

V. b. b.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 5. No. 85

3rd December 1925

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

## C O N T E N T S

D. M.: The Historical Change in the C. P. of Germany.

### Politics.

Arthur Rosenberg: The Final Struggle over Locarno in the German Reichstag.

Karl Radek: The Guarantee Pact. V. The Change in the German Policy.

Locarno — the New Slogan of Imperialism.

Paul Marion: The Crisis in France.

J. B.: The Two Wars in Arabia.

### The Communist Persecution in England

The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. to the C. P. of Great Britain.

Solidarity of the R. I. L. U. with the Condemned English Communists.

Comrade Lozovsky on the Sentence in the English Communist Trial.

### Hands off China.

Against the Unequal Treaties and the Customs Slavery of China.

### Inter-parliamentary Conference at Brussels

Resolution on the Policy of Protective Tariffs and Trade Agreements.

### Union of Soviet Republics.

A. Bubnov: The Fiftieth Birthday of Comrade Kalinin.

## The Historical Change in the C. P. of Germany.

By D. M. (Moscow).

The National Conference of the CP. of Germany, which was recently held in Berlin, is one of those events in the life of the Communist International which, like the French Party Conference at Tours and the Party Conference of the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany at Halle, are turning points in the development of the communist movement. This conference met after a three months' discussion within the Party. This discussion was waged round the questions which were raised by the well-known letter of the ECCI.

Since the defeat of the German revolution in October 1923, and since the discussion which raged at that time round the opportunist mistakes of the Brandler group, the present discussion was the first serious political discussion which thoroughly roused the Party and filled it for months with intensive political life. The significance of this discussion with regard to the Bolshevisation of the main cadres of the CP. of Germany can only be compared with the significance of the discussions which have been going on for the last three or four years in the CP. of Russia. The history of the CP. of Germany will remember this conference as an event of the greatest political importance which closes the chapter of the most serious defeats of the German proletariat and opens a

new period of growing activity. It is no mere coincidence that, in connection with the conference, the "Berliner Börsenzeitung" speaks of a new communist offensive, of a new communist danger.

The whole conference was carried on under the sign of the liquidation of the remnants of the ideology of the CWP. of Germany which gave expression to the defeatist mood of the least active sections of the German proletariat. For this reason the significance of this conference is far greater than that of a whole number of ordinary Party Conferences which take place under the sign of the "normalisation" of the life of the Party. The task of the conference was to draw the balance and to deduce the lessons of one of the most serious crises through which the CP. of Germany has ever passed. This crisis was all the deeper because it broke out immediately after an ordinary Party Conference at which the mature demands resulting from the development of the Party had not found expression.

The crisis in the CP. of Germany had, in its embryo form, the character of a conflict between the Maslow and Ruth Fischer group of leaders and the Executive of the Communist International. At first this fact led astray many

thoroughly honest comrades. It seemed to them that this crisis was a peculiar crisis of the "foreign policy" of the Party, that it chiefly referred to the sum of the questions connected with the regulation of the relations between the Party and the Comintern, it seemed to them that it was essentially a question of the problem of the discipline due from the CP. of Germany to the Comintern. The mere formal way of putting the question which entirely ignores the whole political content of the discussion and transfers the whole centre of gravity to mechanical, soulless discipline, shows how much that is unhealthy was bequeathed to the Party by the Ruth Fischer and Scholem school, it shows that it is possible to adopt their methods in the smallest detail in Party practice when carrying out party resolutions, in spite of the theoretical condemnation of these methods. At the best, such a mechanical castration of the discussion would have reduced it to the question of the replacement of the group of leaders, Ruth Fischer and Maslow, by the immediate leadership of the CP. of Germany through the ECCI. This would in reality have led to over-centralisation which would certainly not have promoted the independent activity, the initiative and the political growth of the Party.

It is only now, three months after the opening of the discussion, that we clearly realise what deeply rooted problems of the German communist movement it opened up to the Party, how closely it was connected with the change of attitude which is going on in the whole international Labour movement. The crisis of the CP. of Germany, which clearly brought to light how inadequate are the working methods of the Party apparatus for winning over the broad masses of the working class, is the natural outcome of the whole international situation which may be characterised by stating that a certain shifting has taken place of the lines of demarcation which have developed within the international working class in the course of the epoch of wars and revolutions.

For this reason it is the duty not of the German Party alone but of all brother parties to make a thorough study of this crisis. At the time of the growing influence of the Left wing in the English trade union movement and the first signs of a similar trend towards the Left in other countries, this crisis signals to all sections of the Comintern the chief duty of our time, the task of breaking down at all costs the barriers which international capital has succeeded in erecting since the war within the working class through its agent, international social democracy. The old frontier posts which were erected round the spheres of influence of the Comintern, the 2nd International, the Red International of Labour Unions and the Amsterdam International no longer correspond nowadays with the actual relation of forces and are constantly becoming more contradictory to the growing activity of the working class. And woe to the Party which ignores this process and which, in the new conditions, clings conservatively to the methods of approaching the masses which originated in the period of defeats, of the ebb of the revolutionary wave!

Subjectively, a crisis of this kind may appear in the form of a "crisis of leadership", but objectively it is of much deeper significance. This can be learned from the example of the German Party. To-day it is not enough to turn our attention to the individual mistakes of the Party as we did at the beginning of the German crisis, to-day we must emphasise the chief points, the essentials of this crisis and make its experiences the common property of the whole international communist movement. If however we consider the German crisis from this point of view, we shall be compelled to recognise in the first place that this crisis has three main forms of manifestation.

First of all it is a crisis of the relations between our Party and the broad masses of the workers who are outside the compass of our Party, it is a crisis which is expressed in the symptoms of the isolation of the Party from the class of which it is the vanguard. In a country in which the power is in the hands of the proletariat, a crisis of this kind would inevitably lead to a catastrophe of the revolution, in a country however where the working class is only fighting for power, it drives a Party of the masses to sectarianism, if, it lasts long enough.

Secondly, it is a crisis of the relations between the leading upper strata of the Party and the broad lower strata in the periphery of the Party, it is a crisis of an internal political regime, in which the relations outside the Party, the relations between the Party and the non-party masses are reflected as in a mirror.

And finally, but only in the third place, it is a crisis of the relation of the Party to the Comintern, that is the crisis of a Party whose policy and practice of organisation is contradictory to the generally recognised principles and the tactics of the international communist movement.

All these three forms are so closely interwoven in the German crisis that it is really very difficult to distinguish them from one another. It is impossible for instance seriously to speak of conquering the masses and at the same time to maintain in the Party an ossified regime of personal dictatorship which narrows the basis of the Party's influence to the uttermost. The sectarianism and the gulf between the upper and lower strata within the Party corresponds to the isolation of the Party from the masses outside the Party. However loudly and hysterically a leadership, which defends an inner-party regime of this kind, may shout at meetings about the necessity of "conquering the masses", however many solemn oaths it may take at international congresses to carry through the tactics of the united front, it will inevitably prove to be a wretched bankrupt, as its whole point of view is at bottom contradictory. The disparity between word and deed, the "double entry book-keeping" towards the Comintern, which made the Maslow and Ruth Fischer group famous, arises from this. All this convinces us that no one of the forms of this crisis can be considered separately. The crisis must be studied in that dialectic connection, in which one form melts into the other. This Marxist method of studying the German crisis will be the only right one.

The fundamental factor in the crisis of the C. P. of Germany is undoubtedly the crisis of its relation to the masses.

As regards tactics, this crisis of the relation to the masses, found expression in the crisis of the tactics of the united front. After the defeat of 1923 and after the Frankfurt Party Conference the Party confined itself to an extremely limited basis. The young, politically inexperienced leaders, personated in the Ruth Fischer and Scholem group, satisfied itself with the self-deluding theory that "the Party is swimming against the stream", that, in the present situation of defeat, it cannot conquer the masses. Such a theory in its absolute form, without making allowances for historical ups and downs was, first of all, an ideological cover for the passivity and laziness of the most capable Party functionaries, and secondly it cultivated, in the Party, the ideology of permanent defeat.

This ideology was no coincidence. The German proletariat has suffered three serious defeats since 1919, in January 1919, in March 1921, and finally, its most serious defeat, in October 1923. After each of these defeats, the Party shivered in a CWP. (Communist Workers Party, an extreme ultra Left sectarian party. Ed.) fever. In looking back, we must openly confess that the Frankfurt Party Conference was not only a Party Conference for the development of a healthy Left Labour wing in the Party, not only a Party Conference which had liquidated the opportunist mistakes of Brandlerism in the application of the united front tactics; this Party Conference was also one at which the moods of depression, doubt and deep pessimism, which had been called forth by the defeat of the German revolution, found their "platform" in the ultra-Left proposals.

Within this Left wing at Frankfurt there were at the same time two tendencies. The one tendency was that of the most advanced part of the German working class which, with proletarian instinct tried to find a way to overcome the social democratic remnants in the Party, a workers' tendency from which, under the leadership of the Hamburg transport worker Thalmann, the iron cohort of Bolshevism is springing up. The second tendency (Maslow, Scholem, Korsch, Rosenberg etc.) has the roots of its social origin in the petty bourgeoisie, which is driven into "opposition" and destroyed by inflation; a tendency which has no traditions; a tendency which has tried to call into being some kind of specific German Bolshevism which is to be "more left" than the Leninist theory and the Bolshevik practice of the CP. of Russia. In this latter tendency were at the same time expressed the influence of petty bourgeois German nationalism, mistrust in the methods of the proletarian revolution and an echo of the "Western orientation" of the capitalist classes of Germany.

As long as the C. P. of Germany was in the stage of criticism of the Brandler faults, these tendencies were united by the platform of the fight against Brandlerism. The ultra-Left group however made a caricature of this perfectly justified criticism

of Brandlerism. In Frankfort and after Frankfort it was not content only to demonstrate **opportunist mistakes** in the application of the united front tactics, it rejected altogether the **tactics of a united front with the social democratic workers**. While it was at the head of the Party leadership, it had not dared, since Frankfort, to make a single attempt to unmask social democracy by making use of the concrete experiences of the masses, but satisfied itself in its agitation with empty platitudes.

These tactics of the self-isolation of the Party from the masses, which were a consequence of the defeat of the German proletariat, could not but come into conflict with the increasing mass movement which was growing beyond the forms of organisation of the C. P. of Germany. The process of secession of the ultra-Left group from the Thälmann fraction, came to the fore through dire necessity, from the moment when the Party began, like a sensitive barometer, to record the increasing activity of the German working class, from the moment when the feeling of oppression, which had weighed on the masses, began to disappear. It was just at this moment that the Party clearly recognised what injurious ballast the ultra-Left group represented for the Party in the period of its transition from defeats to new conquests, from the fatalist ultra-Left philosophy, that cover for passivity, to the effective tactics of mass activity.

It was only because the sore spots were discovered at the right moment, because the situation within the Party had ripened to the point of veering round, that the letter of the E. C. C. I. found such a sympathetic echo in the Party, that the Thälmann group succeeded so rapidly and so comparatively easily in overcoming this crisis. Had it not been for the E. C. C. I. letter, we should have experienced a catastrophe in the German Party in four or six months, we should have experienced a revolt of the masses against the group of leaders of the C. C. The best evidence of this change of attitude in the C. P. of Germany is supplied by the most recent municipal elections in Berlin. Although these elections coincided with the height of the Party discussion, although the whole election campaign was carried on extremely weakly from the technical point of view by the district leaders in Berlin, the C. P. of Germany was the only Party which could record success at the elections. Practically the whole of the bourgeois Press, which was alarmed at the success of the Communists at the Berlin election — every fifth elector voted communist — recognises, even with an excess of zeal, that this victory is a result of the interference of the E. C. C. I.

To what extent is the C. P. of Germany forced to transform the relations within the Party after the Party Conference, by this increasing activity of the working class which is making itself felt to an international degree altogether and in Germany in particular? It is an indisputable fact that the shifting of forces which has taken place between the 2nd and 3rd International after the war and the revolutions, and which are particularly conspicuous in England, will inevitably bring about, and have already brought about, a splitting off from social democracy and from the reformist trade unions of a number of groups and tendencies.

These groups will take their stand between communism and the reactionary leaders of the 2nd and the Amsterdam International. It is hopeless to dream of the disintegration of social democracy or of winning over their masses to the Communist Parties, without development of such groups and tendencies in the camps of the 2nd and Amsterdam Internationals. At the present time in Europe, we are not living in a period of revolutionary street fighting in which the shifting of forces takes place with catastrophic rapidity. We are faced by a much slower process of destruction of the old framework. We can foresee that, in the present period, there will be a graduated series of various intermediate groups between us and social democracy which will be the objective instrument with which we shall penetrate into the masses, which are still, at present, under the influence of social democracy. Some of these groups, for instance the Left Minority Movement in the English trade unions, will approach us very closely, others will still have one foot firmly planted in Amsterdam while others again will waver between these two groups.

It is evident that this molecular process of the international Labour movement must find expression in the internal policy of our Party. If we in Germany really set ourselves the task of winning over the masses, we must frame the conditions within our Party in such a way that we do not break down all the bridges over which the social democratic and non-party workers

might come to us. Up to now the Party has turned the face of Scholem towards these masses; the National Conference of the C. P. of Germany wants to show them the face of workers of the Left, who have experience of work among the masses, who are in touch with the factories and who are able to talk to the masses in a proletarian language which they can understand. We cannot indeed talk seriously about the C. P. influencing the social democratic workers and at the same time, as Ruth Fischer and Scholem have done, put at the head of a whole number of organisations, Bohemians with half artistic and half literary tendencies, who not only have no authority in the eyes of the social democratic workers but who are very little appreciated in their own organisation. Such a selection of persons for the leading posts within the Party has as little to do with "Bolshevisation" as has the defeatist ideology with Bolshevism. A similar policy within the Party was only the continuation of the line of self-isolation of the leaders from the masses within the Party.

It is by no means necessary to be a genius in order to see the close connection between the internal and general policy of the Party. Further, there is a similar connection between the establishment of a connection between the Party and the masses and the question of groupings within the Party. The old group of leaders, Maslow and Ruth Fischer, who had in practice formed a Bloc with Scholem, carried on, under the mask of fighting Brandlerism, a desperate campaign against the group of the old Spartakists with Ernst Meyer at their head. This is what Ruth Fischer called: "a fight on two fronts", against the Right and against the Left. In its true nature however, it was neither the one nor the other, as the group Maslow and Ruth Fischer on the one hand, allowed itself to be taken in tow by the ultra-Left, while on the other hand it described as Brandlerism any sensible proposition which tended towards an extension of the sphere of influence of the Party among the masses. And this peculiar geography within the Party was at bottom nothing but a cover for the liquidatorship of the ultra-Left, an expression of the worst kind of sectarianism within the Party.

The new situation of the Party demands of us a specially clear demarcation of the borders, beyond which the deviation to the Right begins, which is incompatible with the general lines of the Party. If the assertion is true, that at the moment when a re-grouping of forces is taking place within the working class, we shall have outside the Party a whole series of links which bind us to the social democratic masses, the other assertion is also true that, just in this period of the shifting of forces, tendencies will make themselves felt within our Party also, which conceal within themselves the danger that social democratic ideas will be smuggled into our Party. The well-known attitude of Schönlanck with his liquidatory standpoint as regards the C. P. of Germany, is a symptom of this new danger from the Right. This is a new form of Brandlerism in a new concrete situation. And it is characteristic that the Meyer group not only did not shelter Schönlanck, but was the first to propose his expulsion from the Party. The task with which the Party is now faced, clearly arises from this, the task of fighting against the liquidatorship from the Right and from the Left, of the fight against Schönlanck's and Scholem's liquidatorship, and the rallying of all elements which take their stand on the resolutions of the last National Conference, round the present group of leaders of the C. C.

Which of these two dangers is more serious for the Party? Theoretically speaking, both dangers are equally injurious. But in the present concrete historical situation of the C. C. of Germany, the ultra-Left danger has a more disintegrating effect on the Party than the deviation to the Right. It is sufficient to point out that Schönlanck's exclusion from the Party was hardly noticed. No single voice, apart from those of Scholem and his friends was raised in his defence; neither during the discussion nor at the National Conference itself did anyone support his point of view. On the other hand, 12% of the members of the National Conference belonged to the Scholem fraction, and the question of removing Scholem from his post in the Central Committee called forth a desperate fight out of which the present leading Thälmann group issued victoriously though only after considerable exertion.

In what circumstances might the Right danger seriously threaten the Party and cause a Right crisis of the nature of the Levi crisis? In the immediate future, this could only happen in one event, if the Party succeeded through clever tactics, in

winning over from social democracy 100,000 to 200,000 social democratic workers. In this case the new sections of the Party might bring along with them their old prejudices and restore Brandlerism to life, and in this case we should be compelled to mobilise the whole front against the Right danger, as we did at the time of the fight against Brandlerism. At the present time, Brandler's political corpse is the only capital on the interest of which the Scholem fraction still lives within the Party, though it is indeed at its last gasp. And if, in the immediate future, the C.P. of Germany makes no great mistakes in applying the tactics of the united front, we can maintain in all confidence that by the next Enlarged Executive of the C.I., we shall have recovered completely from the ultra-Left infantile disease.

The National Conference of the C.P. of Germany has proved convincingly that no return to the old situation is possible. The Party has forgotten nothing of its fight against the mistakes of genuine Brandlerism, the German workers paid for the experience they gained from these mistakes by the suffering resulting from a severe defeat. Such lessons cannot be wiped out of the consciousness of the working class. That would be contradictory to the history of the Labour movement. The fight against Brandlerism — but not the caricature of that fight — was one of the best features of the Bolshevisation of the C.P. of Germany.

The National Conference has now, with a firm hand, turned over to the second page of Bolshevism by drawing a line of distinction between the communist movement and the theory of the childish nonsense of the ultra-Left. It is no catastrophe if, in the process of this hard steeling and on this thorny path, a few persons, who are not up to the task of being leaders of the German proletariat, turn away from us. By collective efforts of its staff of proletarian leaders and of its apparatus, the Party has surmounted the crisis and has issued from it more healthy, more determined and more capable of manoeuvring and fighting. This conference was permeated through and through by a healthy proletarian optimism; calm confidence in the future of the C.P. of Germany prevailed. The last National Conference of the C.P. of Germany was that humble but infinitely precious gift which the German proletariat from the front of the class war offered to the E.C.C.I. and the C.P. of Russia on the eighth anniversary of the Russian proletarian revolution.

## POLITICS

### The Final Struggle over Locarno in the German Reichstag.

By Arthur Rosenberg (Berlin)

A few days ago there appeared in the "Berlin Tageblatt" the following private telegram from New York:

"Since the visit of the President of the Reichsbank, Dr. Schacht to New York, Wall Street has become more interested than ever in the German emissions. That the attractive power of German investments is to be attributed to the terms of interest granted by the German credit-seekers, which are more favourable here than in any other country, need not be emphasised. In addition there is the increasing confidence in the German economic organism as a whole. According to information derived from leading financial circles here, a great number of new German industrial loans are to be granted shortly. The greatest interest is concentrated upon the negotiations of the New Aniline Trust, whose credit requirements are estimated at about 50 million dollars. About 12 million dollars are required by Catholic institutions".

This report reveals the reasons why the acceptance of the Locarno Pact and the entry of Germany into the League of Nations is proceeding so smoothly. Regard for American credits pushes aside all considerations and objections. The American financial world is still keenly interested in German business. But America only loosens her purse strings when the debtor country can give a guarantee for the maintenance of domestic peace. The agreement between England and France and the agreement of both these countries with Germany was the pre-condition for America's active interest in the recon-

struction of European capitalism. Once these pre-conditions were given the United States could, with the help of the Dawes Plan, undertake the settlement of the reparations question. But in order to secure the Dawes Plan it was necessary to remove the political tension between Germany on the one hand and England and France on the other, that is to say the political complement of the economic system of General Dawes. Such a complement is provided by Locarno. That is why both the American bankers and the German bourgeoisie are in favour of Locarno. The English government also obtains diplomatic advantage in that Germany's entry into the League of Nations involves the separation of Germany from Russia and, in consequence, the strengthening of the anti-Russian bloc of Austen Chamberlain.

In their Locarno policy, Luther and Stresemann were, right from the beginning, sure of the approval of the National Federation of Industry and of the German great bankers. With two such auxiliaries at its side the German government can shape its fingers at all the fractions of the Reichstag. Thus Dr. Luther has been able to remain quite calm in face of all the outcry, from the German Nationalists up to the Socialist Party of Germany. The German National Ministers resigned from the Cabinet, Frenken, a member of the Centre joined them, the social-democrats declared that, in the event of the German Nationalists rejecting the Pact, they would not fetch any chestnuts out of the fire for the National Bloc, that is to say, they also would not vote for Locarno. The Economic Party declared itself against Locarno. Louder and louder arose the cries demanding the dissolution of the Reichstag. The parliamentary majority of Luther was melting away.

But Luther remained calmly at his post, he did not even have the Reichstag summoned earlier than he had originally intended; and he now has all the trumps in his hands. During the whole crisis in Germany the leading Entente newspapers have meddled in the most intrusive manner in German domestic politics. Every week one could read in the "Temps" and the "Times" what Chancellor Luther should do and what he should not do. Luther and Stresemann have, in general, acted in accordance with this good advice.

First they endeavoured to heal the breach with the German Nationalists, for the difficulty with the Reichstag fraction of the German nationalists arose quite unexpectedly. Even after the return of Luther and Stresemann from Locarno, almost every well-informed person on German politics thought that the German Nationalists would, although with a few sighs and lamentations, proceed on the road to Geneva. Even the German Nationalist Ministers themselves had no idea that their term of office would so soon be at an end. Both the big industrialists and the big agrarians of the German Nationalist People's Party were in favour of American credits, and therefore in favour of Locarno and the League of Nations. But there suddenly came the rebellion of the German Nationalist electors in the country, and at the Conference of the German Nationalist Party at the end of October the Party leaders were simply swept aside.

The millions of German Nationalist petty bourgeois, peasants and intellectuals had quite other ideas as to the Hindenburg era. They have been severely disappointed by the "revaluation" of their securities and savings which had depreciated in value; the Dawes Plan was accepted with the help of the German Nationalists, and now is to be followed by the German Nationalist consenting to the abandonment of Alsace-Lorraine and approving the German alliance with England and France. This was too much. The black-white-red petty bourgeois rebelled. What should the leaders of the German Nationalists do now? By exerting all their forces they could have managed at the German Nationalist Party Conference, held on the 15th of November in Berlin, to defeat the opposition of the opponents of Locarno. But this would have given rise to the danger of a party split. At the very least the German Nationalist Party would have been involved in a prolonged and dangerous crisis and rendered incapable of any action.

But the existence of a great German Nationalist Party is just as necessary for the German bourgeoisie as is the existence of a great Social-democratic Party. The present social-democratic party holds back eight million workers from the class struggle, whilst the German Nationalist People's Party places seven million petty bourgeois, agrarians, intellectuals, and even workers, in the service of big capital. The disruption

of the German Nationalist Party would have revived the spirit which led to the **Hitler Putsch** and the **Rathenau murder**. For this reason the leaders of the German Nationalist Party cunningly evaded the attack of the opposition. The Party withdrew from the government, it rejected the Locarno Treaty; Herr **Hugenberg** of the firm of **Krupp** and Herr von **Tirpitz**, the old friend of the industrialists, are writing the opposition articles against **Locarno** and **Stresemann**; the fascist opposition in the German Nationalist camp is thereby rendered harmless and the unity of the Party is saved.

This cunning German nationalist manoeuvre has only been rendered possible by the fact that the Social-democratic Party of Germany, as the faithful watch-dog of the German bourgeoisie, sprang to the aid of its master, proclaimed the unconditional acceptance of Locarno and furnished the necessary votes in favour of Locarno which should have been provided by the German Nationalists. Thus the final struggle over Locarno was carried out in the Reichstag in an atmosphere of deadly boredom and general lack of interest. The firm majority for Locarno from **Hilferding** to the **German People's Party** was there, the German nationalist opposition was very mild, and was quite "understood". Only the **Communist Party of Germany** conducted a serious struggle in the interest of the working people and against the bargaining away of Germany to the League of Nations and to the New York Stock Exchange. In spite of all the clever manoeuvres of the German bourgeoisie and its parliamentarians, there is to be seen a certain amount of resentment among the social-democratic and also the German nationalist masses of electors. The growing solidarity of the working masses with Soviet Russia and the embitterment of the petty bourgeois masses over the treacherous Policy of the National Bloc will find political expression. The Communist Party of Germany is emerging from the Locarno struggle with increased strength and with growing authority among all sections of the German working people.

## The Guarantee Pact.

By Karl Radek.

V.

### The Change in German Policy.

In the history of Germany's foreign policy since the war, two periods can be distinguished. The first period of German policy since the war is, in spite of the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, characterised by the fight against the Entente. The Treaty of Versailles was signed by representatives of a German Government in which the **Social Democrats** were the leading party. The latter regarded Versailles as a capitulation to a strong enemy, resistance to whom was not even to be thought of. The majority of the social democratic leaders did not indulge in thoughts about questions of the future. They believed that the fight against Versailles would create such an acute situation in the country that sooner or later the most radical fraction of the German people, the **Communist Party**, would come into power.

But the old ruling classes, the **large landowners and industrialists**, whom the November revolution had not robbed of the sources of their economic strength, sabotaged the Treaty of Versailles. Illegal military organisations prepared the cadres for the future war of revenge and sabotaged the payments to the account of Versailles. This policy for its part found expression in the sabotage of financial reform, produced a fall in the currency, and thus made the fulfilment of the London plan of payment of 1921 impossible. This policy however did not mean merely the sabotage of the economic solutions of the Treaty of Versailles. As the final result, the German big landowners and capitalists enriched themselves to such a degree that they were freed from the necessity of seeking loans in foreign countries. Further, Germany was clever enough in those years to raise a foreign loan of not less than five milliards of gold marks.

This policy of the German bourgeoisie was based on speculation on the dissensions between England and France which had already been obvious at the Conference of Versailles and which the German bourgeoisie felt at every step at its conferences with military and diplomatic representatives of the Entente. These differences became especially acute from the moment of the economic crisis in Western Europe in 1921 and

found expression in the memorandum which was issued by **Lloyd George** at the Conference of Cannes: "If France has devastated areas, England has an annihilated trade which also needs restoring."

In the hope that the dissensions between England and France would be intensified, the German Government of Herr **Cuno** decided to start a conflict with France about the telegraph poles which Germany was pledged to supply to France and which she claimed to be unable to supply because of the high prices demanded by the German speculators. The Cuno Government, egged on by **Lord d'Abernon**, was convinced that if the French occupied the Ruhr, England, in order to prevent an immediate contact between the Ruhr coke and the metal industry of Lorraine, would be compelled to oppose France. The German Government was cruelly deceived.

Lord d'Abernon's instigations were due to other causes. British imperialism, being unable to make a direct attack on France, decided to let France run its head against German coal. England was far-sighted enough to calculate that the occupation of the Ruhr would not be enough to enable France to get a hold over the Ruhr industry and that it would therefore bring France no material benefit but drive it into great expenditure and thus lead to the collapse of **Poincaré's** policy. **Lord Curzon** therefore stigmatized openly the policy of the occupation of the Ruhr as being contrary to the terms even of the Treaty of Versailles, but he did not take a single step which might have led to a breach with France.

The British calculation proved to be right. When Germany, after having overstrained her economic forces and led her industry to complete destruction, capitulated to France, the latter was not able to make full use of her victory. For a few weeks, **M. Poincaré** stalked around as proud as a peacock, but when the celebrations were over he could not fail to notice that the franc began to fall precipitately and the ground to shake under the feet of his government.

The interference of England and America and the financial help granted to France, placed the latter at the mercy of Anglo-American financial capital. Germany, which stood on the edge of a precipice, Germany, at whose door October knocked, had to make a radical change in her policy. But, before entering into the question of the form in which the political change in Germany found expression, we must in a few words, recall the part played by the **Soviet Republic in Germany**.

In 1919, Germany avoided all connections with the Soviet Union. On the one hand, this was caused by its internal situation. At the moment when it was carrying on a life and death struggle against the German revolution, it could not have any relations with a State in which the power was in the hands of the proletariat. In the second place, the German bourgeoisie was convinced that the Soviet Union would be destroyed by the Entente.

The victory of the Red Army over the armies of intervention, which coincided with the victory of the German bourgeoisie over the German working class, changed the situation completely. The German bourgeoisie was of the opinion that Russian influence in Germany was ceasing to be an immediate danger, but at the same time, being convinced of the power of the Soviet Union, it began to consider whether it could succeed in supporting itself on the Soviet Union in its fight against the Entente. According to the German plans, the task of the Soviet Union in the German system of policy consisted in liquidating the difficulties arising out of the Treaty of Versailles in connection with Poland. Moreover the Soviet Union was to offer an outlet for German exports.

England was the first country to pass from intervention to business relations with the Soviet Union. Thus Germany calculated at the same time on **British help against France and on Russian bayonets and Russian markets**. At that time the Eastern question did not interpose between England and the Soviet Union, and Germany hoped to be the bridge between English capital and the Soviet Union. "English money, German talent for organisation, Russian work and Russian raw material" that was the slogan of **Rathenau**, **Felix Deutsch** and other bourgeois promoters of an approach between Germany and the Soviet Union. The Treaty of **Rapallo** came into being on the basis of these considerations. It was concluded by **Rathenau** and **Wirth** in the conviction that the negotiations in the **Villa Albertis** would lead to an Anglo-Russian compromise.

After the German resistance in the Ruhr Basin was broken, the whole position of German foreign policy was radically changed. In the first place, its economic basis was changed. The

collapse of the mark made it absolutely necessary for Germany to obtain foreign credits, which were needed not only for the internationalisation of the German debt to the Entente, but also for restoring order in German economics which had been thoroughly shaken by the fight for the Ruhr during the whole period of inflation. German industry had re-equipped itself to a large extent during the inflation. As it received credits from the Reichsbank, industry bought new machines and built new buildings, but paid its debts in the falling mark. At the same time, the inflation meant a premium on exports. The money derived from exports of industrial goods was also concentrated in industry and enabled heavy industry to buy up whole branches of light industry which they combined into vertical trusts with the coal and iron concerns. The whole policy of these trusts consisted in a hunt for actual values.

When an end came to inflation, when an end came to the flow of the enormous credits of the Reichsbank at the cost of the deterioration of the German mark, i. e. at the cost of the masses of petty bourgeois and workers, heavy industry was left without money. The actual values, the machines and factory buildings which had been bought, all these required working capital if they were to be a source of profit. At the same time the period of feverish competition came to an end, for, after Germany had changed to the new gold currency, the prices of German products began to approximate to world prices. The hunt for actual values gave place to a hunt for available capital, for money.

But Germany needed not only working capital but stock capital as well. The new equipment of German industry during the period of inflation had been of a very chaotic character. The urgent demand for credit is the predominant feature in German industry. This resulted in a collapse of the vertical concerns. The Stinnes concern which ruled Germany during the period of inflation, has completely broken down. The Sichei concern is breaking down, the Stumm concern is in danger and even the oldest firms such as Thyssen, Klöckner and Krupp see danger ahead.

Where was credit to be obtained? The German banks themselves were not in a position to grant it. Now, at the end of 1925, they have not more than two fifths of their pre-war capital and cannot grant more than a quarter of the pre-war credit. The impoverishment of Germany and the loss of the savings of the petty bourgeoisie have weakened the power of the banks. The banks however have a certain amount of credit in England and America. The money which comes into Germany from these countries passes through the German banks. The banks make use of this situation to destroy the vertical trusts which had tried to put an end to the hegemony of financial capital. If Stinnes annihilated the petty bourgeoisie, if he subjected middle industry to himself and laid a hand on the large banks, the banks are now taking their revenge and plundering the plunderer. Both the liquidation of the Stinnes concern and that of the Castiglioni concern in Austria, are an example of a predatory raid on the part of financial capital on the industrial princes of the inflation period.

It is, of course, nonsense to draw from this conclusions as to the extinction of the trusts in Germany. The process of the decay of the vertical trusts is accompanied by a process of the establishment of trusts in industry on a new basis. The creation of a West German mining trusts which embraces half the production of the steel trust and a third of the production of the coal trusts, the creation of an Upper Silesian mining trust, the creation of a chemical trust with a capital of half a milliard of marks, clearly show that it is not merely a question of a transition from one form of trust to another. The new trusts make it their task to concentrate industrial production into one uniform type, to cheapen the organisation apparatus and, with this object in view, they shake off everything which was only connected with them during the time of inflation. But the reorganisation of industry encounters two difficulties: the question of credit and the question of markets.

The credit question is causing Germany to trim its sails according to the countries which are in a position to provide it with credit. In 1924, these countries were England and America. Germany received from them 3 — 4 milliards of gold marks, that is an amount just equal to Germany's deficit in foreign trade during the period from September 1924 to August 1925, i. e. the first year when the Dawes plan was in force. (German exports in this period amounted to 12,443 million gold marks, her exports to 8,138 million gold marks. The deficit therefore amounted to 4,304 million gold marks.) The question of markets comes to

grief over such conditions being imposed on the Soviet Union and the Far East which would allow of the extension of German exports. In the West, German export meets with resistance from the Powers which are most advanced as far as industry is concerned. The idea of allowing Germany the possibility of extending its exports in the East, is beginning to be accepted by the circles of Anglo-American capitalists.

The Experts' Report placed Germany and France in the hands of Anglo-American capital. The dependence of France on American capitalism and English imperialism will grow from day to day. The "new epoch" which social democracy promised to the whole world after the signing of the agreement of August 1924, means in reality nothing more nor less than a hope that American capital will not allow French and German capitalism, both of which are in its power, to get as far as an open conflict, and that France will no longer be able to extend at the cost of Germany.

The German bourgeoisie determined to make the best of this situation by codifying the conclusion of an international treaty which was to prevent France from continuing its policy of cutting up Germany piecemeal. Germany calculated that France would still be strong enough to keep its hold on Alsace Lorraine in the next period of history, and therefore resolved to refrain from claiming the restoration of those districts, hoping in this way to create an atmosphere which would do away with the remnants of the policy which was preparing for a further advance of France into the interior of Germany.

The absence of any political aim and the losses resulting from the occupation of the Saar and Rhine districts would necessarily lead to the liquidation of the occupation and in this way restore to Germany the districts which had been occupied in accordance with the Treaty of Versailles. The Guarantee Pact in which England stands sponsor for the frontiers of Germany as well as those of France, would bring about that which the dissensions between England and France cannot bring about, the liquidation of the Anglo-French Entente. At the same time the establishment of peaceful relations between Germany and France would necessarily increase the confidence of American capital in the settling down of Europe, and in this way accelerate the influx of American capital into Germany. Thus the striving after credits is closely linked with the efforts to restore German supremacy in the occupied territories.

But how is this German plan going to solve the question of markets? The solution of this question requires first of all that the monopoly of foreign trade in the Soviet Union be combated and secondly that an end be put to the period of revolution in Asia and law and order be restored in the Asiatic countries. England is the country which promotes the opposition to the Soviet Union and to the national revolutions in the East. Whereas in the first years after the conclusion of the Treaty of Versailles, Germany staked everything on the conflicts between France and England, it is now beginning to stake everything on the dissensions between Great Britain and the Soviet Union. No serious intervention against the Soviet Union is possible without Germany being accepted in the camp of the interveners. The inadequacy which prevailed during the intervention in 1918 — 1920 was to a large extent due to the fact that the Entente was obliged to send its munitions and troops by sea, whilst Germany, which was in a condition of revolutionary fermentation, remained at the back of the intervention.

By agreeing to join the League of Nations, Germany does not so much become a tool in the hands of England as a territory which ensures direct connection between the interventionists and those countries which, according to England's plan, are to be the instruments of immediate pressure on the Soviet Union. Germany understands very well that as long as France carries on an independent policy, though only in the measure in which she is doing it at present, Germany will not receive permission to arm to the extent which would be necessary for her to take part in the campaign against the Soviet Union. But that section of the German bourgeoisie which is willing to take part in England's campaign against the Soviet Union, is convinced that England is prepared to pay in political and economic values for military cover in the rear.

They lay their stakes on Poland getting into a very difficult situation in the case of a war against the Soviet Union. It wants to use the situation, in order, with England's help, to abolish the Danzig corridor. Though to-day, when the question of altering its frontiers is mentioned, Poland replies by threatening to defend them with armed force, Germany is convinced that, if it succeeds in drawing Poland into a war against the Soviet

Union, suitable moments will be found in which Poland will agree to give up the corridor in return for German neutrality and help. The abolition of the corridor would relieve Germany of the danger of losing one of her most important corn-growing districts, East Prussia, and would give it the possibility of uniting the "Reichswehr" into one single army and in this way increasing the strength of the ruling classes in Germany both within and without their own borders.

When a final settling up is made with the Soviet Union, if the allies succeed in obtaining considerable concessions in the social legislation of the Soviet Union, which would allow an extensive influx of foreign capital, Germany will appear on the scenes as the organiser of Russian industry in the name of Anglo-American capital. The new slogan of German anti-Soviet circles runs: "Polish swords, Anglo-American capital and German economic organisation."

It is still however a great question whether the fox will not find himself in the position of the bear, as in the fable, whether, owing to the lack of an exact analysis of the international situation and on account of a wrong estimation of American policy which Germany supposes to be identical with that of England, Germany will not, in this experiment, find itself stuck in a bog.

## Locarno — the New Slogan of Imperialism.

The following is taken from the leading article of the Moscow "Isvestia" of 22nd November 1925.

It is now perfectly clear that Locarno will become more and more a "noble cloak" under which is concealed the robber-greed of the great Powers, that Locarno is that veil behind which the imperialists are preparing their plans. Locarno is becoming the central, popular fighting slogan of the aggressive policy of all countries which are wont to undertake imperialist manoeuvres, as well as of those countries which only dream in secret of imperialist adventures.

In this connection the campaign which has been introduced in the Swedish press for the creation of a "Northern Guarantee Pact", which is to be participated in in the first place by Sweden and Finland, merits our attention. The main reason for this demand for a "Northern Locarno" is alleged to be the necessity of securing the safety of the Border States, among which the Finnish "brother nation" is in a difficult position.

What is the aim of this Northern Locarno? Are the Swedish frontiers threatened or have they been threatened with any danger from the side of the Soviet Union? Has Sweden even a shred of evidence that the Soviet Union is planning something against Sweden which could injure the sovereignty or the economic well-being of the country? And why is Sweden so very much concerned over the fate of the Finnish Republic, which is said to be in a "difficult position"?

Has Finland any reason to be fearful of her fate on account of her great "Eastern neighbour"? Are there in the Soviet Union any such chauvinist elements which, perchance, are endeavouring to destroy the political independence of Finland? Did not Svinhuvud, in December 1917, receive from the hands of Lenin himself the declaration of the newly-formed Soviet government as to the complete independence of the Finnish people and as to the independence of the Finnish State, which had been so brutally trodden down under Tsarism and which also was also sharply denied by the Provisional Government of Kerensky, Tchernov and Miljukov?

It is not Finland who is threatened by the peace-loving Soviet Union, which is engaged in creative constructive work, but vice versa: a portion of the Finnish citizens are stirring up a jingoistic mood against Archangel and the Murmansk area which belong to the Soviet Union.

What are the reasons for the demand for a Northern Guarantee Pact? Has it not arisen from the intention to draw the nearest neighbour of the Soviet Union, Finland, and with her the other countries bordering on the Soviet Union, into that political combination which is behind the Locarno Pact?

Has not Chamberlain's blessing lighted upon the Baltic Sea and penetrated to its coasts in the same way as it permeated all the depths of the lake and all the slopes of the mountains of Locarno?

No less attention deserves to be paid to the declaration of Vandervelde, the Foreign Minister of His Majesty the King of Belgium, that the Treaty of Locarno is not in any way directed

against the Soviet Union and that "a second Locarno will arise when all Europe has come to an understanding with the Soviet Union".

It was not for nothing that Vandervelde, following the example of such well-known "friends" of the Soviet Union as Briand and Chamberlain, emphasised the peaceable intentions of the agreement of Locarno as regards the Soviet Union. The proletariat of these countries is undoubtedly remaining partly sceptical and partly hostile towards Locarno. It is necessary to delude the proletariat, and this is the aim of Briand and Chamberlain, and also of Vandervelde.

But this is not the only thing which is engaging the attention of Vandervelde. He is announcing a second Locarno which will result in reconciling the "whole of Europe" with the Soviet Union. Of course, it is very good of Vandervelde to be so concerned for all Europe. But why does he not think in the first place of Belgium? Why does he not pay attention to the mood of the Belgian proletariat and also of the Belgian industrialists? It is not the Soviet Union which refuses de jure and de facto recognition of Belgium. It was not the Red Armies of the Soviet Republics which occupied Belgian territory and devastated the country. It is not the Soviet Union which refuses to maintain and to extend trade relations with Belgium. The facts are the other way about. It is Belgium which is hostile towards the Soviet Union, it was Belgian soldiers who took part in the intervention and the blockade of the Soviet Union.

It is therefore not the imperialism of the Soviet Union against which defensive measures must be taken; and a second Locarno, a new Guarantee Pact cannot and will not serve this purpose. The fact of the matter is that the spiral spring of Locarno, which was pressed together with so much pains and efforts, will, as it becomes gradually released, awaken the greed of such governments and groups of Powers for whom Locarno has become the slogan for their imperialist greed in general and their anti-Soviet class in particular.

## The Crisis in France.

By Paul Marion (Paris).

The second "left orientated" Pailevé Ministry has miserably collapsed after three weeks existence. It has been wrecked on the question of the moratorium on the treasury bonds. 30 members of the Left Bloc, scandalised by the fact that the Third Republic, for the first time in its existence, did not redeem the state bonds as they fell due, and actuated by the desire to prepare the way for a concentration cabinet, voted against the consolidation of the treasury bonds. The Ministry was defeated by 278 votes against 275. The 26 Communists played the decisive role.

\* \* \*

Under the rule of the National Bloc, and particularly under Poincaré, the French heavy industry (and with it the banks), which had developed during the war and by the annexation of the iron-ore districts of Lorraine, as well as by the possibility of seizing German coal, had a prosperous future before it and had a firm hold of the entire apparatus of the bourgeois State from 1919 to 1924. It desired to take advantage of France's military hegemony on the Continent in order to make France the greatest metallurgical power in the old world.

This ambitious programme collapsed a few months after the Ruhr occupation, because the financial weakness of France, a result of the enormous expenditure during the war (inflation and loans), made it impossible for Poincaré to resist the Anglo-Saxon offensive against the Franc. French capitalism had to accept the Dawes Plan, which exactly laid down the payments to be received from Germany, and also reduced the same, which resulted in raising the difficult question of the finances of France (foreign and inner debts).

A great portion of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry of France, frightened by this failure, by the inflation and the high prices, broke away from the National Bloc, that is from heavy industry. A certain number of leaders of manufacturing industry (Loucheur) and of great banking houses (Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas) who are interested in the foreign policy of "European pacifism", which leaves their hands free to carry on their colonial undertakings and their international stock exchange operations, were in need of the services of the Left Bloc.

This resulted in the elections of May 1924. But the democratic petty bourgeoisie and the majority of the workers who are under its ideological influence who brought the Left wing into power, achieved nothing else than a change of masters. They came out of the hands of one section of great capital (heavy industry) and into the hands of another section (the banking houses and manufacturing industrials).

The Herriot Ministry, after a few apparent successes in international politics (London Conference and Geneva Protocol), soon encountered insurmountable difficulties at home, before all in regard to the problem of the financial liquidation of the war: 160 milliard Francs consolidated or long-term debts, 120 milliard short term debts. Faced with the dilemma of having to meet the demands of its electors and the unanimous refusal of the capitalists to sacrifice the least portion of their possessions, the position of the Herriot Ministry soon became untenable. Driven to inflation in order to meet the short terms loans as they became due for repayment, it was soon compelled to resign.

There was then formed the first Painlevé Ministry. To all outward appearances it was a Ministry of the Left Bloc, but as a matter of fact it was already a concentration to the Right. This character at once became evident when, to the growing financial crisis, there were added colonial complications (Morocco war). There followed a regrouping of political forces. The capitalists of heavy industry gradually moderated their attacks against the Painlevé Cabinet, with the exception of a small minority of them who financed the fascist organisations, the outer activity of which became more alarming in November and December 1924.

The banking houses and the manufacturing industrials, who were closely connected with the Moroccan war, compelled the Cabinet to avoid too serious collisions with big industry and to refrain from carrying out the reforms which had been formerly promised by the Left Bloc. The capitalists as a whole now strove to reconcile their various interests at the expense of the middle classes and of the proletariat. This movement called forth a counter movement on the part of the petty bourgeois and the workers of the Left Bloc, the final result of which was that on October 29, there was formed a new ministry of the Left Bloc, again under the auspices of Painlevé, who has fully deserved the designation of "weather-cock".

But the great majority of the Left Bloc electors still remain very mistrustful of Painlevé the second, whilst even the Comité des Forges and the representatives of the textile industry are now furiously attacking the new ministry, partly in the form of fascism and partly in the form of classical parliamentary opposition by the National Bloc.

Meanwhile, the financial crisis increased enormously: tremendous additional expenditure and decline of revenue on the one side and fresh inflation on the other.

On the 8th of December next 3 milliard short-term loans will fall due for repayment. The deficit of the budget will require several milliards before the end of the year.

The Ministry of the petty bourgeoisie, which is completely dominated by the banking houses, could not resort to radical measures which would have consisted in laying the great weight of the burden of taxation upon big capital and reducing the share borne by the middle classes and the proletariat. Involved in hopeless contradictions, it was bound to suffer a severe defeat. The original plan of finance which was submitted on the 7th of November, was two days afterwards torn to shreds by the Finance Commission. On the 12th of November, after a number of compromises, it was patched together by the Left Bloc and submitted again; but on the 14th of November the socialist parliamentarians suddenly opposed the inflationist proposals which it still contained, and Painlevé was obliged to amend certain paragraphs.

After stormy debates which lasted five days (17th to 22nd November), the majority for the Ministry gradually shrank to a minority by three votes. The young politician Montigny, a radical member of parliament and one of the assistants of Caillaux avenged his master and prepared a concentration Ministry.

Meanwhile the Communist Party had already on the 8th of November submitted proposals to the Socialist Party for a united front in order to mobilise the socialist masses and the workers for a fight against the threat to the workers in the shape of the financial crisis and the fascist movement. On the 23rd of November the Communist Party received its offer in an Open Letter, supporting it by a parliamentary declaration and the introduction

of a campaign from below, in which it put forward the demand for a fight, first against fascism, secondly for reform of the finances at the cost of the capitalists, and thirdly for a great programme of social reform. Up to the time of writing the leaders of the socialist Party have not accepted this proposal which meets the requirements of the masses. The Communist Party however will resolutely proceed forward on its way.

## The Two Wars in Arabia.

By J. B. (Jerusalem).

The insurrection in Syria is at present the centre point of general attention. The centre of gravity of politics in the Near East has been transferred to Damascus. In view of the direct encounter between the Arabian national movement and imperialism, an encounter which has taken the form of a revolt of the mass of the people, the smaller conflicts in other countries lose their significance. Even the fratricidal war between the Arabian States, which for months previously was followed with such breathless suspense (the object of the fight being nothing less than the holy places of Islam) has lost its interest. All the same, the development of events in Arabia is of such significance that it deserves attention.

The most important event is undoubtedly the siege of Medina which has lasted for months. It has several times been erroneously reported that this town had capitulated to Ibn Saoud and the Wahabiti. The only truth in the report is that Medina is hard pressed by the Wahabiti. As however they cannot bombard the town because they would rouse the whole Mohammedan world against them, they are compelled to try to starve the garrison into capitulation. According to latest reports, the garrison cannot hold out much longer. They have appealed to all Moslems in a message in which they describe their desperate position and, in order to prevent Medina falling into the hands of Ibn Saoud, they propose two other alternatives, either handing over the town to Egypt or incorporating it into the Trans-Jordan territory ruled by Emir Abdulla, in other words flying to the protection of the English mandate.

This proposal which, in view of the improbability of Egypt interfering, can have but one meaning, proves that England is continuing to weave its intrigues in Arabia. We get a still clearer picture of the nature of these intrigues if we add that the telegram mentioned was despatched just at the time when the British Government Mission, with Sir Robert Clayton at its head, met Ibn Saoud in order to negotiate with him as to the regulation of the frontiers between Mesopotamia and Trans-Jordania on the one hand and Nedj (the kingdom of Ibn Saoud) on the other hand. As a real, active intervention of England in the Hedjaz-Nedj war and still less an occupation of Medina by the English did not come into consideration at a time when the waves of the anti-imperialist movement ran high in connection with the Syrian insurrection, the "imperial" telegram from Medina must be interpreted as a clever move in order to make the obstinate Ibn Saoud more pliable to the wishes of England.

In the conferences of Bahara (near Mecca), Clayton tried by other means also (such as compensations, promises of help, threats) to persuade Ibn Saoud to grant the concessions which are necessary for England's overland route (Egypt—Palestine—Trans-Jordania—Mesopotamia via North Arabia). Clayton actually succeeded in coming to a passable agreement with Ibn Saoud with regard to the frontiers between Nedj and Mesopotamia. With regard to the regulation of the frontiers of Trans-Jordania, Ibn Saoud categorically refused to make any concessions. The reasons for his refusal are very characteristic: firstly, that Trans-Jordania — in contrast to Mesopotamia, which has at least externally an Arabian Government — is part of the English Palestine mandate, which is based on a Zionist and consequently an anti-Arabian foundation; and secondly that he, Ibn Saoud, does not wish, by yielding territory to Trans-Jordania, to sacrifice his direct connection with Syria (he refers to the French mandatory territory). Thus Clayton's mission must be regarded as a failure in its essentials.

Ibn Saoud's appeal to the Governments of Egypt, Persia, Afghanistan, Mesopotamia and Turkey, in which the Sultan of Nedj for the first time proposes (up to now all overtures for peace have originated with his opponent, King Ali of the Hedjaz) a congress of the Mohammedan countries to determine the further

fate of the Hedjaz, marks a new turn in the long drawn-out Hedjaz-Nedj war. The future regents of the Hedjaz (naturally excluding the Hashimist family about whose dethronement the endless war is waging) should, according to his proposal, be chosen by a plebiscite; the supervision of the "holy land of Islam" should be entrusted to a council composed of representatives of the various Mohammedan countries. It is difficult to foresee to what extent Ibn Saoud's initiative will succeed. If it did come to pass, it would result not only in the liquidation of the fratricidal war in North Arabia but it would also form the first step towards the realisation of that which has for years been the object of the constantly spreading **Pan-Islamitic movement**.

The second war — the fight between the Imam Jihje of Yemen and the Idrisi of Asir — is also still going on. Although, here in South Arabia old feudal quarrels are the immediate motive for the fight, just as in the Hedjaz-Nedj conflict in the North, the imperialist groups backing the fighting tribes, are in this case more clearly recognisable. Asir is, practically speaking, under British protection, while Yemen maintains a close friendship with Italy. As the Suez Canal cannot be taken from England, Italian policy has for a long time plotted to gain control of the South coast of the Red Sea. On the African side, the Italian colony Eritrea is a valuable point of support, whereas on the Asiatic side, the desire for expansion of the war-like Imam Jihje towards the South (English territory: Aden) and to the North (Asir) is very welcome to the aims of Italian imperialism. The Imam Jihje can, up to the present, record success along the whole line. He has conquered the most important points of support and some ports from the Idrisi and is setting out to conquer the whole country. As such an extension of Italian influence would be a danger to England, the Idrisi is being supported as far as possible. The English made great efforts to win over Ibn Saoud to fight against the Imam, but this manoeuvre failed.

The two wars, in the North and in the South, are causing serious convulsions to the economic situation in Arabia. As a result of the long fighting, the power of resistance of the individual Arabian States is crumbling. The imperialists and above all England, while cunningly stirring up the fire of the fratricidal war, are waiting for the moment when exhausted Arabia will, like a ripe fruit, fall into their lap.

## THE COMMUNIST PERSECUTION IN ENGLAND

### The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. to the C. P. Great Britain.

Moscow, 26th November 1925.

The Presidium of the E. C. C. I. has sent the following telegram to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain:

"The E. C. C. I. is indignant over the sentence of the Court against our English comrades and sees in this sentence the continuation of a whole campaign of persecution against the English proletariat. The persecutions against you are persecutions against the whole working class. We are convinced that all class-conscious workers of England will support you against the persecutions of the bourgeoisie. We do not doubt that the English Communists, in spite of all persecutions, will fulfil their duty towards the working class."

### Solidarity of the R. I. L. U. with the Condemned English Communists.

Moscow, 27th November 1925.

The Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions has sent a telegram to the condemned English communists, expressing its brotherly solidarity with the C. P. of Great Britain and the Minority Movement and characterising the attack of the Baldwin government on the Communist Party and the Minority Movement as the first step in a large-scale offensive against the vital interests of the whole English working class. The attempt to render the Communist Party illegal is intended to facilitate the employers' offensive. This attack has followed on the decisions of the Labour Party Congress at Liverpool

against the Communist Party and the Minority Movement, and the inner connection between these decisions and the sentence is obvious. That section of the English working class which honestly voted at Liverpool for MacDonald's proposals can now recognise for whom he was smoothing the way by condemning the Communist Party.

The R. I. L. U. firmly hopes that the whole English working class will regard the sentence of the London Court as a blow against itself and will give the bourgeoisie the answer it deserves.

### Comrade Lozovsky on the Sentence in the English Trial.

Moscow, 26th November 1925.

In a leading article in the "Pravda" Lozovsky writes regarding the sentence in the English Communist Trial:

The trial not only bore a definite undisguised class character, but was the direct work of the Conservative Party, which is now at the helm of State and to which the Public prosecutor as well as the judge belong.

The only "crime" of the Communists who belonged to the alleged illegal Communist Party (but which has in fact existed quite openly for six years) consists in the fact that the theory and practice of Communism is not laid down in the English Constitution.

Lozovsky points out how miserably the evidence collapsed, which sought to prove that the English Party is financed by Moscow and how this had to be abandoned. When one takes into consideration the benevolent attitude of the authorities and the police to the fascist organisations, the utter shamelessness of this comedy of justice becomes obvious. The English bourgeoisie which for years, along with the reformists, has maintained that Bolshevism is an imported article and that it could not gain any foothold on Anglo-Saxon soil, sees itself faced with the growing Communist Party and now seeks to combat it by resorting to demonstrative trials intended to intimidate.

The English bourgeoisie is destroying the whole decorum of formal democracy, of the impartiality of the law, of bourgeois liberty etc. and is overriding those parts of the Constitution which hinder the suppression of the working class.

All English workers who accept at their face value the so-called independence and neutrality of the Courts have now received an object lesson, and can no longer fail to recognise the true class character of the decision of the Court against the Communist Party.

The English bourgeoisie is following the same road as its vassals, Poland, Roumania and Bulgaria, and considers it opportune to introduce its colonial regime into England itself. This, at least, serves to show how much stability there is in the Conservative Government and the class it represents.

The condemnation of the Communists betokens a new phase in the history of the English Labour Movement. It is the aim of the Conservative government to disorganise and isolate the Communist Party. But it has achieved the exact contrary result. There is not the least doubt that the entire English Labour Movement will seriously consider this question. The trial of the English Communists has ended, the trial of the English bourgeoisie and its Constitution is beginning!

### To our Readers!

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

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

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

These subscriptions include all Special Numbers besides the Regular Number.

Readers in England can also obtain the "Inprecorr" from the Communist Bookshop, 16, King Street, London W. C. 2.

## HANDS OFF CHINA

### Against the Unequal Treaties and the Customs Slavery of China!

Appeal of the Professors of the Peking National University.

Peking 18. November 1925.

To the friends of the Chinese people! To the intellectual circles of the world! To the working masses of all countries!

China has for decades been suffering under the monstrous oppression of the imperialist Powers. By unscrupulous wars, by financing the militarists and civil war, the imperialists have reduced our country to a state of absolute defencelessness.

By means of violence, political pressure and intrigues, the great Powers have immeshed our country in a net of treaties which completely robbed China of her right of self-determination.

England, France, America and Japan carried on the world war under the slogans of "Right of nations to self-determination, freedom of cultural and economic development for the peoples!"; and these are the very same Powers who are compelling our people to tolerate foreign courts of justice on Chinese territory, extraterritoriality for those portions of territory which have been snatched from us and also for the citizens of the imperialist countries, and foreign control of our customs regulations and of our finances. These are the same Powers who brutally scorn our right to self-determination, who suppress the freedom of China by means of armed force and shamelessly violate the Chinese people who are suffering severely from the consequences of the maintenance of this state of affairs.

Our late leader, Sun Yat Sen, designated the treaties which were forcibly imposed upon China as **Unequal Treaties**. The whole of the Chinese people is demanding the abolition of these unequal treaties. The customs slavery to which the Powers have subjected our country is ruining the finances of China and preventing her economic development. And now the diplomats of the imperialist States are to meet together in Peking in order to decide among themselves how our customs duties are to be settled in the future. The whole Chinese Republic echoes to the cry of our people: "Away with the unequal treaties! Down with the customs slavery! Complete customs autonomy for China!"

Yet the diplomats, these zealous representatives of the interests of the capitalist groups of their respective countries, remain deaf to these cries. Like their capitalist and imperialist masters in America, England, Japan and France, they regard China as a sort of semi-colony for supplying raw materials, as a market for their goods and as a suitable place for the investment of their capital, as a reservoir of cheap labour power. It is from this standpoint that the representatives of the great Powers wish to fetter China in the future, as hitherto, by means of the setting up a customs system in accordance with the lust for profit of the imperialist capitalist powers; they wish to carry out a customs policy for the plundering of China and for the throttling of her economic life. The realisation of these intentions would mean plunging China into the abyss of ruin.

**Friends of China! Working masses of all countries! Peasants of the World!**

The Chinese people are carrying on a desperate life and death struggle. The intellectuals, the workers and peasants are and will be still more exposed to indescribable sufferings if the fresh slave plans of the imperialists should succeed. But the masses of the West will also be immediately affected if millions of our people are made to suffer unrestrained exploitation by imperialism.

**Intellectuals, workers and peasants of the West and of the whole world.**

We have heard resounding from your ranks the slogan: "Exploited and oppressed of all countries, unite for the overthrow of imperialism!" This slogan is in accordance with the need of the hour. The Chinese people are fighting steadfastly against their deadly enemy, against imperialism. Down with the customs robbers! We have confidence in you, working masses of the West, that you will clearly recognise the necessity of a common struggle along with us. We are convinced that the masses of the West will no longer permit the imperialist govern-

ments of their countries to carry on the insolent customs robbery in China and to plunder our country and our people. We send you this appeal, with brotherly greetings in the name of the fighting Chinese people, thoroughly confident of your active solidarity. We are profoundly convinced that no intellectual, no worker or peasant of the West will hesitate to support energetically the exploited and suppressed Chinese people in their severe struggle against imperialism.

**Down with the unequal treaties!**

**Down with the customs robbery and the customs slavery!**

**Complete customs autonomy for China!**

**Down with Imperialism!**

**Long live the alliance of the exploited classes of the West with the suppressed peoples of the East!**

## THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY COMMUNIST CONFERENCE AT BRUSSELS

### Resolution on the Policy of Protective Tariffs and Trade Agreements.

1. The war has tremendously intensified the contradictions of capitalist international economy. The extension in the apparatus of production is becoming more and more disproportionate to the limited possibilities of sale. No satisfactory regulation of the question of the cost of the war and of the paying off of international debts has yet been found. The consequence is a permanent chain of crises concerning markets and currency which are constantly recurring and always becoming more severe in almost all capitalist countries (agrarian crises in America and Germany, industrial crises in England and Germany, currency crises in Germany, Poland, France etc.)

One of the means by which the bourgeoisie tries to master these international crises is its policy of high protective tariffs, of prohibition of imports, of anti-dumping laws, of concessions for imports and exports from case to case, of fixing contingents of imports (also of immigration as for instance in the United States), of granting privileges to "national" shipping and industry and of obstinately fighting against the foreign trade monopoly of the Soviet Union, as well as of attempts to strangle the native industries in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

At the same time, the bourgeoisie is attempting in the various countries to bring about at least a temporary settlement between the contradictory interests of the various national groups of capital, by a system of commercial treaties, constructed on the basis of "fighting duties", import contingents etc., and further by certain international agreements (for instance the proposal of an international economic conference, the slogan of "a European Customs' Union", the project of an agreement as to "international regime in seaports").

2. Whereas however, in the period of early capitalism, protective duties and commercial treaties had the object of developing the internal market, now, in the period of monopolist capitalism, they are turning into an obstacle to technical progress and to the internationalisation of economics as well as into a means of ensuring the rule of the great national groups of capital, the trusts, concerns, cartels and syndicates, and further into a weapon or, as the case may be, an object of bargaining for the great groups of capital in the distribution of world markets. They are an instrument for intensified exploitation both of the broad masses of workers in the capitalist States and of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

The commercial treaties of the capitalist governments are, in the imperialist period, not means for bringing about "understanding between the peoples" and "peaceful competition", but means for the embittered fight of the imperialist robbers for markets and for territories to exploit. They are also means for enforcing the "Dawesation" of the weaker capitalist States by the groups with economic and military predominance, as well as for strangling the independent and economic development of semi-colonial peoples.

The slogan of "treaty duties" is nothing but an attempt to make "customs' war" a permanent condition among the individual imperialist robber States. Customs' wars however not only mean the destruction of economic relations, they are

not only combined with a constant increase in the cost of living and unemployment for the working masses, they involve at the same time the **direct danger of fresh military encounters.**

3. An essential feature of the imperialist customs' and trade policy dictated by the great trusts, cartels etc. are the **private negotiations and private agreements of large groups of capital** which run parallel with the official government negotiations and in reality determine them (for instance the negotiations between German and French heavy industry). The intensified fight for markets, the growing formation of international cartels is expressed in the ever-increasing establishment of **definite import and export contingents in favour of large industry combined in concerns.** These measures are associated with the closing of factories and increased unemployment and serve at the same time to intensify the exploitation of the proletariat and to make the weaker industrial groups and the peasant masses dependent on the large concerns.

4. The **social democratic parties of the 2nd International** in no way carry on on principle a fight against the imperialist customs' and trade policy, they do not carry on a fight which is determined by the class interests of the proletariat and of the strata and peoples who are oppressed by the imperialist bourgeoisie. It is true that at times they carry on a certain parliamentary opposition to the bourgeois policy of protection for reasons of demagogic agitation, but in practice, the social democrats of the most various countries have always proved to be helpmates of one group or other of the bourgeoisie in their country, whether they tolerated the introduction or the increase of certain industrial duties and only protested against agricultural duties "in the interest of the consumers", or whether they themselves took a positive share in the introduction of "moderate" or "gliding" protective duties. Social democracy everywhere supports the illusion that international treaties and agreements of capitalist States or of groups of large capitalists, as the case may be, might solve or at least mitigate the existing economic and currency crises. It should be especially emphasised that social democracy has done nothing to combat the exploitation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries by the extortionate customs and trade policy of the imperialist robber States. It does however, hand in hand with the bourgeoisie, combat the commercial and economic policy of the only proletarian State in the world, the **Soviet Union.** Nowhere in the world does social democracy mobilise the broad masses to fight against the imperialist commercial and economic policy.

5. In contrast to this, the **Communists** declare that the contradictions of capitalist economy in the period of monopolist capitalism are not less, but greater, more violent and, as they affect the working masses, more devastating. The international agreements and formation of cartels of the great monopolist groups of capital are, in exactly the same way as the treaties, alliances and conferences of the imperialist governments, not instruments for preventing new economic or political crises, conflicts and catastrophes, but means of power of the strongest monopolist groups of capital and imperialist States, and thus the source of new and worse crises, conflicts and wars. **The whole customs and trade policy of the capitalist imperialist States is consequently nothing but a continuation of the old war policy with other means and the preparation for new armed conflicts.**

It is therefore the duty of the **Communist Parties** of all countries to carry on the **most intensive fight against the customs and trade policy of the imperialist governments, inside and outside the Parliaments.** They must in every individual case point out the reactionary effect of the protective tariffs which threaten not only the existence of the proletariat but also the existence of the broadest middle strata of the rural and urban population in the present period, and they must mobilise the masses for fight against the whole protection policy of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The Communist Party must fight to the uttermost against the social democratic conception, according to which "moderate" or "sliding" protective tariffs may be granted to industry or to certain branches of manufacturing industry, nominally in the interest of the workers. In no case do the working masses benefit by protective tariffs in the highly capitalist States. Above all, protective tariffs do not prevent the importation of capital and so do not prevent the subjugation of protected but weaker economic bodies by strong international financial groups. Further, any protection in one branch of industry is necessarily followed by demands for protection in another branch. Anyone who agrees to **industrial duties, even**

under the mask of "financial duties", "treaty duties" etc., gives the large agrarians the most powerful argument for their demands for duties. Duties for "protection of the currency", for "improving the trade balance" also only serve the purposes of the large groups of capital.

The slogans of the agrarians: "increase agricultural production", "food from our own soil", "protection of farming" are also only slogans for misleading the proletariat, peasant and petty bourgeois masses. In reality agrarian duties always serve the purpose of increasing profit from land and the capital profits of landed proprietors and agrarian capitalists.

6. Duties on luxury goods can only be conceded by the Communists when it is a case of products which are really only consumed by the bourgeoisie as luxuries (pearls, diamonds, expensive furs).

It is a special duty of the Communists to carry on a broad, careful work of enlightenment of the masses of the small and middle peasantry as to the part played by and the effect of, both agrarian and industrial duties. Protective duties on commercial plants, such as fruit, tobacco, vegetables and wine should also be rejected. Should however a sudden removal of the capitalist protective measures threaten the existence of broad strata of the small peasants in consequence of their being heavily taxed and exploited by the big agrarians and big industrialists, the Communists must indeed promote the rapid removal of these duties but at the same time promote the carrying through of serious measures for cheapening and increasing peasant production or for turning over to other kinds of work in certain branches of production.

Should, as a result of the protective tariffs or of certain tariffs, the broad peasant masses be exposed to ruin and to the supremacy of certain foreign trusts and concerns who wish to monopolise the home markets, the question must be asked whether the Communists, after they have made the above proposals and these proposals have been rejected, might, in the interest of maintaining the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, agree in Parliament to certain protective measures as a provisional modus vivendi. This question is to be made the subject of a thorough enquiry in the whole Communist International.

At the same time, it should be explained to the strata of small peasants, by energetic agitation, that the protective policy of a State developed on capitalist lines is at bottom, in its effect, against their interest, and that other measures must be taken for their protection.

7. This fight of Communism against the capitalist imperialist protection policy, by no means implies identification with the principles of bourgeois free trade. "Free trade" in the period of monopolist capitalism means in practice the dictatorship of the strongest groups of capital over the weaker ones. It does not diminish but increases the material and financial exploitation of the working masses and the concentration of all the means of production in the hands of a few gigantic international trusts, concerns and financial corporations. "Free trade" by no means leads to the economic satisfaction of the world markets but, on the contrary, to increased competition between the large international groups of capital for the final distribution of markets and territories for exploitation. The slogan of the industrial adherents of free trade as regards corn, "cheap bread", is only a cover for their intention of lowering the wages of the workers. The unrelenting fight of the Communists against the policy of protection and the commercial treaties of the imperialist States which are based on it, must therefore be closely combined with the destruction of the illusions of the free traders.

The fight against the undercutting of the large trusts and syndicates must be carried on as a fight for equal wages and for the eight hours' day in all countries, and therefore as a fight against the anti-dumping laws of the bourgeoisie and for international trade union unity.

The whole fight against the tariff and trade policy of the imperialist bourgeoisie must be combined with a broad and permanent propaganda demanding proletarian control of production, a workers and peasants government and an economic alliance with Soviet Russia, as the proletarian solution of the existing problems. A proletarian State, in which the working class rules, will carry out an economic policy in the interest

of the working masses by means of a monopoly of foreign trade.

8. When commercial treaties are being concluded between bourgeois governments, the Communist Parties of the countries in question should get in touch with one another in good time and determine their attitude in the closest agreement with one another. The consent to or rejection of a commercial treaty must in each individual case be determined, not according to the reformist point of view by an "understanding with the powerful capitalists and their governments" but according to the point of view of an understanding with the working masses. The character of the commercial treaties as instruments of the large groups of capital which rule in the imperialist States, must be sharply outlined in the propaganda and agitation. Our attitude in this connection must not be determined by the momentary advantage of the working class of a single country, but must be governed by the permanent interest of the workers of all countries, including the oppressed colonial and semi-colonial peoples. The consent to a special commercial treaty is only permissible when it is a case of making use of existing contradictions between the individual groups of capital in the interest of the working masses. Consent in Parliament must therefore in each case be combined with an explanation of the motives.

9. The question of protection and trade policy must on principle be answered differently in a country with a proletarian dictatorship such as Soviet Russia, and in capitalist States. In the former, foreign trade is exclusively in the hands of the workers and peasants. In proletarian States, the monopoly of foreign trade serves exclusively to keep off imperialist attempts at exploitation and to promote the development of socialist industry and of cooperative farming. The Communist Parties in the capitalist States must therefore fight with all their force to secure the recognition of the foreign trade monopoly of Soviet Russia by the imperialist governments, to persuade them to grant in each case the "most favoured nation terms" to Soviet Russia and to conclude a close economic alliance with this first proletarian State.

10. As regards the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the Communists must fight to the bitter end:

- a) against the demands of the imperialist robbers that the income from tariffs should be pledged,
- b) against the claims of the imperialist States, for partial or complete tariff unity in the semi-colonial countries,
- c) for the complete independence and autonomy of the semi-colonial peoples in their customs and trade policy.

d) for the complete economic and political autonomy of the colonies and dominions.

e) for the removal of colonial undercutting, by granting to the native proletariat the unrestricted right to form Unions and to strike, with the object of obtaining equal wages and the eight hour day throughout the world.

## UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

### The Fiftieth Birthday of Comrade Kalinin.

By A. Bubnov.

50 years of age and 27 years of revolutionary work, these figures serve to characterise the life history of comrade Kalinin.

Michael Ivanovitch Kalinin is known throughout Soviet Russia and the whole world as the Soviet Union's "Oldest", as the permanent chairman of the Central Executive Committee of our Soviets since the death of comrade Sverdlov.

But Kalinin embodies before all the history of our working class, the history of our labour movement and the history of our Party.

Kalinin entered the Party in 1898, that is after the first victorious struggle of Marxism with the Narodniki, after the first great advance of the labour movement of the nineties, in the year of the first Congress of our Party. He belongs to that famous fighting body of advanced workers who were beginning to advance the cause of the workers and to build up our Party at the end of the 'nineties of the last century.

Kalinin has passed through three revolutions as well as the black years of reaction, the victory of the October Revolution, the civil war and the enormous progress in the building up of the Soviet State. In him there is embodied the battle-tryed advanced section of the working class of our country and an extraordinarily comprehensive experience in struggle and in constructive work.

Kalinin is not only a turner, but also a tiller of the soil, not only a worker but also a peasant. He is the embodiment of that alliance between the workers and peasants which constitutes the strength and stability of the Soviet Union.

During the trying years of the struggles and encounters of the civil war, the Red Army saw Comrade Kalinin more than once in its fighting ranks on all sections of the Red front. He is not for nothing an honorary member of the Red Army.

Comrade Kalinin unites by a special bond our firmly-steeled Party with our heroic working class. Comrade Kalinin is a Bolshevik of the genuine Leninist school.