

INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 2. No. 24

PRESS

28th March 1922

CORRESPONDENCE

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III. — Postal address Franz Dahlem, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

POLITICS

The Outlook for the Genoa Conference

We call the particular attention of our readers to the following article. The Editor.

America's Absence.

** As was to have been expected, the American Government will be not be present at the Genoa Conference. America will neither take part in the elaboration of means for the restoration of European economy, nor will it, what is of more importance, act as the banker who furnishes the funds for the carrying out of the decisions. American public opinion supports this decision with the argument that it is senseless to waste American money for European affairs as long as the European powers do not give up their huge armaments. In reality, however, the armament problem is of subordinate importance. It is merely a political slogan used by the Republican government in preparation for the next congress.

The actual reason for the refusal of America to finance the restoration of Europe is that the American government has not extraordinarily large sums at its disposal and that the private capitalists are at present engaged in the exploitation of Central and South America. The capitalist groups interested in exports to Europe are extending credits to private European capitalists. Under such circumstances, if the United States should appear at the Genoa Conference with empty hands it would risk being told:

"The cancellation of the debts would considerably contribute to the salvation of Europe, in which America is so much interested. France for instance has to pay as much in interest on its debts to the Allies as it can receive from Germany in the way of reparation payment."

The absence of America means that the Genoa Conference, even if successful, will be able to do very little in the economic field for the restoration of European industry.

Peace or Robbery?

Time passes rapidly. Men forget not only the happenings of several years past — they even forget what happened three months ago. Probably nobody now remembers how the English liberal press and the large majority of the German press welcomed the reports of the decisions of the Cannes Conference and of the convocation of the Conference of Genoa. Lloyd George was praised as a man who not only had the courage to realize that capitalism was on the verge of the abyss but also had the courage to take steps for the salvation of the existing order. There were statesmen in Germany, very clever and educated gentlemen, who were even convinced that the relationship between Germany and the Allies had attained a point where it appeared as if the Treaty of Versailles had been signed thirty years ago. The Boulogne Conference between Lloyd George and Poincaré was a cold douche for these people who imagined that a good speech, spoken in English and repeated in French, changed the balance of power. Germany will not even be permitted to utter one word in Genoa to the effect that the restoration of Europe is impossible without the abrogation of the Treaty of Versailles. German statesmen had already consoled themselves,

thinking that they would not have to repeat the old German arguments

As is proper for German scientists, the German experts are brooding over new plans for Europe's salvation and the restoration of European economy, although they are bound to play the blind man — not to see the Treaty of Versailles. No doubt, the German specialists will go to Genoa with great cases packed full of brilliant scientific memoranda and projects (which by the way are worth less than the paper on which they are printed).

The Allied bourgeoisie has no plan for the restoration of European industry, since it does not want to renounce the Treaty of Versailles. As a substitute, the Allied specialists are working all the more busily at plans for the exploitation of Russia. London newspapers and the semi-official German Wolff news agency reported on the 28th of February upon the session of the organization committee of the international corporation and the national corporations for the economic restoration of Europe. The international central corporation is to have its seat in London and have an initial capital of £2,000,000. It is to control the actions of the various national corporations. The total capital of all the national corporations is to be £20,000,000. England, France, Italy, Germany and Belgium will participate in the international consortium as charter members and will each invest £4,000,000. The other participants in the consortium will be the United States, Japan, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland and Czecho-Slovakia. According to the Paris "Temps", Germany and Italy will be advanced the necessary sums for participation in the consortium by England. In this way England will control three shares in the consortium and will have a directing influence. For the same reason Poland has been excluded from the consortium. Polish statesmen, who imagined their Poland to be a great power, and who considered Soviet Russia as a pawn in the intrigues of Poland and the Allies, have thus been acquainted with international politics and now see that military splendor is of no avail when one must make purchases with money borrowed from the Allies.

As for the opinion of the consortium upon the nature of its labor, the Wolff agency reports as follows:—

"The delegates were of the unanimous opinion that the corporations will not do business with or in any country, which has not recognised all its debts and obligations previously or later entered upon by the government. The countries in question must also agree to the restitution of all foreign property or make compensation for damages incurred through its confiscation. Furthermore the consortium will not deal with any country which does not afford impartial legal protection to commercial and other contracts through a code of laws and which does not offer any guarantees for trade."

If this decision of the Allied experts, who came together to elaborate preparations for the consortium, is the viewpoint of the Allied Powers, these powers are sabotaging the Genoa Conference even before its coming together. Should the Allies demand of the Soviet Government the denationalization of the industrial enterprises formerly belonging to foreigners, they would receive the reply, "Come and take them by force!" In case they should attempt to burden the Russian people with a mountain of debts, the Soviet Government would be in duty bound to respond, "Gentlemen, come and try to collect these debts! The Russian peasant will receive you with hay forks; the Red Army with artillery and machine gun fire."

The conditions elaborated by the organizers of the consortium differ cynically from those of Cannes, on the basis of which the Genoa Conference is being called. The Russian Government firmly and unequivocally rejects these conditions. It will be backed not only by the Russian laboring population, which in spite of all its misery does not desire a future of slavery. The workers of all countries who are fighting against the denationalization of the railways, will stand behind it. Even a section of the bourgeoisie will stand behind Soviet Russia for they have begun to realise that the restoration of Europe by the method of exploitation is impossible. The plan elaborated by the organizers of the corporation is even senseless from the standpoint of the interests of the bourgeoisie as a class. In the present condition of Russian industry, denationalization would mean its complete decay. The capitalists would only obtain the salvage from the ruins and would not even be able to export this salvage from Russia. Therefore it is possible that this entire plan is only an attempt to scare Soviet Russia in order to force it to recognize all the debts.

Germany as Henchman of the Entente.

After the return of the representatives of the Soviet government who had negotiated with representatives of the German Government concerning the mutual relations between these two countries, the German press published a number of reports upon these negotiations. It sang paeans of praise in the honour of the representatives of both contracting parties who had so skilfully carried on the negotiations. The "Ost Express" news agency recently published a dispatch from Moscow to the effect, that the Russian representatives had in their report to the Soviet government upon the negotiations stated that they were highly satisfied with their results. These reports are intended to hoodwink German public opinion which is extremely disturbed by the policy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Berlin Foreign Office knows very well, not only on the basis of the statement made by the negotiators of the Soviet government but through the dispatches the German Commissioner in Moscow, that all these reports are not correct. We have no reason to conceal this. This is also known to the Allies from the reports of their agents for whom there exist no secrets in Berlin. It can only be added that the German government not only *did not agree to the most moderate demands of Russia but that it even (I speak of the Foreign Minister) created an atmosphere which did not permit one to draw the conclusion that Germany's limited means was the obstacle to the negotiations.* The Russian Government had all the reason in the world to suppose that the German Foreign Minister is prevented from carrying on a policy of *rapprochement* with Russia by international pressure. The Wolff dispatch of the 27th of February on the negotiation for the consortium removes all doubts on that score. It emphasizes the fact the rapacious conditions elaborated by the organization committee of the consortium were accepted unanimously, i. e., with the agreement of the German representatives. *We thus see that the representatives of the new Germany support a policy towards Russia which is even more rapacious and shameless than that of the representatives of the Kaiser at Brest Litovsk.* The government of the Kaiser merely demanded damages for the nationalized property formerly belonging to the Germans. It demanded that at a time when Russia was not exhausted as a result of three years of blockade and intervention. If German public opinion cares to remember, Germany also participated in the international intervention policy by supporting Krassnoff, by not withdrawing its troops from Russia after the fall of the imperial government and by pillaging Russian property in the compulsory retreat of the German troops.

This policy of exploitation is all the more shameless since these same representatives of the German bourgeoisie were at a loss to express their moral indignation when the newspaper published the report that the Soviet Government is ready to recognize the Treaty of Versailles if France guarantees the execution of \$116 of the Treaty, i. e., compensation for the damages caused in Russia by Germany. At that time the representatives of German diplomacy declared that we injured the moral prestige of Soviet Russia by participating in the pillage of Germany. Now they themselves have joined the plunderers.

I am not morally indignant when I call a spade a spade and the cynicism of German diplomacy what it really is. We did not expect anything else from German diplomats. We are not astonished that they are now just as willing to pillage as during the war. We are not surprised at their stupidity.

Upon what are they speculating? Firstly, upon the united front of the bourgeoisie, and secondly, upon the ability of the German bourgeoisie to export at present as much as they can produce to the Western countries, due to the present low rate of

exchange of the German mark. However, the united front of the bourgeoisie is but a myth. If Soviet Russia refuses to accept these rapacious conditions, the representatives of various capitalist groups will do business with Soviet Russia unofficially, as soon they need to. Genoa is not the end of the world. The deals we will be unable to conclude before or at Genoa, will be concluded after Genoa. The German bourgeoisie will not long be able to compete in the world market favored by its low prices. As a result of the continual rise of prices in Germany they are approaching the world market level. The hour will come when the German capitalists will need Russia more than Russia needs them. The entire play of Herr Rathenau, who is so clever and so sly that he probably will deceive himself, will only result in the exposure of the policy will deceive himself, will only result in the exposure of the policy of the present German government as a policy of lackey service for the rich and exploitation of the poor.

Soviet Russia and the Working Class.

The strength of Soviet Russia lies in the fact that it can tell the entire truth about its policy, since the truth about the dangers threatening it mobilizes the workers and peasants of Russia and the working class of the world for Soviet Russia. It is not a question of sympathy for Soviet Russia—a sympathy which the Social Democrats are trying to destroy. The interests of the international working class are at stake. We ask the workers whether they are willing to permit the reestablishment of capitalist rule throughout Europe. We ask the English Labor Party which demands the nationalization of the mines whether it is satisfied with the return of the mines of Russia to their exploiters. We ask the German workers and even German public opinion if they desire to have Germany become a henchman of the Allied plunderers and be hated in all Russia by actually entering into an alliance with the Entente. We do not doubt for a moment that the Soviet Government will have the sympathy of all the workers and even of the far-sighted bourgeoisie when it rejects such rapacious conditions in Genoa. After three years of chaos, of pillage and decay, which followed the notorious Treaty of Versailles, Europa has had enough of the pirate policy which is attempting to exploit the entire world like a hyena. These carnivorous animals are hated. German imperialism, that wounded, limping animal, however, only rouses contempt.

"Prada", March 12th, 1922.

The Georgian Gironde as a Political Type

by L. Trotzky.

** The most important rôle in the history of Menshevism was played by Georgia. It was in Georgia that Menshevism came to the clearest expression of the adaption of Marxism to the needs of the intelligentsia of a reactionary and mostly pre-capitalistic people. The non-existence of industries meant the non-existence of the national bourgeoisie. Trading-capital was chiefly in the hands of Armenians. The spiritual culture was chiefly represented by the intelligentsia of the lower nobility. The new capitalism that was setting in had not as yet created a new culture, although it did create new needs. The Georgian nobility could not satisfy these needs with the income it got from vineyards and sheep-breeding. The dissatisfaction with Russian officialdom and Czarism joined with hatred of capitalism, as represented by the Armenian merchant and usurer. The uncertainty of the morrow and the search for a remedy rendered the younger generation of the nobility and the petty-bourgeois intellectuals receptive of democratic ideas. They were thus driven to seek support among the workers. At this time, at about the end of the nineteenth century, the program of political democracy had long ago lost its Jacobin or Manchester character, and had been completely modified in the course of historical development. It no longer constituted the ideology of the oppressed masses of Europe. These petty-bourgeois intellectuals professed various Socialistic theories, which were constantly being rejected by Marxism. The desire of the younger petty-bourgeois generation of city and country, influenced as it was by the jealous hatred of capitalism, to get a broader field for literary, political and other activities, the first movement of the journeymen, the factory and the few industrial workers, and finally the utter dissatisfaction of the oppressed peasantry—all this came up in the new Menshevik "edition" of Marxism.

This "new edition" recognized the inevitability of capitalist development, sanctified the ideas of political democracy that had already been compromised in the West, and predicted that

after many, many centuries, the working-class would come to power, and that the democracy would organically and unhampered develop into the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Noble" by birth, bourgeois by manner of living and in their psychology, and with false Marxist passports in their pockets, the leaders of Georgian Menshevism stepped into the arena of revolutionary activity. Thanks to their Southern sensitiveness and capacity to adapt themselves they often rose to the leadership of the students' and general democratic movements. The prison cell, exile and Duma tribune fortified their authority and lent a definite traditional character to Georgian Menshevism. The more turbulent the revolutionary sea became, and the more complicated the domestic and the international revolutionary problems became, the clearer could the petty-bourgeois weaknesses of Menshevism be seen, especially that of the Georgian wing. Political cowardice is a very characteristic feature of Menshevism. But the revolution can ill bear cowardice. During the great events, the Mensheviks were very sad and miserable creatures indeed. Their cowardice revealed the cringing of the petty-bourgeois before the great bourgeois, of the bourgeois intellectual before the general, of the petty lawyer before the "genuine" diplomat, and of the vain provincial before the Frenchman or Englishman. Their cowardice before the patented representatives of capital is the reverse side of the hauteur they display before the working-class. Tseretelli's bitter hatred against Soviet Russia may be partly attributed to his indignation against a comageous attempt made by the workers. The workers actually *dared* to accomplish something which only he, as an educated petty-bourgeois, could be capable of, and even that only with the permission of the bourgeoisie.

When Tchkhenskeli or Gegetchkori speak of Communists no epithet is too black for them; but when they address the Czarist general Alexeieff, or the German von Kress or the Englishman Wokker, they take the greatest pains to put on the fine polished tone of the Swiss maitre d'hôtel. The ghosts they fear most are the generals. They therefore seek to assure them and convince them in the most reverential and dutiful manner that Georgian Socialism has nothing in common with any of the other forms of Socialism. All the other Socialisms are destructive and breed unrest, whereas the Georgian Socialism carries with it a guaranty for "peace and order". It seems that their political experiences make the petty-bourgeois cynical, but not in the least sensible.

The diary of Djugeli is a characteristic self-portrait of one of the Menshevik "knights", who burns villages and makes entries in his diary in the style of a degenerate gymnasium student, of his great delight over the beauty of the conflagration, and his great resemblance to Nero. No doubt these contemptible nummers are impersonating the Bolsheviks, who do not conceal the fact of civil war and their harsh treatment of the enemies. Djugeli and his teachers are not in the least aware of the fact that this open policy of revolutionary force, which has no fear of itself, is based upon its historical right and revolutionary mission. They do not in the least comprehend that this policy has nothing in common with the wild cynicism of a "democratic" provincial tyrant who burns peasant villages and looks into the mirror gloating over the resemblance he bears to the degenerate Roman Emperor.

Soon after Jordania, Ramishvili, the Minister of the Interior, proclaimed with false pathos the right of the democracy to unmerciful terror, basing his argument on Marx. From Nero to Marx! . . . This grimacing sophistry of the provincial petty-bourgeois and their superficial monkey-like imitations are eloquent witnesses of their emptiness and sterility.

The more the Mensheviks became aware of the absolute powerlessness of "independent" Georgia, and the more acute their need for Allied protection became after Germany was defeated, the more carefully did they hide the instruments of their "special division", and in place of the false and cheap Djugeli-Nero mask, they put on the equally false and equally cheap mask of Jordania-Tseretelli-Gladstone, the great promulgators of liberal platitudes.

This falsified Marxism was really a psychological necessity for the Georgian Mensheviks, especially to the younger generation, since it served to reconcile them with their essentially bourgeois attitude. Their political cowardice, their democratic rhetoric, their platitudinous pathos, their instinctive repugnance to everything exact, complete or sharp on the intellectual field, and their jealous idolatry of all the outer forms of bourgeois civilisation—all these features combined to form a psychological type which was diametrically opposed to the Marxist type.

At those occasions in Petrograd, Tiflis or Paris, upon which Tseretelli spoke of "international democracy", one could

never tell whether he meant the mythical "Family of Nations", the International or the Entente. Yet he so expresses himself as to suggest the inclusion of the world proletariat. The haziness of his ideas and concepts aids him in his sleight-of-hand tricks. Again, when Jordania, the "head of the clan", speaks of international solidarity, he does not fail to refer to the hospitality of the Georgian kings. After his return from Europe, Tchkhenskeli announces "that the future of the International and of the League of Nations (!) is assured". National prejudices and splinters of Socialism, Marx and Wilson, rhetorical enthusiasm and petty-bourgeois limitations, pathos and humbug, International and League of Nations, a drop of sincerity and an ocean of plain charlatantry,—all this crowned with the self-satisfaction of the provincial apothecary, formed a mixture which shaken by historical events, constituted the soul of Georgian Menshevism.

The Georgian Mensheviks were thrown into raptures by the 14 points of Wilson. They greeted the League of Nations; not so long ago they had greeted the troops of the German Kaiser as they entered Georgia. They hailed the entry of the English troops. They cheered the friendly statement of the English admiral. Of course, they greeted Vandervelde, Kautsky and Mrs. Snowden. They would cheerfully at any moment greet even the Archbishop of Canterbury were he willing to damn the Bolsheviks a few times. In this wise, these gentlemen prove that they are flesh of the flesh of "European Culture".

They unmask themselves almost completely in the memorandum which the Georgian delegation presented to the League of Nations.

The latter part of this memorandum reads as follows:—

"The Georgian nation which recognizes the principles of Western Democracy naturally sympathizes immensely with the idea of creating a political system which being a direct sequence of the war, will serve as a means of preventing future wars. The League of Nations which embodies this system is the most significant work of humanity (!) on the way to its future unity. The Georgian government hereby applies for membership in the League of Nations, and it is of the opinion that the very principles that are to be applied from now on (!) for the regulation of international life in the spirit of solidarity and cooperation, in themselves justify the admission of the old (!) nation, once the vanguard of Christianity (!) in the Orient, into the family of free European nations. Be it also taken into consideration that the Georgian nation is at present the only vanguard of democracy. It stands alone in its efforts to work freely and diligently in the household of its legitimate and undisputed heritage".

This statement can in no way be altered or modified. It is a classical document of bourgeois banality. The Socialist who after reading this memorandum does not vomit **should at once** and forever be thrown out of the labor-movement. The net result of Kautsky's studies of Georgia, is his conviction that true, unlimited and unadulterated Marxism exists only in Georgia. In the whole of Russia, however, with its factions, inner fights and splits, as well as in the rest of this sinful earth of ours, which in this respect is no better than Russia, this is not the case. At the same time, however, Kautsky does not forget to point out that Georgia possesses neither large-scale nor middle-sized industries, and consequently no industrial proletariat. The majority of Menshevik representatives in the Georgian Constituent Assembly consisted of teachers, doctors and officials; the majority of electors—peasants. But Kautsky does not take the trouble to account for this ostensible historical wonder. He who, together with all the Mensheviks, accuses us of parading the retrograde features of Russia as progressive and advantageous finds his ideal of Social Democracy in the most reactionary corner of the old Russia.

The fact that Georgian "Marxism" has as yet not undergone the splitting and fractional struggles that the other unfortunate countries had to go through is in reality only a sign of the low degree of development of its social structure. The process of differentiation between bourgeois and proletarian democracy takes place much later here than elsewhere. All this only goes to show that Georgian Menshevism has nothing whatever in common with Marxism. Instead of dwelling upon this fundamental question, Kautsky condescendingly declares that he knew the Marxism principles when we were still in our swaddling clothes. We shall not contest this advantage of Kautsky's.

Shakespeare's wise Nestor based his claim to fame upon the fact that his sweetheart was at one time more beautiful than the grandmother of his younger enemy. But is it not also possible that just because he studied the Socialist alphabet so

very, very long ago, Kautsky is now unable to apply the ABC to Georgia? The longer and less fought for Menshevik regime in Georgia is in his opinion the fruit of the highest tactical wisdom. But in reality it is a mere sequence of the fact that in reactionary Georgia the epoch of revolutionary Socialism set in at a later period than in other parts of old Russia.

ECONOMICS

The Effect of the New Reparations Note

by A. Friedrich (Berlin).

** The Berlin Bourse has replied to the latest note of the Reparations Commission by a fall in the value of the mark putting all previous downward tendencies completely in the shade. When foreign currencies are taken as a standard, the German mark has depreciated to an eightieth of its prewar value, or, in other words, the mark of to-day is worth precisely 1.25 prewar pfennigs. Another fact as equally significant as the fall of the mark is the circumstance that the stock quotations are not keeping pace, as has been the case up to now, with the rate of exchange. This is a sign that the German bourgeoisie is being rendered distinctly uneasy by the present state of affairs, and is not setting any great hopes on the development of Germany's economic position.

The attitude thus expressed on the Bourse is being proclaimed by the German press in indignant phrases. Assent to the latest demands of the Reparations Commission, the exaction of 60 milliards of fresh taxes at the command of the Entente, is universally declared to be impossible. The taxation compromise arrived at with such infinite pains, and which provides for raising a total sum of 100 milliards of marks by means of direct and indirect taxation, is now as uncertain of actual realization as the German government itself is uncertain of maintaining its position, which is founded on this taxation compromise.

However this may be, the demand made on the German government by the Reparations Commission on March 21st is neither more nor less than that provisionally formulated by the Supreme Council at Cannes at the end of January. The Supreme Council then determined that the total sum to be paid in reparations by Germany during the current year was to be 7.17 milliards of gold marks. Of this 720,000,000 gold marks were to be paid in cash, that is, in foreign currencies, and the remainder in kind. The note of the Reparations Commission of March 21st confirms this provisional decision. It neither adds nor subtract anything.

The contents of the note merely signify that this German debt, as fixed at Cannes, and acknowledged by Dr. Rathenau and the German government, is now being "mobilized". The German government was prepared for this some weeks ago, the conference at Cannes having demanded the submission to the Reparations Commission of a statement showing the manner in which Germany expected to raise these sums, in what way she intended to arrange her finances and administration, and especially, what steps she is taking towards the collection of the necessary taxes.

Upon this the German government drew up a plan for a budget which in theory provided for a surplus of some paper milliards for domestic expenditure, a surplus unfortunately since swallowed up by the enormous depreciation of the mark during the last few weeks, and by the resultant rise in prices of all materials with its attendant necessary rise in wages and salaries. With regard to the reparations the contemplated budget of the German government did not contain a word of reply. It was simply stated that the required sum of 172 millions of marks would be raised by "loans". No information was given regarding the loans. In reality, only a fraction of the sum is covered by a loan, the so-called "forced loan", expected to bring in 40-50 milliards of paper marks, according to the plans of the taxation compromise. If and when this sum will actually be at the disposal of the German government is extremely problematical.

No wonder that the Reparations Commission expressed dissatisfaction with the financial and administrative plans of the German government. It was not found possible to combine the German domestic budget with a reparations budget. The German government had no alternative but to meet the reparation obligations as before, by means of purchasing foreign currencies. In this manner more than a quarter of a million gold marks have been paid to the Entente since the end of January. As the amount

of foreign currencies in the Reichsbank did not suffice to cover these payments, this development of the situation was bound to lead to a further depreciation of the mark. As soon as the payments in kind come into force, the effect will be the same. The reparations agreements newly made within the last few weeks aim at having the largest possible quantity of goods delivered by Germany to the Entente in payment of the reparation account. This is the object of the "free commerce" between the German capitalists delivering and the Entente capitalists receiving, and of the fixing of world market prices. The German government can however only pay the reparation transactions of the German capitalists by printing more paper money, a procedure naturally running parallel with further depreciation of the German mark.

The Reparations Commission is very well aware that the debt may be "mobilized" in this way for a few months, but not permanently. For these methods of fulfilling the reparation obligations are bound to lead in a very short time to the bankruptcy of the German state, and perhaps not to a financial breakdown alone, but the collapse of German political economy and of the class dominating it. The Reparations Commission thus sees itself obliged to step in. And apparently the steps taken will consist of proposing measures to the German government by which German finance and administration may be made to harmonize with the reparations budget.

The initial demand of the Reparations Commission is the substitution of the very questionable "forced loan" by a tax on capital, by which about the same amount is to be raised. Besides this, the burden of taxation, already swelled to a total of 100 milliards of marks by the taxation compromise, is to be increased by 60 further milliards. The Reparations Commission bases this demand on the fact that the recent depreciation of the mark has rendered the greater part of the expected tax revenue illusory. The German government is also called upon to take measures against capital being carried abroad, to control the traffic in securities, and to confiscate German capital in foreign countries. The Reparations Commission requires exact information regarding all legislative and administrative measures. In conclusion, we have a threat of recourse to force should the German government fail to meet all these demands, or pay unpunctually.

If the German government were prepared to meet all these demands, it would encounter stubborn resistance on the part of the German capitalists whose existence would thereby be threatened. The policy of endeavoring to fulfil the reparation obligations, if continued on the new lines laid down by the Reparations Commission, would have the additional result of calling the German proletariat on the scene. For there is no need to waste a word over the obvious fact that 60 milliards of marks increased taxation, to be borne in some form by the masses, is unbearable.

Besides this, even if the demands of the Reparations Commission could be realized, there would be not actual prospect of payment of the German debt. The Reparations Commission submits a calculation to the German government showing that the latest depreciation of the mark increases the German budget deficit to about 270 milliards of paper marks. The fresh demand for 60 milliards of new taxes, 40 milliards of which are to be raised during the current year, even when taken in combination with the tax on capital also demanded, forms no solution to the deficit remaining in the German treasury.

It is sufficiently evident that the propositions of the Reparations Commission are not sufficient to restore German public finances to a sound condition, and the complete payment of the reparation debts rendered possible. They are measures whose first object is a wide extension of the Entente's rights of control over German legislation, administration, and finances. The Reparations Commission is doubtless well aware of the impracticability and inadequacy of the measures which it suggests. The demands made are rather to be regarded in the light of fore-runners, leading the way to a complete control by the Entente over the whole of Germany's political and economic organisation. The capitalists of France and England are hoping that a great advance has been made towards obtaining the largest possible sum of ready money, towards the harnessing of German industries for pioneer service within the sphere of influence of Entente capital, and towards wiping out the competition of various branches of German industry. And there can be not doubt that the yoke laid on the shoulders of Germany by Entente capital is rendered much heavier by the new note of the Reparations Commission.

The German bourgeoisie cannot extricate itself from the situation. As before, those groups of capitalists who still manage to discover favorable business prospects under present conditions will be anxious, with the help of the Right Socialists and of

the trade-unions, to provide for the fulfilment of even these fresh demands of the Reparations Commission.

The German proletariat alone can thwart the designs of the Entente capitalists. By the "seizure of real values", by exercising influence over German production, and by close contact with Soviet Russia, the German proletariat could create a political and economic basis for the liberation of Germany from the yoke of Entente capital. The alarming depreciation of the mark, in combination with a taxation swallowing up almost half the wages of the proletariat, is rapidly reducing the broad masses of the German population to abject poverty, and if the proletariat is to continue to exist, this basis of liberation must be created speedily.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The Fight for the United Front in Italy

The "Alliance of Labor".

● by *Edmondo Peluso*.

** The leaders and officials of the various Italian labor organizations are just beginning to perceive the barrenness and futility of their policy of isolation, uncertainty and inaptitude. Under the pressure of the masses, which instinctively feel that the only means for vigorous resistance against the capitalist offensive lies in united trade-union action, the Italian Railwaymen's Union, headed by Socialists, Anarchists and Syndicalists, has taken the initiative of calling upon the representatives of the Left political parties of Italy, (Anarchists, Communists, Republicans and Socialists) to meet during the first half of February and discuss the creation of a so-called "Alliance of Labor".

The Communist Party declined to participate in this conference, but in the letter which it sent explaining its absence, it declared its readiness to do everything in its power to bring about unity of action in the ranks of the Italian proletariat. Moreover, this is what the C.P.I. has been striving for since last August when it proposed to the Trade Union Conference of Verona, that a united trade-union front be formed; this motion was of course rejected by the majority, consisting of bureaucrats and functionaries of the Italian C.G.L. (General Confederation of Labor).

Today, when the situation has become untenable for the heads of the unions, the leaders of the railwaymen have thought this an opportune moment for calling a conference of the "vanguard" political parties at Rome, for the purpose of laying the foundation for a preliminary "Entente", and of establishing an "Alliance of Labor" by bringing their influence to bear upon their respective trade-union organizations.

The Communist Party of Italy, although refusing to take part in the Conference, has recognized the importance of such a step towards proletarian unity, but it was constrained to point out that this "unity" carries the germ of sterility that exposes it to the danger of becoming a purely formal alliance, devoid of all power, as long as it is not based upon the unification of all pending demands, upon the energetic struggle to improve the proletarian standard of living and upon the use of trade-union direct action as far as the general strike. However, the first conference of the Executive Committees of these "revolutionary" political parties has taken no such action whatever. On the other hand, while preserving its independence and freedom of action, the C.P.I. has encouraged its adherents to support those points on the program that contributed to the foundation of a united proletarian front.

The preliminary conference of the "Alliance of Labor" was followed by an assembly that took place on the 19th of February, participated in by the leaders and executive committees of five of the most important Italian labor organizations, namely, the C.G.L., the Railwaymen's Union, the Italian Syndicalist Union, the Syndicalist Labor Union and the Federation of Harbor Workers.

In the recess between the first and second session, the Communist minorities in the C.G.L. and in the Railwaymen's Union asked through their official representative body, the Communist Trade Union Committee, that representation should be extended on a proportional basis. To this request D'Aragona answered in the name of the trade-union bureaucracy that the C.G.L. statutes did not give a political committee the right to appoint representatives of the C.G.L. As if the Communist Trade Union Committee which acts in a trade-union capacity were a political committee!

The minority of the Syndicalist Union, which, like the Communists, is in favor of the Moscow Red Union International, was also refused representation.

In this manner, more than 500,000 of the best, most class-conscious Italian workers found themselves shut out from this conference, which was to form an "Alliance of Labor".

The whole of the National Committee is in the hands of the reformists. Is this not sufficient proof that the "Alliance of Labor" is nothing more than an agreement between the leaders of the various trade-unions? The agreement and unity which will take place among the workers, will have to undo all the intrigues of these trade-union bureaucrats.

Soon after this sham "unity" was effected, the C.P.I. defined its position by officially declaring:

That while the Communists desire to unite all the local agitation, of a craft nature, into one general block of demands, the C.G.L. is opposed to it;

Furthermore, that the Communists desire to develop their means of action in the trade-unions, leaving to each political party its freedom in the Parliamentary or governmental field;

And finally, that the Communists hold that outside of the question of constitutional rights, and the general proletarian conquests, it is also necessary to take into account and fight for the question of wages and labor-contracts.

In giving a general résumé of the situation, we may say that this "Alliance of Labor" is the first step towards the clarification and unity of the proletarian struggle; although there is always a possibility that the bureaucratic leaders may deviate from this course of development. These feel that the masses are slipping through their fingers. From the very start their program is doomed to defeat, for instead of concentrating all the isolated and sectional divisions into one class army it is based upon the only foundation possible for them: the restoration of civil rights and liberties and the defense of the general conquests of the working class.

By general conquests our trade-union bureaucrats mean the eight-hour day, but they are dumb as to the question of wages and labor-contracts, because these are already conquests of a definite kind.

As for weapons, we see that the "Alliance of Labor" does not exclude the general strike, whereas the Communists propose the united front in order to arrive at the general strike.

The governmental crisis which has just come to an end has demonstrated that the entire policy of the reformists, while using the proletarian masses as a lever, is itself pulling toward class collaboration.

The "united front", as the gentlemen of the C.G.L. desire it, is also designed to regain for these gentlemen their political reputations and to sustain them in the opinion of the proletariat. But we believe that they are laboring under an illusion. The Italian Communists are on their guard to see that the "defeatists" of the proletarian movement in Italy are paid in kind and that the movement of proletarian demands follow the only path of success—that of the Social Revolution.

The Convention of the United Mine Workers of America.

by *John Dorsey*.

** Alex. Howat and the Kansas miners were not fairly defeated at the recent miners' convention. Lewis won by the use of tactics that would shame Tammany Hall in its palmyest days. The incident was but one more in the long effort of the reactionary administration to crush the valiant fighter, Howat.

In order to show how some of the trickery was worked it will be well for us to start at the inception of the convention struggle. As everyone knows, the charters of the Kansas local unions were revoked and Dorchy and Howat, then in jail, were expelled from the organization when they refused to obey the dictates of Lewis and knuckle under to the Kansas operators. All this was contrary to the International constitution, because no man may be removed from an official position (much less expelled from the union) without first having had a trial—and to this day Howat and Dorchy have not only had no trial, but they have not even been told why were expelled. Lewis laments about the unfairness of the capitalist courts; then turns around and denies a trial to members of his own organization in a way

that no capitalist court in the country would dare. It will take organized labor many years to live down the shame of the Howat case.

Howat went to the convention determined to get a square deal. He demanded a hearing, but Lewis, ruling that he was not a member of the organization and also that the convention was empowered only to consider scale questions, refused to give it to him. Howat upset this shaky contention by pointing out that every member had the right to a hearing at the convention before he could be expelled, and also that the present convention was not a special one, but merely a continuation of the September convention. He appealed to the body to reject Lewis' ruling, which it did by a rousing majority.

This was a fair test of strength, and it showed that the bulk of the delegates were with Howat and determined that the constitution and the principles of unionism should be lived up to. But Lewis was not deterred by this fact. His partisans immediately demanded a roll call—which represents an expense to the miners' union of about \$4,000. To secure a roll call the support of 700 delegates was necessary. About 400 stood up, but these were conveniently counted as enough and the roll call ordered accordingly. The steam-roller, thoroughly oiled, was working in fine form. All that remained to do further was count Howat out of the vote, and that was done scientifically enough.

Padding The Vote.

The first move of the administration was an attempt to call the roll without the delegates being in possession of the customary printed report of the credentials' committee showing who was entitled to vote. But this did not go, it was too raw. The Howat forces insisted upon getting copies of the report. Defeated in this manoeuvre, the Lewis supporters were not slow to devise another. The claim was made that the report of the credentials' committee had not yet been printed and that the convention would have to wait until such was done. Result, over two days' delay, and a splendid opportunity for the machine to fix things up so that the vote would go their way.

Finally the vote was completed, and on the face of it it showed that the administration had won by 2073 against 1955, or a majority of 118. But even a cursory examination of the vote shows that Howat had a clear majority, probably as much as 400. Take the Kansas delegation's vote, for example. This body cast 63 votes against Howat, whereas, in all fairness, they should not have been allowed to vote at all as it was their case that was being tried: Howat lost not only the 125 votes of the old Kansas delegation, who were ruled out, but he also had the votes of the provisional organization cast against him. Had there been any honesty prevailing in the situation the readjustment of the Kansas case alone would have given Howat a clear and clean majority. In passing, it is interesting to note that the administration advanced the Kansas provisional delegates \$100.00 apiece to come to the convention. Why, if not merely to pile up the vote against Howat?

But Kansas was only a detail in the general skulduggery to beat Howat. The administration whipped the paid officialdom of the organization into line and voted them solid against Howat. With the exception of John Brophy, Mother Jones, the Illinois officials, and a scattering one here and there, the great number of district officers, international organizers, etc., voted with Lewis. They cast at least 700 votes, and if we count the votes of those who are dangling for jobs, the "payroll vote" would probably run up to almost twice that number. The nature of the vote was that the actual miner delegates voted overwhelmingly for Howat and the officialdom almost entirely against him. It was the bureaucracy against the rank and file.

Many were the schemes used to swell the administration vote. One stunt that netted scores was this: In U.M.W.A. conventions the roll is called twice, the second time for absentees on the first call. Consequently the habit has developed for most of the delegates to stay away from the second call, when they have already cast their votes. Knowing this, the administration took advantage of it by not registering many votes that were cast for Howat on the first call. Then they called off the names again on the second call, and the delegates, believing that they had voted, were not there to respond, and were marked down "not voting". In this manner Howat lost many votes. How many it is impossible to say, but probably enough to have changed the final result. One delegate declared that in District 1 alone Howat was thus cheated out of 26 votes.

But this was only one means used by the administration to harvest illegitimate votes. There were many others. Every device known to the professional ward politician was used to fatten the vote of the "reliables". Often they were given the

votes of locals that had expired since the September convention, and in some cases, of locals that had not sent any delegates at all. Besides that locals were voted, by administration men of course, that did not appear at all upon the report of the credentials committee. Demands for explanations were either ignored or gavelled down. The whole thing was a swindle. It is safe to say that with an honest vote Howat would have carried the convention by a substantial margin.

No Secession Movements.

Now the big question is, what are we going to do about it? Of course, the dual unionist (or rather the 57 varieties of him) is here to tell us that our only hope is in braking up our organization and in joining his particular side-show. But it is very doubtful if he will get much of a hearing with the rank and file. Such secession movements have never worked out except in the interests of the bosses—at least that is the case so far as the mining industry is concerned. Fortunately Howat is not one of those heroes who think that the best way to win a fight is to run away. He is a dogged battler, such as the radical movement has yet hardly produced, and he is going ahead with this struggle until he finally wins out.

Howat has stated many times that he is against dual unionism. He is for fighting the thing out within the organization. At a meeting in Indianapolis he said, "We shall never start a dual organization, we are going to belong to the U.M.W.A. The great rank and file will move once they learn the facts, and they will know them eventually". After the September convention all the rebels, or those who were most loudly proclaimed as such, felt that they were hopelessly beaten—they are always ready to confess defeat in the old unions and to leave the reactionaries in charge. But Howat is not of this calibre. He has gone ahead fighting, and got Lewis just about licked. All that is necessary now is a fair count of the votes, and Howat's tactics of everlastingly going to the rank and file and religiously staying away from dualism, will eventually get him that fair count, whether in another convention or in a referendum. It will be but a matter of time until Howat and the rest of the Kansas miners are reinstated in the United Mine Workers. And when they go back it will indicate that a revolution has taken place in that organization.

The thing to do now is to carry the word into every local of the U.M.W.A. and show how the Kansas miners have been treated. Lewis cannot stand against the truth. The only thing that can possibly keep him in power now is for the rebels to get cold feet, as they usually do, and launch into some reckless splitting-away movement.

The Offensive of the Czech Exploiters

by Alois Neurath (Prague).

** After the defeat of the miners, the other employer groups are not permitting the favorable occasion to slip by, and are also beginning to attack. The exploiters of the glass industry have made the beginning. For several weeks the employers and the glass workers have been at loggerheads. In the glass industry, "home work" is still very extensive and the exploitation of the wage earners is therefore greater than in any other branch of industry. A few weeks ago the workers asked for a small increase in wages. As a result of the "glorious" conclusion of the miners' strike, the employers answered with an announcement that they intended to decrease wages to the extent of 20, 30 and more per cent. The trade-union leaders and the Social Democratic papers announced a relentless struggle against the employers in regard to the reduction of wages. We draw attention to the fact that the trade-union bureaucracy had the opportunity of convincing themselves during the last struggle that the capitalists are not frightened by talk, and that the exploiters ignored all the recommendations of the government. The workers — not alone those organized as Communists — know very well (and the trade-union bureaucracy also know it), that in no serious affair has the government been able to restrain the capitalists. The government dances as the employers whistle, and the capitalists know how to whistle.

The representatives of the workers demand the intervention of the government. For tactical reasons nothing can be said against this. No harm is done if this simple and valuable truth is continually demonstrated anew to all of the workers that the government not only does not anything that is against the interests of the capitalists, but that when a serious occasion arrives it is to be found with all of the powers at the disposal

of the state on the side of the exploiters. Till recently the employers have for tactical reasons played the game and permitted the mediation of the government.

In the struggle between the employers and the workers in the glass industry the capitalists are not acting as wisely as their colleagues, the mineowners. They feel their strength and evidently expect that there is a big difference between the words of the trade-union leaders and their actions. The Ministry for Social Welfare invited the representatives of the workers and the employers to a mutual conference on Wednesday, March 8th. The capitalists declared that they have no use for any mediation, that they do not need any discussions and demanded that before a conference take place the workers accept the demands of the employers. The conference, however, took place and a representative of the employers also took part who added to the forwardness of the employers his own contempt and declared that he had merely come to *enjoy himself personally*. This "lack of manners" was even too much for the representative of the Ministry. The latter could not permit it to be so openly revealed that the employers are sure of the support of the government. Therefore the representative of the Ministry tried to call the representative of the employers to order. Hereupon the man rose and contemptuously left the conference.

Thus the employers intend not only to reject the demands of the workers (this the employers no longer mention), but to cut wages considerably. The trade-union bureaucracy still has time to act in order to prevent the employers from treating the workers as entirely helpless slaves. But so much is certain, that the capitalists must be made to feel that the representatives of the workers are not only going to take up the struggle, but are also going to carry it through together with the aid of the workers of other industrial groups. Even if a comparatively small group of workers is concerned, its defeat can only be prevented if all the labor parties and above all the representatives of the Trade-Union Federation convoke a general conference to discuss the measures that will have to be taken by larger sections of the proletariat than are now involved in the struggle. It remains to be seen whether the trade-union leaders are able to draw the correct consequences from the recent struggle of the miners.

The Unemployment Problem in Austria

by Ernst Haidt (Vienne).

** In Austria, unemployment was up to a short time ago, fairly negligible. During the clearing sale period which was favored by the lowness of wages most workers found employment, so that the number of the unemployed sank almost below the normal figures. In the months of November and December they began slowly to amount, so that by the end of December they totalled 25,000. This figure, however, in the first days of March jumped to 80,000. This was partly brought about by the increasing desire of the employers for profit, who attempted to gather in the greatest possible gains. On the other hand, however, and apart from this reason, the employers adopted a policy of dismissals which is closely connected with the contemplated wage cuts which they announced at the general meeting of the Employers' Federation. They declare these wage reductions to be absolutely necessary in order to be able to compete with foreign countries. In order to weaken the workers in the contest they closed down some factories altogether, and in other factories sought to reduce the number of workers.

For a long period the amount paid in respect of unemployment insurance benefit remained unchanged so that in comparison with the constantly increasing cost of living it became more and more inadequate. This in January caused a number of builders and bootmakers, who represented only a portion of the unemployed, to submit the demands of the unemployed to the Municipal Authorities of Vienna and the government in a spontaneous demonstration, in which they demanded in the first place the provision of work and also the increasing of the unemployment benefit.

The government had by no means forgotten the remarkable demonstration of the 1st of December with its demolition and pillaging, and fearing fresh demonstrations promised whatever the unemployed demanded. Meanwhile unemployment in the provinces made itself felt to an enormous extent and there also the unemployed issued their demands. Everywhere unemployed committees were set up with a central committee in Vienna which coordinated the claims of the unemployed, and energetically demanded of the trade-unions that they take up the cause of the

unemployed. At the mass-meeting of the unemployed there were 17 trade-union representatives present as well as the Trade Union Committee and they there agreed upon the following:—

Demands.

1.—Immediate organization and provision of unemployed relief work, in particular the increasing and improving of the rolling stock of the railways, development of the telegraph and telephone systems. Commencement of electrification of the railways and building of hydroelectric stations.

2.—Immediate realization of the proceeds of the house tax recently levied by the Vienna Municipality by means of a state loan and at the same time the commencement of intensive building of dwelling houses.

3.—Improvement of the existing state unemployment insurance in its provisions and amount, in particular the rendering of this insurance independent of the amount of sick pay, and the reduction of the period of qualifying for benefit from 20 to 10 weeks.

4.—Rigid observance of the existing regulations compelling employers to reinstate workers in the workshops and the control there through the Workshop Committees.

The representatives of the unemployed, who interviewed the government officials as well as the mayor, obtained promises for the provision of work for the unemployed through the introduction of a rent tax the proceeds of which would be devoted to building work. The raising of the amount of unemployed maintenance was definitely refused by the Finance Minister. A motion was introduced in the Parliament by the Social Democratic Party which proposed the increasing of the unemployed maintenance by about 50 per cent. As was to be expected, this motion was flatly rejected by the bourgeois majority and according to all appearances the trade-union leaders and Social Democratic Party in Parliament seem to be satisfied with this.

Now, however, the situation is becoming exceedingly acute. The present undoubted commercial crisis, aggravated by the Employers' offensive, who with a view to wage cuts intend to discharge as large a number of workers as possible, daily increases the army of the unemployed; while the maintenance of existence becomes increasingly impossible. If one take into consideration that an income of 30,000 crowns a week barely suffices to provide the most primitive necessities, it is evident that the unemployed with an income of 5,000 crowns suffer direct starvation; not to mention that great number who do not come within the scope of unemployed insurance and so are even without that small income. The decision of the Conference of Trade Union Officials, according to which the employed workers are to contribute a separate tax for the unemployed, signifies little enough and is apparently intended to conceal from the working-class the fact that the trade-unions will not put up a serious fight in the interests of the unemployed. The 80,000 unemployed comprise today, however, in little Austria a body which must be reckoned with, and which will be compelled by circumstances to take up the struggle for the bare possibility of existence. All endeavors to keep down the unemployed movement through police regulations are bound to fail, for the unemployed are into the position of either venturing everything for the obtaining of a possible existence or going under altogether.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

Disarmament, the League of Nations, and the Amsterdam International

by W. Łada.

** The so-called "Provisional Mixed Commission" of the League of Nations met recently in Paris at the instance of the latter in order to consider ways and means for a reduction of armaments. The commission which then met for the third time since July 1921, consists of six civilians, six members of the advisory committee for military, naval and air warfare problems two members of the economic and two of the financial committee of the League of Nations and three labor delegates appointed by the Executive of the International Labor Bureau. Of the three representatives of the employers which the statutes of the commission provide for, only one (delegated by the Czech-Slovak employers) is a member of the commission, the other employers represented in the executive of the International Labor Bureau having declined the honor. As, however, the labor delegates

(Messrs. Jouhaux, Oudegeest and Thorberg) are members of the Executive of the Amsterdam Trade Union International, the deliberations of the commission deserve the attention of the international working class.

What the Commission does for Disarmament.

The commission was appointed at the first general assembly of the League of Nations. It consists, as we have seen, for a large part of members who were not delegated by their respective governments, but by the League of Nations. This procedure is intended to insure the impartiality of the commission. It follows, however, under these circumstances that the various governments are not bound by the decisions of the commission. The commission intends to collect statistical material on the magnitude of armaments in 1913 and 1921 and on the basis of the results of the comparison elaborate a plan for a general reduction of armaments. Apart from this it will deal with the problem of the manufacture of war material by private industry and, upon a motion moved by Jouhaux is to call an international conference to consider this matter. The progress of the commission's work can be ascertained from a paragraph in the Paris "L'Information" dated February 22nd declaring that *Belgium, the Netherlands and Switzerland were the only countries which after a lapse of ten months reported to the commission on their armaments.* According to a declaration made by M. Viviani, the president of the commission, that body must let "a strictly realist spirit" govern all its activities; painstaking statistical preparations and discussions which (according to the same source) would undoubtedly sometimes prove painful, are essential in preparing the work of disarmament. Thus the commission decided at its last Paris session that in order to continue its work, a number of new members amongst them a labor delegate appointed by the International Labor Bureau must be asked to collaborate. This constitutes a fresh "victory" of the Amsterdam Trade Union International which in this manner will augment its representation in the so very important "Provisional Mixed Commission". With regard to a reduction of armaments the commission has decided that for the time being an international agreement in that respect is out of the question. A disarmament project would have to be elaborated by the League of Nations after consultation with the various governments which ought to be heard first with regard to the measures essential for their national security, their international obligations, their geographical situation and their social conditions. Regarding the statistical inquiry into armaments, the commission, because of the "favorable" progress made hitherto, has been unable to do more than call upon the League of Nations to speed up the collection of the necessary documents. The commission will meet again on July 15th of this year in order to deliberate on the "general directions for a plan for reducing armaments".

That feeble child of M. Jouhaux' mind, government control of private concerns manufacturing war material, was also paid attention to by the commission. After lengthy preparations and activities, and after the sessions of a few sub-commissions, the commission came to the conclusion that the Council of the League of Nations should enjoin the necessity for speedy ratification of that treaty upon the parties to the Treaty of St. Germain. The commission furthermore expressed its desire to know what the Washington Conference had done in that respect. It was also decided to continue preparations for calling the general conference on the control of the private manufacture of war material.

That represents the sum total of the labors of the last session of the League of Nations commission on disarmament which sat in Paris from 20th to 23rd of February, and simultaneously the result of the ten months' activities of that commission! It is difficult indeed not to write a satire. That man of subtle irony, M. Viviani, who, though a former premier and official French delegate to a number of diplomatic conferences, represents France "quite unofficially" on the disarmament commission of the League of Nations, found high praise for "the rapidity of work, the precision of the methods, and the ability of the members" when conference was finally adjourned. All these qualities were—in M. Viviani's opinion secure guaranties for the final result.

Amsterdam and the Disarmament Commission of the League of Nations.

In November 1921, at the time when the Washington Disarmament Conference met, the leaders of the Amsterdam Trade Union International decided to hold a disarmament conference of their own as a foil to the bourgeois conference. M. Fimmen, secretary to the Federation, declared at that time that the Washington Conference was called for the purpose of hoodwinking the workers and diverting their attention from the machinations of imperialism. M. Jouhaux, first vice-

president of the Federation, declared just as publicly that the opening conference in Amsterdam was not intended to be a counter-demonstration against Washington. And in order to emphasize this, Jouhaux, together with a number of his colleagues in the International Labour Bureau, sent a cable to Harding, four days before the Washington Conference met, in which the most ardent wishes of the undersigned that the Washington Conference would prove to be a milestone on the road to international disarmament, were expressed. In the December session of the Executive of the Amsterdam Trade Union International, a lengthy discussion was held on the question of participation in the disarmament humbug of the imperialist bourgeoisie. In this discussion the Jouhaux tendencies gained the upper hand and it was decided to continue the tactics of "revolutionary" phrasemongery against militarist reaction in the appeals to labor and of reformist cooperation with the very same militarist reaction in their "disarmament" commissions. In the articles written by Jouhaux for his organ, "Le Peuple", during the session of the Disarmament Commission of the League of Nations, that worthy declared in the vernacular of a clown performing as a people's tribune, that if the various governments and the League of Nations did not "seriously" tackle the problem of disarmament, they would deeply disappoint their peoples, bring to naught all hopes put in the League of Nations and add a new and perilous bankruptcy to the large number of previous failures. He even hinted that if in the question of disarmament the League of Nations did not travel the way mapped out for it by the Amsterdam Trade Union International, the latter with its "24 millions of organized workers" would find ways and means of compelling the League to travel that road. When, however, at the adjournment of the Paris session it was shown that the mountain had brought forth a mouse and that the disarmament commission of the League of Nations had no other duty than that of uttering platitudes on disarmament, the same Jouhaux declared in all seriousness that the achievements of the commission's activities should not be underestimated and that "it was a result not at all expected at the beginning of the deliberations." ("Le Peuple", Feb. 24, 1922.)

The Truth about Disarmament.

It is generally known that in the course of the Washington Conference those previous allies France and Great Britain were often at loggerheads. Lloyd George's press was more than once very outspoken about the fact that France is the greatest military power and holds the first place in the armament race. In reply the editor-in-chief of the "Matin", M. Lausanne, published an article under the characteristic headline "Logs and Chips" in which he proved that according to the British budget estimates for 1921-1922, *Great Britain will spend 204,080,300,00, or 10,612,175,600 francs while France had only appropriated 4,552,963,749 francs for the same period.* ("Le Matin", Jan. 27, 1922.) These astronomical figures clearly indicate the present extent of "disarmament". The organs of the compulsorily disarmed German militarists, the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung" and the "Kreuz-Zeitung" maliciously compile the data on the progress of "disarmament" in the victorious imperialist countries. These papers have computed that the naval budget of the United States of America has increased from the equivalent of £29,000,000 in 1913-1914 to £134,000,000 in 1920-1921; that of Great Britain has during the same period increased from £49,000,000 to £91,000,000, and that of Japan from the equivalent of £11,000,000 to £49,000,000. Army expenses have during the same period risen from £28,000,000 to £123,000,000 in Great Britain (exclusive of the Indian army), from 1,900,000 francs to 4,760,000,000 francs in France, from \$149,000,000 to \$699,000,000 in the United States. If, having read these figures, one sees dispatches announcing that the Geddes Committee in Great Britain proposes a reduction of £16,000,000 in Great Britain's military expenses, one must truly wonder at the "progress of disarmament". Regarding naval disarmament we can gather much from the editorials of the "Temps" of February 24th and 25th, at the time when the disarmament commission of the League of Nations was in session. According to the "Temps", the regulations for naval disarmament adopted at the Washington Conference are not compulsory, but only binding as long as the parties concerned wish to consider themselves bound by them. The "Temps" comes to the conclusion that it could not be otherwise in the absence of a super-government with a powerful navy at its disposal. This means that all nations should be disarmed and all armaments be transferred to a syndicate of Lloyd George, Poincaré, Harding and their imperialist bosses. Jouhaux and his colleagues of the Amsterdam Trade Union International are furthering this aim, when supporting the disarmament humbug of the League of Nations.