In the international situation there is a certain temporary partial stabilisation of the capitalist powers. It would be folly not to recognise this fact. On the other hand however, and as a blind fold, the temporary stabilisation only conceals the fact of continuous internecine struggle.

This is also how the Locarno Agreement is to be understood, for on the one side it has the character of an apparent pacification of Europe, while on the other side it is the result of an acute internal struggle and contains the germ of a whole series of future conflicts.

It might have been expected that, with the stabilisation of capitalism, the revolutionary movement would have subsided, but nevertheless it is constantly flaring up in ever fresh countries. The so-called stabilisation of capital has simply to put up with such facts as a number of colonial wars (Morocco, Syria) and a revolutionary movement such as we see at present in China.

Thus the struggle between various forces goes on under new forms, the fight of the capitalist States among themselves, the fight of all the capitalist countries against the revolutionary elements in the East.

As is well known, the capitalist countries hoped that we should not succeed in the reconstruction of our country, that we should not be equal to the task of building up our economies, that our forces would automatically disintegrate in consequence of the bankruptcy of re-establishing industry which they had anticipated.

They cherished these hopes for a good long time. For the time being they have postponed the question of exercising military pressure against us. Now they see that we have completed our economic tasks, that our economic position improves from year to year, that our forces are constantly increasing and that if they do not succeed in putting a stumbling block in our way, we shall, in a few years, if not the richest, at any rate one of the richest, the most united, energetic and self-confident countries of the whole world.

This prospect must alarm those States whose power is based on the oppression of colonial peoples. It is not difficult to see that the idea of a war which would disturb our further development, is based on the view that the Soviet Union must be strangled before it finally gets on its feet and collects its forces. We must not regard our enemies as fools, they are extremely clever when it is a question of defending their class interests, and they see that every month lost may prove fatal to them.

Why do the capitalist countries not try to attack us at once?

Mainly because they cannot agree amongst themselves.

Locarno is the first attempt to come to an understanding which is to open the way through Germany to the frontiers of Soviet Russia for English and French capitalism. As however Germany, which was recently shattered up by them, feels herself to be an oppressed and plundered country — and this is felt not only by the working masses but also by the bourgeoisie of Germany — the agreement on the part of England and France to act in common with Germany, meets with considerable difficulties. It is much more important of course that the working class should realise that Locarno is the first step in the attack planned against us, and that all the capitalist governments are afraid that any attempt at hostile action against us would demoralise their own forces.

It is precisely the growth of the revolutionary movement which guarantees that the war to which I have referred, and which will undoubtedly lead to the minds of the capitalist Powers, in spite of the passionate desire of Churchill, Poincaré, Millerand, etc., will be postponed, and in fact will not be realised at all if the growth of the Labour movement in Europe continues.

The revolutionary movement in Europe itself is progressing. It suffers to call to mind the most recent events in order to show us what is going on in the minds of the capitalist Powers, in the brother parties in Czechoslovakia, Germany and Belgium. In France we see a really strong Communist Party backed by the working class; we see an extraordinary change of attitude in the English trade union movement.

In the English Labour movement especially, the tactics of the united front have led to very important results. As is known, the development of the English trade union movement led to the formation of an Anglo-Russian Unity Committee whose task it is to carry on a common fight against capitalism, and consequently against the foundations of capitalism in general. This committee has not remained a mere pious wish, it is developing a real activity of its own, is initiating actions and carrying the masses with it. This change in the English Labour movement, the connection which has been established between the English trade unions and our own council, is a great success for the tactics of the united front.

If we take all these facts into consideration, we see that the situation is one in which Churchill and Millerand, however much they may wish to fight against us and strangle us before we have arrived at our full strength, will not do so, that is, will not have the power to do so.

They will not by any means whatever, be able to arrest the revolutionary movement in the East, for it is a historical movement, backed by hundreds of millions who want to burst their capitalist chains. The proletarian movement in Europe, on the other hand, will develop further.

We have then every reason to assume that, in the immediate future at any rate, we shall have a breathing space for our work of reconstruction.

**Politics**

The Offensive of American Imperialism in Asia and Africa.

By F. Raskolnikov (Moscow).

Imperialist America, who was working behind the scenes at the Conference of Locarno, succeeded in realising her programme in Western Europe. In its chase after new markets, American imperialism is now developing a feverishly active policy in the East, it is making convulsive efforts to extend its "sphere of influence" on the Asiatic and African continents.

In China. American capitalism is supporting the Chii group with Wu Pei Fu at its head and is egging him on to definite acts of war.

America appears in China under the banner of the policy of the "open door" and professes, in words, to be a "friend" of the Chinese people, but in reality is carrying on an independent imperialist policy of oppression which aims at ousting America's competitors from the Chinese market and taking possession of the natural wealth of China. At the Peking Conference on Customs, America is also pursuing a line of her own which deviates sharply from the interests of Japan and the other competing imperialist powers.

In Persia. The American General Administrator of Persian finances whose sphere of activity is Teheran, has, since autumn 1922, actually directed the finances of Persia. But that is not enough. American imperialism is at present attempting to extend its field of activity. Only recently, the Persian Parliament, on American initiative, passed a law which allows the Government to appoint twelve more American specialists for 3—5 years. One will be nominated director of agricultural policy, another is to be expert at the head of the railway department, and the rest will concern themselves with directing the affairs of the country. Agriculture, railways, finances, foreign trade, tariff policy, in one word, American imperialism is threatening the fate of falling into the clutches of American imperialism.

In Syria. American imperialism has for a long time been interested in this country. As early as in 1919, at the time of the Versailles peace negotiations, an American commission went to Syria to study its economic resources. At the time of the war of the French troops against the Druses, the insurrection in Damascus, Homs, Hama and other places in Syria have attracted America's attention. Two American torpedo boats were recently sent from Gibraltar to Beirut, the chief port and centre of administration of Lebanon.

Morocco. The deposits of ore in the territory occupied by the Rifis, attract the capitalists of all imperialist countries. The French and Spanish capitalists who ruled in this territory even before the imperialist war, carried on a desperate fight against the German firm of Mannesmann & Co. which was trying to gain an economic hold throughout Morocco. After the war.
French Imperialism in Syria.

By G. eri (Paris).

The "Chicago Tribune" a few days ago, published very precise and serious information from its correspondent in London, stating that this time the purely aggressive character of the co-operation between France and Britain in the Near East. According to this report M. de Jouvenel's visit to London and his discussions with Chamberlain have led to an understanding on very important questions.

The first part of this agreement aims at creating a united front against the Turks and the purely aggressive character of the Vilayet of Mosul. If the Turkish troops were to attempt to cross the borders of Iraq, they would meet with firm resistance from Great Britain.

In return for this, this clause forms the second part of the agreement — the two imperialisms will set up a common policy in the administration of the mandatory territories of Iraq, Syria, Palestine and Transjordania.

Finally, the last part provides for "appropriate measures for facilitating a common policy in the Balkans, with the object of bringing about unity in the Balkans and of preparing for common action in the defence of the Balkans against Turkey, should this be necessary".

If the Turks should dare to defy the decision of the League of Nations as regards the determination of the frontiers of the Vilayet of Mosul, the Balkan States are, by order of the League, to march into Europe and to confine them within the frontiers of Asia Minor.

French imperialism, which is greedily trying to maintain and extend its rule in the Near East and to restore its shaken prestige in Syria, is allowing itself to be taken in by its powerful British neighbour.

As was to be expected, the British Foreign Office has questioned the truth of this communication, but the modesty of the denial alone is enough to make things clear to us.

It is indeed not the first time that a predatory treaty of this kind has been concluded between France and Great Britain, and the history of the negotiations between these two Powers in the last few years provides us with valuable data in this respect.

When the world war broke out, all the "friendly and allied" States were eager to seize upon the advantages which Germany had gained in the East in the course of her powerful campaign to further her "advance towards the East". In May 1916, a treaty was concluded between the Tsar, France and England for the division of the Ottoman Empire.

Constantinople was promised to the Russians. The other Turkish provinces, inhabited by Arabs, Armenians and Kurds, were divided between the three allies. Immediately after the treaty was signed, the French, British and English marched forwards in the South East, France prepared to undertake an expedition against Alexandria, where the attack on Verdun upset all these attractive plans. The French leaders thereupon formed the Oriental Army, which consisted to a large extent of Syrians and Armenians to whom France promised independence. A short time before the armistice, first Beirut and then Jerusalem were wrested from the Turks.

In the meantime other events had taken place. Proletarian Russia had naturally withdrawn from the competition between the rival imperialisms. A new treaty was concluded between France and England, who this time were joined by Italy. This treaty, the so-called "Three Party Treaty of Saint-Jean-de-Mauv"c"., recognised the equality of the economic treatment of the three Powers, but granted France a prior claim to Cilicia, Upper Mesopotamia and Kurdistan.

The French zone of influence embraced altogether the Syrian littoral and Cilicia, and secondly the hinterland, including Mosul, where the independence of an Arabian State was to be protected.

The English zone of influence consisted first of all of Iraq (Mesopotamia, Bagdad to Samora), and secondly the adjacent part of that Desert. Thus also an Arabian State was to be protected. As regards Palestine, it was to be subjected to international control.

British troops, however, conducted military operations in the whole country from 1917 onwards. At the same time, England put Faisal, whom she had bought for gold, into that part of the zone where she had to "protect" an independent Arabian State.