these lines. We must fight all the more strongly to maintain and strengthen our positions in the Kuomintang as long as the basic mass of its membership is under Communist influence.

The Kuomintang is doomed if it does not follow the path of the developing agrarian revolution. The Communist Party has no interest in that happening; it is interested in strengthening its influence within the Kuomintang and transforming it into a powerful workers' and peasants' party, an organ of the democratic plebeian revolution. This possibility exists, and it would be absolute childishness not to utilise it.

Let the despondent sceptics caw about the victories of the traitors. The Marxist-Leninists know that the elemental forces of the revolutionary masses of China must hack a way to victory, no matter what barriers the bourgeois counter-revolution may put in its way, no matter how many executions are performed by the feudal reactionaries, no matter what guns the foreign forces use to destroy Chinese towns.

# The Future of Indian Politics

M. N. ROY

PRICE 1s. 6d.

Post free for 1s. 8d.

Obtainable from the  
Communist Bookshop

16 King Street  
London WC2

*An application of Marxist methods to the analysis of India to day. The first section is devoted to the "New Economic Policy of Imperialism"—the policy of alliance between the British exploiters and the Indian industrial capitalists. The second section is "The Politics of Compromise." The third might be said to deal with the question that is stirring now in the minds of all real Nationalists in India—CAN INDIA FOLLOW CHINA?*

# Kemalism on the Road to Capitalist Development

**T**HE armies fighting for the independence of Turkey were able to win a brilliant victory over the mercenaries of the Entente imperialists by the self-sacrifice and heroism of the "mehmedtchiks" (peasants of Asia Minor mobilised for the army). Before the end of 1922 Anatolia was entirely cleared of the invading forces which were driven into the sea or captured. The armed people encamped at the gates of Constantinople and the Dardanelles, occupied by British troops, and waited patiently for an opportunity to finish the work of national liberation.

In Lausanne, the Kemalists showed themselves unable to exploit as they should have done this exceptionally favourable situation, in order to free Turkey once and for all from all imperialist interference. They were very exacting and ambitious in regard to political independence, but they were not insistent enough where economic problems were at stake. Here the roles were reversed. The allied delegates would not cede an inch of the rights previously attained. Convinced that all political privileges are the result of economic pressure, they would not consent to any definite solution implying even the least bit of sacrifice on their part.

The debt question was simply dissociated from the Treaty and adjourned; it has not been settled yet. In regard to the Customs question they imposed on the Kemalists a provisional solution valid until 1928, which subjects them, with a few changes, to the old tariffs. This means that next year—five years after political independence—the Turkish Republic will have an entirely independent Customs regime. As to the concessions and big capitalist enterprises in the hands of imperialist capitalists, the Kemalists simply recognised their legitimacy with the sole proviso that they should submit to the laws of the country. They hoped that owing to the suppression of capitulations—unequal treaties similar to those in China—they would be able to dislodge imperialist capitalists from the strategic positions of a nation's economic life simply by equality of treatment as between natives and foreigners.

## Bourgeois Illusions

This was, of course, an attitude natural to a nationalist bourgeoisie which looks upon itself as having the exclusive right to exploit the natural wealth and labour forces of the country, but which sees at the same time the danger of severing all connection between itself and international capital, foreseeing that it will eventually have to approach the latter for support. The leaders of the young Anatolian bourgeoisie were dazzled by the fact that, contrary to expectations, they had succeeded in making the imperialist powers recognise the complete political independence of the country. It seemed to them that all else would follow of itself. And instead of jeopardising once more what had been already acquired, they preferred to consent to compromising solutions or to the postponement of contentious points on which opinions were diametrically opposed.

After signing the Lausanne treaty, the Kemal Government was face to face with the same difficulties

as the "Unionist" Government after the revolution in 1908, but with the important difference that world capitalism had already entered upon its period of decline and that in a considerable part of the terrestrial globe the proletariat had snatched power from the hands of the bourgeoisie. The task which still remained to be accomplished was formidable. Abdul Hamid had been able to keep in power for 33 years only by satisfying the contending appetites of the rival imperialists by the concessions which he bestowed on them in turns. Thus it happened that all the live sources of national production had become the property of foreign capitalists. A rapid invasion of all the spheres of economic activity by these privileged capitalists had literally stifled the middle classes, and hampered their development by a competition with which they could not cope. To try to limit this systematic pillage of the national wealth, the most conscious sections of these classes, under the leadership of the Committee of Union and Progress, (the "Young Turks"), effected a constitutional revolution and abolished the absolutism of Abdul Hamid.

## Influence of Imperialism

But although in power the "Unionist" bourgeoisie was encircled by imperialism and had no support from outside; it could not tear the country out of the hands of the international financiers who had established themselves as if they were in their own country. This inexperienced bourgeoisie (which was by the way very small), was bound to seek the friendship of one of the rival imperialist groups. It soon degenerated and became declassed, playing the role of broker and partner for foreign capital. Nothing short of the exceptional conditions of a state of war could make its government take the initiative in the suppression of capitulations and give it a chance to develop independently, by letting it enjoy temporarily the power which control over the State apparatus can give.

After Lausanne, the well-to-do sections of the middle classes of Anatolia, represented by the Kemal party, came into power under more favourable auspices.

Apart from the fact that a breach had already been made in the imperialist encirclement, the path to be traversed had been cleared by the experience of the "Unionists." But a still more important factor was that five years of unprecedented exploitation of the domestic market, because of isolation from the outside world through the war, had enabled certain sections of the middle classes (peasants, artisans, small industrialists) to make direct contact with national production and to make in the midst of general penury considerable economic progress. Thus the social basis of the new regime was much more robust.

The Kemalists had forces on whom they could depend for the solution of tasks which had discouraged their predecessors. The weakness and corruption of the monarchist epoch had had the disastrous result that all railway lines and ports, all big enterprises engaged in public works, nearly all the mines, the most important industrial enterprises, all foreign trade as well as the

**Kemalism and Capitalism**—continued

principal banks were in the hands of the imperialist capitalists. It was essential to carry on a methodical and patient struggle against this intrusion—if not to remove or paralyse it—at least to place it under thorough control to prevent it impeding the independent development of the nation's economic life. In this respect one can already ascribe tangible results to the account of the People's Party.

We will now review in the industrial, commercial and financial spheres the numerous manifestations of this underground economic struggle, which still gives to Turkish nationalism its anti-imperialist imprint.

**Transport and Industry**

The Kemalists were quick in realising the importance of railways for the proper modern exploitation of the country. They also soon grasped that without dominating the railway lines one cannot aspire to predominant influence on national economy. Therefore they paid from the very start special attention to the question of transport. One can truly say that up till now the pivot of the policy of Ismet Pasha's Cabinets has been his railway and public works policy. We give below a table illustrating the distribution of the railways of Turkey between the various groups of imperialist capitalists.

Franco-Belgian capital (region of Smyrna, Adana and Thrace) .....	1,700	kilometres
British capital (Aden region) .....	515	
German capital (old Bagdad line: Angor and Konia region) .....	1,650	
Other capital .....	200	
	<hr/>	
	Total	4,065

During the war the government had taken for military reasons the exploitation of the Anatolian railway line (German capital) into its own hands. One of the chief concerns of the second National Assembly of Angora was to decide the future fate of this railway line. The Assembly was divided into two camps: on the assumption that the State is a bad steward, one side advocated immediate resumption of exploitation by a concessionist company. The other side, on the contrary, basing itself on the encouraging results of State management and on the vital importance of having direct command over this main artery of Anatolian trade, advocated definite nationalisation with compensation. The company did everything to avoid the latter solution. After heated discussions, the advocates of nationalisation won the day. This vote constitutes the point of departure of the railway policy of the Kemalists. Although the government continues to exploit and improve the railway line, it has not yet been able to come to an understanding with the company in regard to the amount of compensation. It is said that the company is to receive 60 to 80 million dollars, the value of all the Turkish railways being estimated at 250 million dollars.

**Railways Needed**

But it was essential to provide also the other parts of the country with modern means of communication. The network of railways inherited from the old regime only served the Western Southern provinces of Asia Minor. The Northern and Eastern provinces had been utterly neglected. The Nationalist bourgeoisie expected

to derive very great profits from these semi-feudal regions. The ambitious projects of the Chester concession were, of course, aimed at connecting Eastern Anatolia and the Black Sea coast with the centre and the south of the country and introducing modern technique there. After the lamentable failure of this visionary enterprise, no other group of foreign capitalists had offered to execute works of this kind on conditions acceptable to the Nationalist Government.

The unfavourable solution of the question of the Anatolian railway line on the one hand and the various restrictive legislative measures (compulsory use of the Turkish language, dismissal of all the non-Turkish personnel, compulsory registration by the competent authorities, exaction of bail, adhesion to Turkish Chambers of Commerce, etc.), in regard to existing foreign enterprises on the other hand, had prejudiced international financiers against the young Republic. The uncertainty of the situation in connection with the deadlock in the Mosul question and the libellous campaigns against the Turkish Nationalists carried on by the imperialist ranks were a contributing factor to the cautious and far from benevolent attitude of international finance. Not only was no new capital imported, but certain institutions of old standing, particularly those dependent on Great Britain, liquidated their businesses.

**Government Building**

Determined nevertheless to work for the realisation of its economic programme, the People's Party decided in 1924 to construct out of its own funds—that is to say by recourse to the State budget—railway lines which it considered essential for the exploitation of the natural wealth of the country. A carefully elaborated plan was launched without delay. Government organs put in hand the construction of the proposed railway lines simultaneously at several points. We give below a table of railway lines in the course of construction or shortly going to be constructed:

Railway line	(in kilom.)	
	Total length	Already working
Samsun-Sivas .....	380	132
Angora-Sivas .....	500	318
Kutahya-Tavouchahli	220	98
Angora-Heraclei .....	420	—
Guller-Ergani-Diarbekir	500	—
Ulukichla-Cesare ...	190	—
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	2,210	548

If we count the short branch lines in the course of construction, over 600 klms. of railway lines, including many bridges and tunnels, have been constructed by Turkish workmen and engineers with the money of the ratepayers and taxpayers of the country. But this work was making but slow progress. Responsible administrators were guilty of considerable abuses at the expense of workers' wages and supplies of material. Moreover, these enterprises caused great fiscal difficulties. The Government was intent on accelerating the pace of construction without paying the cost immediately.

Thus, last winter, it accepted with alacrity the offers of two groups of foreign capitalists (Belgian and Swedish) to build the railway lines in question on credit. This is not a concession in the true sense of the word. The railway lines will belong to the State. But the conditions imposed by the capitalist groups are exacting. The real value of the work to be done—over

**Kemalism and Capitalism**—continued

one million kilometres of railway lines and the equipment of the ports of Samsun and Heraclei—is not to exceed 70,000,000 dollars, whereas the treasury of the Republic will have to pay over 100,000,000 dollars in the course of ten years.

The Kemalists are delighted to have to do with non-political capitalists. But the rumour is that city financiers are behind the Swedish group. One may say that these two arrangements are the first step of the Kemalists on the road of compromise with imperialism.

**Futile Plans**

In the industrial sphere the government has restricted itself to encouraging and supporting private enterprise. As the capital at the disposal of the Anatolian bourgeoisie is very small indeed, words very seldom lead to deeds. We have to do here with a mass of plans which have no future.

At first attention was only paid to the agricultural industry. The latter mostly situated in the regions invaded by the Greek army had been seriously damaged by the Greek retreat. The government, by ceding these half-ruined enterprises at a ridiculously low price to the protégés of the People's Party and by giving them loans and subsidies, made it possible for them to reach and even to exceed in the course of three years the pre-war level of production, in respect of distilleries, olive oil and soap factories, mechanised flour mills, the canning industry, etc. Special mention must be made of the leather industry. In regard to these industries not only has there been restoration and amelioration of what already existed, new works with improved technique have also been constructed. These factories produce already enough to satisfy a considerable part of the requirements of the internal market.

Apart from this agricultural industry one can also mention a few electrical works, factories producing building material, a big aeroplane factory (Turco-German), two sugar refineries, etc. The capital invested during the last few years in these industrial enterprises is about 12 million dollars. One may say that one-third of these funds come from the State, one-half from private capital (native and foreign) the remainder, that is to say, about two million dollars, from national savings—for it has become the rule lately to give to big industrial as well as commercial enterprises the form of limited liability companies. The mass of small investors who were suspicious of these are beginning to get used to investing their small savings in bonds.

Certain enterprises owe their existence to the participation of these social strata.

Apart from the protective measures contained in the Encouragement to Industry Act, the government gives industry financial support in various forms amounting to about 400,000 dollars annually. Enterprises financed by foreign capital, provided they parade under the label of a Turkish company, benefit by all the exemptions laid down by this Act.

As to heavy industry, with the exception of the State munition and gun factories and a few big railway repairing workshops, it is non-existent in Turkey. There is certainly a small metal industry which gives employment to 15,000 workers. But there are very

few enterprises employing more than 100 workers. In most cases, the workshops employ 10 to 50 workers or even less.

Of late there has been much discussion as to whether Turkey can be converted into an industrial country. The absence of iron mines made people generally inclined to consider impossible the establishment of heavy industry, which is the primary condition of industrialisation. The discovery of abundant iron deposits in the Kemlik and Torba regions has made the young bourgeoisie very hopeful. Immediately an ambitious plan was made for the extraction of iron ore and for industrialisation. The government was to take from the budget eight million dollars for the exploitation of the iron mines, to lay the foundation of the heavy industry. As yet nothing has been done in this direction.

With a few exceptions the other Turkish mines are exploited by foreign capital. In this sphere, too, lack of but insignificant beginnings. In this sphere, too, lack of capital is inducing the Kemalists, who are determined to work in the direction of capitalist development, to arrive at a compromise with imperialism.

**Commercial Development**

The efforts of the Kemalists to develop the country and to increase national production have also given a great impetus to commercial transactions and particularly to foreign trade. This relative development is due to the improvement of the social conditions of the well-to-do sections of the national peasantry and bourgeoisie, whose representatives, the People's Party, encourage them in every possible way to enrich themselves through the social changes imposed by the new legislation, through the gradual introduction of modern commodities into the villages of Anatolia, where prior to the revolution the population led a very primitive existence, and finally, through the ever-growing participation of the Turkish population in all the spheres of economic activity.

Contrary to the general assumption, most of the foreign trade is still in the hands of foreign firms, Greek and Armenian exporters who continue to carry on their business through the intermediary of Turks whom they use as figureheads. But one should bear in mind that in the course of the last three years the essentially agricultural and industrial young bourgeoisie has succeeded in gaining ground in the commercial sphere. It is precisely the commercial and financial section of the Kemalists which inclines more and more towards a prompt compromise with foreign capital. The daily paper "Djumhouriet République" is the mouthpiece of this section of the Nationalist bourgeoisie.

The official figures for foreign trade lead to the following conclusions:

In 1923 a simultaneous decrease of imports and exports was noticeable as compared with 1922. This was due to the devastation in the Smyrna and Afion region by the Greeks and by the Allied armies of occupation on their departure. In 1922 Turkish trade was still entirely dominated by imperialist capital.

Since 1923 the trade balance has been steadily developing. Imports and exports have increased simultaneously, the later at a more rapid rate than the former.

**Kemalism and Capitalism**—continued

It is worthy of note that the trade balance of Turkey always shows a deficit. This is not due to any of the economic and social changes which have taken place in the country. Under the old regime there was also an unfavourable balance every year. A study of the official Custom House bulletin from 1887 to 1911 will show that there is an average yearly deficit of five million pounds gold.

	Imports (Total Turkish gold pounds)	Exports
From 1887 to 1911	642,500,000	406,100,000

This means a deficit of 238,000,000 Turkish gold pounds in 25 years. This continuous flow attracted the attention of economists, who failed to find any justification for it in the economic conditions of the country and in the general trend of business, all the more so as the figures given by the statistical departments of the country interested in the foreign trade of Turkey did not correspond with those given in the official bulletins of the Turkish Customs. According to a statement by the Angora Commissariat for Trade, published in a Constantinople newspaper, the explanation of this anomaly was that goods exported across the Southern frontiers of Asia Minor in most cases escaped registration, and on the other hand exporters had the habit of declaring figures generally 20 per cent. or thereabouts lower than the actual figures.

It is interesting to note that for the last few years this unfavourable balance has tended to decrease gradually. It fell from 60.1 million pounds in 1923 to 34.9 million in 1924, only to increase again to 43.1 million in 1925. It is estimated that it will not exceed 30 million for 1926.

The distinctive feature of the present commercial development of Turkey—whether in reference to limited companies or in respect to private enterprises—big enterprises predominate and small enterprises disintegrate, just as in rural economy. Unfortunately, there are as yet no statistics giving figures of this process of absorption of small trade by the big sharks. According to superficial information gathered in the regions of Constantinople and Smyrna, £30,000,000 of trading capital belonging to small traders has been withdrawn from the market. Allowing on an average 500 Turkish pounds per shopkeeper, one arrives at a total of 60,000 traders ruined and retired from business.

**Trade Monopolies**

Under the old regime of capitulations, Turkey could not establish a monopoly and raise Customs dues. There were only a few monopolies (salt, fisheries, tobacco), administered by the Public Debt. In regard to Customs, the Kemalists were bound by the Treaty of Lausanne, to abide by the existing tariffs, reserving to themselves the right to multiply them with certain coefficients fixed in the treaty, to compensate for the depreciation of money, but in regard to the question of monopolies the Turkish government was given complete freedom of action.

Since 1925 the government has made full use of this freedom; first of all by abolishing a clause of the contract which granted exploitation of the tobacco monopoly to a group of Franco-Belgian financiers (*Régie générale*

*des travaux publics et des chemins de fer*). The government reimbursed the capital invested by this group. The experiment of directing the tobacco industry and trade through an apparatus under the direct control of the Finance Ministry has produced excellent results. The receipts, which under the co-interested *régie* had never exceeded five million Turkish pounds per year, reached 10 million Turkish pounds in 1925.

Moreover the government introduced a whole series of new trade monopolies of various kinds. Some provide for the exaction of a supplementary Customs tax in the guise of monopoly of foreign trade; this is the case in regard to oil and sugar. Purchase and sale of these commodities within the country are perfectly free, only that all importers are obliged to inform the administration of the corresponding monopoly when placing their orders and must procure a license varying between five and eight piastres (1½d. to 2d.) per kilogram. The administration on its part can—if it so wishes—import a stock of merchandise on its own account and can dispose of it to the retail traders at cost price plus the monopoly tax. Thus it is supposed to play the role of regulator.

**Monopolies Farmed Out**

There are others which are monopolies pure and simple, comprising imports, manufactures and sales. Such are the monopolies of spirits, firearms, explosives, matches, cigarette paper, etc. As the government has not enough capital to invest in these enterprises, it has preferred to give up its right to exploit them to groups of foreign capitalists. Thus a group of Polish capitalists have taken over the monopoly of spirits, a group of French capitalists the monopoly of explosives, and a group of Turko-Israelite capitalists, the match monopoly. The most characteristic conditions imposed on these exploitation companies are: payment in advance of a considerable sum representing the revenue anticipated for a certain number of years; establishment in the country of a minimum of industrial enterprises whose business it is to satisfy the requirements of the internal market; participation in the administration of the companies of Turks enjoying the confidence of the Kemalist Party. Thus for instance, the chairman of the Board of Directors of the spirit monopoly is the former Minister of Finance, Hassan Bey.

As to the mass of the population the consequence of these monopolies is: higher prices for the commodities in question, accompanied by very reduced consumption. We have already shown in this article by statistics that this reduction has assumed proportions in regard to oil and sugar which have alarmed administration of the Indirect Taxes Department. During the first seven months of 1926, compared with the first seven months of 1925, sugar consumption decreased 26 per cent. and the consumption of oil 34 per cent.

One should also bear in mind that these monopolies are very hard on small traders who cannot sell their merchandise at a profit, and being burdened with fiscal charges beyond their means are compelled to close their shops.

The attitude of the Kemalists to the workers is dictated by the constructive principles of their economic policy as a whole. Our analysis has fully proved that the Nationalist bourgeoisie and the People's Party, working hand in hand, are developing the utmost energy,

**Kemalism and Capitalism**—continued

are taking advantage of all opportunities, are making full use of the resources and the power of the State and are mobilising the whole nation for the sole purpose of concentrating in their own hands all the available capital of the country and of accumulating new capital as rapidly as possible.

**Increased Exploitation**

They enforce this concentration by the use of the most brutal methods of pressure and threats and by bringing into play the economic laws of unhealthy competition by means of administrative and fiscal measures. The rapid disintegration of small exploitation in town and country which results from this is steadily swelling the ranks of the proletariat. Although the demand for labour power increases with the progressive development of production, the more rapid bankruptcy of the petty bourgeoisie and the poor peasantry precludes the absorption of all the labour power on the market. Thus we have now in Turkey a reserve army of unemployed which will help the bourgeoisie in its development by providing it with cheap labour.

This is a very vital question for the young Turkish bourgeoisie. It cannot accumulate capital except by relentless exploitation of labour power and of the mass of consumers. It needs a disorganised proletariat unable to offer any resistance to its enslavement in the interests of the capitalists. Moreover, the Nationalist bourgeoisie has to exact from the workers excess surplus value, as it has to cede a considerable part of it to foreign capitalists on whose support it depends.

**Attacks on Workers**

These being the aspirations of the Kemalists, they have been relentless in their oppression of the working class since they have come into power. This oppression has taken various forms according to circumstances, but its object always remained the same. When they endeavour to place their own creatures at the head of trade unions, when they suppress labour papers, condemn Communists, foment rivalry among workers of different nationalities or support in exceptional cases certain of their demands—their sole object is to disorganise them, to deprive them of conscientious leaders, to damp their fighting spirit, in a word to sow among them disorder and pessimism in order to kill in them the spirit of solidarity and class consciousness.

The C.P. of Turkey is doing its best to counteract this demoralising policy. Turkish workers have already a long time ago realised that their salvation lies in an indefatigable struggle against the exploiting classes and that they have no other friends and defenders but the Communists. Revolutionary propaganda has a great influence over them and all the vexatious and repressive measures of the Kemalists add only to their hatred for the bourgeoisie, be it Kemalists or Unionists.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES.**

The subscription rate for the new edition of the "Communist International" is 8s. 6d. per year, post free.

**The Source of the Zinoviev Letter**

**ANTI-SOVIET FORGERIES.** A record of some of the forged documents used at various times against the Soviet Government. Workers' Publications, Ltd. London, April, 1927.

**R**ECENT events show new animation on the part of the accomplices of Chamberlain and Joynson Hicks, the Russian White Guards. From slander and forgeries against the first Workers' and Peasants' State of the world, they have turned to murder and incendiarism. It is particularly important at this time that the workers of all lands should be made aware of the history of the counter-revolutionary struggle against the Soviet State, paid for and organised by England.

False documents, the Zinoviev letter, cipher telegrams, etc., are not the least important methods of struggle used by the counter-revolution. On the contrary. By such means they prepare "public opinion" to think of the representatives of the Soviet Union as incendiaries and murderers, to murder whom can be nothing else than an easily justifiable act of revenge of a "patriot."

**New Forgeries to Come**

The day of forgeries is certainly not yet ended. The typewriters of "Arcos" and the wastepaper baskets of the Soviet Russian Embassy at Peking will surely yet be used as the "sources" of world-shaking documents.

It is, therefore, extremely welcome that a collection of the most convincing proofs of the forgeries of the counter-revolution has been published in England. The collection of these documents of abjectness and stupidity has a foreword by George Lansbury, which declares: "It is the duty of the British Labour movement to check the torrent of lies in this country, and when next Labour takes office, to see to it that all secret service forging and propagandist campaigns are put an end to, and the people of Russia accepted as comrades and friends into an all-inclusive International..."

Between these lines of Lansbury's we can read his eternal Utopianism, a stranger to reality, but also his honest indignation against the methods of Joynson Hicks and his political friends. His appeal "that the British Labour movement should possess a long memory" must not pass by unheard, not only in England, but in all countries. Just as in its time the Zinoviev letter, "thanks to the crass stupidity of certain leaders of the Labour movement," fulfilled its task of causing confusion, so in the future just as stupid a document will be believed, unless the masses, particularly in England, are made acquainted with the history of the forgeries.

**An Amusing Incident**

The book in question gives an historical account of the most important forgeries (of these not less than twenty are enumerated), which were manufactured from various sources for various customers. The keynote and the purpose is the same in all: "to prove" the identity of the Soviet Government with the Comintern.

**Zinoviev Letter**—continued

Authentic documents prove to us the existence of the forgery factories of Druzhelovsky and Jakubovitch. The amusing incident is recalled to mind, when one of these forgers had the impudence to send the account for the Comintern letter headings ordered by him, to the Soviet representative at Vienna. There are also to be found photographic copies of the forged letter paper of the Comintern, the die-stamps bearing an incorrect wording, the frightful instructions bearing the signature of the traditional "Comrade Dorot," assignments of money to "Diki" and similar bright things.

Most instructive, too, is the reproduction of the debates on the Zinoviev letter, which took place in December, 1924, in the House of Commons, when it had to be admitted that this document could not be produced because—it did not exist.

Besides these as it were classic forgeries of the counter-revolution, there are two parts of the book which deserve special attention: first the association between Joynson Hicks and his scholars in the English police at Shanghai and international petroleum capital. That was the incident of the representative of the Soviet Petroleum Syndicate in China, Dosser. As is well known, to be free of this dangerous competition, he was accused of agitation against England. Without mentioning the entirely new method of procedure (a few hours after his arrival from Hong Kong, where he was on his through journey to Canton, he was brought on an English ship to Shanghai, where he was brought before the extra-territorial court on the charge of a crime which he was supposed to have committed in Hong Kong, that is, on English territory), the "corpus delicti" against Dosser was a mandate of the "Agitation Bureau of the Russian C.P." in Shanghai, which was insinuated into a book belonging to Dosser by an ingenuous White Guard some days after Dosser's arrest. This document, a mandate on the organising of strike committees in Hong Kong and Canton, was obviously completed in such a hurry, that its author could not even sign it. In spite of its odour of petroleum, and its primitiveness, it brought the author the considerable sum of 4,000 dollars, not to mention the increase in salary which obviously accompanies the performance of such a work of art.

**Some "High Comrades"**

If this Dosser mandate is a unique example, in its impudence, of the forgeries of the counter-revolution, it is surpassed by the correspondence in the year 1923, which was given to Rakovsky, at that time Soviet representative in London, by one who participated in the swindle.

These documents, letters of the "Socialist Labour

Party (?) of Great Britain," to various persons, have the historic merit of affording a few bright moments to a number of English workers in these hard times.

The letters, which are addressed to the Comintern, excel by their extraordinary political childishness. That we are concerned with money questions did not need to be made clear for the first time. One of these letters—October, 1923—contains not only matters about the despatch of £3,000, but also says that a copy of the letter had been sent to the Executive of the S.L.I. in Hamburg. What this S.L.I. is, we are not fortunate enough to be told, since the existing Socialist Labour International, as is well known, never had its headquarters at Hamburg, and the worthy Friedrich Adler, as far as our knowledge goes, has never conspired with the Comintern. The letter is addressed to A. P. Rosenholz, in Moscow, who in this letter receives the title of "High Comrade." If this "High Comrade" were sufficient to show the ridiculousness of this forgery, we could be contented with it. But the glory of the forgers' society will be perpetuated by a "private and confidential" letter to—Arthur Henderson (quite undeservedly the authors of the letter deny him the title of "High Comrade"). This letter, of which the contents have been sufficiently broadcast in the press, throws a great light on the "far-flung net" of the influence of the Comintern, which extends not only to the "Socialistic Labour International in Hamburg" (!!) but also to the I.W.W. in America, Bishop Brown, and a comrade of the name of Stinnes, who, we are not mistaken in believing, must be the well-known Hugo Stinnes.

**An Antidote for Poison**

So much for the documents contained in this collection, which well repays reading. Reading through the book carefully, it is difficult to believe that these impudent forgeries could have had such political importance. The day of forgeries is not yet over. Even if the counter-revolution tries through individual acts of violence to further their work by new methods, they will not renounce their beloved forgeries, particularly since it serves to supply an inexhaustible source of money for their criminal activity.

Perhaps this book has a certain danger, as the preface says, in that it can give a certain amount of advice for the production of such forgeries. But perhaps—and that is the task of this book—it will serve to make the newspaper readers, and particularly the working class, immune from the poison of the document forgers, and in this manner to give the death blow to the lying propaganda of the diehards.

A translation of this collection of documents—at least the most important parts of it—into other languages would be very welcome, so that it can be made accessible to the workers of all countries.

F. G.

