

Another Peace

WHILE the world is still staggering from the shock of the peace terms imposed upon Germany by the Allies, come the terms that are being imposed upon Austria. These terms are in accord with the general character of the terms imposed upon Germany, and are if anything still more terrible.

These terms, in general, are: Austria must accept responsibility for damages and losses caused to the Allies by her war of aggression; she must pay for all damages to civilians; the indemnity is not stated, but Austria must pay "a reasonable" sum by May 1, 1921; Austria must surrender all her merchant fleet and one fifth of her river fleet; she must abolish conscription, reduce her army to 30,000, and surrender all her cables to the Allies.

But these are only a fraction of the terms. Austria, among other economic measures, must surrender to Italy, Serbia and Rumania a fixed number of domestic animals.

These terms indicate that Austria is to be crushed economically. Her industry is to become unimportant, since a nation economically is unimportant without a merchant fleet; and Austria is deprived of her fleet. She is, moreover, to surrender all cables, and make other economic concessions which will ruin her.

Austria is bankrupt. Her industry and agriculture are ruined. The problems of reconstruction are enormous. But during the period when all resources should be concentrated on reconstruction, Austria is to use these resources in order to meet the Allies demands for tribute.

These peace terms are not simply a threat to the peace, liberty and security of the people of Germany and Austria; they are equally a threat to the peace, liberty and security of the world.

It is a peculiar logic that insists upon punishing the nations "guilty" of the war in a way that produces conditions for new wars in the days to come.

But it isn't passionate motives of vengeance that inspire the diplomats of the Allies. That is simply a means of arousing popular enthusiasm for their brigand's program. The motives of the Allies are cold, calculating motives of power. They must destroy their rivals; they must secure world power; they must divide the world along lines of Imperialism. It is these purposes that are responsible for the most predatory peace treaty of modern times.

Together with this general purpose involved in world power, there is another and more immediate purpose. The major belligerents, except the United States, have suffered heavily from the war. They are on the verge of bankruptcy. In order to prevent this bankruptcy (and a revolution among their people) they are trying to exact every penny they can cut of Germany and Austria with which to meet their liabilities.

But Germany and Austria are also bankrupt, and to exact tribute means completing their bankruptcy. The bankruptcy of these two nations must necessarily affect conditions in all nations. The Allies are trying desperately to avert a problem that must down them in the days to come.

The diplomats and financiers of the Allies admit that this problem of financial bankruptcy is serious. The only tangible proposal thus far made to meet the crisis has been the proposal that American finance should form a huge corporation to meet the capital needs of Europe. This might work, for a time, but at the cost of making the European proletariat

permanent slaves and assuring the United States undisputed financial world power.

Not having any general plan to meet the crisis, the Allies adopt the opportunistic tactics of despoiling Germany and Austria in order to meet their own obligations, feeling that even if these two nations break into revolution, the solvency of the Allies will be able to stabilize the situation.

But the fundamental facts are that these methods cannot meet the terrific crisis in which Europe finds itself. The Allies are trying to solve an international crisis by national aggrandizing and by a partial internationalism which is simply the mechanics of Imperialism.

These terms of peace are indicative of the fact that there is no hope for the world, either for peace, security or prosperity, being assured under Imperialism. Imperialism means conquest and spoliation, and war: there is no way out except through the Communist Revolution.

War was a consequence of the contradictions; and these unsolvable contradictions will yet strangle Capitalism.

Repudiating Deserters

AT this moment, while Socialist history is being written in fiery letters, it is of great importance to know the activities of the adherents of the movement.

It is clear that revolutionary discipline in the Left Wing has been disregarded by an organized, disgruntled clique composing the minority at the Left Wing Conference. Disruption has been created at the moment when the rank and file were breathlessly watching the actions of their representatives, who were to form common plans and a common platform by means of which to land the final crushing blow at the Socialist Party in its present form, laying the basis for a new movement.

Apparently, the disrupters had believed in the theory of the conquest of the Party by a "peaceful" and gradual transition. But suddenly, contrary to this view, the Party bureaucracy—although not accepting the Left Wing theoretical conception concerning the nature of revolution—abruptly surprised these comrades by a counter-charge consisted of suspensions, expulsions and "re-organizations." This terrible shock caused our minority Left Wing comrades to drop their guns in the mud, like "brave" soldiers, and start fighting as to who should be in the first ranks of the retreat. They measure revolutionary capacity very peculiarly: those who soonest leave the Party, that is, retreat, are the most revolutionary, and *vice versa*. In lieu of revolutionary discipline and common action, the minority act like bravados and insist upon separate action, to the slogan: "We are the Left Wing."

Among the minority delegates, 31 in all, we find the delegates of the Lettish Federation. In spite of the fact that the official organ of the Federation, which is under direct control of the Central Committee, has been agitating for the conquest of the Party, these delegates unscrupulously, without the consent of the members of the Federation, is lining up with the splitters of the Left Wing.

At its regular meeting July 13, the Lettish Branch (Federation) of the Bronx condemned the stand of the Central Committee of the Lettish Federation. It endorsed the decision of the Left Wing majority and advised the Central Committee and the members to act with the Left Wing.

Yours for the Communist Party,
K. STRASDIN.

One Lie Nailed

By L. E. KATTERFELD.

IN an article sent broadcast through the National Office Press service, James Oneal claims that in our recent Party elections the old National Executive Committee wasn't repudiated at all, at all.

He admits the figures published in the Ohio Socialist as current, but alleges that "these figures show a *very small* vote in the states as a whole, which confirms the charge that the Left Wing through a campaign of terrorism has driven many party members from the Locals in sheer disgust." In this article he bases his whole argument upon the assertion that the vote was much lower than in other Party referendums and that therefore the fact that the Left Wing received a majority of the votes cast does not mean repudiation of the old N. E. C.

Even if it was true that a very small vote was cast in the recent referendums, that would not justify the old N. E. C. in suppressing the referendum results. But it is not true.

Oneal says:—"This report shows a TOTAL of a little more than 16,000 votes cast for the referendum." The fact is that it shows 20,674 votes for the 26 States included in the Ohio Socialist tabulation. Left Wing candidate John Reed received 16,074, while the leading Right Winger, Victor Berger, received only 4,465, while James Oneal, "our" present International Delegate was "endorsed" by the magnificent total of 1,726.

Oneal alleges that the vote was much smaller than is usually recorded in Party elections. The fact is that it is one of the largest ever polled in any party referendum. In the election for N. E. C. one year ago 17,310 votes were cast, of which only 10,611 were in the 26 states that we have tabulated. This year those same 26 states give 20,674 or nearly TWICE AS MANY as last year.

If the states that have so far suppressed their referendum returns show the same increase as those already tabulated, the vote this year may actually surpass the "high water mark." Here are some figures from the official reports of the National Office: The spirited contest over the St Louis program brought out 22,345 votes for the majority and 2,752 for the minority report, total 25,097. The total vote in the 1917 election to International delegates showed only 14,219 Comrades voting. Berger was elected at that time with 4655 votes

The highest vote ever cast on any referendum in the Party's history was in 1912, on the question of holding our national convention in Indianapolis instead of Oklahoma City, a little over 34,000. In that same year John Work, received the highest vote ever polled by any individual in the Party, 22,081 against 6,440 for J. O. Bentall for National Secretary. When we consider that at that time the Party had about 20,000 more members than at present, and that this year several thousand good standing party members were prevented from voting because reactionary party officials refused them the ballots, we must conclude that actually a larger percentage of our membership voted in this years referendum elections than ever before.

In view of these facts, what becomes of Oneal's assertions and allegations? I commend these figures to our would-be "historian" James Oneal. Was he ignorant of these facts, or did he deliberately lie in his efforts to defend the defeated and discredited party officialdom and to prejudice the membership against the Left Wing and Revolutionary Socialism?