

Peace That is Aggression

CAPITALISM can produce maggots only. For a time, these maggots may be camouflaged with the scent of ideals and lofty declamation; but at the end they are revealed openly in all their ugliness and putrescence. Capitalism thrives upon organized plunder and calculating deceit; and all its ideals, all its morality, all its "aspirations for a finer world" are simply the expression of a monstrous hypocrisy, to promote its supremacy and disguise its malevolence.

The war was an apocalypse, revealing the seared and ugly soul of Capitalism. It was conceived in plunder, nurtured in fraud, and prosecuted by means of hypocrisy and brutality. Imperial Germany immediately revealed its lust of conquest: it brutally violated Belgium, openly placed its faith in the sword and the grenade, and developed grandiose plans for world domination, territorial plunder and annexations. The Allies were equally bent on plunder, as the contents of the secret treaty agreements amply prove. And all the while each group of belligerents was disgustingly declaiming about national defense, democracy and the civilization of the world.

The two belligerents proved their equality in crime and their similarity of purpose by their efforts to crush the proletarian revolution in Russia, to annihilate the Soviet Republic.

It was a war of plunder, of aggrandizement, a war against the colonial peoples and against the proletariat. It was Imperialism.

The character of the peace treaty is in absolute accord with the character of the war. The betrayers of socialism and the naive petty bourgeois radicals who placed faith in the Allies' ideals must now realize that these ideals were—maggots. During the war, Capitalism put forth a mighty effort to preserve and aggrandize itself; and this effort is clearly apparent in the peace treaty. It annihilates German Capitalism? Of course, since in the epoch of Imperialism the Capitalism of one nation aggrandizes itself by the expropriation of the Capitalism of another nation. It is beast rend beast.

The treaty is not only characterized by its own provisions, but by incidental circumstances.

First of all, there is China's refusal to sign the treaty, as a protest against awarding Germany's territorial and economic "rights" in China to Japan, particularly the Shantung Peninsula. These "rights" were wrested from China by German Imperialism through seizure and the might of brigandage; in a treaty that was "to make the world safe for democracy" these "rights" should have reverted to China. No! German Imperialism in China is expropriated, not to protect China, but to aggrandize Japanese Imperialism.

The treaty affirms directly the subjugation of the peoples of Egypt, Morocco and of all the former German colonies, and indirectly of all colonial peoples. The claims of Ireland and Corea to independence are complacently brushed aside.

But there is another important circumstance. The war was, fundamentally, a product of the antagonisms international finance-capital; the lust for territory in answer to the requirements of imperialistic finance-capital, and in this is revealed the character of the epoch. The war has made Great Britain, France, Japan and the United States, more particularly Great Britain and the United States, the financial (which implies political) masters of the world. As a proof that the peace is a prelude to financial aggrandizement, consider these tidings from Washington, May 12:

A new consortium has been arranged for the control of loans to China. Instead of Japan having the chief voice on such matters, as claimed under the secret agreements she made with China during the war, the matter will be handled by American, French, British and Japanese bankers backed by their governments.

An arrangement has been made whereby the Siberian railroad will be put into condition by these four powers, and Italy is to be advanced at once a temporary loan of \$20,000,000.

Great Britain and France, which failed in their efforts to have the United States take German bonds to cover their indebtedness to the American people, have now practically arranged to turn over securities of Brazil and other South American countries as part payment.

The dispatch adds that "at the State Department it was said officially that under the conditions which are to govern the consortium the Government practically, if not in specific terms, guarantees the investments of the banking groups interested." And: "Deep interest is taken in the plan to have the United States take over South American securities to cover its loans to Great Britain and France. Since this plan will have the effect of lessening European interests in South America it will strengthen the Monroe Doctrine and remove one of the possible causes of serious complications in the future."

Here is a financial trust of four imperialistic nations, with Great Britain and the United States in ac-

tual control; here is a plan to dispose of Siberia as international finance-capital determines; here is China being made a financial appanage of four great powers; and here is a brazen admission that the Monroe Doctrine is now an instrument to promote the supremacy of United States capital in the Latin-American republics.

This is a financial partition of the world, the unity of governments and investors, of politics and finance-capital. This is Imperialism, and it blisteringly characterizes the peace that is an aggression being concluded at Paris.

The financial partition of the world among the Great Powers, particularly the Big Three, is part of the territorial partition included in the treaty with Germany. Germany yields up all its colonial territory and all its trade and financial "rights" in all the world; these are aggrandized by France, Great Britain and Japan. France "gets" Alsace-Lorraine, unconditionally, with its iron and coal mines, and the Saar Basin and its coal, conditionally; recognition by Germany and the "League of Nations" of French supremacy in Morocco, and France will probably "get" Togoland and Kamerun; Japan "gets" the "German" Pacific Islands north of the equator and Chinese Shantung; while Great Britain "gets" the juiciest portions, German East Africa, South-West Africa, the Samoan Islands and other Pacific possessions. These territorial annexations, this subjection of colonial peoples, is disguised under the term "mandatory," but in fact constitutes annexation—a territorial re-division of the world in the interests of Imperialism. The United States "gets" no territory, but financial recognition and the acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine—which in fact "grants" Central and South America to "our" Imperialism.

This means an enormous aggrandizement of Anglo-American-French Imperialism, which is increased by the absolute crushing of Germany as an imperialistic power. Germany, moreover, is compelled to recognize Great Britain's "protectorate" in Egypt and the taking over by the Allies of all its former imperialistic "rights" in various undeveloped nations.

The treaty erects a number of independent nations, which is considered as a "victory of democracy" by the unsophisticated. But this is directly imperialistic. These small nations are in no sense independent, being the political and financial vassals of the Allies, instruments of their Imperialism and threats at the proletarian revolution in Russia.

The treaty is an aggression against the peace and liberty of the world. It aggrandizes French and British Imperialism; and the results of the whole work of the Peace Conference is to assure Anglo-American domination of the world, political and financial.

The League of Nations, it is now clear beyond dispute, is an imperialistic instrument of the Great Powers, of the Allies. It is in the name of this League, which was to assure the peace and liberty of the world, that Germany is strangled and Anglo-American Imperialism assured the domination of the world. And this is made all the more clear by the proposal that Great Britain and France pledge themselves to come to the aid of France in case of a new German attack—what this actually means is the conclusion of an offensive and defensive alliance between these three great powers. Why, if the League of Nations is to assure disarmament, peace and liberty, should this three-power alliance be necessary?

The treaty is an aggression against the peace and liberty of the world. Consider Russia: she is not included in the treaty, except in mention of reparation by Germany and in the clause providing that "German troops at present in territories to the east of the new German-Polish-Russian frontier shall return as soon as the Allied and Associated Governments deem wise." Why not immediate evacuation? The answer comes in the plans for an Allied army of 40,000 troops to march against Petrograd by way of Helsingfors, opening a new war against Soviet Russia.

It is Imperialism ascendant. It is, since the world revolution did not materialize, the natural outcome of the war. Imperialism is tightening its grip upon the world, and will wreak its predatory will unless the proletarian revolution intervenes. World Communism is the only answer to world Imperialism.

REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM

BY LOUIS C. FRANKA

This book considers the fundamental problems of Imperialism and Revolutionary Socialism—war, moderate Socialism, the Socialist collapse, the nation, State Capitalism, unionism and mass action, proletarian dictatorship, etc.

248 pages; 75¢ a copy

Special prices to locals and agents

THE REVOLUTIONARY AGE

885 Washington Street Boston, Mass.

Bolshevikjabs

OF course it is not in good taste to say "I told you so," but we are only human and we did warn Germany what would happen if she persisted in sticking to Scheidemann.

* * *

However, things are never so bad but what they might be worse—suppose Wilson had had 28 points?

* * *

And imagination staggers before what might have happened to Germany if there had been 12 points to violate.

* * *

The chief difference between democracy and autocracy it would seem from the Peace terms is that democracy takes so much longer to say it.

* * *

There is one thing stands out clearly in the whole affair at Paris and that is the mandatory. If the Bolsheviks had only thought of it what a lot of trouble we would all have been saved. For instance, the Soviets bluntly declare for the expropriation of the banks, and naturally bankers all over the world get sore; they declare for the seizure of the land and all landowners get red in the face with indignation; but if they had given the workers a mandatory over the banks and the peasants a mandatory over the land both the bankers and the landlords would have gotten used to working for their living before they had found out what it meant.

* * *

No banker could draw a tear from the world at large by emitting loud wails about confiscation if it was clearly stated in black and white that the only change in the *status quo* was the granting of a mandatory to the workers for the purpose of protecting the banker from himself.

* * *

Now if England came out boldly and stole the colonies from Germany that she had stolen from the natives, it would be clearly a violation of both the principles of democracy and self-determination. But when she is willing to have a mandatory thrust upon her, especially a mandatory that will necessitate the upkeep of a large army in those colonies for the purpose of explaining to the ignorant natives what a mandatory really is, all that we can do is gaze with reverent awe upon the sacrifices a good empire is willing to make for the benefit of the world in general.

* * *

We use the "good empire" advisedly because there have been bad empires, such as Rome and Spain and Germany. Rome and Spain both seized territory when they won a war, and undoubtedly the Germans would have seized territory if they had won, their whole attitude during the war showed that they had none of the finer qualities at all. They deliberately invaded Belgium, instead of rushing to aid her from herself as the Allies did in Greece, they ruthlessly announced their purpose of raping Russia instead of rushing troops into the country for the purpose of stabilizing the government, and at Brest-Litovsk they never even hinted at the use of a mandatory.

The mandatory is the acid test of an empire.

* * *

Of course the mandatory has its limitations and this is where internationalization steps in. A mandatory over the Saar basin might give rise to adverse comment by suspicious minded persons. But who, in this age of progress, could object to internationalization?

* * *

Internationalization satisfies everybody, even the Germans will be allowed to burn coal from the Saar region—if they pay France for it.

* * *

At any rate the Allies are not fooled about the Peace terms—they are already making provisions for safeguarding France from the results.

* * *

It has now definitely been established that Conscription is an evil practice—in Germany.

* * *

"Germany must pay the entire cost of the armies of occupation from the date of the armistice." Talk about adding insult to injury!

* * *

And the Allies insist that Germany consider the treaty of Bucharest as a "scrap of paper" which is a complete victory for the principle of the "sanctity of treaty obligations."