

HEADING FOR WAR

By
T. Bell

LONDON 1929 .
MODERN BOOKS LIMITED

PUBLISHED IN MARCH, 1929.
PRINTED IN ENGLAND BY THE
DORRIT PRESS, LIMITED
(T.U. THROUGHOUT)
68-70 LANT ST.,
LONDON,
S.E.1.

INTRODUCTION

THE great Imperialist War of 1914-18 was conducted under the slogans of "the last of all wars," "for democracy and freedom," for "lands fit for heroes to dwell in," etc. But the mass of the peoples have learned otherwise. To-day, it is no longer necessary to argue with intelligent working men and women, to prove that 1914-18 was a war for markets, for territory and sources of raw materials, conducted by powerful groups of capitalists and financiers against each other. As in all such wars the working masses were mere cannon-fodder in the settlement of these differences. Ten millions dead and twenty millions wounded (tens of thousands of whom are crippled for life), mostly the flower of working class youth—such was the price paid for listening to the deceptive slogans of the bourgeoisie and their allies in 1914-18.

We have recently celebrated the Tenth Anniversary of the "Peace" that was to become a new heaven and earth for the lot of the war-weary masses. What has "Peace" brought? Has war been banished for all time? Are there any signs of the sword being turned into a ploughshare? Is the world nearer the age-long dream of universal peace and no more war? In the following pages we venture to bring forward some evidence to show that, far from ushering in a new era, outside the territory of the Soviet Union the elements of new and even greater and more terrible wars are stronger than even in the decade before 1914. The same greed and rivalries of imperialist groups obtain. The race for armaments goes on, this time for newer and more deadly weapons than before. Human flesh and muscle are to be supplemented by

mechanical devices, poison gases and deadly germs, making the next war a perfect horror.

Aware of the approaching crash, the capitalists are striving with might and main to hurry forward their preparations. Not the least important of these is the propaganda for "disarmament" and for "outlawry of war." Torn between the devil and the deep sea the imperialists talk peace the while they are arming. This "peace propaganda" serves the objective purpose of preparing the masses for war. Knowing there is a deep and widespread peace sentiment amongst the toilers, the "disarmament," "negotiating," and "Peace" conferences are intended to place the "enemy," which is always the other side, in the wrong. It serves to create the illusion that our government has exhausted every avenue for peace. Thus the more Peace talk prevails the nearer we are to war.

For these reasons we should be mistaken if we failed to underline the pacifist role of the social-democratic ministerialists and of the semi-mystical and "radical" pacifists of the "left" social-democracy. We have already had sufficient proof that the chief leaders of the Second International have passed from being mere social patriots to social imperialists. MacDonald in England, Boncour and the French socialists, Vandervelde, Brancke, Hilferding, Bauer and the official gang of the Second International make no bones about where they stand to-day. They are the open defenders of "their" imperialists' territory and property. But the great danger is in the camp of the "lefts," who chatter about resisting the war and refusing to assist the warlords. In the following pages we give some examples of their behaviour.

Yet another link in the chain of war preparations

is the growth of bourgeois opposition to the workers' organisation. Open persecution of the Communists—in some countries a perfect White Terror—accompanies all kinds of schemes of class collaboration for the wrecking of organised resistance to war. The bourgeoisie hopes to paralyse the militant organisations while pursuing a policy of corrupting the reformist organisations and leadership. There are signs, however, that they are not succeeding as well as they hoped. The French elections, the German elections, the increased powers of resistance of the British workers in spite of the labour bureaucracy and the economic movements in all countries, are all evidence of a radicalisation of the masses, which will grow rather than diminish.

The war of 1914-18 found the workers in the majority of countries unprepared to meet open suppression with a well-trained organisation. In reality when the bourgeoisie drives the revolutionary workers' organisations of to-day underground they are sowing the harvest of dragons' teeth that awaits them. Communist Parties are in fact being trained under the present conditions of persecution for the sterner work of illegal combat against the war that is coming. Combined with the historical experience bequeathed by the Bolshevik Party and the Spartacists, the bourgeoisie will find persecution a boomerang from which they will not recover.

As to the question whether the next war will be a war of the combined imperialist forces against the Soviet Union or a war between two imperialist groups, it is difficult to say. Lenin has warned us to treat war seriously, to beware of trifling "incidents," for wars are prepared with great secrecy, and come stealthily upon us. What is important

for us is the persistent manoeuvring to isolate the U.S.S.R. and to form an anti-Soviet bloc of the imperialist Powers. The rupture of relations between the capitalist States and the Soviet Government, and the financial blockade all point in one direction, viz., a new war against the proletarian power. An internal crisis, such as was the aim of the Donetz saboteurs, may be the signal for the imperialists to begin war.

In the following pages we give illustrations of the retarding and accelerating factors making for the war that is imminent. One feature is outstanding. The next war will release tremendous revolutionary movements throughout the colonies. The colonial and semi-colonial peoples have had ample demonstration of the attitude of the Soviet Republics towards the question of national independence and separation from the bonds of imperialism. For one thing, the Soviet Union in a defensive war against the imperialist attack will be able to count upon the pressure of the national revolutionary movements upon the imperialist governments. These movements, side by side with the radicalised mass movement of the industrial workers and poor peasantry of the countryside, will sound the final knell of imperialist domination.

The figures are taken from the Statesman's Year Book for 1923 and 1927, the Military Year Book of the League of Nations, and the official budgets.

T. B.

HEADING FOR WAR

ANGLO-AMERICAN RIVALRY

WHAT are the objective signs of the imminence of war? Let us look at the important groupings of the imperialists. Foremost amongst the many signs we must place the antagonism and rivalry between America and Great Britain. Anglo-American antagonisms are at present the fundamental imperialist antagonisms. The economic differences between Great Britain and America were given a vivid military-political expression in the naval rivalry which has been assuming enormous proportions in the last few years. Having at the Washington Conference, 1922, secured equality of forces with Great Britain regarding ships of the line, in 1927 the United States endeavoured to induce Great Britain voluntarily to recognise equality of forces in cruisers. By this America wanted—without war and on the basis of economic supremacy—to compel Great Britain finally to relinquish the old principle of its policy: a navy stronger than the navy of any other Power, and to establish for the given period equality of forces with America. In the summer of 1927 a naval conference of the United States, Great Britain and Japan took place in Geneva on the initiative of America (France and other countries refused to participate in the conference). At this Conference America brought forward its proposals. But this time Great Britain did not give way, and the Geneva Conference was a failure. After this, feverish preparations were made for the construction of new ships, particularly in the United States.

What kind of a navy American imperialism wants

for its "defence" is shown by the data of the naval shipbuilding programme placed before the legislative organs for endorsement, and by the explanations given by Wilbur, the Secretary of the American Navy.

The American and British press give the following official data on the new naval programme of the United States. The Bill makes provision for the construction, in the course of the next five years, of seventy-one new naval units, including: 25 cruisers of 10,000 tons each; 5 aeroplane carriers ("Saratoga" type, 33,000 tons); 9 torpedo boats, and 32 submarines.* When giving his reasons for this programme, Wilbur made the following statement:

"When we placed this programme before the naval authorities we left aside the correlation 5-5-3 and concentrated our attention on satisfying our own needs. The mistake in connection with the new shipbuilding programme consists in attaching too much importance to this correlation; if the Washington Agreement is not extended to all types of ships, the proportion 5-5-3 is a false criterion for the definition of our construction programme."

"The fact," says Wilbur, "that Great Britain insists on the necessity for itself to build cruisers of a comparatively big tonnage regardless of the naval programmes of other Powers is the most eloquent proof that we also stand in need of an increased tonnage in cruisers regardless of the shipbuilding programmes of other Powers."

* The Congressional Naval Commission has curtailed the programme in its final draft. The original programme called for 25 cruisers to be started in 5 years. The new 15-cruiser programme specifies their being started by July 1st, 1931, i.e., in 3 years. Thus there is no real reduction at all.

In the course of his speech, Wilbur brought forward the argument about the necessity of "defending trade," and declared: "Our merchants and manufacturers must be able to keep their hold on the foreign markets on which they have firmly established themselves, and as a normal situation develops again in Europe we must seek new markets for our production. The display of the national flag stimulates considerably the struggle of our business men for new outlets, and the success of this struggle greatly depends on the prestige which modern cruisers create for the State."

The total cost of this construction programme was to be, according to the first estimate, 725 million dollars. However, some naval authorities in the United States (e.g., Admiral Hughes), think that this sum will have to be increased to one billion dollars. Wilbur's statement was made on January 11th, 1928, and two days' later he stated officially that for the construction of new warships the United States intends to spend in the course of the next twenty years 2,570,000 dollars. This 20 years' programme is to include the construction of 43 cruisers of 10,000 tons each and a number of large submarines and squadron torpedo boats. Wilbur thinks that by carrying out this programme, the American navy will be able to do justice to the "defensive tasks which are confronting it," though it is true that this programme will infringe the correlation of forces laid down in the Washington Agreement.

However, the statement which shows the real frame of mind existing in American naval circles with regard to a future war with Great Britain, formed part of a speech made by the American Admiral, Charles Plunkett, who occupies the post

of Chief of the Naval Department in Brooklyn (New York Harbour). Speaking on January 23rd 1928, in the National-Republican Club in New York, on the subject "Must the United States have a navy equal to that of the biggest navy in the World?" Plunkett made the following statement with regard to the outbreak of war: "We are nearer than ever to the danger of war because we pursue a trade policy of competition and oust other nations. Such a policy leads inevitably to war, but if you do not want war, then be a worm and wriggle yourself into the nearest crevice you can see. As long as you dare to contend for control over the seas you will have war as surely as you are sitting now in this room. As long as we pursue our present policy war is absolutely inevitable." To the question of whether Plunkett had in view war with Great Britain, he said: "Yes, I have in view Great Britain, or any other nation the interests of which may be touched. Great Britain will not declare war on us from the first, but it will compel one of the small nations to do so and will then hide behind its back."

By all that has been said of Anglo-American antagonisms it is clear that they are at present the fundamental imperialist antagonisms. Their future development leads inevitably to war. The coming years will be taken up with military and political preparations for the coming war. The principal antagonists will be Great Britain and America. These preparations will be the keynote of the entire international situation in the coming period.

BRITISH-FRENCH-ITALIAN RIVALRY

The next fact we consider is the relations between Britain, France and Italy. Not so long ago

Europe was divided into two camps, the British and the French, Great Britain selecting Italy as its ally, and France leaning towards Germany. Thoiry and Leghorn are still identified with a definite course in European politics, viz., an Anglo-Italian rapprochement to counteract the Franco-German rapprochement.

During the last year, however, a certain change is noticeable in the attitude of British diplomacy to France.

Great Britain has come forward as arbiter between France and Italy; it is bringing definite pressure to bear on Italy, compelling it to make concessions. As a result of this Italy had to moderate considerably its aggressive tone towards Yugoslavia and had also to make concessions in its demands for participation in the administration of Tangier; finally, the appointment of the new French Ambassador in Rome and the opening of Franco-Italian negotiations bear witness that the relations between these two countries have entered upon a more peaceful stage. Both countries are now looking for compromises capable of delaying the outbreak of war which seemed imminent in 1926-27.

Great Britain has relinquished its former position on the solution of the guarantee problem, which, as everyone knows, differed considerably from that of France, and brought forward new viewpoints (in its memorandum on this question on January 18th, 1928) which bear witness to their definite conformity with the viewpoint of France.

Preparations are made for an economic rapprochement between Great Britain and France; negotia-

tions are contemplated for a trade agreement; an Anglo-French bank is to be established in London; the agreement on the distribution of the future production of Mosul oil has been initialled.

The above-mentioned facts indicate that we have to do with a definite change in the tactics of British diplomacy, which is to a certain extent altering the international situation of the European continent.

There is no doubt whatever, that this change in the policy of Great Britain must have serious reasons. An analysis of the recent general international situation leads us to the conclusion that among the main reasons are:

(1) The increasing accentuation of differences between Great Britain and America. (For analysis of these differences see above.)

(2) The rupture of Anglo-Soviet relations, and the active anti-Soviet policy of Great Britain, which is endeavouring to carry out its most ardent desire—a united anti-Soviet front of the European States.

(3) The growth of the economic power of Germany whose revival must inevitably bring in its wake the revival of the old Anglo-German differences.

(4) The stabilisation of the French currency which resulted in the consolidation of France in the international field, in the sense that France has become more independent with regard to foreign politics.

These factors compelled British diplomacy to relinquish its former anti-French policy and to carry on for a more or less prolonged period a policy of collaboration with regard to France. The further development of Anglo-French relations will depend

on the development of the four factors we have mentioned above.

In any case, we see at present a definite tendency towards a rapprochement between the two main imperialist Powers on the European continent.

ITALIAN-FRENCH-YUGOSLAV RIVALRY

Italian-French and Italian-Yugo-Slav relations are greatly influenced by France and Great Britain, and though there is a certain relaxation for the time being, we must bear in mind that the danger of war in the Mediterranean exists and that sooner or later war must break out, for the fundamental differences between these countries cannot be settled peacefully. Such a war will inevitably develop into a world war because it will immediately embroil Great Britain and a number of secondary Powers.

Here it is important to take stock of the distribution of the British fleet. At present the main forces of Great Britain are concentrated in the Mediterranean. Nearly the whole of the French fleet is also in the Mediterranean. A comparative table of naval forces in the Mediterranean gives us the following picture :

Comparative Table of Naval Forces in the Mediterranean

	Ships of the line		Cruisers	Aeroplane carriers	Flotilla leaders	Torpedo boats	Submarines
Gt. Britain	... 11	... 10	... 2	... 4	... 32	... 7	
France	... 9	... 6	... 1	... 4	... 27	... 9†	
Italy	... 5	... 11	... 1	... 4	... 40	... 41	
Spain	... 2*	... 10	—	—	... 8	... 15	
Greece	... 2	... 2	—	—	... 23	... 2	
Yugo-Slavia	—	... 1	—	—	... 11	... 2	

* Obsolete 17,000 tons.

† This does not include submarines for coastal defence, the basis of which is frequently shifted.

Comparative Table of the Naval Forces of Italy and France by 1931

According to programmes adopted before 1-1-28

	Ships of the line		Cruisers		Aeroplane carriers		Torpedo boats		Submarines	
	Total	Effective Craft	Total	Effective Craft	Total	Effective Craft	Total	Effective Craft	Total	Effective Craft
France	9	6 ...	17	9 ...	4	4 ...	100	83 ...	86	56
Italy	5	5 ...	20	16 ...	1	1 ...	143	101 ...	63	46

From the foregoing table we gather that Great Britain is master of the Mediterranean, and is able to unite its Atlantic fleet with the Mediterranean. Moreover, Great Britain has on its side Italy, and probably Spain. Should there be a war France would be in a difficult position to keep up communications with North Africa and Syria.

The determination of the British bourgeoisie to maintain its historic hold upon the route to India and the East and to strengthen its grip on the Middle Eastern Empire, is faced with Italian ambitions for colonial expansion in Syria, Anatolia, Arabia, Egypt, and Abyssinia. Of course, we must not forget that all the imperialist Powers are united on suppressing subversive nationalist movements in Asia and North Africa, while the lure of the Caucasian oilfields unites them in their common hatred to the Soviet Republic.

FRENCH-GERMAN-BRITISH RIVALRY

As to another important grouping, viz., France, Germany and Great Britain, it is already clear that the German bourgeoisie cannot reckon on co-operation on the question of a proposed revision

of the Dawes Plan with Great Britain, so we see a veering towards the U.S.A. There is a certain connection here with the improvement of Anglo-French relations. These relations are directed not only against the U.S.S.R., and the subversive nationalist revolutionary movements I have referred to, but also against Germany.

The economic development and consolidation of Germany are making it again a dangerous rival of Great Britain. All negotiations for the establishment of international concerns and agreements (with regard to steel, coal and the chemical industry) of which Germany and Great Britain would form a part have not yet materialised, which cannot certainly be explained by chance or temporary causes (such as inadequate concentration of British industry). We have to do here with more serious causes, in many respects analogous with those which called forth the pre-war Anglo-German antagonism. The influence of British capital in German industry, fairly considerable a little while ago (2 to 3 years ago) has been recently reduced to nought.

Rivalry on the markets of Eastern Europe, Scandinavia and the rest of Europe must be expected soon. One should bear in mind that over 70 per cent. (in 1927, 72.7 per cent.) of the German exports went to European markets. The elimination of British goods from the European markets is at present, for Germany, a struggle on the lines of least resistance, and in this respect Germany has achieved truly remarkable results as the following table shows:

*Germany's and Great Britain's share in Imports
of the Countries of Eastern Europe
in percentages*

	1924	1925	1926	1927
<i>Finland</i>				
Germany ...	29.8	39.9	34.9	32.6
Great Britain	18.8	17.0	12.9	14.2
<i>Esthonia</i>				
Germany ...	36.6	29.4	29.2	26.4
Great Britain	13.3	12.2	12.1	14.3
<i>Latvia</i>				
Germany ...	38.9	41.4	39.9	—
Great Britain	16.3	13.8	9.9	—
<i>Lithuania</i>				
Germany ...	—	56.5	53.8	53.4
Great Britain	—	8.3	7.9	6.4
<i>Poland</i>				
Germany ...	—	31.0	23.6	25.2
Great Britain	—	7.9	10.4	9.2
<i>Yugo-Slavia</i>				
Germany ...	8.3	9.9	12.0	11.9
Great Britain	10.6	8.2	5.8	6.6
<i>Bulgaria</i>				
Germany ...	20.3	19.6	21.9	20.4
Great Britain	13.2	13.1	11.3	12.2

(*Wirtschaftsdienst*, Nos. 16 and 17.)

U.S.A.-JAPAN-BRITISH RIVALRY

Take another group, the U.S.A.-Japan-Great Britain. The antagonisms between these Powers in the Far East are among the most important imperialist antagonisms. They are fraught with the danger of war. In recent years the character of these antagonisms has undergone frequent changes: alternately, Anglo-Japanese and Japanese-American antagonisms take the upper hand. A few years ago, when under the influence of America,

Great Britain severed the alliance with Japan at the Washington Conference and began to construct the Singapore Naval Base, relations between Japan and Great Britain seemed more hostile than between Japan and America. Later on, however, events took place which accentuated again Japanese-American relations: prohibition of Japanese immigration into America in 1924, Pacific manoeuvres of the American fleet in 1925, development of American naval bases in the Pacific, etc.

At the time of the Geneva Naval Conference in 1927, the situation was such that Japan turned against the United States and supported the main proposals of Great Britain. Chinese events, which were a severe blow to Great Britain, compelled it to seek agreement with Japan. That is why in 1927, the Japanese and British press felt inclined to discuss the question of a renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance. Seeing this turn of events, the United States indulged in a counter-manceuvre directed towards rapprochement with Japan and isolation of Great Britain. In this respect a very significant fact was the visit of Japan by the representative of the American bankers, Lamont, and his negotiations concerning a big loan for the South Manchurian Railway. These negotiations were proceeding satisfactorily and were to end in an agreement. It is only under the influence of a big wave of protest in China that the Americans are still abstaining from the grant of this loan. As to Japan, one could also notice in its policy a certain tendency towards rapprochement with America. Being in need of capital and intent on consolidating its position in North China, Japan is compelled to seek collaboration with the United States.

However, in the first months of 1928 events took

place which threatened to thwart the attempts at rapprochement between Japan and the United States and to accentuate again their mutual antagonism. Such events were: The agreement between America and South China on the Nanking incident, and Japanese intervention in Shantung. The former indicated America's intention to take a more active policy in China, and therefore it alarmed Great Britain and caused a certain amount of confusion in Japan. The Japanese intervention in Shantung in May is certainly very much disliked in America, and will probably induce it to take counter measures. Great Britain, however, is endeavouring to utilise the new situation for the consolidation of its relations with Japan to the detriment of the United States.

ARMAMENTS EXPENDITURE.

So far we have dealt with the political implications of the antagonisms and rivalries of the imperialist groups. Here we must speak about the military budgets. The increase of the sum total of expenditure by the five leading Powers: France, Great Britain, Italy, U.S.A., and Japan for defence, including military expenditure of other departments than the war department is staggering.

Taking the years 1913, 1923-24, 1926-27, 1927-28, the totals in millions of dollars for these respective years are 1,132.7; 2,118.9; 1,881.9; 2,057.1.

Coming to the numerical strength of the land armies (regulars only) of the five big Powers, these taken together constituted in 1913, 1,753,000; in 1927, 1,896,000, and in 1928, 1,865,000.

Thus in comparison with 1913 the numerical strength of the armies had increased by 112,000 in 1928.

However, the numerical strength of armies is not exactly indicative of contemporary militarism. At present the main factor at the expense of which the strength of armies is growing is military technique.

In this respect the Air Fleet takes first place. The development of the military air fleet of the big Powers in the last few years is shown in the following table which gives only aeroplanes on the active list (except Germany) :

<i>Number of Fighting Aeroplanes on the Active List</i>					
	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
Great Britain	408	599	630	630*	834
			close on		close on
United States	520	560	600*	620	700*
		close on		close on	close on
France ...	1,250	1,400*	1,550	1,580*	1,650*
Italy	250	400	665	640	600
Germany† ...	145	249	324	416	512
Japan	150	200	327	394	434
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	2,723	3,408	4,096	4,380	4,730

* Approximate figures.

† Only civil aeroplanes.

This table shows that the air forces of the big Powers are increasing from year to year, having almost doubled between 1923 and 1927.

These figures do not reflect the growth of the air forces at the expense of numbers. For instance, according to the table, it seems that in 1927, the number of aeroplanes in Italy has decreased a little, but this certainly does not mean a weakening of the Italian air fleet; on the contrary, it has grown in strength because a considerable number of obsolete aeroplanes were replaced by aeroplanes of the newest types. The same process of re-armament is taking place also in other countries.

The navies of the Big Powers are also growing at the expense of the newest types of ships.

Thus, for instance, the tonnage of the aeroplane carriers in the British navy in 1922 was 76,000

Respective figures for Great Britain and Japan are: in 1926, 30,000 and 15,000 tons; in 1930, 88,000 and 69,000 tons. This type of ship did not exist at all in the composition of the fleets in the pre-war period.

The following figures show the increase in the tonnage of submarines:

	1913	1926	1930 (assumed)
	(Thousand tons)		
Great Britain ...	55	46	80
United States ...	21	80	92
Japan ...	5	37	50
France ...	41	38	125
Italy ...	16	18	48

Apart from the regular armies, all bourgeois States maintain and prepare for war a considerable number of reserve organisations of a military type and irregular formation. These military-social organisations are growing rapidly. The table below gives an idea of this, although it does not include all organisations.

*Numerical Strength of Military-Social Organisations
(in thousands)*

	1913	1927	1927
France ...	—	1,040	1,100 (approx.)
Great Britain ...	—	500	550
United States	330	1,561	1,727
Italy*	—	218	259
Germany†	—	3,630	5,000 (approx.)

* Fascist Militia.

† Only military national unions.

Thus we witness a continuous strengthening of militarism and a quickening in the war preparations of the Big Powers. The figures we have given show clearly that the scope of the next imperialist war will exceed that of the war of 1914-18, which no one dares any longer call the last war.

THE CAPITALIST WORLD AND THE U.S.S.R.

The hostility of the capitalist world to the U.S.S.R. is due mainly to the enormous revolutionary influence of the U.S.S.R. as the centre of the Communist movement and the world revolution.

The political and economic stabilisation of capitalism which has taken place in recent years, and which has brought in its wake increased power for the bourgeoisie and a weakening of the position of the working class, has inevitably increased the hostility of world capitalism to the U.S.S.R. as the main obstacle in the way of a final stabilisation of capitalist society.

Having inflicted defeat on the revolutionary movement in a number of countries, the world bourgeoisie has begun to feel more and more the necessity of doing away with the U.S.S.R., as the prop and pillar of this movement. Therefore, the struggle against the U.S.S.R. is the next stage of the offensive of world capitalism against the working class and the continuation of its (capitalism's) stabilisation efforts.

The purely economic interests of capitalism also demand the inclusion of the U.S.S.R. in the world capitalist economy.

The ever-growing want of markets by the capitalist countries is inducing them to make use of the Soviet market which has enormous potential possi-

bilities. However, the role of the Soviet market is not as big as in the pre-war period, which is shown by the following figures on the percentage of U.S.S.R. trade in world trade:

	1913	1926
Imports	4.2	1.3
Exports	5.1	1.5

This decrease in the trade turnover of the U.S.S.R. compared with the pre-war level is, in the opinion of the bourgeoisie, a consequence of the monopoly of foreign trade and the elimination of private capital. Therefore, the first and foremost task of international capital consists in doing away with the monopoly of foreign trade and in securing for itself a more free access to the Soviet market.

The market of the U.S.S.R. could also be very important for the investment of capital. The export of capital which is assuming more and more importance in the economic expansion of the capitalist States, invests the Russian market with ever-growing importance. But at present, capital does not find its way into the U.S.S.R. On the one hand, because of distrust and on the other, because of disinclination to contribute to the development of socialist economy in this country. For an adequate utilisation of the Soviet market in this direction, international capitalism must destroy the main foundations of the socialist economy, first and foremost, nationalisation.

When considering the economic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist countries, it is essential to realise that in the last two years the pressure on economic positions in the Soviet Union has been increasing.

This economic pressure was given an impetus after the rupture of Anglo-Soviet relations. To

illustrate the growing hostility of the international bourgeoisie towards the U.S.S.R., one has only to point to the following facts:

(1) Almost complete unanimity of the British bourgeoisie with regard to severance of relations with the U.S.S.R.;

(2) Attempts at a credit blockade of the U.S.S.R., noticeable in a whole series of States;

(3) Irreconcilable attitude of the French bourgeoisie in the economic negotiations with the U.S.S.R.;

(4) Persistent attempts at a Franco-German Entente (De Monzy Plan) at a uniform economic policy with regard to the U.S.S.R.; the financial-industrial circles of Great Britain and the United States are also being drawn into the negotiations on this question;

(5) The affair of the Soviet gold in America and the attempt of the French Government to seize it;

(6) Germany's increased demands in the economic negotiations with the U.S.S.R., and the breaking off of these negotiations under the pretext of the arrest of German engineers;

(7) Sudden irreconcilable attitude of the Greek bourgeoisie which, under the influence of Great Britain, is endeavouring to sabotage the trade agreement with the U.S.S.R.;

(8) Campaign against the trade agreement in Latvia.

These facts show clearly that if complete unity of action has not yet been achieved on the part of the international bourgeoisie, its pressure on the economic conditions of the U.S.S.R. is becoming more and more concerted and effective.

As the process of capitalist stabilisation continues

and as the need of markets must inevitably increase, one must expect further increased pressure on the U.S.S.R. by world capitalism. This pressure will inevitably bring the capitalist world face to face with the question of a military solution of the task of including the U.S.S.R. in the capitalist economic system.

In conformity with the above mentioned facts an accentuation of the political relations between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist world is noticeable.

A decisive event in this respect was the rupture of Anglo-Soviet relations in 1927. This certainly indicated a change in the relations between the capitalist world and the U.S.S.R. The former stage, the keynote of which was recognitions and attempts on the part of the capitalist States to establish a *modus vivendi* with the U.S.S.R., must be considered at an end. Since that time, relations between the capitalist world and the U.S.S.R. have entered upon a period of new complications, breaks, increased demands, ever-growing irreconcilability and efforts on the part of the world bourgeoisie to form a united front against the U.S.S.R.

After the Anglo-Soviet rupture, and in connection with it, anti-Soviet tendencies increased everywhere; as witness the following facts:

- 1 (1) Complications with France in connection with the recall of Rakovsky, and, generally speaking, increased anti-Soviet attitude of French imperialism.
- (2) Growth of anti-Soviet tendencies in Germany, which had a reflex in the press and also in the policy of the German Government.
- (3) Poland's policy, increasingly hostile to the U.S.S.R. after Pilsudsky's assumption of power,

became particularly provocative after the Anglo-Soviet rupture. Very characteristic are in this respect, the terrorist acts against Soviet representatives, the almost undisguised threats and preparations of Poland to occupy Lithuania (November-December, 1927), the policy of the Baltic countries, openly hostile to the U.S.S.R., the belligerent propaganda of the Polish semi-official press (frontiers of 1772), the feverish war preparations, etc.

(4) The anti-Soviet tendencies in the Baltic States have considerably increased; in Finland, Esthonia and Latvia, governments have come into power which are either openly Anglophile or are under strong British influence.

(5) British imperialism has become much more active in the East. It is certainly owing to this that the position of the U.S.S.R. in China has become worse and that Turkey has adopted a more pronounced western orientation.

(6) Complications with Greece are also mainly due to British influence.

These facts show that the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist world are becoming more and more acute. Yet, another very untoward factor in the international position of the U.S.S.R. is the defeat of the Chinese revolution. This defeat is strengthening imperialism and first and foremost British imperialism, which constitutes the greatest danger to the U.S.S.R. Owing to this defeat, British imperialism can now concentrate its main efforts on struggle against the proletarian State. The policy of France after the elections, which were a victory for Poincaré, will probably assume a still more anti-Soviet character than has hitherto been the case. No doubt British pressure on France

for the purpose of inducing it to break off relations with the U.S.S.R., will become more persistent; moreover, it has now a better chance of success than before. In this respect the manoeuvre of British diplomacy, intended to bring about a rapprochement with France, constitutes a great danger. One can safely assume that Great Britain's present tactics which aim at re-establishing Anglo-French collaboration and at reconciling European differences with the United States, but to the same extent, by the British policy of encirclement of the U.S.S.R., and preparation of intervention. *

As to Japan, there have been lately symptoms in its policy of a less friendly attitude to the U.S.S.R. The anti-Soviet campaign in Japan is developing, particularly in connection with the so-called Communist conspiracy. At the same time the activity of the Far Eastern White Guards who are closely connected with the ruling circles in Japan is certainly increasing.

The whole evolution of German foreign policy in recent years, particularly after Locarno, shows that in its relations with the U.S.S.R., Germany is reckoning more and more with the big Powers. The growing power of German imperialism makes the German bourgeoisie more and more interested in bargains with the imperialist Powers and less and less interested in political support of the U.S.S.R. In view of these considerations, one can assume that Germany is not creating for Great Britain and France insurmountable obstacles when deciding the question of war against the U.S.S.R. All the above mentioned facts and consideration make us conclude that the War danger for the U.S.S.R. has grown and has a tendency towards further growth.

This conclusion is also confirmed by the growing

armaments and war preparations of the western neighbours of the Soviet Union.

WAR PREPARATIONS OF THE WESTERN NEIGHBOURS
OF THE U.S.S.R.

The western neighbours of the U.S.S.R. will play the role of an armed vanguard in the war of the capitalist world against the proletarian State. Therefore, considerable attention is paid to their war preparations and the consolidation of their armed forces.

Before estimating the armed forces of these western neighbours, it is essential to point out their successes in war preparations in the sphere of external politics. In the course of 1926 alone, they concluded the following military-political agreements directed against the U.S.S.R. ;

(a) The Franco-Polish Military Convention which supplements the agreement of 1925.

(b) The Polish-Roumanian agreement and military convention.

(c) The Franco-Roumanian agreement and military convention.

(d) The Italo-Roumanian agreement of "friendship" supplemented by the secret agreement on military-political support of Roumania.

Apart from these fundamental alliances and agreements, there are agreements concluded in an earlier period, namely: the Latvian-Esthonian alliance, secret agreements between Poland and Latvia and Esthonia, the Polish-Czecho-Slovakian agreement, Roumania's agreement with Czecho-Slovakia and Yugo-Slavia, etc.

All the alliances and agreements of mutual support constitute a broad system which connects the

western adjoining countries one with another as well as with the most important big Powers. Although Great Britain is not directly concerned in these agreements, this certainly does not mean that its active help to these border States in a war against the U.S.S.R. is not guaranteed. The disinclination of Great Britain to tie its hands by alliances is a question of tactics, but this certainly does not lessen our belief that British support will be the main support in a war by Poland and the border States against the U.S.S.R.

The war expenditure of these western neighbours to the Soviet Union is growing from year to year. For instance, the budget of the War Ministry in Poland amounted in 1926 to 624 million zloties; in 1927 to 663 million zloties; in 1928 to 745 million zloties; i.e., an increase by nearly 20 per cent. in three years.

However, these figures do not include by far all the war expenditure of Poland. Considerable amounts are granted for military needs in connection with other departments, for instance, for the war industry, the frontier defence forces, the militarisation of the population, military colonisation, etc. If one were to take into account the entire war expenditure which can be ascertained from the budgets of the various Ministries, one would arrive at a considerably large amount of expenditure for military needs, namely, in 1927, 844 million zloties or 44 per cent. of the total State expenditure, and in 1928, 1,025 million zloties, or 41.3 per cent. of the total State expenditure; thus last year alone the military expenditure of Poland increased by 21.4 per cent.

The military expenditure of Roumania is also growing; in 1927 it constituted 41 million dollars,

for the War Ministry alone, and in 1928, 49 million dollars, i.e., an increase of 12 per cent. in one year. In relation to the whole budget, military expenditure constitutes in 1927, 20 per cent., and in 1928, 20.4 per cent.

Military expenditure is also growing in the Baltic States, with the exception of Finland, where about 30 per cent. of the State budget is spent on military needs.

The numerical strength of the armies of all the western neighbours (Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Poland and Roumania), is also growing from year to year. In 1923, 431,000; in 1927, 521,000; and in 1928, 552,000; i.e., an increase of 30 per cent. in five years. This increase is calculated according to the budgets, but the actual numerical strength of the armies is bigger.

The number of military organisations which constitute in every country the unofficial and purely class army, is continually and rapidly growing; military organisations in Esthonia, Latvia, Finland and Poland had 300,000 members in 1923, 700,000 in 1926, and about 1,400,000 in 1928. Thus, the numerical strength of the military organisations in the western adjoining countries (minus Roumania) increased almost five-fold. In Poland between 1926 and 1928, the number of Fascist military organisations more than doubled (565,000 in 1926, and 1,200,000 beginning of 1928).

The above figures are only an inadequate illustration of the growth of armaments and the war preparedness of the adjoining countries. The rapid growth of the air and sea fleets, the enormous development of the war industry and the construction of the strategical railways play an important role.

The army and navy air forces in commission has grown as follows :

	<i>No. of Aeroplanes in Commission</i>			
	1923	1926	1927	Beginning of 1928
Poland	140	220	260	292
Roumania	112	132	171	178
Finland	48	72	70	80
Esthonia	14	24	32	80
Latvia	24	33	40	54
Total	338	481	573	640

Thus, the air forces of the five States alone have almost doubled in five years.

The naval forces of the western neighbours are also increasing.

The greatest development, however, is noticeable in the war industry. Considerable amounts are assigned for its development in all border countries. As a result of this, Poland put up in the last few years several big works for war purposes, it has also created its own aircraft industry and has considerably developed the chemical industry. Owing to this the war industry in Poland could provide in 1927, 30 per cent. of the munitions required in war time, against 8 per cent. in 1924. The aircraft industry can satisfy all the needs in this direction.

Roumania, Latvia and Finland are also extending their war industry.

Finally, all border countries have been building strategical railways with the participation of foreign capital.

All the above statements show that the western neighbours of the U.S.S.R., with the support of the Great Powers are extremely active getting ready their armed forces for war against the

U.S.S.R. One thing is certain: the development of the last two years steadily increased the war danger for the U.S.S.R. and this tendency will probably last.

The mobilisation of the forces of the international proletariat for struggle against the danger of military intervention, far from losing its importance, is on the contrary, at the present juncture, the foremost task of the Communist International. Since the civil war this task has at no time been as pressing and important as now.

PEACE, DISARMAMENT AND THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

It is one of the paradoxes of our times that the nearer the imperialists get to war—the more diligent they are in piling up armaments and improving their war technique—the louder they shout for “disarmament” and the more demonstrative they are for “Peace.” The facts just cited above prove how hollow and pretentious is all the talk of “Peace” and “No More War.” The armaments race, which proceeds side by side with the growing antagonisms of the imperialist Powers, of which it is the direct outcome, gives the lie direct to the idea that we have now entered upon an era of peace.

But what is the meaning of all this fine talk on the part of the imperialists and their social democratic allies? We know that under threat of the proletarian revolution the imperialist brigands created the League of Nations in 1919, and promised disarmament to the war weary peoples. We also know that it took the League six years to remember its promise, for not till December, 1925, was the Preparatory Disarmament Commission set up. It has had several sittings since then, but the date of the actual Disarmament Conference is still

to be fixed. It is clear now from the Geneva Debates and from their actions that none of the capitalist governments even think of limiting armaments. All this fine talk and discussion on "security," "disarmament," "outlawry of war," etc., is merely a screen for the preparations of war. This is the true historic role of the League of Nations.

In the pretentious discussions of the imperialists on their alleged disarmament plans there is, however, one disturbing influence. This is the Soviet Government. At first, the imperialists took advantage of the absence of Soviet representatives at Geneva, due to the conflict with Switzerland over the assassination of Vorovsky, to accuse the U.S.S.R. of sabotaging the "Disarmament" efforts of the League. It was not until the summer of 1927 that the situation changed so as to enable the delegation from the Soviet Government to tear aside the veil of hypocrisy that concealed the imperialists' hostility to the U.S.S.R. under cover of the League of Nations.

The proposals of the Soviet Government were a severe blow to the imperialists. For the first time a Great Power made a solemn declaration for complete disarmament. The imperialist diplomats were so upset that all they could do was to adopt the attitude of ridiculing the Soviet proposals. At the same time they could not get over the fact that millions of proletarians outside the influence of the Communist International received the message with open sympathy.

The Soviet Government is the one Great Power that is in a position frankly and openly to declare for disarmament. It alone of all the governments is the real defender of peace, and pursues a peace policy in all its relations with the governments of

the world. Having no territorial ambitions; being concerned in building up its socialist economy, peace for the Soviet Union is indispensable for the growth and development of the proletarian State.

The Soviet Government, however, cannot shut its eyes to the persistent scheming and planning of the imperialists for a renewed military attack upon it. But the success of such schemes and plans is as much a question of the mood of the working masses as is the growth and perfection of military technique. Publicity and propaganda for the peace policy of the Soviet Government become, therefore, an indispensable weapon in the struggle against the imperialist counter-revolutionary war. In this connection the new "Friends of the Soviet Union," which arose out of the Tenth Anniversary of the Republic, is destined to play an important part in bringing before the masses of workers the achievements of the Russian proletariat under conditions of comparative peace. It goes without saying they make a serious mistake who think that the workers and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union have renounced all military preparations and defence of their country. The imperialist invaders will find a wall of steel awaiting their attempts at intervention.

But it is necessary for the sections of the Comintern to distinguish between the Peace Programme of the proletarian State, flanked on all sides with open enemies ready to pounce on it to destroy it, and the anti-war tasks of the Parties in imperialist countries. Not all sections of the Comintern have understood this distinction of the significance of the Disarmament proposals of the Soviet delegation to Geneva. There is evident a tendency to adopt mechanically these proposals as the Party pro-

gramme against the war aims of their respective imperialist governments. It is necessary emphatically to condemn such an erroneous attitude. Defence of the Disarmament proposals of the Soviet Government can in no way be regarded as a substitute for the anti-militarist activities of the Communist Parties.

The proposals of the Soviet delegation were a thunderbolt for the social-democratic politicians. The posing of these would-be peacemakers was shown up as never before. All they could do was to splutter after the manner of the good bourgeois ministerialists that they are, and chatter about being "impracticable," "fantastic," etc. The social-democrats accuse the Soviet delegation of sowing illusions and leading the masses to believe the capitalist governments could and would accept their disarmament proposals. The draft resolution proposed for the Brussels Congress of the Labour and Socialist International, for instance, makes a strong point of this by declaring it, the L.S.I., "does not fall into the error of believing that a complete disarmament can be achieved as long as the governments are dominated by capitalist and imperialist classes." This is clearly aimed at the Soviet proposals.

The "Vorwaerts" wrote in December, 1927, that it is unquestionable that Soviet Russia wants peace, that its disarmament proposal is a repudiation of old principles, a conversion to pacifism.

The National Joint Council of the British Labour movement adopted a resolution on December 8th, is what the Labour movement has always held should be the purpose of all civilised governments 1927, declaring that the "purpose of these proposals in the whole of their foreign policy, viz., the elim-

ination of armed force as the decisive factor in the international relations of civilised peoples, and the substitution of armed force by a policy based on reason, justice and international co-operation."

The social-democrats, however, conceal the essence of the Soviet proposals, i.e., the declaration that imperialist armaments are inseparable from capitalism, the appeal to the working class to fight against the capitalist system, and against imperialism as the root causes of war. They ignore the very opening statement of comrade Litvinov of November 30th, 1927, in which he declared:

"The Soviet Government adheres to the opinion it has always held that under the capitalist system no grounds exist for counting upon the removal of the causes which give rise to armed conflicts. Militarism and big navies are the essentially natural consequences of the capitalist system. By the very fact of their increase they intensify existing differences, giving a vast impetus to all potential quarrels, and inevitably convert these into armed conflicts."

The attitude of the Social-Democratic Parties generally towards the U.S.S.R., at Geneva is largely determined by their attitude towards the momentary political manoeuvres at Geneva. It so happened that the German social-democracy took a relatively friendly attitude simply because Litvinov's action at Geneva eased the position of the German delegation.

The French social-democracy, following the policy of the cartel were against the breaking off of relations with the Soviet Union, but were contemptuous of the disarmament proposals. Especially the Brussels "People," which is frequently the mouthpiece of the French Socialists on foreign political questions on which they do not want to

commit themselves openly, stated frankly that the Russian Disarmament proposals did more harm than good to the cause of disarmament.

The British Labour press saw in the recognition of the Disarmament proposals cheap sport. The Labour Party demanded nothing more than a friendly consent to the Russian proposals for negotiations.

The policy of all these parties of the Second International pulls them hither and thither between the necessity of reckoning with the pacifism of their supporters (especially in the election campaigns), with the necessity of struggle against the U.S.S.R. (likewise in the election campaigns) and the foreign political requirements of the moment. Thus the German social-democracy takes the position that owing to the Versailles Treaty, Germany has a claim upon disarmament by other countries regardless of any sort of international arbitration and security treaties. The British Labour Party takes the position that disarmament must be preceded by the adoption of international arbitration and security treaties, the exact opposite of the German position. The French socialists take the position that disarmament, security and arbitration form an inseparable whole and must be settled simultaneously.

The standpoint of their governments is easily recognisable in the position of the French and Germans. The British position clearly reflects the standpoint of the last Labour Government and perhaps also the coming Labour Government.

The subservience of the social-democratic leaders to their bourgeois overlords is equally reflected in the question of the form of the armies. Hilferding, for example, in a speech at the Kiel Congress held in May, 1927, declared:

"Before the war we were definitely opposed to standing armies and we advocated the militia form. . . . I make no secret of the fact that I am, and I believe also the vast majority of our executive, is now opposed to the militia system. We are opposed to it because the militia system today, and the French example shows this, considering the new military technique, is the strongest form of militarism conceivable.

"If this is so, it follows that our attitude to the Reichswehr cannot on principle be a negative attitude. And it is not a question of fighting against the Reichswehr but of fighting for the Reichswehr so as to make it a reliable instrument of the Republic."

On the other hand the name of Paul Boncour is indelibly stamped on the new French mobilisation law for the militarisation of the entire population. Boncour, in his preface to Jouhaux's book on Disarmament, in attacking the mercenary armies of the barracks, declares "the States should be constrained to orientate their military organisation towards forms which approximate to the militia." Jouhaux himself declares in the same book (page 77): "The essential difference between the militia and the professional army being that the first has an exclusively defensive character, the League of Nations imposes on its members the will to restrict this organisation to purely defensive purposes, and to abandon the spirit of conquest by force."

The British Labour Party defends the present form of professional army, confining itself to "treaties for land disarmament to apply to the Continent." So far as the British colonial army is concerned, it remains outside any discussion or consideration.

From the foregoing it is apparent that three important tasks fall upon Communist Parties: (1) to show how the social-democrats suppress the fact of the existence of a war danger; (2) to show how the social-democrats on the questions of disarmament and security are at sixes and sevens, each party championing the point of view of its own bourgeoisie, and, therefore, the swindle of promises regarding peace made to placate a left swerve among the electors; (3) to show how the social-democratic parties defend the interests of their own bourgeoisie in foreign policy.

So far these tasks are being carried out indifferently. It is necessary to take up this campaign more systematically and energetically than has been the practice in the past.

DANGER OF PACIFISM.

The greatest danger for the revolutionary proletariat in the present period is the widespread movement for pacifism. Pacifism is the most deceptive form of lulling the masses to sleep while wars are being prepared by the bourgeoisie. The pacifist declares against all wars, against bloodshed and violence, against all military service and the use of arms. In this respect some socialists find an identity between the pacifist desires for peace and the ultimate socialist ideal of universal and complete disarmament. Thus we find in all the peace movements pseudo-socialist elements who flirt with pacifism.

The pacifist movement appears under different heads in a kind of sub-division of labour. There is the clerical and semi-religious type, the League of Nations type, and the pseudo-socialist type that flirts with the two former.

Open bourgeois religious pacifism has, for its objects the deliberate softening of the horrors of capitalism and the provision of spiritual dope for the better acceptance of imperialist aims and their successful realisation. It is the preparation for having God on the side of his "chosen" people, who are always the bourgeoisie and the governments of the "Fatherlands." Ideological warfare against such deceptive propaganda is an essential part of our daily Communist activity.

The League of Nations was and remains the biggest swindle perpetrated on the war-weary peoples following the blood-letting of 1914-18. It created and still fosters the illusion amongst the small States, old and new, of equal status and of a guarantee against territorial revision and further wars. At the same time it imbues large sections of the working masses with the idea of "disarmament," "negotiation" and "arbitration" rather than war. These fictitious beliefs it fosters at enormous expense by means of League Conferences, press propaganda and its special organs like the International Labour Office and the League of Nations Union, the while the big imperialist groups decide the business of the League in secret conclave and without consultation with the small States.

In effect, the League has been an excellent screen for imperialist intrigues and the secret preparations for more wars. It maintains the fiction that the governments within the League desire nothing but peace, whereas the power of finance and arms of the big groups are dominant in practice. The pacifist propaganda carried on under the auspices of the League is the finest ideological preparation of the masses for war, particularly for a war on the Soviet Union which remains outside the League. Since

the Covenant of the League has a certain obligation on all its members to go to war against an "aggressor" it would not be impossible for the capitalist governments to create the conditions for declaring the proletarian State of the U.S.S.R. an "aggressor." Already, deliberate provocative acts have been committed (Peking, London, assassination of Soviet representatives), especially by the British bourgeoisie, which leads the movement for an anti-Soviet bloc of the imperialists. The prospect of a holy crusade against Bolsheviŝm conducted under the white ensign of the League of Nations by MacDonald, Boncour, Vandervelde, Pilsudski, Mussolini and the Second International is more than a figment of the imagination; it is a possibility quite in keeping with the vicious hatred for the Soviet Union and the Communist International.

One particularly dangerous form of pacifism is the discouragement by the social-democrats of all forms of violent struggle against capitalism, while the purely social-imperialists, MacDonald, Boncour, etc., are not against violence or the use of arms if these are directed against the enemies of "their" bourgeois "fatherland." We have evidence of this already in Irak, Egypt, Syria, Morocco, China and Indonesia. They are for supporting the State power of "their" bourgeoisie with blood and iron when necessary. They would not hesitate to use the State power against the workers at home should these workers revolt. Therefore, the pretence of these Second International ministerialists, that they are against violence and the armed struggle is the sheerest hypocrisy. They are only against it for the proletariat, but not for the bourgeoisie.

But the bankruptcy of pacifism is probably most obvious in the role of the pseudo-lefts of the social-

democracy in the struggle against war. Of these "left" socialist pacifists the Brailsford-Lansbury-Brockway-Maxton group of the I.L.P. are particularly outstanding. As illustration of the confusionism shown by this group a few examples will not be out of place. Brailsford, describing the state of latent war in Europe, exclaims despairingly:

"Not only is there no super-national authority that can assume the government of the world; it is not in the interests of the owners of the world's navies that such an authority should exist."
 ("New Leader," June 24th, 1927.)

But writing on the British claim to control Egypt he says:

"If there is a case for the continuation of mixed courts, or if some foreign supervision of the police should for a time be desirable, is there any reason why the League rather than the British Empire should not act? The League is no less obviously the ideal guardian of the Suez Canal."
 ("New Leader," April 13th, 1928.)

A whole series of I.L.P. writers concentrate upon vindicating the idea that the danger of war comes from talking about it as if war is a "state of mind." And so Brailsford summing up the international situation for 1927 says:

"The danger (of war) lies in the fantastic belief of Moscow that Great Britain is bent on destroying her by war. To my thinking, that belief is exaggerated."

Not only do the I.L.P. leaders throw the blame for the war danger on the Soviet Government, but they even help to create an atmosphere of hostility against it on pacifist grounds. Thus Lansbury declares:

“Those who desire no more war must refuse to fight in any war, by whomsoever undertaken.”

Nevinson follows this up by a call to refuse to go to war, and cites the Soviet Republics among those States which compel men to serve in the army “against their conscience.” The complete hypocrisy of this I.L.P. group of “left” socialist-pacifists was perhaps best illustrated in the refusal of Brockway to come to Soviet Russia on the Tenth Anniversary on the pretext that socialists were detained in prison, and that there was no political freedom in Soviet Russia.

Individual refusal to serve in the army is one of the most dangerous forms of pacifism. Its futility as a weapon of struggle against the imperialists and war was completely exposed during 1914-18, nevertheless it is still part of the stock-in-trade slogans of an important section of “left” social-democrats, particularly in England, America and the Scandinavian countries. In Germany, too, this pacifist slogan of refusal to serve has its advocates. Thus Kurt Heller, the radical “military critic” of the “Klassen Kampf” (issue No. 4) declares:

“From the pacifist viewpoint it is necessary to do away with compulsory military service also in times of civil war . . . those for whom the pursuits of art, philosophy, scientific research, religion and technical progress, are more vital than a fight, those who think they can bring more good to their class . . . than by violence exercised with an armed hand . . . to compel such people to be soldiers would be most intolerable.”

The Communist answer to the pacifist refusal to serve in the army, to those who abhor “violence” and discourage the use of arms has been aptly given long ago by Lenin. In his article on “The Mili-

tary Programme of the Proletarian Revolution," Lenin declared :

"An oppressed class which does not learn the use of arms, to possess these and to become practised in them, is only fit to be oppressed, ill-treated and handled like slaves."

FASCISM

The present period of imperialist preparation for war on the Soviet Union is marked by an intense persecution of the revolutionary movement and the Communists in every capitalist country. In "democratic" countries anti-working class legislation, arrests, trials and imprisonment of the Communists are the order of the day. In Fascist countries, Italy and the Balkans, Poland and Baltic States, inhuman torture, life sentences and murder are being meted out to the Communists and anti-fascist workers generally. Everywhere, the bourgeois slogan of outlawing of war is accompanied by the slogan of outlawing the Communist Parties. The Communist Parties are entering the period of illegality predicted by the Third Congress.

As crisis follows crisis and the relations of the imperialist groups in the struggle for markets becomes more strained, the drift to war becomes more certain. The bourgeoisie of the whole world knows that decisive battles are about to be fought out. They also know that these battles will bring to the front the open and decisive class struggle between the working masses and the capitalist exploiters.

In this struggle the bourgeoisie understands that the Communist Parties and the revolutionary proletarian Soviet Republics will lead the working class against it. If the bourgeoisie, and therefore, the bourgeois order is to survive, it must first crush

the Communists as its most deadly adversary. This is the objective background for the present wave of persecution and White Terror.

Therefore, when, in "democratic" America, England and the Scandinavian countries, in "republican" France, Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, and in "Fascist" Italy, Poland, Japan and correspondingly in all the satellite countries of the big imperialist Powers, persecution and suppression of the revolutionary workers is rampant it is clear that the present period is a period of preparation for war.

Fascism assumes variable forms in different countries. In America, under cover of the Klu Klux Klan, and the American Legion, fascist terror held sway over the period immediately following the war. "Company unionism" and the hired Pinkerton gangs and thugs provide a favourable field for the growth of American Fascism.

In Great Britain, in addition to the Anti-Socialist and Anti-Communist League, the British Empire Union and the Economic League, Fascist groups have been organised by the bourgeoisie to play the part of strikebreakers, as well as anti-Communist propagandists. Similar functions are destined for the British Legion, the Officers' Training Corps and organisations such as the Comrades of the Great War. While the recent formation of non-political unions, Mond Chemical Co-partnership schemes and the Mond-Citrine "Industrial Peace" campaign are preparations for fascist groups in industry; the whole ground being prepared by the anti-trade union law.

In Germany, the unofficial armies, the "Stahlhelm," the "Wehrwolf," the "German Officers' League," the "Jungdo," and the social-democratic Reichsbanner, represent military forms of fascism.

But fascism expresses itself no less significantly in the factory sports clubs, the nationalist and white factory nuclei, the works' police and works Pinkertons.

In all the capitalist countries the single aim of the various forms of Fascist organisations is the destruction and suppression of workers' and peasants' organisations, the suppression of all democratic "rights" of the working masses for the more efficient defence of the bourgeois State and security of its imperialist war aims.

In the Communist struggle against Fascism no universal recipe can be given for the methods of combat. The Communist Parties must apply their political understanding towards the most effective means of mobilising the workers and peasants on the basis of practical and concrete demands for the fight, against Fascism and its decisive defeat. The Parties can learn much from the experiences of the German Red Front.

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing chapters we have endeavoured to bring forward some objective evidence that the imperialists are heading for war, and some of the preparatory steps they are taking to wage it when it comes. It is clear from the rivalries and antagonisms between the respective groups that a new redistribution of the colonies, and of spheres of influence is overdue. But the question is how? The contradictions of capitalist economy inherent in the epoch of imperialism cry out for a solution to the problem of markets. With a ruthless and irresistible force the capitalists are scrapping old methods of production to make way for the rationalisation of industry. The forward move of the trusts and cartels on a national and international scale points to the centralisation of capital under a single world trust.

But the very process of centralisation and concentration of capital, its higher technique and composition, only accentuates the inner crisis of capitalism, rendering it more and more unstable. The unequal development of capital within the respective countries leads to one-sided loading of the scales. The more powerful groups dominate and exploit the weaker. Moreover, those dominant groups accompany their reorganisation of industry with a greater intensification of the exploitation of labour, lower wages, longer hours, abolition of time-worn customs, and trade union privileges. The rationalisation of capitalist industry can only be successfully carried out on the basis of a passive working class without organisation, or under the domination of a reformist trade union leadership which collaborates with the imperialists for "Peace in Industry"—a method of securing the aims of

capitalism. Thus the conditions for wars emerge from the actual process of capitalist development towards a universal world system. Antagonisms and rivalries between the imperialists themselves on the one hand; a festering mass of discontented wage slaves on the other, with enormous numbers of unemployed and unemployable.

But the more interdependent and centralised the capitalist system becomes, the more it approximates to a world system. This encourages the belief fostered by some social-democrats that we have in this tendency the greatest guarantee for peace. There can be no greater illusion. Such a theory ignores the inequality between the imperialist groups; their differences in economic and political power. Moreover, it rules out the over-riding necessity of gaining fresh markets and new sources of materials for the sale and production of an ever-increasing volume of products.

How important this capitalist inequality in economic and therefore political power has become was seen at Geneva in the defiant speech of Chamberlain, when he declaimed upon the superiority of the British Empire to any obligations to the League of Nations, and also in the reservations he made in his reply to the Kellogg Note. The attitude of France towards any attempt to revise the Versailles Treaty is notorious; the bourgeoisie of the United States, while still worshipping the Monroe Doctrine, is forced to take a hand in world affairs. What the Japanese bourgeoisie could not gain by negotiation in China a few years ago, it now feels strong enough to take by force. Thus we see that force and violence as the arbiter in international disputes between the imperialist Powers is

more pronounced to-day than in any other period of history.

The one thing, however, upon which the world's capitalists are united is antagonism to the proletarian Republics of the Soviet Union. This antagonism is conditioned by the closing of one-sixth of the globe to financial colonisation and exploitation of sources of raw materials. The loss of this rich prize has been a severe blow to the imperialists, and helps to intensify the internal crisis of capitalism. Moreover, the steady growth of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. is an exciting example to the proletariat of the world, whose living standards are being steadily lowered, to do as the Russian workers do. Therefore, the problem of crushing the proletarian State is a constant factor in the manoeuvring of the capitalist diplomats.

But millions of toilers throughout the world have come to look upon the U.S.S.R. as the advance guard of the social revolution and the ally of the oppressed working masses. The capitalists, therefore, will not find it easy to make war on the Soviet Union. They fear to rouse this latent support of the Socialist Republic. They will, as they are doing at present, with the assistance of their social-democratic allies, conduct a propaganda barrage against the Soviet Union. They will shriek about "red imperialism," "dictatorship and violence," "Bolshevism, the disturber of social peace," etc., and try to rouse the maximum of hatred preparatory for war. It is here where the peace programme of the Soviet Government, occupies its important place in world politics. The Soviet Government has no territorial designs. It wishes for nothing but peace to build up its socialist industry. It

alone can frankly offer to disarm completely. The proposals of Litvinov at Geneva for complete disarmament undoubtedly created a tremendous impression amongst the more politically backward workers who want peace. The unanswerable logic of destroying arms and munitions dumps and abandoning the terrible devices for murder, made a strong appeal and has raised the Soviet Power in the eyes of these workers as the real defender of peace. The peace programme of the Soviet Government is therefore a powerful retarding influence against war. But against the peace programme of the Soviet Union the bourgeoisie conducts an aggressive propaganda for "outlawing" war. Under the screen of international pacts and negotiations it pretends to find a way out of the impasse it is in. It stimulates and encourages all kinds of pacifist movements as a means of lulling the masses to sleep in the belief that "their" governments are sincerely desirous of securing peace. The social-democrats assist the governments with high falutin' talk of international arbitration courts and the Protocol as the instrument for securing peace. But even they are forced to maintain military forces in reserve to be used against recalcitrant States, who refuse to abide by the decisions of the League of Nations.

War is inevitable under imperialism. The contradictions of the capitalist system cannot be composed or reconciled permanently. At what point, when and where it will break out we cannot tell. Of this we are sure—the next war will be a world war. It will draw whole nations into the conflict. Above all, it will rouse millions of colonial peoples to fight for their revolutionary aims, for independence and separation from imperialist domination. The combined alliance of industrial and peasant

masses in the West with the oppressed peoples of the East in revolt against predatory imperialism. Such is the prospect that opens before us when we contemplate the coming of the new war.

MILITARY GUARANTEE FOR THE OPPRESSION OF COLONIAL PEOPLES

British Colonial Forces

Armies of Occupation.

In Germany	8,500
In Egypt	14,000
In Iraq	6,700
				(plus 20,000 native troops.)
In Trans-Jordania and Palestine				900
In China (with Hongkong)	...			29,900
				<hr/>
<i>Total</i>		60,000

British Forces in the Colonies

In Europe: Gibraltar and Malta				6,600
In Asia: Aden, Ceylon, Borneo, Singapore, Cairo and others	16,600
In Africa:	18,500
In Oceania and America:	...			3,700
				<hr/>
<i>Total</i>		45,400

The Army in India 383,000
(At the disposal of the British Command)

*Total at the direct disposal of the
Command* 488,400

Dominion Armies

(At the disposal of the local governments) :

Canada	128,000
Australia	52,000
Ireland (Free State)	16,500
South Africa	17,000
New Zealand	22,000
<i>Total</i>				235,500

Altogether in the British Possessions 723,900*Land Forces of the United States in the Colonies*

China	2,400
Nicaragua	2,700
Panama	8,600
Hawaii Islands	14,400
Philippines	12,100
Porto-Rico	1,100
Alaska	400
<i>Total</i>				41,700

The Colonial Army of France

Morocco	85,600
Algeria and Tunis	67,200
Syria	15,700
China	1,800
Indo-China and Africa	48,900
<i>Total</i>				219,200

*Share of Various Imperialist States in Imports of 11 Colonial Countries.
(In percentage of total imports.)*

	<i>Great Britain</i>			<i>U.S.A.</i>			<i>France</i>		
	1913	1924	1925	1913	1924	1925	1913	1924	1925
Ceylon ...	29.2	22.2	23.5	1.2	2.9	2.6	0.7	0.6	0.7
China ...	16.5	12.1	9.7	6.0	18.4	14.8	0.9	1.0	1.3
India ...	64.2	54.4	52.3	2.6	5.8	6.1	1.5	1.1	1.3
Indonesia ...	17.5	14.7	—	2.1	6.7	—	0.8	1.1	—
Malay States	14.5	13.6	13.2	1.7	3.4	3.9	0.7	1.0	—
Philippines ...	10.1	5.2	5.5	50.0	55.9	57.9	2.7	1.1	1.1
Siam ...	21.5	17.1	—	3.2	2.7	—	1.7	3.4	—
Algeria ...	3.1	3.1	—	2.0	3.4	—	82.5	79.1	82.5
Egypt ...	30.5	27.6	25.2	1.9	3.5	3.6	9.2	9.4	9.5
Nigeria ...	68.6	72.8	73.6	4.2	7.5	—	0.2	0.7	0.8
Haiti ...	7.3	6.7	8.5	73.0	80.0	76.9	16.9	6.0	6.7

(League of Nations Reference Book)

*Share of Various Imperialist States in Imports of 11 Colonial Countries.
(In percentage of total imports.)*

		<i>Germany</i>			<i>Japan</i>			<i>Italy</i>		
		1913	1924	1925	1913	1924	1923	1913	1924	1925
<i>Ceylon</i>	...	3.0	1.7	1.6	2.1	2.1	2.0	0.5	0.6	0.8
<i>China</i>	...	4.8	3.7	3.4	20.4	22.6	21.0	0.1	0.6	0.6
<i>India</i>	...	6.9	6.2	5.9	2.6	6.9	7.9	1.2	1.5	1.8
<i>Indonesia</i>	...	6.6	6.9	—	1.6	9.9	—	1.0	1.8	—
<i>Malay States</i>		2.1	0.9	—	3.5	2.5	3.0	1.3	0.8	—
<i>Philippines</i>	...	5.4	2.0	2.3	6.4	7.9	9.1	0.4	0.2	0.3
<i>Siam</i>	...	7.3	3.4	—	2.3	3.4	—	0.9	1.2	—
<i>Algeria</i>	...	1.1	0.1	—	—	—	—	0.6	0.9	—
<i>Egypt</i>	...	5.8	5.8	5.8	0.3	1.9	1.9	5.3	10.3	10.5
<i>Nigeria</i>	...	11.3	6.4	7.9	—	—	—	—	0.4	—
<i>Haiti</i>	...	6.5	3.1	4.0	—	—	—	—	0.5	0.7

(League of Nations Reference Book)

Already Appeared

Ten Days that Shook the World

by JOHN REED

A vivid account of the November Revolution in Russia
as witnessed and recorded by that brilliant journalist
and author, the late John Reed

Cloth 4s.

Post free 4s. 5d.

Paper 2s.

„ „ 2s. 3d.

The Proletarian Revolution

By N. LENIN

In the form of a reply to Karl Kautsky, Lenin gives
a very clear exposition of the Bolshevik theory of
Revolution and Democracy

Cloth 3s.

Post free 3s. 5d.

Paper 1s. 6d.

„ „ 1s. 9d.

Reminiscences of Lenin

By KLARA ZETKIN

Dealing with Lenin's views on the position of women,
: : and other questions : :

Cloth 2s.

Post free 2s. 4d.

Paper 1s.

„ „ 1s. 3d.

Ten Years of the Communist International

An Historical Survey
by I. KOMOR

Paper 6d.

Post free 7d.

Marxism

An essay by NIKOLAI LENIN

Paper 6d.

Post free 7d.

Wage-Labour & Capital

By KARL MARX

Paper 4d.

Post free 5d.



Ready at end of March

Women in the Soviet Union

Paper 1s.

Post free 1s. 2d.

Revolutionary Lessons

A short selection from the 1917 writings of
N. LENIN

Paper 1s.

Post free 1s. 2d.

The Communist Manifesto

A new translation by E. & C. Paul

Paper 4d.

Post free 5d.

Ready in April

Azure Cities

A collection of stories by modern
Russian writers

Cloth 7s. 6d.

Post free 8s.

Preparing for Revolt

By N. LENIN

A section of this book has been
previously published under the
title "On the Road to Insurrection"
Also included in this book is the
pamphlet "Will the Bolsheviki
Maintain Power?"

Cloth 5s.

Post free 5s. 6d.

Paper 3s.

Post free 3s. 6d.

Of all bookshops, postage extra, or from

MODERN BOOKS, LIMITED

: 26 BEDFORD ROW, W.C.I. :

Or, at American prices, from
WORKERS' LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
35 East 125th Street, New York