

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2. No. 20

14th March 1922

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 Four Power Pact and the Far Eastern Situation.

by Sen Katayama.

The Washington Conference ended with a policy of questionable compromise on the Far Eastern problems. They call this compromise the Four Power Pact. It contains four things, namely:

1. The four powers (England, America, France and Japan) agree between themselves to respect their rights in relation to their insular possessions and dominions in the regions of the Pacific Ocean. Controversies will be dealt with in conference with the help of those powers not in the insolved controversy.
2. The nature of the pact is defensive against any other power or powers.
3. The pact is for ten years and after that any power can withdraw upon 12 months' notice.

4. When it is signed by four powers the Anglo-Japanese Alliance concluded July 13, 1911 in London shall be terminated.

The pact is a compromise at least for three powers, England, America and Japan. America wants the Anglo-Japanese Alliance abrogated at all costs. In order to obtain this America signed the pact against her traditional policy of non-entanglement in foreign affairs. The New York Times gives a rather painful apology to the effect that America's position on the pact is not against her traditional policy in its editorial of December 9, 1921: —

"President Harding and the American delegation are pleased with the result achieved. It has been their purpose to enter into noalliance, entangling or otherwise. The new arrangement is regarded by them as avoiding this complication."

They may tell the American public that the pact is only an agreement with the three powers on the Pacific possessions and dominions but at the same time it destroyed the obnoxious alliance between England and Japan. Thus America gained her object without sacrificing hardly anything. True, the pact is not an alliance but its second article is a defensive agreement against other powers. The signing of the pact puts an end to the Anglo-Japanese Alliance but that does not mean that the British and Japanese break off their relations in the Far East. They are still allies under the pact. And moreover the present pact of the four powers is nothing but the British proposal of the triple alliance presented by the Lloyd George to the Washington politicians in a modified and moderated form and also disguised as an agreement.

England's statesmen have accomplished their aim in concluding the four power pact and can now pacify the British public, because the pact puts the end to the very unpopular Anglo-Japanese Alliance and yet keeps Japan as her unpaid police man for India as before. Present British interests in China are too great for Britain to make Japan her possible enemy, while she does not like to make the American people consider that the British government is not a friend of the American people. Thus England killed two birds with one stone — the Pacific Four Power Pact.

French colonial interests in the Far East are no possible danger to France, Japan or the other powers. But in case of trouble that threatens into develop into war between America

and Japan France is able to retain her colonial interests in the Far East by taking side with either America or Japan provided that England is on her side. So France expects to hold very good cards in the coming contest in the Far East. The latter half of the first clause of the pact almost solely provides for the very possible conflict between America and Japan, hardly for no other powers.

Apparently Japan is also gainer under the four power pact! Under this pact there will be no immediate danger of war with America on the questions of the Far East. She has the tacit consent of the three powers in her activities in the Far Eastern regions. America, while, maintaining her attitude toward China, the "Open Door" and "Equal Opportunity for All Countries", somewhat changed her policy toward Japan since the return of the mission to the Far East in the Summer of 1920 headed by Frank Vanderlip and Thomas Lamont, the Wall Street magnate. They and the Japanese capitalist clique headed by Shibusawa and others seem to have come to a definite agreement on the Chinese markets under the China Economic Consortium. After some strenuous propaganda conducted by the Wall Street magnates mentioned above with the help of other small flies in the financial circle, they succeeded in convincing the big capitalists of the country of the advisability of the joint exploitation of China. During the Summer of 1921 the change in the American policy toward Japan appeared in the public press. It sounded somewhat as follows:

"Japan has teeming millions, that she must either feed, or send outside the country and get material for her growing industry from other countries. The White countries, the American Pacific coast, Canada, Australia and other colonies held by the White races shut their door to the Japanese. Therefore it is fair and reasonable to let Japan develop her influence in the Far Eastern regions."

This kind of talk has been taken up by various dailies and periodicals all over the country.

Thus America prepared herself for the Washington Conference. The militarist Japanese government had at first some suspicions as to the real motives of the Washington statesmen but the government had a certain understanding with the capitalists (Wall Street magnates) and accepted Harding's invitation. For the first time the Japanese became interested in the foreign policies of Japan and they discussed freely the program of the Washington Conference. The disarmament question became a burning topic with the Washington Conference and the best and the most intelligent classes of the people openly declared that Japan's best interest is not in militarism but in the peaceful pursuit of her national life. This change of attitude of the people toward militarism made the military representatives at Washington yield readily to the proposals made by the American delegates and Japan gave way to the demand of America in regard to the question of Yap.

While the Four Power Pact temporarily gives Japan a somewhat free hand in the Far East and tacit consent to help the reactionary Russians, she has already increased the troops in Siberia and occupied important places in the Amur Province. Thus Japan has started to act the hangman's part for the imperialists of the world in the Far East under the Four Power Pact and is determined to crush the workers' and peasants' power and influence in Siberia and to destroy the Workers' and Peasants' Republic of Russia. This gives Japan still freer hand to exploit the fisheries and other industries in the Marine Province and Kamchaika.

Thus the Washington Conference has at least temporarily decided upon the joint exploitation of China and Siberia. In the latter it tacitly permitted Japan to assist the reactionary elements of the old Russian Czarist and capitalist cliques. On the whole the Washington Conference succeeded in establishing a compromise imperialist policy of the big powers in the Far East and yet its results show that they are preparing for the coming imperialist conflict in the Far East. America wanted the British-Japanese Alliance terminated simply because America can not fight against the combined power of England and Japan singlehandedly.

Politically France has been very much interested in the Far East, especially in the Siberian situation, from the beginning of the intervention of the Allied Powers. French statesmen held the pretty idea that they can strike at Soviet Russia by helping the counter-revolutionary army in Siberia, but after the fall of Koltchak they withdrew their army and stopped their actual intervention in Siberia except for financial and other substantial support. They with the English and American governments left the task of actual support of the counter revolutionary generals to the imperialist Japanese government. Among the imperialist powers the French government has been the most interested in the Siberian invasion next to the Japanese government and openly or secretly supported the reactionary leaders and Japan as its imperialist representative. The American and English governments equally supported and acquiesced in French and Japanese activities in Far Eastern Siberia. American government officially declared that she had no objections to Japan's Siberian activity. But when Japan occupied the northern half of Saghalin Island and also some important strategic points in the Island of Kamchatka American statesmen, unable to make any protest against the audacious Japanese army and navy activities, raised a feeble voice in a rather roundabout way making the declaration to the Russian people through the Italian Foreign Office: "The integrity of the Russian territories". This was to deceive the Russian people on the one hand and enter the American protest against the Japanese occupation of the Russian territories, while all the time supporting the counter revolutionary armies in Poland and other border nations.

The much commented upon and criticized French-Japanese secret agreements concerning Siberia played a quite important role in the diplomatic drama staged in Washington after New Year. On the 2nd of January the "Manchester Guardian", printed over two columns on the secret agreements between France and Japan as to their policy against Siberia and Soviet Russia. French militarists are desperate and crazy about the Workers and Peasants' Government. They seem still to have an idea that they are able to crush Soviet Russia by financing Poland and Rumania and by helping the counter-revolutionary leaders in Siberia through the imperialists of Japan. It is not likely that the so-called secret agreements between Japan and France are as given by the "Manchester Guardian" in its last paragraph. The daily's account does not give any detail of the conclusion of the treaty. But anyone can make it out by the cables exchanged between the two governments on the Siberian questions. Whether the secret treaty between France and Japan has been concluded or not it is a fact that Japan has been carrying officers of the Wrangel army from the Black Sea and Constantinople to Vladivostok since the defeat of General Wrangel in the Crimea.

Whether the Franco-Japanese secret treaty is true or not matters very little to the Far Eastern countries; they are both enemies of the Far Eastern workers and peasants. They are trying to exploit them and their countries for imperialist purposes. But the exposure of the secret treaty will serve a propaganda purpose for England and America. It is natural that all the white capitalist countries cannot but dislike Japan's Far Eastern exploitation and they all want to crush Japanese imperialism in order to have a free play in the Far Eastern regions, but the fact remains that Japan is the strongest power in the Far East. Hence there arises necessity of ousting Japanese imperialism. If only they could do so! England can crush Japan with America's assistance even if France sided with Japan. But although as the result of the war of 1914-18 England crushed her then rival, Germany, she has now a stronger rival in America. Lloyd George knows very well that crushing Japan with America will bring forth a greater rival of England than the rival she crushed in the last war.

All the capitalist countries want the Chinese markets for their goods and for their investments. But all cannot get it, at least all want it alone. There is only one way to get it alone for any country, namely, to fight for it. This is a plain fact that every capitalist country knows; but to fight for it is not an easy matter and to win it in the fight is not so sure as the "open door policy". Thus the Washington Conference was

called in order to sound the sea of public opinion. The result is the Four Power Pact in the Far East. The pact apparently assures the ten years' security in the Far East, but really the situation in the Far East has become much more dangerous and unsteady than under the British-Japanese alliance, because the pact is a mere agreement among four powers and the conference that might be held in event of controversy, say of two powers (America and Japan), may meet a deadlock by the tie vote of the two others (England and France). The probable decision of the conference, has no obligatory force for either of two powers. It has, therefore, as little power as the Hague Peace Conference decision at its agreements. Thus the situation in the Far East has become more critical and dangerous than ever before. The imperialists' war is unavoidable and it may come any time. There is nothing now that guarantees the peace in the Far East. The Four Power Pact has, however, one good quality as checking imperialist Japan in the coming Far Eastern capitalist conflict, because Japan's favorite tactics in war are "Steal a march upon the enemy". Japan won its first war by these tactics in the China-Japanese war of 1894-5 and also in the beginning of the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5. These tactics of Japanese imperialism will not be used under the Four Power Pact. On the other hand it will give a certain advantage to America where the war spirit or jingoism can only be stirred by means of public opinion through the press and the public meetings. The pact will give such necessary time for the American government. This all means that the next imperialist war in the Far East will be facilitated for three powers: England, America and France.

The world imperialist powers as I have somewhat extensively reviewed above are ever ready to exploit the Far Eastern countries and especially China. With such aggressive organized imperialist powers of the world before them, the Far Eastern countries are in a deplorable and chaotic condition on account of the ever menacing Japanese imperialism.

Korea is under the iron heel of Japanese imperialist rule. The people are oppressed, the poor peasants are exploited by the Japanese landowners, who really stole the land from those poor peasants. The Oriental Colonization Company has been organized for the special purpose of exploiting Korean agricultural industries and they are capitalizing Korea's best land and making the Koreans all tenant farmers enslaved under the Oriental Colonization Company. The shareholders include the Korean capitalists including the Korean royal families, but they have no power in the management of the Company. The railways, mines, and other industries are monopolized by the Japanese capitalists or by the Japanese militarist government.

The Korean independence movement is vigorous as is shown by its nation-wide uprisings in 1919, although the latter were crushed by the bloody hands of Japanese militarism. Koreans paid unspeakably big prices—their lives, sufferings and also many years of prison. Yet the uprisings gave the Koreans hope and great impetus for their future struggles. They showed the entire world their capacity of revolt and national unity. The Korean uprisings of 1919 were directly influenced by the American missionaries and without doubt indirectly influenced by the Russian Bolshevik revolution. And they are nationally awakened for their emancipation from the foreign imperialist yoke.

The uprisings of 1919 and the invasion of five thousand Korean soldiers fitted out in Siberia which, although it dealt a strong blow at the imperialist army, failed utterly must have taught the Korean independence leaders the necessity of better and wider as well as deeper organization among the Koreans outside as well as in Korea in order to strike the final blow against imperialist Japan. The Korean independence leaders who are outside Korea and in Korea should have firm organizations with strict discipline and well-regulated means of communication and they should always keep in touch and act in unison. They should also act in cooperation with the workers and peasants' organizations of China and Japan as well as Siberia. They should realize that the independence of Korea can not be accomplished without the substantial support of the Far Eastern proletariat.

China is yet in the development stage of political revolutions started in the year 1911. China has no stable government with power and influence all over China. The Peking government lives on the support of the foreign creditor governments. The Canton government has not much influence over the provincial governments which it has been fighting for its existence. Not only that but provincial governors and different factions are all the time quarrelling with one another. The Peking government is in the stage of bankruptcy and it only exists by borrowing. The Canton government is in no better financial condition than the Peking government. It has no relations with any

foreign powers and is recognized by no country. Thus China is living or going through her revolutionary period; a period that must be settled by some strong government, whether that government be reactionary, liberal or democratic. China needs a strong government that could stand on its feet and fight against the foreign aggressors and imperialists of the world. But such a hope is utter utopian. China is already divided economically among the capitalists of England, France, Japan and America under the name of spheres of influence and interests. China's only salvation is to become herself a Soviet Republic like Russia and throw off the yokes of foreign imperialism and capitalism. The supposed coming imperialist world war will not benefit China, whoever should come out as the victor, unless China takes advantage of the war to throw off the foreign yoke of the world capitalists and imperialists, and join hands with the Russian Soviet Republic.

The Chinese poor peasants and workers are exploited by both foreign and home capitalists and the poor people in general are in the most miserable condition still under the heavy yoke of the patriarchal and feudal regime. But since the 1911-1912 revolution the Chinese people began to awake politically, intellectually and socially. National consciousness among the Chinese has been exercising its power and influence conspicuously in the Shantung affair. Then it played a rather remarkable role in the boycotting of goods from Japan. Socially the Chinese are fast breaking down old feudal customs and usages. Until the first revolution Chinese social life was rigidly controlled by the old men; the old men in the family having the sole power and influence over the rest of the members of the family. But since the Chinese youth have awakened and asserted their due power and position in society, they have created a young men's China that will decide the destiny of the country. The youths of China have infinite possibilities before them, if they see the Far Eastern situation and meet it boldly and radically and create the new Chinese social conditions necessary for the future.

Siberia is still struggling with the reactionary remnants of the Koltchak armies and others who are supported by the greedy and brutal imperialists of Japan. The latter have quite recently renewed their attacks on Siberian cities apparently encouraged by the tacit agreements among the capitalist powers gathered together at Washington to give at least temporarily a free hand to Japanese imperialism. It is quite evident that those reactionary leaders of old Russia can do nothing in Siberia without the help of the Japanese imperialists who are trying to get a foothold in Siberia in order to exploit Siberia's resources. Outer Mongolia has established a Free Republic and has now made a threat with Soviet Russia. It is a matter of time for Siberia to establish a Soviet Republic as an indivisible part of the Soviet Republic of the Workers and Peasants.

Russia of the workers and peasants needs a breathing spell. England, France and Italy are asking Soviet Russia to negotiate with them on economic questions. It means a great unfought victory for Soviet Russia. They have been beaten by Soviet Russia even in spite of the world economic blockade around Russia. Without Soviet Russia Europe and England are not able to restore their economic life and activities. Soviet Russia has become the greatest potential power and influence in the very economic life of Europe and Asia.

Soviet Russia within a short space of time will be able to help the Siberians to drive out the Japanese from Siberia and aid in making the Chinese workers and peasants allies of Soviet Russia. The Japanese imperialists will be easily beaten by the mighty army of Red Russia. Thus the future of the Far East is assured. The Far Eastern countries will emancipate themselves from the imperialism and capitalism of Japan, Europe, and America. When the world imperialist governments now gathered together shall be ready to fight their imperialist war in the Far East the great Red Army of Soviet Russia will be more than ready to defeat the greedy aim of the imperialist countries, and to help the Far East to establish the Republic of Workers and Peasants.

Russian-Polish Relations Before Genoa

by L. Domski (Warsaw).

Different times, different stories... Not long ago Poland was the main factor in the continual war menace in Eastern Europe, and the outpost of the Entente against Soviet Russia. Now Polish policy is sailing under a peace flag and the Polish foreign minister Skirmunt has developed the peace policy into a

system, with the result that he incurred the most violent enmity of the militaristic sword rather than their social-patriotic helpers. But his policy completely corresponded to the needs of Poland, that on the one hand has been destroyed by war and on the other hand has harvested so many imperialistic victories that it is temporarily satisfied.

The chief concern of Poland before the Genoa conference is not to make new territorial acquisitions but to have its old acquisitions sanctioned by the Big Powers. For this reason the Polish government recently made treaties and agreements on all sides. At the last Baltic conference it succeeded in carrying through the resolution according to which the next conference of the Baltic states is to convene in Warsaw. On the other hand, an approach towards the Little Entente was made. Of course, this action is being carried on. By being in continual touch with France, to which Poland stands in a relation of vassalage, Poland keeps its aim in view also here and it is probable that the Franco-Polish Treaty, signed July 6th, contains guarantees for Poland in regard to the Vilna district, Eastern Galicia and Upper Silesia, which is all the easier for France, since under Polish sovereignty the two last named districts will remain in the future as before the prey of French capital.

But one of the main characteristics of the Polish foreign policy lies in its *peace policy towards Soviet Russia*. And if Skirmunt considers it important to declare solemnly in each of his international treaties that the treaty was not in any way directed against a third power, this reservation clearly refers to Soviet Russia, just as Skirmunt in his getting in touch with the Small Entente directly approached Karachan with the assurance that Soviet Russia need not fear any unfriendly designs on the part of Poland. These assurances are all the more trustworthy, since there is no state in Europe today which would be more interested in friendly relations with Russia and even recognition of the Soviet government than Poland.

In this regard, Soviet Russia is now harvesting the fruits of its wise policy free from all imperialistic ambitions towards the border states. It is true that the Polish policy towards Russia was, under French influence, subject to several changes. Thus the well-known note of Poland which protested to the Big Powers against the supposed non-fulfilment of the Riga Treaty on the part of Russia, was undoubtedly a bomb ordered in France. But now, before Genoa, the main object in view for Poland is to achieve an international sanction of the Riga Treaty.

"The most important question for us", said, for instance, Jan Domsbki, the former chairman of the Polish peace delegation in Riga, and the representative of the Peasants' Party in the foreign commission of the Polish Sejm, "is the safeguarding of the boundaries that have been assigned to us in the peace treaty. We must demand from France the full recognition of the Riga Treaty, eventually in the form of an additional clause to the political treaty."

The representatives of other parties in the Sejm commission also expressed themselves in a similar sense. And in his speech held at the same session Minister Skirmunt especially stressed "the duties" of Poland towards Russia. According to his words, Poland as the nation which knows Russian conditions the best, has the obligation to help Russia in its reconstruction. Even though the profit interests of Polish capital are behind these words, nevertheless the form of the speech is characteristic of the "tone" of Polish-Russian relations. And it is most characteristic of all when Skirmunt in a talk with the correspondent of the Paris "Temps", in contrast with his former note tries to bring about a feeling favorable to Russia and the show the "steady and noticeable bettering of our relation to our Eastern neighbour".

It is a fine joke of history that just the Polish bourgeoisie which for years raised a cry in regard to the steady threatening of the Eastern Polish borders by the "Red Imperialism" of the Soviets must now try to get the assistance of Soviet Russia against its Western "ally". And it is interesting to observe how just the interest of self preservation of Poland and the other border states make them by sheer necessity allies of the Soviet government in their international policy.

* * *

Notice: The above lines had already been written when the Polish governmental crisis broke out. Whatever may be its results, the main lines of the Polish foreign policy as characterized above will hardly change, since the present attackers of the cabinet, the National Democrats, are essentially satisfied with the Russian as well as with the Western policy of Skirmunt.

A Political Murder in Finland.

The Democratic Minister of the Interior shot by Monarchists.

by Yrjö Sirola (Moscow).

** On the 14th of February, Heikki Ritavuori, the Minister of the Interior, was shot while walking in the street in Helsingfors by Knut Tandefelt, a merchant. The act is of a purely political nature and the murderer is a faithful pupil of the German reactionaries.

Four years ago the working-class of Finland revolted against the onslaught of the reactionary forces which threatened the democracy under the false motto: "Against Russians and Robbers!" After the White Guards, aided by the Germans, came out victorious, the Monarchists believed that their Messiah had come, and with a slight majority in their sham-Parliament they chose a German king. It was clear that this governmental *coup* was perpetrated against the will of the peasants and workers. In the elections of 1919, the Monarchists were badly defeated. Although the revolutionary workers were either in the concentration-camps or boycotted the elections, the Social Democrats won 40% of the seats in Parliament. And in the Summer, it was not the bloodhound Mannerheim that was chosen president, but the Conservative Progressive, Professor Stohlberg.

The Cabinets that followed inclined more and more towards the left. The present Cabinet of Vennola (Professor of National Economy and, Cooperator) is supported by the parties of the center, the Progressives and the Agrarians, and by the Social Democrats, who due to the spirit prevailing among the workers, do not themselves participate in the government. It is a weak government, which persecutes the revolutionary labor-organizations and their press—yet does not afford comfort to the Monarchists, who were particularly enraged by the recent amnesty granted to several political offenders of 1918 (most of them innocent Social Democrats), but who were still more shocked by the wavering attitude of the government towards the robber-bands that operated in Karelia, and whose adventure ended in defeat.

Therefore the shot and its victim

Had the perpetrator of this crime succeeded in his attempt to flee, this outrage could then have easily been attributed to the Communists. As it is, the Monarchists attempt to save their man by labeling him "irresponsible".

The Democrats and Social Democrats are frantic with rage; their civil "peace and order" fares very badly. The labor press shows clearly where the democrats' indecision and their partial measures lead to—the reactionaries are becoming more and more insolent and brazen-faced, and they are openly threatening a *coup d'état*.

The Situation in Hungary and the Coming Elections

E. P. ** In countries with relatively speaking normal conditions where the capitalist regime has continued without interruption, elections for Parliament are of much greater importance than they were before the war. Such elections constitute desperate attempts on the part of the bourgeoisie of the country with "normal" conditions to gain a breathing space, a short respite from the deadly embrace of the everlasting crisis. This statement is even more true in the case of Hungary where the coming elections are intended to give the Horthy government a new lease of life.

The White Terror in Hungary has strayed into a blind alley. The times are past when, without being dependent upon a certain section of the population, the Whites could hold sway solely by right of the mailed fist, which had become the highest principle of government, and formally in the name of all possessing classes. In order to maintain themselves, Horthy and his gang were as the years went by obliged to secure a foothold within a class and thus form for their rule a social basis, a continuous historical title to existence, a reliable economic hinterland, so to speak. The only class suitable for this purpose were the small peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie. The situation in Hungary after the overthrow of the Soviet government allowed of no other but the middle classes, which were not capable of governing independently, providing both the historical background and the basis for the White Terror. The great landowners, and the great bourgeoisie following dutifully in their wake, who in March 1919 voluntarily surrendered the power to the proletariat, could not become the latter's immediate successors. The example of the Hungarian ruling classes (till the end of the war the great

landowners had reigned supreme with the bourgeoisie playing feebly the second fiddle in politics) has demonstrated that for a ruling class there is no more perilous course than the surrender of power without first putting up a struggle. Following the overthrow of the proletarian regime, at a time when apparently nobody aspired to power, it could only be the small peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie with whose sanction an adventurer like Stefan Friedrich could under rather unusual conditions grasp the helm of the state. And this class which knows nothing whatsoever of what is historically possible and what is impossible, which as a result of its social position between two chairs is incapable of recognizing and comparing even the most fundamental lines of development—this class provided and still provides out of its ranks the nuclei of the White Guards.

But a regime supported only by the middle classes cannot continue for long. Hungary is a country of great landowners whose natural ally is the bourgeoisie, while the remaining sections of the population are merely to be the objects of exploitation and domination. And these classes represent the decisive economic factor against which even the most ruthless terror cannot continue for long; they are far superior to both the petty peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie and hence will sooner or later overthrow the latter's instrument, the Horthy government. There is open war between the landed interests and the bourgeoisie on one hand and the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the allied Horthy regime on the other; a war in which the first named category will prove victorious thanks to its economic predominance. The landed interests and capitalism wage their warfare under the flag of Legitimism. The natural aim of economic and political development is in Hungary as in other countries reconstruction of capitalism and of a capitalist state under the dominance of the economically strong classes. A crowned king is the personification of a state such as that—the holy symbol to be worshipped by the masses. This capitalist state would not only suppress the proletariat but the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie as well. Hence these two classes favor Horthy; they attempt to turn back the wheel of history a whole century and let the middle classes govern—after their fashion; they stubbornly resist any attempts at reestablishing normal capitalist conditions, and when the Legitimists had their ex-king Karl himself march against Budapest, they even took up arms against him. But though the peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie could with the help of the Allies defeat Karl's plans, they could not exterminate the Legitimist movement. In Hungary too, there is only one kind of *capitalist* reconstruction possible, and this can naturally only be accomplished by the great bourgeoisie in alliance with the landed interests. And because these capitalist endeavors are the moving factor behind the Legitimist movement, the latter cannot be obstructed.

In consequence of these facts, Horthy is striving to reach an agreement with the Legitimists, in order to make sure of a big share of power for the future. Shortly after the battle with the royal troops (who were regular rebels to be punished with death) Horthy gave the "conspirators" their liberty and assured them that they would remain unmolested. He also took care to eradicate the worst features of the terror regime and thus give the Legitimists who in Parliament were continually demanding reestablishment of law and order, less cause for alarm. Nor can it be denied that before Parliament was dissolved, Count Bethlen endeavored frantically to reach an agreement with the Legitimists making it possible to pass his tentative draft of an election act in accordance with the constitution. The Legitimists, however, who were furious at the resistance offered to the crowned king and at the arrest of a number of their leaders (who were allowed to make their cells comfortable with their own furniture and were, as was remarked previously, discharged after a few days) did not give in, and Parliament had to be dissolved without the new election act having been passed.

But Horthy is untiring in his endeavors to reconcile the landed interests. He had a committee of the greatest legal luminaries in Hungary empower him to draft an election act such as they thought suitable and on the basis of it decreed the new elections. Following we quote the principle provisions of the new regulations which were published recently:

"Every man over 24 years who has at least 10 years ago acquired Hungarian citizenship, has for 2 years lived in the same locality and gone through the first 4 grades of an elementary school is eligible. The age limit does not apply to knights of the Karl Army Cross and university and college students. Women must be 30 years old and, apart from the conditions for men as to citizenship and locality, gone through 6 grades of an elementary school. Women having 3 legitimate children or having independent income or earning their own living need only have absolved 4 grades.

All voters over 30 years old can also be elected to the National Convention. In Budapest and suburbs and in a number of larger towns as well balloting to be in secret, in the other districts public. In the proportional elections every list must be signed by at least 5,000 electors. In districts with less than 10,000 electors the lists must be signed by at least 10% of the electors. In districts with more than 10,000 electors, a candidate must have the signed approval of at least 1,000 electors. In a total of 223 election districts with 2,400,000 electors, the balloting will be secret in only 46 districts."

The regulations represent a slap in the face of both the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie; and a further attempt to pacify and please the Hungarian counts and magnates. The direction in which things are drifting is even plainer indicated by the manner in which the Bethlen government intends to conduct the elections. For a few days ago the government by wire placed a number of provincial governors on the retirement list and appointed others in their stead. The dismissed governors (which functionaries wield a decisive influence upon the election) belong without exception to the Small Peasants' Party, while the newly appointed officials are prominent members of the nationalistic cooperative party, founded by Count Tisza.

There can be no doubt that the elections represent an attempt of the Horthy regime to change horses, lest it be too late, and by means of a compromise with the Legitimists to gain a new lease of life. If and how far he will succeed, cannot be predicted. The elections will give the final answer to that. It depends upon the attitude of the Hungarian proletariat whether the landed interests and the capitalists will continue to struggle for power singlehanded or ally themselves with Horthy and his gang. The Hungarian proletariat must understand that "reconstruction" of order in the Legitimist sense of the word means merely that all non-proletarians will be spared by the White Terror. In Hungary, too, the proletariat can only defeat the White Terror by its own undaunted revolutionary struggle.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The Splitting of the French Trade Union Movement

by V. Godonnéche (Paris).

As is known, the National Council of the C.G.T. which held its session on the 13th, 14th and 15th February 1922 should have been convoked according to regulations for the month of December 1921. But Jouhaux and his friends feared too much that a properly called and constituted National Council would condemn them for their policy of expulsions. It will be recollected that in Lille the Congress had decided to reestablish the unity of the Federations, and that Jouhaux himself had declared from the platform that no further expulsion would be made. In conformity with the decision of Lille a control commission was set up composed equally of representatives from the majority and minority who were to supervise the management of the paper "Le Peuple".

In the split in the Railway men's Federation, it was apparent—even such acknowledged reformists as Digal recognized it—that the wrong was on the side of the Confederation's Bureau and the dissidents Bidegaray-Montage, as the Semard Federation gathered round itself the great majority of the organized railwaymen.

The change of date for the holding of the National Council, the continued expulsions, the sanctioning of all the intrigues of the leaders through a "conflict commission", was all apt to exhaust the patience of the minority and give them reason to believe that the conclusive and general expulsion of all oppositional elements was being prepared by the leaders of the Confederation. The calling together of a Unity Congress is being taken advantage of as a pretext by the Reformists. On the day after the Congress the Federation's Bureau and the officials of the reformist Federation demanded of the trade-unions and local bodies that they declare—under threat of expulsion—that they were against the decisions of the Congress. At the same time they sought to realize the scheme which they had already had in view: the formation of organizations composed of their adherents, who up to now stood isolated in the trade-unions and revolutionary Federations. After some weeks of this disruptive work the National Council was at last called together. By the calling of the National Council it became clearly evident that only the Reformist organizations, the supporters of the majority, would be

allowed to take part. By this means they assured themselves of a National Council that would give Messrs. Jouhaux & Co. the least possible trouble.

On the eve of this pseudo-National Council the Union of Syndicates of the Department of the Seine called a great protest meeting. It was a perfect success. The great hall of the trade-union building could not contain the great mass of workers who sought admission. On the first day of the session of the National Council the management committee of the "Unitaires" published a statement in which they charged that the C.G.T. had refused to call together a properly constituted National Council. They declared that they were ready to dissolve their organization if the National Council adopted the proposals of the "Unitaires". These are "the abandonment of all motives which up to now had served as a ground for the split, the reinstatement of all those expelled, the calling of an extraordinary Congress of the Federation in the first half year of 1922 dedicated to the 'Unity of the Trade Union Movement' and the fixing of a date for this Congress; notification that at this Congress only those organizations are to be represented which were already in existence at the time of the Congress in Lille." Through this declaration the revolutionaries demonstrated their steadfast willingness to do all that lay in their power for the unity of the trade-union movement.

After Jouhaux' mendacious report as to the origin of the split, after a speech by Merrheim, who declared that the revolutionaries were solely responsible for the split, and a speech by Doumoulin who argued that one should not comply with the demands of half a dozen excitable "Unitaires" to call an Extraordinary Congress which would mean their submission to the ultimatum of the revolutionaries, this pseudo-National Council pronounced by 94 votes (34 trade-unions, 60 federations) against 3 federations its confidence in the Confederation's Bureau and refused by 87 votes (32 trade-unions and 55 federations) to convene an Extraordinary Congress.

In this speech Jouhaux did not fail to use threats of resignation in order to keep his own supporters docile. Merrheim manipulated "documents" about the organization of Communist groups in the German federations. Doumoulin, member of the French Socialist Party, who likewise has nothing to do with politics (!) tried to justify his taking part in the last Conference of the social traitors of the 2½ International.

The figures given by the union officials cannot be considered as authentic. In the 71 unions and 37 federations were included the newly-founded organizations, a great number of which have no members at all. Of these 71 unions only 44 have actually remained faithful to the C.G.T. The figures given by the leaders of the split are nothing else but a clever piece of bluff.

After the vote of confidence had been taken a committee of the "People" reported on the organ of the Federation. This committee could only state that everything was in the best of order. It was then decided to hold an Extraordinary Congress to which only the "faithful unions" were to be admitted. There is no doubt that this Congress will render the split a *fait accompli*.

The bourgeois press openly expresses its delight in the split now conclusively decided upon by this precious National Council. The "Temps" records this fact as a triumph of democracy, liberty and the national spirit and appeals to the workers to energetically repudiate the pernicious speculation of the revolutionaries on their honest simplicity. "Le Journal" states that the discussions were free from revolutionary phraseology. It observes that in the program the great shibboleth of nationalization is not to be found, a proof of their "growing reasonableness". The bourgeois papers conclude from this that the program of the new C.G.T. is the work of "sensible intelligent and law abiding" people. "The exact reverse of the work of those dangerous revolutionaries." That is the moral to be drawn from the Conference of this pseudo-National Council which has sanctioned the split of the French trade-union movement.

The Destruction of the German Building Trades Federation by the Amsterdamers

by A. Enderle (Berlin).

The Central Committee of the German "Building Trades Federation" in connection with the Executive of the Berlin local have expelled 147 members of long standing in the Federation without any investigation and court of arbitration, on the ground that by their "Communist intrigues" they had broken the political neutrality of the Federation and had acted contrary to its statutes.

This expulsion en masse is without doubt the introduction to the „general cleansing” of the Federation of all opposition elements announced some time ago. What however has caused the Central Committee under the leadership of Páplow—a member of the executive committee of the Amsterdam Trade Union International—to carry out this criminal act? In 1914 when the German Social Democracy and almost all trade-union leaders changed their course, it was above all the Central Committee of the Building Trades Federation that made itself prominent in the nationalistic incitement of the workers against “the enemies” and in the complete support of the imperialists and “annexationist” politicians. It was in the “Grundstein”, the organ of the Federation, that the annexation of Belgium was openly supported and it was there that the sentence appeared.

“German workers will never again set down with their English trade colleagues at the same table for the purpose of negotiations.”

After the end of the war the Central Committee were among the most ardent defenders of the working alliances with the employers. Already during the war but especially after the outbreak of the revolution a strong opposition against the Central Committee began to develop among the members of the Federation, in which not alone the Communists but also in a very large measure the Independent Socialists took part. At that time, the Opposition was firmly organized by the Independent Socialists, and a number of discussions and conferences were held throughout the country, with the purpose of overthrowing the Right Socialist Central Committee. In a large number of local organizations the Independent Socialists secured the majority. In the same way the administrative committee of Berlin was almost completely controlled by the Independents.

With the revival of the Amsterdam Trade Union International the conflict with the revolutionary Moscow wing began. In this struggle all the Independent leaders went over to the Amsterdam side with the result that soon there was no difference to be discerned between them and the Right Socialist adherents of Páplow. Just as the Central Committee of the Federation during the war surpassed the trade-union bureaucrats in all of the rest of the trade-unions federations in nationalistic pro-war propaganda, it now showed itself as the most fanatical antagonist of the Communists. It was the first among the trade-unions to proceed with the expulsion of the Communists. Indeed, it was able at the beginning of 1921, to destroy a complete local group, the local federation of Chemnitz, because there the Communists very soon had the majority of the members back of them. Since then scarcely a week passes in which Communists who have been trade-union functionaries for many years, are not expelled in a dictatorial fashion in the various districts of Germany. But its object to make the Federation “free from Communism” reacted in the opposite direction. The influence of the Communists grew incessantly. The fact that the expelled were known among their colleagues as the most courageous and most energetic fighters in the class-struggle against the employers, caused the resistance of the members against the Central Committee to grow and more and more members of the Federation to turn towards the Communists.

Thus it happened that in the Berlin local during this year's election of the delegates for the Union Convention, 80 % of all the votes cast went to the Communists as against 40 % last year. The Berlin local committee did, however, not want to bow to the wishes of its members, prevented the statutory general convention of the newly elected delegates from meeting and declared the elections void. It called together all the non-Communist delegates of the old general convention, declared this gathering as the lawful general convention and here decided to submit to the Central Committee the motion that the Communist delegates be expelled from the Federation. This motion the Central Committee immediately accepted, since it was the originator of the motion. In a mimeographed letter to the expelled members it was insolent enough to refer its action to the decision of the “General Assembly”. How over-hurriedly and irresponsibly the whole mass expulsion was carried on can be seen in the fact that not alone Communists but old Social Democratic functionaries, and even a number of workers who were no longer members of the Federation received this letter of expulsion.

The plan that the Central Committee is carrying out is as follows:—

In Spring the General Assembly for the entire Federation takes place. The Central Committee knew that in an election carried out according to statute, it would be in the minority. Since the candidates for the convention of the Federation are put up in the general conventions of the local groups, it tried at first to prevent the candidature of Communists through an expulsion of the delegates. If it is not possible with such a fake

majority at the general convention of the Federation to hold in check the majority of the members, it counts on an open rebellion on their part and a split of the Federation. And that in the final analysis is its aim. *It wants to prevent under all circumstances wide spread strikes and struggles against the employers.* The Central Committee has consciously set itself to the “peaceful” reconstruction of capitalist economy. It does not want to oppose the employers in strikes but thinks it is able to abolish the capitalist economic system by means of cooperative building associations. Because the members see the impossibility and danger of this method and are more and more coming to the conception that they can only evade their growing misery by means of an energetic class-struggle, their opposition against the Central Committee is continually increasing.

The Central Committee is however in its policy in complete agreement with the authorities of the German General Federation of Labor, which in „the interest of the state” wants to spare the present economic system from all violent disturbances.

THE COMMUNIST YOUTH

A Conference of the Young Communist International

by Otto Unger (Moscow).

In the middle of March the session of the International Bureau of the Young Communist International will be held in Moscow. About eight months have elapsed since the Second Congress of the Young Communist International. During this time considerable experience has been gathered with regard to the fulfilment of the tasks set forth by the Congress. In this period there has taken place within the Youth movement a mighty transforming and developing process. This and the important decisions which may be justly expected from the session of the enlarged Executive of the Communist International induced the Executive Committee of the Young Communist International to call this session.

Their agenda will be extremely extensive. The question is how best to profit from the experiences gathered up to now in the two principal spheres of activity of the youth organizations: the economic struggle and Communist educational work, to correct mistakes made up to now, to examine the gains made hitherto and thus to make a basis for still more intensive activity. In this manner the discussion of these two items on the agenda form naturally the centre point of the sitting.

The work done up to now with regard to these two objects showed that the process of transformation in the unions could only be achieved by exertion of all our efforts. This was partly due to the fact that the importance of this work had not been fully realized by all the young comrades. On the other hand our small number of experienced functionaries had to enter the “Party” and new ones could not be trained speedily enough.

In addition to this we must realize that the comparative ebb of the revolutionary situation, the constantly increasing economic crisis by which the working youth is particularly hard hit, has produced a practically paralyzing apathy in their ranks. This is evidenced by the fact that today they succumb much more easily to the divertive influences of capitalism, and are no longer so eagerly taking part in the activity of the revolutionary organizations as they did at the end of the war. From this fact there arise two problems which must be faced by the Conference:—

A thorough discussion of our working methods among the young proletarians and the measures to be adopted in order to defend the working youth against their growing economic misery. There is of course no telling how far we will succeed. The earnest work of the last months in those directions justifies our hoping for the best results.

In addition to this work the Conference will also deal with the work in the proletarian athletic clubs, with a thorough and complete organization of the unions, with the development of the press and the antimilitarism campaign.

It is evident that the problem of the reactionary youth organizations, the religious and other organizations of the proletarian youth, will be thoroughly discussed. Up to now the former still contain hundreds of thousands of young proletarians, who under no conditions can be suffered to remain with them any longer. For this work too the Conference will create a definite basis. With regard to the other organizations of the proletarian youth, the Conference will have to deal with the negotiations aiming at unification which have lately taken place between the social patriotic and centrist Youth Internationals.

The reports on the political situation and the situation within the Comintern and the working-class as well as the report on the activity of the E. C. will serve as a basis for the discussion of all the items of the agenda outlined here.

A series of lectures actual political and economic questions held by leading comrades of the Comintern will at the same time supply all those who take part in the Conference with valuable material for their further work in the unions. Furthermore several lectures will be held upon dialectic materialism.

On the whole the Conference is thus characterized by the gigantic amount of work to be performed by the members of the International Bureau. For the whole of the Communist movement, the accomplishment of these tasks will mean a mighty advance, will mean that the young guard of the working-class has recognized its duties and tasks in the arena of the whole movement and is ready to do them.

IN SOVIET RUSSIA

The Strike in the Workers' State

by G. Zinoviev.

The renaissance of private capital and the regeneration of concession-capital give rise to groups of workers who work not directly for the proletarian state, but for private employers. This category of workers is rather numerous. At the present time there are about 50,000 workers employed in private enterprises in Moscow alone. The number of workers employed by private employers in Petrograd reaches over 10,000. If we take into consideration the fact that the number of workers in general in the cities of Moscow and Petrograd has been greatly reduced we at once see that that part of the working-class employed in private enterprises is already very large. The percentage of workers exploited by private capitalists will undoubtedly rise. The concession-capitalists will also employ a considerable number of workers.

It is the task of the trade-unions to represent and defend the interests of this category of workers to their utmost. The working conditions in the private enterprises during the transition period seem to be quite favorable to the officials, mechanics and workers; at any rate this seems to be the case in the first period. But in a short while the mechanics and workers employed in these private enterprises will begin to see and feel that without the protection of the proletarian state and the trade-unions, they are subject to the mercy or mercilessness of the exploiter, against whom they alone are absolutely powerless.

Our trade-unions must once more create strike-funds and prepare themselves for the economic struggles which they are to direct and lead under the new economic conditions in defense of the interests of those workers who are employed by private and concessionaire capital. This does not mean that we shall always resort to the strike in the private and concessionaire enterprises. The trade-unions that operate under a Soviet form of government and have the complete government machine solidly behind them should be in a position to check the private employer and the concessionaire even without a strike.

All this is clear and simple. But the more difficult question is the one of a strike in *state*, i. e., in Soviet enterprises. As every one knows, such strikes did break out during the four years of Soviet rule.

As long as we are still so poor, and as long as we are still made to feel how we were driven to ruin by the economic blockade, by the intervention of foreign imperialists and by the sabotage of the worst part of the technicians, so long will we have to count with the possibility of strikes within the government-factories. At the time when the first strikes broke out under the Soviet regime, i. e., when we witnessed the first strike in the proletarian state, the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries simply overbubbled with joy, for they believed that these strikes would inevitably overthrow the Soviet power. These fools calculated along the following lines: —

“The workers struck against Czarism, and as a result Czarism went overboard; the workers are striking under the Soviet rule — ergo: the Soviet power must likewise fall”.

Of course, they completely failed to comprehend the character of the strikes in our proletarian state. They failed to see that our strikes were of a totally different subjective and objective character than the strikes under Czarism and under Kerensky. It must not be understood that we say *all* of the strikes that we have witnessed in our proletarian state during the past few years were of a purely idyllic and innocent character. Not at all. These

strikes were sometimes of a distinct counter-revolutionary nature. These strikes always caused untold damage to our economic administration, thereby also endangering the existence of the proletarian state.

In spite of all this, however, these strikes were in reality no class-struggles at all; they were mere *household disputes*. In times of exceptionally poor food conditions, and of unusually intense suffering under the financial and fuel difficulties, these groups of workers voiced their protest through the strike. But these were mostly “*frictions and conflicts between single groups of the working-class and single institutions or organs of the proletarian state*”, as the resolution of the Central Committee of our Party rightly expresses it.

These “frictions and conflicts” have greatly hurt the proletarian state and consequently also the working-class as a whole. But unfortunately there is no way of immediately eliminating such “friction and conflicts”. These disputes and conflicts have two primary causes:

1—The general impoverished state of our country which was driven to ruin by world-imperialism, and

2—Serious errors committed by single institutions and organs of our proletarian state; the mistakes which the resolution of the Central Committee characterized as “bureaucratization”.

No one can determine with any degree of precision the extent to which the general poverty and the bureaucratization of these institutions are each responsible for the friction and conflicts arising.

It is the task of the trade-unions to practise timely intervention in preventing such “bureaucratized” strikes, and with the aid of our economic organs to attempt the complete elimination of the strikes caused by the general poverty.

This task is not an easy one. Such work requires officials who, as the above-cited resolution of the Central Committee already states, live in the midst of the masses; men who know the worker's life thoroughly, who at every moment, in any arising question can, without the least idealization give a correct estimate of the mood and temper of the mass, its real thoughts, needs and desires, the degree of its class-consciousness; and of the strength of the influence of the prejudices and remainders of old times; men, who through their good-fellowship and through their energetic and sincere attempts to satisfy all the needs of the mass, should be able to win its unlimited confidence.

During the period of “War Communism” just past, our trade-union functionaries had only one answer to every strike:—

“You have no right to strike; you have no right to demand that the trade-unions represent your interests as sellers of the commodity, labor-power. The Soviet state is a workers' state. Under a Soviet government the workers need no special protection for their economic interests.”

This answer was essentially correct. It is essentially correct even at the present moment. But there is a danger in its mere repetition, in its becoming a stereotyped formula, if the trade-union officials are not themselves in the midst of the workers' life, if they do not know and understand it thoroughly, if they do not step in in time to prevent the bureaucratization of some of our government organs, and particularly if they do not succeed in convincing every worker that everything that can possibly be done under the circumstances is being done for him. The border line is very narrow; it should therefore not be transgressed. The correct treatment of the question becomes a stale catch-word which only repulses the workers if the trade-union officials get out of touch with the workers and if they fail to achieve the *maximum improvement possible under the circumstances*. Of course, we all know how limited our means are, and how little we are at present in a position to increase wages in our government enterprises, or to improve working-conditions in general. But let us be frank and outspoken. Have we really done everything in our power to improve the miserable sanitary and hygienic conditions in our government enterprises? Again, have we really done our best to improve the working-conditions, even in the most important of our government-enterprises, and even if we take full account of the miserable state of our finances? No, a thousand times no!

The resolution of our Central Committee reads as follows:

“The best and most important estimate of the success of the trade-unions' work, is the degree to which it succeeds in preventing mass-conflicts in the government-enterprises and in instituting a policy that will offer an all-around and effective representation and defense of the workers' interests, thereby eliminating all causes leading to friction and conflicts”.

This is of course correct. In the capitalist state, all other things being equal, we may safely say that *that* trade-union which has carried out the greatest number of strikes is the best and most militant one. In the Soviet state, the contrary is true. The careful policy which must offer thorough and effective protection to the strike weapon, which weighed so heavily upon the Soviet power in times of great stress....

A proletarian state which, like our Soviet state, is in the transition-stage cannot at present pass a law which is to prohibit all strikes in the government enterprises, although the danger, the insanity and the reactionary, sometimes even counter-revolutionary, character of these strikes is an axiom for all advanced workers. At the same time however, our proletarian state cannot proclaim the unlimited right to strike in the government enterprises, as the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries demand in the interest of the bourgeoisie. It is no contradiction in our tactics but a contradiction arising from the actuality of the transition period.

The stronger our Soviet state becomes, and the more successful we are in improving our economic administration, the quicker will our wounds that were caused by the war and the counter-revolution heal; the more radically we proceed in cutting away the tumors of Menshevism and counter-revolution from our social structure, the sooner our trade-unions increase their role as arbitrators in the settling of disputes and conflicts, the higher the cultural degree to which the workers reach and the lesser the bureaucratization of our individual government and economic organs becomes, the sooner will this contradiction disappear. This new assignment of trade-union tasks gives the trade-unions considerable rights, but it also assigns to them certain considerable duties. The campaign provided by the resolution of our Central Committee will require months of work. This resolution treats not only of the immediate questions of the trade-union movement in the narrower sense of the word, but it also deals with the general situation of the working-class at the present time.

Our trade-unions must transform themselves. In the immediate future a considerable revival of trade-union activity will take place. The party must be "on the spot" and ready for action. An immense amount of work is before us. The trade-unions must at all costs be equal to their new, very important and very complicated problems.

IN THE CAMP OF OUR ENEMIES

The Frankfort Conference

by Ernst Meyer (Berlin).

** The five-country-conference of the Social Democratic Parties at Frankfort on the Main did not dare to sit in public because it was greatly feared, as the Berlin "Vorwärts" says, that an open session might lead to futile disputes and conflicts, that is, the Second International feared that the International 2½ might come in with suggestions and plans that differed from its own in principle. But the "Vorwärts" and the Second International are now relieved, for the International 2½ very nicely permitted itself to be taken in tow by the Second International, and even Serrati and Levi approved the resolutions of this Congress, which were passed in the spirit of the latter.

The resolutions of the Frankfort Conference bear the indelible stamp of "statesmanlike" motions made by Social Democratic ministers. This fact was perceived even by the French Socialists, who insisted that a flourish be lent to the resolution dealing with the reparations question, by appending the little statement that only Socialism could cure the world. The chairman of the conference, Vandervelde, responded to this motion, which was nothing more than a transparent mask, in a satirical manner by dropping the remark that the motion might as well be passed, since it lends to the resolution the necessary "red cap".... This witticism was received with mirth by the conference.

But this red cap in no way hides the bald-pate of the half-baked Frankfort resolution, which only spells compromise. From the report of the debates on the reparations question, which the "Vorwärts" is now publishing, it becomes only too clear that the resolutions passed are barren formulas which are not backed by a sincere will to carry them out, and which are above all, ill-adapted for concentrating proletarian forces for the purpose of shifting their heavy burden upon the bourgeoisie.

When Serrati commenting upon the resolution, writes in "Avanti": "This altogether barren document is of no other significance to us than that of a promise and a wish", he already

goes too far. Nevertheless, the report published by the "Vorwärts" gives us an insight into the ideology of the greatest Socialist parties represented at Frankfort which are still dazed by the spirit of the war. The complete accord of the parties was effected by a sort of mutual amnesty which conceded to every party the right to don its national costume.

The Western parties were granted the concession that Germany (what part of the German people remained undiscussed) must pay reparations to the victorious countries, while the parties of the Western countries made the counter-concession that Germany should be granted a moratorium on its next payments. It is interesting to note that Dittmann moved that Germany is to make reparations only within the limit of its paying capacity. Thus, the refusal of the German bourgeoisie to pay is a barrier for the German Independent Socialists which is simply to be accepted, instead of concentrating all of the proletarian forces in an effort to break through this barrier.

It is true that Paul Levi did make an attempt to authenticate the principle of responsibility of all the capitalist countries for the last war and for all its consequences. But such a matter of course, expressed as a principle, could only have hurt the ostensible unity and Levi lost no time in "explaining" that his fundamental viewpoint was a misunderstanding. He expressed his deep regret that the Conference could possibly have been led to believe that his fundamental viewpoint could have any practical consequences whatever. Levi completely separated his fundamental principles dealing with the "very general theoretical question of the war guilt of international capitalism" from the practical suggestions and plans for the clearing away of the war-ruins. He expressly voted for the resolution whose plans and suggestions rest on the principle of the recognition of national differences. But even this was not enough for the nationalists of the French party, and after a short recess, the *Independents*, who at first nodded assent to Levi, made another general retreat by declaring that they are in complete accord with the resolution of the conference in principle as well as in practice, and that this resolution would be adapted by the U.S.P., in its future actions. As a matter of fact this ratification by the *Independents* is nothing more than the formal recognition of their own policy, as manifested in their support of the Wirth cabinet. The nationalist streak in the blood of the German Majority Socialists came to light in their attitude on the question of alliances. While the British Labor Party rejected all alliances between capitalist governments, the German S.P.D. supported the Belgian Party which declared that such treaties were permissible. Here again, the German Social Democrats showed that they were even more reactionary than the English labor representatives, and as a result the resolution adopted by the conference on the disarmament question, pale as it was, was rendered still more anaemic by the votes of the S.P.D. delegates. This resolution is altogether naked; it even forgot to put on its "red cap".

Although Vandervelde writes in his Brussels party-organ that the Frankfort Conference effected the *united Socialist front* in the Western countries, even a blind man can see that the Social Democratic parties are only concerned with the *unity of paper-resolutions of individual leaders, and not with the united fighting front of the broad proletarian masses.*

It is therefore no accident at all that the *Russian Communist Party* was not invited to the Frankfort Conference. In their intentional limitation of the conference to the five countries, the Social Democrats gave themselves away as being even more narrow-minded and near-sighted than the English government which invited all the countries of Europe to participate in the Conference of Genoa. The capitalists know that even the problem of capitalist reconstruction alone cannot possibly be solved without the cooperation of Soviet Russia. The Internationals 2 and 2½ on the contrary, have neglected to call the Socialist parties of all countries, including Soviet Russia, together at once. To think of Europe's reconstruction without the participation of Soviet Russia is not to think at all. Even the Frankfort Conference finally recognized this fact. A memorandum presented by the English delegation compelled it to deal with the question of Soviet Russia. The discussion of this question had to be postponed however, because the majority of the conference were of the opinion that this question could not possibly be settled in the absence of the Russian comrades. The course and the resolutions of the Frankfort Conference proved that no unity of the proletariat on the question of Europe's reconstruction is possible without the participation of the parties of all countries, and without the formulation of a concrete program, which is to be beyond mere good wishes and empty formulas and must prepare measures that are to have the force and power to consolidate the proletariat in its struggle against the bourgeoisie.