

- INTERNATIONAL -

PRESS

CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2 No. 115

19th Dec. 1922

Central Bureau. Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, 111. — Postal address Franz Dahlem, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, 111 for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
Communism and Freemasonry.		The Hague Conference	
By Leon Trotsky	957	The Peace Conference of the Amsterdammers. (Special Report to Inprekorr.)	961
Politics		The Bloc of the Amsterdammers with the Liberal Bourgeoisie, against the United Front of the Proletariat.	
Five Years of Red Diplomacy.		By Karl Radek	962
By Georg Tchitcherin	958	The Labor Movement	
The Geneva Pact and the Austrian Proletariat.		(R.I.L.U.) Four Years of German Seamen's Union	963
By Ernst Haidt	960		

Communism and Freemasonry

By Leon Trotsky.

The development of capitalism did and does constantly widen the gulf of the antagonism between the classes. In the game of politics it has always been the supreme ambition of the bourgeoisie to rub off the corners of these antagonisms. The history of the past century unfolds a picture of a motley variety of means and methods employed by the bourgeoisie in this direction. Undisguised repression is only the last argument, applied openly . . . at critical moments. In "normal" times the art of bourgeois politics consists, so to speak, in removing from the order of the day the very question of bourgeois domination, to embellish it by political, juridical, moral, religious and aesthetic declarations and to create in this manner a social atmosphere of security for the present system.

It is both ridiculous and naive—if not stupid—to assume that the bourgeoisie carries on its politics only in parliaments and editorial articles. No, this policy is pursued also in the theatre, in the Church, in poetry as well as in the colleges and the elementary schools. The bourgeoisie stultifies the consciousness of the intermediate strata, and of considerable groups of the working class, by poisoning their minds and paralysing their will-power.

The backward and ungifted Russian bourgeoisie least of all succeeded in this respect, and it paid a heavy price for its failure. The bare fist of Tsarism, unsupported by the complex system of camouflage, falsehood, deceit and illusions, proved inadequate in this respect. The Russian worker has become the ruler.

The German bourgeoisie, superb in the arts and sciences, has proved only one peg above the Russian bourgeoisie in the political sphere; the mainstays of German capitalism in the State were the Prussian Hohenzollern and the Prussian drill sergeant. And now the German bourgeoisie are the next candidates for historical destruction.

If one desires to study the methods and the means whereby the bourgeoisie hoodwinked the masses in the course of the centuries, one has only to turn the pages of history of the oldest capitalist countries—Great Britain and France. In these countries the ruling classes fortified their domination from decade to decade by erecting barriers on the path of the working class. The more formidable these barricades were the more perceptible they were.

The throne of the English bourgeoisie would have been smashed long ago had it not been surrounded by an atmosphere of respectability, bigotry and sportmanship. The English

policeman with his truncheon is the guardian of the very last ditch of bourgeois domination, and when matters will reach that stage, the bourgeoisie will be past salvation. A hundred times more important to the maintenance of the British régime is that imperceptible cobweb of respectability and cringing before bourgeois commandments and "proprieties" which stultifies the brain of the trade unionists, Labor Party leaders, and a considerable portion of the working class itself.

The French bourgeoisie in the political field exists chiefly on the interest of the capital of the Great French Revolution. The perversity and corruption of parliamentary democracy are sufficiently well known, one would think, to leave no room for illusions. But the bourgeoisie manages to turn this very corruption into its mainstay. How is it done? The bourgeoisie does it by means of its own socialists. The latter by their criticism and opposition collect a toll of confidence from the masses of the people, and at a critical moment they hand over to the capitalist state the bulk of the votes obtained by them. In this manner the socialist opposition becomes one of the most important pillars of the bourgeois domination. Just as the French bourgeoisie derives benefit not only from the Catholic Church but also from deriding it, so it presses into its service not only the parliamentary majority, but also its socialist, and at times even its anarchist critics. The most blatant example of this was furnished in the last war, when the abbots and the freemasons, the royalists and the anarcho-syndicalists, vied with each other in beating the drum of bloody capitalism.

We have mentioned freemasonry, which in the political life of France plays a by no means negligible part. It is substantially a petit bourgeois imitation of Feudal catholicism. The French bourgeois republic, displaying now the right and then the left wing, then both of them together, makes equal use of both the authentic brand of Catholicism and of its petit bourgeois imitation—Freemasonry—in which the rôles of cardinals and abbots are played by bankers, parliamentary politicians, mercenary journalists and lawyers on the alert for fat fees. Freemasonry, diluting the strong wine of Catholicism and effecting economic reductions of the celestial hierarchy, leaving only the "supreme" being (Père suprême), at the same time adopted the current terminology of democracy—Brotherhood, Humanity, Justice, Virtue, etc. Freemasonry is an unofficial but extremely important component part of the bourgeois régime. Outwardly non-political, like the Church, it is substantially as counter-revolutionary as the Church. To the acute forms of class antagonisms

it opposes mystical, sentimental and moral symbols, which it clothes in a masquerade of ritualism after the manner of the Church. In its origin an inefficient petit bourgeois antidote to the class struggle which rends mankind, Freemasonry has become in its turn, like all movements and organizations of that character, a valuable weapon of the class struggle in the hands of the ruling class against the dispossessed.

It has always been the refined art of the English bourgeoisie to shower its attentions on the prominent leaders of the working class, to flatter them on their respectability, to corrupt them morally and politically by exalting their souls. The various English sects and churches, where the representatives of different parties meet on "neutral" ground, are the most important means of this taming and corrupting process. It was not without reason that Lloyd George termed the Church the neutral electric station of politics. Freemasonic lodges, at least a part of them, play a similar rôle in France. To a French socialist, and to the French syndicalist, admission to the lodge was tantamount to admission to the higher political spheres. Here, in these lodges, were made the useful acquaintances of the budding politician, and all this under the floral decorations of morality, ritualism and mystics. Freemasonry does not change its time honoured tactics with regard to the Communist Party; it does not expel the Communists from its midst; on the contrary it opens its doors widely to them. Freemasonry would not be true to itself if it acted otherwise. It is its political function—to manage the representatives of the working class so as to assist in weakening their wills, and if possible, also their brains. The "brother" lawyers and prefects are quite inquisitive and eager to listen to reports on communism. But can the younger brother of the left present to his older brother of the right the crude figure of the bolshevik with a knife between his teeth? Oh no! Communism as catered to the masonic lodges, must be of a very high and refined order, a pacifist and humanitarian doctrine interwoven by the finest philosophical threads with the brotherhood idea of the freemasons. Freemasonry on the whole represents one of the forms of political servility of the petit bourgeoisie before the big bourgeoisie. The masonic affiliation of "communists" is nothing but the spiritual servility of individual pseudo-revolutionaries before the petty bourgeoisie, and consequently before the big bourgeoisie.

It is needless to point out that the so-called "League of the Rights of Man" is one of the portals of the great edifice of capitalist democracy. Whereas in the lodges the corrupting traffic in souls is conducted under the sign of Brotherhood, the same job is done in the League on the grounds of Justice. The entire policy of the "League" as was eloquently brought to light by the war, moves within the limits prescribed by the patriotic and nationalistic interests of French capitalism. Within these limits the League is permitted, on account of some isolated act of injustice or violation of rights, to raise a hue and cry which serves the purpose of attracting the place-seekers and raising the awe of simpletons.

Both the League and the masonic lodges have always been the arena for the political coalition of socialists with bourgeois radicals. In this coalition the socialists, of course, do not act as representatives of the working class, but as individuals. But the importance of the individual socialists in the lodges is determined not by the weight of their individual virtues, but by the political weight they possess among the working class. In other words, in the lodges and similar institutions the socialist gentry turn to their own account the part played by them in the labor movement. At this job it is easy to cover up traces, because all the manipulations are glossed over by an idealistic ritual.

Cringing, picking up crumbs that fall from the masters' table, servility, place-hunting, parasitism, in the direct material sense and in the more covert "spiritual" sense—this is what freemasonry means to those who climb to it from the bottom up. If the friends of Leon Blum and the friends of Jouhaux walk in the lodges cheek by jowl with their brothers of the left, they are only carrying out strictly the political part assigned to them: at the secret masonic meetings they do the things that cannot conveniently be done at parliamentary meetings or in the press. We can only blush with burning shame on learning that in the ranks of a Communist (!!!) Party there are people who supplement the idea of the proletarian dictatorship by fraternizing with dissenters and radicals, with lawyers and bankers, at masonic lodge meetings. If nothing else were known to us of the doings of our French party than this fact, we could exclaim in the words of Hamlet: "There is something rotten in the State of Denmark". Can the International allow the continuance and the development of this truly shameful phenomenon? It would be tantamount to allowing the French Communist party in the system of democratic conservatism to occupy the same place of left wing support that was formerly held by the Socialist Party. This will never be allowed—our faith in the revolutionary instinct and in the

revolutionary consciousness of the French proletarian vanguard is too firm. With a keen-edged sword the French worker will cut and sever all the political, philosophical, moral and mystical knots which still tie the leaders of his party to the open and covert organs of bourgeois democracy—its lodges, its leagues and its press. If this sword should sever from our party a few hundred or even a few thousand political cadavres, they are only themselves to blame. It will be a good riddance for the party of the proletariat, for its strength and importance are determined by something more than the number of its membership.

An organization of 50,000 members, but properly conducted and fully aware of its aims, admitting of no deviations from the revolutionary path, can and will win the confidence of the majority of the working class and will assume the leading position in the revolution. On the other hand, an organization of 100,000 members, but containing in its midst Centrists, Socialists, Freemasons, bourgeois journalists, etc., will be doomed to perpetual stagnation—without a program, without ideal, without will—and will never win the confidence of the working class.

Freemasonry is an ulcer on the body of French capitalism. This ulcer ought to be cauterized.

POLITICS

Five Years of Red Diplomacy

By Georg Tchitcherin.

Long before the world war, when I was living in Paris and was a member of a section of the Socialist Party, a great wave of anti-semitism and enmity towards Russian emigrants began to rise. The Russian emigrants were persecuted in various ways. When I spoke of this in our section, and said that the Socialist Party should take energetic measures against it, and should take the Russian emigrants under its protection, I encountered a strong feeling of enmity among many of my hearers. Some of them even approved of the system of expelling foreign emigrants from the country. The purest nationalism hung out the sign of *Guesdism*, *Hervéism*, and other extremist slogans, thus concealing its actual tendency. I expressed my feeling against this, and began to speak of how French capital, and indeed the capital of the most developed countries, was helping Tsarism to exploit the Russian working masses in the most barbaric manner. The profits from this exploitation were being enjoyed by the bourgeoisie of France, and crumbs of the gains were being picked up by those classes from which the Guesdists and Hervéists drew their origin. I spoke of the comparative prosperity which I saw all around me, and of the fact that this was purchased at the price of untold suffering for the Russian working people. I was interrupted by interjections: "You are a nationalist". "If I am a nationalist", I replied, "I am a nationalist of the oppressed and a nationalist of the working people of Russia, exploited by world capital; you however, are nationalists of the capitalist exploiters."

The labor movement pursues entirely different courses in highly developed and in backward countries. In states based on exploitation, world capital is supported by a satiated labor aristocracy and by a corrupt labor bureaucracy. The social patriotism of the world war period only brought to light the tendencies already completely developed in the labor movement. We know the theory of the social patriots—that capital and labor in every country have common interests, and must hold together in combatting other countries. This is the clear outline of the theory followed by that powerful labor aristocracy upon which the bourgeoisie of capital is based in highly developed countries. While in states based on exploitation, the labor aristocracy is the greatest obstacle to the revolutionary movement, and while in the exploited colonial countries the only movements towards emancipation possible at present are national movements, the situation in Russia placed between these two categories—was such that it was possible for the proletariat to seize power and to create a republic of the workers and peasants.

The history of the last five years shows us that exploiters and exploited, capitalist and colonial countries, have arrived at a new phase of the struggle. The international antagonisms of the present period can be classified under three categories:

1. International struggle between capital and labor,
2. International conflicts among the great powers, and
3. increasing acuteness of the struggle between the great industrial countries and the colonies.

When the workers and peasants of Russia rose against the ruling class of their own country, they soon realized that their

first enemy is world capital. Tsarism was merely a servant of world capital, and the weak Russian bourgeoisie merely a fig-leaf. The historical significance of the February Revolution lies in the fact that the workers of Russia fully realized that no real democracy was possible in a bourgeois Russia subject to world capital in our epoch of economic world relations, and that pseudo-democracy merely serves to veil the dominance of world capital and of the highly developed exploiter states.

After Entente capital had banished German capital from Russia, it utilized the war for carrying out a far-reaching and systematic enslavement of Russia. The workers and peasants of Russia, who had to sacrifice their lives for the Entente, when Kerensky surrendered unconditionally to the Entente, speedily learned from bitter experience that Entente capital was their lord. The November Revolution thus signifies not alone the overthrow of the Russian ruling class, but a rebellion against the dominance of world capital.

The above-named three categories of international antagonisms seldom appear singly. They are in close contact at every step, utilize one another, and are even often forced by objective events to reinforce one another. The international aims of the working class demand the political and economic defense of the Russian workers' and peasants' state against the attacks of the Entente governments. The conflicts between the great powers took the form of a world war between two coalitions at the time of the establishment of the Soviet Republic. In recent years these conflicts have found expression in the form of ever-growing Anglo-French, Japanese-American, Anglo-American, and other antagonisms. In both cases the great powers fighting against one another also continued to combat the Soviet state, and vied with one another, or even united, in the attempt to strangle the Soviet Republic. We may say, in general, that the phases of the history of the contemporary world, apart from the struggle between capital and labor, are episodes in the history of the scramble for the colonies. The struggle between the leading capitalist great powers revolves around the question as to whose turn it is to subject an oppressed people and transform it into a colony. Thus Germany became a victim of this struggle, and this was no accidental occurrence, no result of individual errors, but merely a symptom of the fact that in the sphere of finance capital, England is the ruling world centre, the head of world capital. Under no circumstances was it possible for Germany to be victorious over England. The former Central European Alliance is transformed into oppressed and exploited countries, and the present economic situation of Germany is only a step in the direction of its further economic subjugation.

The history of the last five years shows two diametrically opposed movements: a striving towards the strengthening of the world domination of the powerful Entente centres and towards a gradual strangling of the weaker nations, but at the same time a strong emancipation movement among the oppressed countries, the struggle for freedom among the peoples of the East, and the ever-growing spirit of revolt against the dictatorship of the strong among the oppressed peoples. The entanglement of these two diametrically opposed processes is one of the main causes of the complexity of our contemporary history. In the ruling countries themselves we see simultaneously a movement towards strengthening the rule of the reactionary oligarchical classes, and the contrary striving of the oppressed middle strata and petty bourgeois masses, seeking salvation in pacifist slogans and in the founding of democratic parties.

Even in earlier days Russia occupied a special position between purely industrial centres on the one hand, and purely colonial countries on the other, and now, after the establishment of the workers' and peasants' power, this is more the case than formerly. During the first period of our existence we were in the claws of imperialist Germany. In the Russian question two tendencies combated one another in Berlin. Ludendorff's war regime wanted to crush Russia by force of arms, to make a second Ukraine of it. Ludendorff did not want to abandon his offensive permanently. Our tactics consisted in an attempt to play off the interests of German industry and German commerce against the war regime. To Stresemann and other far-seeing and influential bourgeois politicians we said: You will gain nothing by the transformation of Russia into a second Ukraine. That would only lead to constant insurgent struggles against you, to constant combats with underground organizations; industry and commerce would not be able to develop, and you would make a desert of Russia without gaining any advantage whatever for yourselves. Just the opposite road, the road of an understanding with us, is the only one which can enable Russia to recuperate economically, and can lead to economic advantages for you. These arguments did not fail to take effect, and the magnates of German industry and

commerce strove to bring about a peaceful agreement with Russia, in opposition to the war regime.

The Entente never lost sight of the prospects of Russia's development for a moment; the struggle for economic rule in Russia signified the struggle for world rule; the advantage of the Entente compared with Germany consisted in the fact that the Russian bourgeoisie was allied to it, with the exception of a few insignificant pro-German elements. The Entente made use of the so-called Democracy, of the S.R.s, etc., who were and remain its agents. During the first period after the Brest Litovsk peace, England's tactics towards Russia were still peaceful. But after the risings in Czecho-Slovakia, England passed abruptly to the tactics of organizing internal uprisings, conspiracies, and then to the sending of military expeditions. Some days after the historical interview of *Noulens*, who expressed his views on the pending intervention, I had a lengthy conference with the chief of the French war commission, *Lavergne*. I said to him: You demand that we take up arms again, which would mean nothing else than our immediate ruin, and the immediate occupation of the whole of Russia by German troops. Is that of any advantage to you? *Lavergne* replied that the powerful German offensive on the French front placed France in so precarious a position, that a delay of a few months was impossible, and that for France's salvation some measure was necessary by which the German troops could be removed from the French front. These lamentations of *Lavergne* were not sincere. We are truly aware that the leaders of French politics regarded the restoration of the German-Russian front as exceedingly desirable, but not from such considerations as those expressed to me by *Lavergne*, but because the leading Entente circles were desirous of withdrawing Russia from the feared economic influence of Germany, so that the latter would remain open for the exploitation policy of the Entente. The struggle between the coalitions for the exploitation of Russia was the primary cause of the intervention.

During the second period of our existence we were in the claws of the Entente. Within the Entente the same two antagonistic tendencies were revealed as those which we were confronted with in Germany before: Churchill, with France at his back, corresponded to the German Ludendorff, while Lloyd George took the place of Stresemann and the other German representatives of industry and commerce. The history of this period is not one of mere substitution of the first system by the second, but shows the intermittent domination of first one and then the other system. The intervention was indeed a war waged by the Entente against Russia with the aid of the betrayers of Russia, and Churchill's methods were essentially the same as the methods of the Germans in the Ukraine. The most respected representative of the industrial circles interested in Russia, *Urquhart*, supported Churchill at that time, and aided the tactics of military dictatorship; under *Koltchak* he endeavoured to restore his economic domination by force of arms. But Siberia repeated the example of Ukraine. Lloyd George's opposing system provided a program for the peaceful penetration into Russia, and for obtaining economic dominance in a peaceful manner. The program submitted to us in April 1919 by Bullit demands that we leave the occupied territories to the White Guards, that is, that we deliver these territories into the hands of the Entente for unlimited exploitation. The second demand was that of the acknowledgement of debts, synonymous with a peaceful seizure of power by Entente capitalists in Soviet Russia itself.

During the period following this, the victory of Lloyd George's system over that of Churchill runs parallel with the growth of the emancipation movement among the Eastern peoples. Lloyd George's tactics of approach to Soviet Russia were not only an endeavour towards the peaceful penetration of capital into Russia, but were at the same time an attempt at compromise against the Eastern nations. In both respects the tactics suffered defeat. After Lloyd George's victory over Churchill in England the antagonisms between these two systems took the form of antagonism between English and French politics.

The English policy of peaceful penetration found its clearest expression in the resolutions of Cannes on a world consortium (with London as the capital city) for the purpose of reconstructing Russia. Under reconstruction we must naturally understand the transformation of Russia into a field for exploitation. The resolutions of Cannes on the consortium were only a clear symptom of that policy which was adopted towards us in the daily struggle, especially in Germany. The program of *Stinnes*, consisted in the creation of a common international capitalist front for the exploitation of Russia, and the utilization of Germany for rendering the requisite technical services to the international capitalist alliance. The Rapallo Treaty was the result of a continuous and complicated struggle for an independent economic co-operation of Russia and Germany outside the lines of the international capitalist front.

In Genoa the program of peaceful capitalist penetration reached its highest point. The conference at Genoa was a most complicated phenomenon. Here the leading role was played by the growing bourgeois pacifism, of which much will certainly be heard in the near future. At Genoa the Entente governments spoke much on European reconstruction, although very little was actually done in the interests of this reconstruction.

The main question of the Genoa conference was whether the independent economic development of Russia would be carried out with the aid of foreign capital but without capitulation, or whether foreign capital would succeed in subjugating Russia. The Russian delegation was assailed by the very finest arts of diplomatic coquetry. As Satan showed Jesus all the riches of the earth, which were to be his if he would deliver himself up to Satan — in the same way the most alluring prospects were opened out before us, if only we would acknowledge capital as our lord. We may fairly say that the fundamental question of Russian policy was expressed with the utmost clearness at Genoa: subjection to capital, or independent development with the aid of capital. Expressed more exactly: *an agreement, but no yoke*. For this reason the formal basis of the whole activity of the Russian Genoa delegation was formed by the Cannes resolution on the equal rights of the two opposed economic systems. The new workers' and peasants' state, originating between the highly developed countries of Western Europe and the oppressed countries of the East, was now firmly established, and presented itself in Genoa as an independent great world power. The new period of its life already begun may be designated as a period of "active politics". Many interviews and conversations with political and economic personalities of many countries, which I had the opportunity of holding in Berlin, enabled me to convince myself personally as to the high degree in which Soviet Russia has already become an independent world power. At the present time, now that the emancipation movement among the peoples of the East grows from day to day, now that the oppressed and exploited peoples of the West are also defending or regaining their means of existence in daily struggles, now that in the most highly developed ruling states the increased strength of reactionary oligarchy is accompanied by increased pacifist opposition, Soviet Russia, employing foreign capital as it does for purposes of its own independent economic development, but not subject to capital, has become one of the central factors of the complex world relations.

Soviet Russia is striving to secure its frontiers, its coasts and the passages to its coasts, its straits, its commerce, so that its economic relations with all countries may be developed. But it is striving for something else as well: one of the most important factors in the play of world forces, Soviet Russia, as an independent political power, seeks friendship with all peoples, and is at the same time ready to enter into compromises and separate agreements with any country. *Agreements but no yoke*, that is its watchword. World capital must stand on the threshold of Russia; within the country itself the working masses conduct their own economies and work out their own future.

The Geneva Pact and the Austrian Proletariat

• By Ernst Haidt, Vienna.

The Geneva agreement with its credit guarantees, which has now been passed through Parliament and thus become law, is intended to place the state finances on a sound basis, and to develop the national economy. Before discussing this we must take a brief survey of the causes of the depreciation of the Austrian crown to 0.0075 of its original value, and of the danger it has run of not being accepted in payment at all.

As the Amsterdammers act as a whole, so has acted the Austrian part of them, throwing itself protectively before the capitalists in order to ward off any attack by the proletariat. The period during which the propertied class was bereft of all support was bridged over under the watchword of democracy, of legality. Where the propertied class possessed no power, democracy speedily created it in the form of civil guards, increased police and gendarmerie, and later by permitting one-time officers and reactionary elements to smuggle into the army. The second election for the national council brought an increased bourgeois majority, which naturally developed every source of power within its reach, and is now ready to attack the proletariat. By means of the first period of concessions to the proletariat, such as unemployment doles, eight hour day, and state food subsidies, the bourgeoisie freed itself from having to participate in economic reconstruction. And as the bourgeoisie was

deprived of nothing during the first period of impotence, it naturally refused to surrender anything when it attained power. With the exception of a ridiculous levy on property, generally composed of war loan, the bourgeoisie gave nothing, but pushed the ever increasing burden on to the proletariat. Increased taxation, increased tariffs, higher prices, and lessening of subsidies, all these solely enhanced the burden of the workers.

All increased expenditures were simply covered by the issue of more banknotes. The workers received more notes, but these declined so rapidly in value that the workers could not meet the increased prices. State and industrial magnates kept themselves afloat by increased prices and tariffs for articles of monopoly and by constantly raising the prices of all articles of general consumption. The state met its expenditures by means of more bank-notes, and the industrial undertakings obtained tremendous credits from the note issuing bank, which they then paid at the end of the month with the further inflated crown, while at the same time they raised the prices of goods. Thus they were enabled to hold back their goods and to speculate with them. The cost of all this was borne by the proletariat, which received nothing but crowns of less and less value.

When the situation finally became untenable, and the banknotes in circulation had reached a face value of 3½ billion crowns, the bourgeoisie looked round for a saving straw. The capitalists do not intend surrendering anything of their property, which of course does not consist of crowns; neither do the agrarians; and these have faithful servants in the government, which means, that they have credit abroad. The begging expeditions of former days have been repeated, but in a worse form than before, simply offering Austria to any one who comes to stretch out a hand for it. Thus was brought about the Geneva convention, an agreement whose credit guarantees and protocols signify nothing more or less than the complete deprivation of political rights for the population of Austria, and the placing of unlimited economic administrative rights in the hands of the financial control of the guaranteeing powers. In order to carry out the agreement, the government must have complete administrative powers, and must naturally exercise these in accordance with the requirements of the finance control.

A few words must be devoted to the attitude adopted by the social democrats in the matter:

At first Social Democracy played the part of unqualified opponent, of one who would under any circumstances, prevent the shameful agreement from becoming law. Austria it was asserted, was in a position to require its own capitalists to surrender 250 millions of gold crowns, and all idea of a credit obtained on such disgraceful conditions as were proposed was to be rejected. But it was not long before Social Democracy began to yield, to carry on a sham fight for the deception of the masses, and at the same time to remove every obstacle that might prevent the shameful agreement from becoming law. This is the more characteristic in that the social democrats kept on emphasising all the time, that it lay in the power of the proletariat, that is, in their power, to prevent the bill from becoming law. Social Democracy has not prevented it, and is thus responsible for the consequences.

The burden imposed is enormous, and naturally falls solely upon the shoulders of the proletariat.

More than eight thousand million crowns of increased revenue are to be squeezed out of the workers.

One hundred thousand civil service positions are to be done away with, and the army of the unemployed thereby increased. The sole participation of the capitalists and agrarians in this arrangement is that they accept presents in various forms. If any proof were required of this, it would be only necessary to refer to the budget figures for 1923. Under one item we find: Saving through reduction of civil service officials: 3.3 billions. A second item; Expenditure for pre-war debts: 3.1 billions. The banks and other undertakings are now obliged to pay their pre-war debts to foreign countries, naturally on a gold basis. In order that they themselves only need pay a paper crown, the state grants them the trifling subsidy of 393 billions. 65,000 civil servants are thrown out of work, in order that the capitalists shall not have to encroach on their gold values. It is superfluous to calculate the taxation of the proletariat per head, for it is not a question of the average amount per citizen; the manufacturers and dealers, as well as the agrarians, shift their share on to the proletariat, which bears the whole burden. It can be assumed without exaggeration, that the total earnings of the worker are confiscated to the extent of a quarter by levies of various kinds.

Worst of all is the fact, that even these terrible measures cannot lead to their goal; state finances cannot be put on a sound basis, nor can economic life be developed by such means.

Austrian production has been based on the sinking crown. The depreciation enabled the employers to rob the workers of a considerable part of their earnings, and to profit by sales and by utilizing credit. The stabilized crown destroys these three possibilities of profit, and now the inability to compete with foreign countries becomes apparent. The factories are out-of-date and worn out, the capitalists, satiated with money, will not be satisfied with smaller profits; the result is cessation of production, closing of the factories and workshop. Foreign markets are thus almost closed.

Increased tariffs and taxes, force prices wildly upwards, and the workers, economically exhausted by unemployment, short time, and reduced wages, are unable to expend a farthing for anything beyond the most primitive necessities of life. The first and lasting consequence of the Geneva agreement is thus the complete strangulation of every possibility of production.

The company of imbeciles who created the Geneva agreement will be not a little astonished at its consequences. To-day we have 100,000 unemployed and of the employed workers 60% are on half-time, but soon we shall have 2 or 300,000 unemployed and 100% on half time, for so long as the proletariat can and will stand by and look on.

For there is one thing mightier than the priest-ridden government and its social democratic supporters, who are ready to betray proletarian interests at every turn, and that thing is hunger.

The Geneva agreement means starvation and death from starvation for the proletariat, and in the streets of Vienna and in the provincial towns, it will soon be evident that the proletariat is not willing to starve without offering any resistance, merely because capitalist interests demand that it does so.

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE

The Peace Conference of the Amsterdammers

Special report to the "Inprecorr."

The international peace congress began its work on the 11th December, at 10 a. m., in the Great Hall of the Tiergarten at the Hague. 600 delegates were present. Almost all the leading spirits of the Amsterdam and Second Internationals attended, amongst others Vandervelde (Belgium), Thomas, Williams, Smillie, Thorne, Tillet, Hodges, Henderson, Mac Donald, Clynes, Webb, Lansbury (England), Leipart, Grassmann, Paplow, Dissmann, Wels, Crispin (Germany), Fimmen (Holland), Friedrich Adler (Austria), Tayler (Czecho-Slovakia), Stauning (Denmark), Jouhaux, Dumoulin, Bidegaray, Blum, Renaudel (France), D'Arragona (Italy). A number of other champions of pacifism like Count Kessier, Professor Quidde, and v. Gerlach, from Germany also gave notice of their intention to attend. Henri Barbusse and Ledebour (Germany), were also expected. There have arrived from Russia: the Menshevik Dan and Abramovitz, as well as the representatives of the Russian trade union alliance, comrades Radek and Lozovsky. The Georgian Menshevik Jordanj and Tseretelli were also present.

The first working session on December 11, began with a report from Jouhaux (France). The hall is decorated with flowers, and densely filled with delegates. But scarcely half a dozen spectators are present. The absence of any socialist or proletarian emblem in the hall is characteristic. Jouhaux spoke with powerful rhetoric, frequently interrupted by the applause of the large French delegation. He first spoke in memory of Jaures, and then declared: The independence of the various peace organizations here represented is not to be interfered with. But these organizations must be united for common action. Secret diplomacy and militarism are to be counteracted by "organizing peace". The League of Nations is not satisfactory in its present form. Efforts should be made towards having the organs of the League of Nations directly elected by the people and not nominated by the governments. The idea of compulsory courts of arbitration must be carried out. The main point, however, is that the workers of all countries undertake to manufacture no more war material. The Greco-Turkish war was rendered possible solely by the fact that English and French workers made ammunition for the purpose. It is also of essential importance to so reform the schools that war is no longer glorified.

This speech was followed by a protest from Williams (England) against the action of the Dutch government in refusing to grant visas to a number of the Russian delegates. Thomas replied that the bureau of the congress would take all necessary steps to secure admittance to all the Russian delegates, as well as to some of the Spanish delegates who have also obtained no visas. After this Henderson (England) spoke; reading somewhat monotonously from his manuscript, to the following effect: It would be too late to proclaim a general strike on the eve of a war. The sole efficient means of combating war is a continuous fight against military and capitalist politics. Capitalist politics are incapable of making an earnest stand for peace. This is shown by the inadequate results of the Washington conference. This annuls what the Versailles treaty determined with regard to Shantung. The speaker then sharply criticizes the Versailles treaty, the revision of which must be obtained by the workers. Under this treaty Germany has been brought into the worst possible position, and the economic relations of the world are destroyed. The League of Nations must be placed on a democratic basis, and comprise all nations. The unqualified recognition of Soviet Russia is to be striven for.

On behalf of the Second International, Henderson thanked the Amsterdam International for convening the congress. This congress embodies an all-comprehensive international of the proletariat in its political, economic, and co-operative organizations. Long live the International!

Henderson's speech, which symbolized in a certain sense the united front of the Second, Second and Half, and Amsterdam Internationals, was received with enthusiastic applause.

The Hague Dec. 11.

The afternoon session of December 11, was devoted to bourgeois pacifism. The speech delivered by the 80 year old Professor Buisson, of the French League for Human Rights, was a sort of family festival for the French delegation. Buisson's speech exhausted the platitudes of petty bourgeois pacifism. He praised the workers for wishing to prevent future wars by means of the international strike.

This speech was to have been followed by one from Professor Quidde. But he had received an invitation from the German Embassy, and the dinner had evidently made him forget the congress! Von Gerlach, Germany, took his place. He declared: The Amsterdam International alone, is too weak to secure peace. Therefore it unites with all pro-peace organizations. The speaker welcomes this alliance between trade unions and bourgeois pacifists, and thinks that they should form into a permanent committee. Gerlach recommends that the workers, leaders, in the interests of unity with the bourgeois pacifists, should not bring forward any special demands of labor at this congress! It is characteristic that this proposition of Gerlach's met with no opposition from the leaders of the 2 and 2½ internationals present.

At the afternoon session the following resolution on Henderson's report was distributed:

The World Congress convened by the International Trade Union Alliance, and held from December 10, to 15, at the Hague, declared that the antagonism of economic interests still causes the danger of war to exist between nations, and that these antagonisms often assume a serious character as a result of exaggerated national feeling, which frequently degenerates into chauvinism.

This chauvinism is especially furthered, and peace endangered, by the owners of private concerns manufacturing armaments, who constantly agitate for increased armaments and enlarged armies and fleets. These dangers are further enhanced by the special agreements and secret treaties made between certain governments, and by the harmful influences of secret diplomacy.

The congress is of the opinion that many of the articles of the peace treaties have led to new antagonisms among the peoples, and that the antagonisms thus caused, daily threaten to destroy the peace of the world, which can only be secured by a real democratic League of Nations directly controlled by the peoples.

The congress appeals to the political parties of every tendency, and especially to the independent political labor parties of the various countries, to carry on an energetic agitation in and outside of Parliament, for the purpose of obtaining the following:

- Control of the private armament industry through Parliament.
- Carrying out of the treaty of St. Germain with regard to traffic in armaments.
- Application of article 8 and the following articles of the peace treaty, the provisions of which are to be carried

out in such a sense that the League of Nations be entrusted with the control of the military armaments of the various nations.

- 3) Revision of the peace treaties on the grounds of the considerations adduced by the commissions appointed by the two political internationals and the Amsterdam international.
- 4) Reformation of the League of Nations into a real league of the peoples.
- 5) Final abolition of secret treaties and secret diplomacy.

The congress expresses the opinion that disagreements between the nations should be settled either by the award of a court of arbitration, or by the judgment of the Permanent International Court of Arbitration.

The congress is of the opinion that it is the duty of every Parliament to take action for disarmament, and to efficiently combat any steps towards offensive war. The congress therefore considers it necessary to seize every opportunity to reduce military and naval budgets.

The congress believes that the conclusion of guarantee treaties between the nations can be one of the means towards the acceleration of disarmament, provided that these treaties are agreed upon among all peoples, and not merely between various groups. For group alliances can lead to offensive and defensive alliances, as before 1914, and increase the danger of war.

This resolution is considerably weaker than Jouhaux's powerful speech of the morning. Here there is no longer any question of appealing to the workers to manufacture no more war material. Nothing remains but a vague criticism of the Versailles treaty and of the present league of nations. It seems as if Vandervelde, the leading diplomat of the 2. International, has had a hand in drawing up the resolution. For even Henderson spoke much more definitely against the Versailles treaty in his report than is done in this resolution.

The motion brought in by the Russian trade union representatives, that they be granted the right of discussion to the main points of the agenda, or at least of lengthened time for their speeches was rejected by the presidium of the congress. The Russian comrades received permission to speak for 20 minutes only in the discussion. Further Russian motions, to the effect that the congress should resolve on its attitude towards the conferences of Lausanne and London, and that it should deal with the question as to why the Communist International and the Red Trade Union International have not been invited to the congress, were also rejected. It is obvious that the wire pullers of the congress are anxious to exclude the communists, and to form a united front with the pacifist bourgeoisie.

The Hague Dec. 12.

To-day's session was opened by *Fimmen* (Holland), who read to the delegates, with unending tediousness, a manuscript printed in German. He described the miseries of war and militarism for the proletariat. This was followed by a long historical review expounding the attitude hitherto adopted towards war by the trade unions. *Fimmen* emphasized the resolution passed at Rome on the general strike and world boycott in the case of war. He assured his hearers that the working class does not regard work in common with bourgeois pacifists as establishing class peace. Work for war purposes is just as much to be condemned as black-leg work. The workers must be so enlightened by the trade unions that they will no longer manufacture war material. — The rôle played by Soviet Russia and the 3rd International, in the conflict against imperialism and the danger of war, was passed over in dead silence by *Fimmen*, who remained faithful to the spirit of the congress in this respect. — The speaker closed with revolutionary words: Rather than enter into a fresh war, the workers should go into the streets, rise against the bourgeoisie, and overthrow it.

Whatever can the president of the congress, Thomas, have thought of this effusion?

The discussion was opened by a German pacifist, *Mrs Berlin*. She at once caused embarrassment to the general strike leaders present by asking why the unions in question still tolerated the manufacture of poisonous gases. She uttered even more heresies than this, she extolled Rosa Luxemburg, and attacked the Stinnes-Lubersac couple!

The next speaker was an English clergyman, the *Dean of Worcester*. After this, comrade *Lozovsky* spoke on behalf of the Russian trade unions. The congress listened to the speaker with the greatest attention. A pitiful attempt at interruption, made by the German trade union bureaucrats, failed in its object. *Lozovsky*, who spoke French, began with a protest that a part of

the Russian delegation was still prevented by the Dutch government from attending the congress. He also entered a protest against a number of bourgeois organizations being invited to the congress, but neither the Comintern nor the R.I.L.U. In addition to this, this congress is merely a European affair; where are the representatives of the workers of India, Java, etc., the lands exploited by English and Dutch capital? War against war is only possible in the spirit of the class war. We are in favor of the united front, but not the united front with the bourgeoisie, but exclusively of the united front within the working class. We propose that a common committee of action of all internationals be formed against war. We are for this united front, with you if you will, if not, against you! *Lozovsky* described the split in the trade unions, brought about by the Amsterdam leaders, and emphasized that war against war signified above all war against the bourgeoisie of one's own country.

The French trade union leader *Dumoulin* immediately answered *Lozovsky*. In unashamed manner he rejected the proposal for a united front. The communist parties are composed of bourgeoisie! Their presence at this congress would thus not further the proletarian united front. We want to have the labor movement independent of the governments. But the communists are dependent on the Russian government! The schism in the workers' organizations, brought about by the communists, is responsible for the growth of reaction in Europe. We are against all war, and are thus also against the so-called wars of revolutionary conquest!

Lozovsky's request to be permitted to correct *Dumoulin's* perversions was refused by the chairman, Thomas.

The next speaker was *Grassman* (Germany). He agreed fully with *Dumoulin's* remarks. He confessed that the "communist phrase of the united front" was nauseous to him. But he is in favor of mutual work with the bourgeois pacifists! The remainder of his speech was a lamentation over Germany's situation under the peace treaties. The German workers are in favor of reparation. But they are unable to bear the costs of occupation by Entente troops.

The Bloc of the Amsterdamers with the Liberal Bourgeoisie, against the United Front of the Proletariat

By *Karl Radek*.

The Hague, December 11.

The "World Peace Congress", which opened on December 10, in the quiet city of state hypochondriacs, shows at once by its externals what it really is. In the first place the seats of the delegates are filled by the representatives of the trade union and party bureaucracy of the Amsterdamers, of the Second, and of the expiring 2½ International. Well known figures! Only here and there a few fresh proletarians, on whose faces the will to fight is expressed, but otherwise good old English gentlemen smelling of naphthalene, Prussian sergeants in mufti, private gentlemen, all as true to type as if cut out of a satirical comic paper. Not a single representative of the colonial proletariat whose exploitation is one of the chief props of the rule of the satiated Dutch, English, and French bourgeoisie. Dutch social democracy has existed for 30 years; it is a powerful party, but it does not concern itself about the proletariat of Java. The English trade unions, the Labor Party with its 140 seats in Parliament, these bring no Hindus nor Egyptians with them, although in these countries hundreds of thousands of workers take part in spontaneous strikes, and although the movements of these masses cause wars and can decide wars. And the best of it is, that the good people who have met together here to talk of peace have not the slightest idea that this small defect is enough to stamp "their" World Peace Congress as a conventicle of European labor aristocracy, even if they had not been willing beforehand to degrade it to this rôle.

This they did when they failed to invite the Communist International or the Red Trade Union International to take part; and are only gracious enough—for still impenetrable reasons—to tolerate the presence of representatives of the Russian trade unions. Whatever opinion may be held as to the Communist International, one fact cannot be denied: that it comprises the sole elements which fought against the war during the war. Messrs Jouhaux, Henderson, and Grassman, the old champions against imperialism, exclude the party of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht from the "World" and "Peace" congress.

Is it necessary to prove that they do this because they do not want to fight against imperialism?

On the other hand we find bourgeois pacifists sitting side by side with these tried and tested anti-military Ajaxes. We might tell many of these pacifists that we are sorry to see them in such company. For there were many pacifists who went to prison for their convictions during the war, and many others who spoke, if they did not fight, against the war, while Messrs Jouhaux and Renaudel, Henderson and Tom Shaw, Grassmann and Wels, were acting as trumpets of war. Whatever else these people may represent personally, at least they represent a fraction of the liberal bourgeoisie which is thoroughly sick of war, and only anxious to carry on their trades in quiet. That is the best which can be said of a part of them. Another part simply represents the war-weary intellectuals, that is, nothing. And with these elements the Amsterdammers, the men of the Second International, and even such "internationalists" as Friedrich Adler, are forming a bloc to "fight" against war. The path chosen by the Amsterdammers is not that of a united front of the proletariat against war, but the formation of a bloc with that portion of the liberal bourgeoisie which is suffering from pacific stomach-ache. That the "fight" which is to be put up corresponds fully to the fighters will be seen from the drafts of the resolutions.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Four Years of the German Seamen's Union

The old trade union of the seamen, the "Seamen's Union", which made a bad recovery from its defeat in the conflict with shipowning capital in the year 1907, and was amalgamated in the German Union of Transport Workers a few years later, had already rendered itself practically impossible among seamen by the war policy of its leaders, headed by the well-known Paul Müller. During the war Paul Müller was an even more consistent champion of Ludendorff's and Hindenburg's policy than the party and trade union bureaucrats themselves in their meetings and publications, and in his writings in the "Courier", the organ of the Transport Workers' Union firmly supported the policy that Germany should "hold out". When the German troops had taken Antwerp, he wrote:

"The German flag it is to be hoped waves over Antwerp, for ever!" He was richly rewarded for this later on, and even to-day occupies the office of seamen's adviser in the seafarers' guild, the shipowners' institution for the protection of seamen: and the Transport Workers' Union does not venture to dispute his position.

It is therefore quite understandable that when in November 1918 the German seamen found themselves for a moment in possession of political power, they first called Paul Müller to account, and sought him in his office for this purpose. He however, did not suffer anything, but only some less guilty persons and some valuable office furnishings. The seamen at this time did not allow themselves to be influenced by the outcries of one bearing sole responsibility after the war-guilty Ludendorff and Hindenburg.

But it would be an error to assume that the seamen were induced to found the international Seamen's Union solely from motives of hate against the old leaders. As members of the Seamen's Union they belonged to the left radical party of that time, which incorporated the idea of a united organization, and in every important political action they have boldly taken sides. As proof of this we only need to recollect the conduct of the Seamen's Union when the social democratic minister of war Noske commanded the White Guards under Gerstenberg to march against the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils in Bremen; here the members of the Seamen's Union were the first to hasten to the aid of their brothers in distress. Unfortunately without success.

It was not until the German revolution had been finally suppressed, — after the murder of Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Leo Jogisches, and others of the best leaders of the German proletariat — that an independent organization of seamen emerged from the many petty party quarrels. In January 1919 the organization assumed the name of the German Seamen's Union, and restricted its sphere of work purely to the economic field. It must however be taken into consideration that the surrender of the mercantile fleet, and the distress resultant on this, partially forced the members of the organization to this course. In later actions they took active part, both legally and illegally.

The "German Seamen's Union" had been successful at that time in gathering a membership of approximately 18,000, thus practically doing away with the old association. The mighty demonstrations arranged by the Seamen's Union at that time resulted in December 1918 in the first wage scale agreement for seamen. This scale was not however arranged by the seamen themselves, but by the associations which had meanwhile joined in a working commun with the shipowners, and which were under the leadership of the Transport Workers' Union. The terms of the agreement were as might be expected under the circumstances, but the Seamen's Union was finally obliged to put up with it, after many protests, which however became less and less effective as a part of the sailors found occupation in undertakings at home. Apart from the decrease in tonnage of German shipping, and the resultant taking up of other professions by German seamen, the number in the Union was also diminished by the devices and machinations of the association working in community with the shipowners. Even to-day, although there is a precedent of a bourgeois legal verdict to the effect that it is punishable to inquire whether a man belongs to an organization or not, it is impossible for a man to find occupation in the deep-seas fishery if he is not a member of the German Transport Workers' Union. Even to-day an agreement to this effect exists between the shipowners and the German Transport Workers' Union. But all these measures do not bring the desired results. On the contrary, the best part of the seamen remained faithful to the organization, and not only this, in June 1919, they proceeded, to found their own publication: *The Seamen's Union*. *The Seamen's Union* was contributed to by the members, and speedily proved an efficient weapon in the conflict against the supporters of the shipowners and against the shipowners themselves. *The Seamen's Union* was the more necessary in that the leaders of the Transport Workers' Union did not venture to confront the members of the Seamen's Union in public meetings, but preferred to intrigue against them secretly in their members' meetings. It is only recently that the leader of the Transport Workers' Union, Schumann, held the first public meeting since the war.

Without concerning themselves about petty party quarrels outside of the Union, the members sought to establish relations with other revolutionary groups. No. 4. of *The Seamen's Union* is characteristic of the attitude of the Union. It contains the new program of the Union which demands, among other points, union with the miners. In accordance with this program, delegates of the Union have been sent not only once, but several times, to negotiate with them regarding coal and other questions. Very close relations were maintained with the Shop Steward movement of that time. Delegates of the Union were present at the congresses. *The Seamen's Union* was naturally much influenced by the movement, and was kept supplied with material by the shop stewards' central. Among the heads of the movement at that time could be counted Däumig, Brass, Geyer, and others, now long since landed in reformist shallows. It was only when this movement could not maintain itself that the Unionists once more stood alone.

In this situation they became engaged in a conflict with the shipowners in October 1919, and lost this after a severe struggle, in consequence of being opposed by the community workers headed by the Transport Workers' Union. This struck a heavy blow at the organization from which it but slowly recovered. The resultant discussion on the errors committed during the struggle, above all on the failure of other workers to support the strikers by solidarity, led the organization to turn to other revolutionary groups.

Despite this the organization remained powerful enough to be able to continue publishing the *Seamen's Union*. Any attempt to restore relations with the old association, in accordance with the new slogan of not destroying the trade unions, but of winning them over, would have been regarded, then as to-day, as an attempt at betrayal on the part of the leaders, and would have been rejected by the seamen as such. The hate against the old association knew no bounds. To this must be added that other revolutionary groups, the Unionists and Syndicalists, had supported the strikers energetically from the first day; the Bremen Syndicalists distinguished themselves particularly in this.

In Hamburg there were many consultations and common meetings among all the revolutionary groups outside of the trade unions, and these finally led to a conference, held in December 1919, at which the representatives of all revolutionary organizations were present. The Syndicalists were represented by Kater and Ricker, the Workers' Union had as one representative comrade Appel. The Seamen's Union was represented by comrades from every local group, amongst other by Scheel (Bremen), Rieger (Stettin), Böttcher (Hamburg). After a report by comrade

Rocker, and a lengthy discussion, the Seamen's Union decided upon affiliation with the Free Workers' Union of Germany. This decision was facilitated by the readiness of the Union of Free Workers to grant the Seamen's Union complete independence. An official conference of the delegates of the Seamen's Union was held the next day, at which the result of the common conference was discussed and approved. The members' meetings held after this also approved the decision, apart from a few contrary votes. It should be specially noted that the German Communist Party, or the communists, were themselves not quite clear on the slogan with regard to remaining in the trades unions or leaving them. But for the seamen the question was completely decided, as it is now. For them there was no return to the old trade union. Naturally the question was never quite disposed of, but reappeared every time a new wage agreement was brought out by the old trade union, as this latter attempted to cover its failings by lamentations over the split, and continues to do so to this day, although well aware that in actual fighting we exercise solidarity with the old union members.

The idea of the international seamen's united organization thus took early root amongst all our comrades, and led to activity on the part of the Union not only on purely national lines, but towards the establishment of a revolutionary united front. These strivings led to the attempt at affiliation with the International Seafarers' Federation. The attempts in this direction led to partial success. Although affiliation with the I.S.F. was not obtained (despite the fact that many organizations belonging to the I.S.F. were in favor of it) many local groups of the Seamen's Union gained close relations with the organizations desirous of seeing them join the I.S.F. Thus close relations were opened up with the Norwegians, Finns, Dutch, and with some groups of English. It is characteristic of the connections made with the English that a representative of the English organization, the Havelock Wilson organisation, had his headquarters in the office of the Hamburg local group of the Union, and it is merely accidental that his office is not still in the rooms of the local group. The "Dutch Federation" and the Norwegian "Seemanns Union" have lately joined these. Even during the time immediately following its establishment, the Union opened up relations with all other organisations, as for instance the Brazilian.

The endeavors towards an international united front for seafarers led to the Union sending 2 delegates to Genoa in May 1920, and though their representation did not lead to admission to the I.S.F., it was still of permanent effect on the representatives of other organizations. Lorenz from the German Transport Workers' Union and Captain Gieseler from the Association of Captains and Officers were delegated as representatives of the German government. The declarations of our comrades were not without effect, especially on the latter. To this must be added the ever more obvious treachery of the executive committee of the seafarers' unions in relation to the seamen who had entrusted them to represent the idea of a united organization of seafarers at Genoa.

At the same time there appeared in the organ of the association of Captains and Officers of the mercantile marine long treatises of the same import, and the relations prepared at Genoa were established with the comrades of the Seamen's Union. After the preliminary work of both organizations had been carried out, the conference of the Association of Captains and Officers of the mercantile marine took place in Hamburg in October 1920, and approved, by 187 against 7 votes, the idea of a united organization for all persons employed in the seafaring profession, as worked out by Gieseler and his colleagues. As in the Transport Workers' Union, every member of this organization was to be an individual member of the Union. After the conference, common consultations were held for drawing up the statutes, and a common draft was prepared and recognized by the members of the Union.

Meanwhile however, a violent opposition arose against the decision of the conference of the Association of Captains and Officers of the mercantile marine; this was carefully nurtured by all bourgeois papers, and succeeded in its aim. The Association as such did not join the united organization. Gieseler followed the logical consequences and joined the united organization with a number of his followers; of these some have again fallen away, so that it may be rightly said that the idea in itself was right, but premature. To-day we know that if we had limited ourselves at that time to revolutionizing the existing committee of action of the seafarers' unions we should have taken a step forwards in the seamen's movement. Through this transaction the members of the Seamen's Union have forfeited their honorable name, for the new united organization was named the "German Seafarers' Union", and the organ of the union the "Seafarers' Watch". The organization, on the other hand, grew from day to day, and soon attained a membership of about 10 000.

Further development has shown the Union to be correct in the opinion that its aims are better attained if as a Union, it comprises the "lower" orders only, and not as in the contemplated united organization all persons employed in the seafaring profession, but that, as is still the case to-day, the mechanics, nautical technicians, and other members of seafaring branches, keep to themselves, and the whole be gathered together in one committee working against, and not with, the shipowners. The Union has already been active along these lines, and can report excellent results. For instance the latest action taken in the seafaring industry, attended with such good success. The seamen are also afforded a possibility of forming a united front with their colleagues the transport workers. The traffic union founded lately by the Transport Workers' Union will undergo the same experience. It is impossible to imagine the traffic union otherwise than as a structure of which the seafarers, the railwaymen, and the transport workers form the triple pillars. This idea receives more and more recognition from the seafarers, and the membership of the German Seafarers' Union increases daily. The approximate membership of the Seafarers' Union to-day is 16,000. It should be further observed that the Union of German ships' engineers and marine mechanics is already organized in the free trades unions, and gave proofs of its good will during the last wages movement.

The Unionists never really lost contact with our Russian comrades, not even at the time when they belonged to the German Free Workers' Union (syndicalists). They have invariably appreciated the difficult position of the Russian proletariat much better than the comrades of the Free Workers' Union, and have never concealed this fact. They have never failed to lend support, legal or illegal, when the circumstances demanded it. It is therefore only natural that the more clearly the Free Workers betrayed their antagonism to the Russian proletariat, the more the Union turned from the Free Workers. At the conference of the Union in October 1921, at which the R. I. L. U. was represented by Rusch and Farvig, and the syndicalists by Rocker, the feeling among the delegates was in favor of the former, and only a few inept remarks on Rusch's part are to blame that the syndicalists did not receive a refusal at once.

In May of this year, at the extraordinary Union conference, the sympathy for our Russian comrades had increased to a point that conditions of affiliation with the R. I. L. U. were discussed. A committee was appointed to formulate the conditions, but this has unfortunately not yet been carried out. But if alliance of the Union with the R. I. L. U., to the great revolutionary united front, is not outwardly conspicuous, it is all the stronger internally. And the seafarers await their final affiliation at the pending congress in Moscow.

German Seafarers' Union.