

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of International Events

Vol. I, No. 35

Saturday, June 14, 1919

Price 3 Cents

The Mooney Strike

THE American workers are up against a great decision. Upon their action depends much that may happen in the days to come. This decision is whether they shall respond to the proposed general strike on July 5, to free Tom Mooney.

Response means action. It means power. It means power not only for the release of Mooney, but developing power for the release of the workers from the tyranny and exploitation of capital.

The decision no longer concerns Mooney alone. It concerns the whole working class, its action and its immediate destiny. Just as the conscious workers have used the Mooney case as a means of attack upon the whole system of Capitalism, just so the conscious capitalists have used Mooney as a means of attack upon the whole working class, and particularly the militant and class conscious elements among the workers.

The Mooney issue is a class issue. It is not an issue of "justice;" the justice of Capitalism is class justice. It is not an issue of "fair play" or of "legal rights." The issue is now an issue of power, and power alone will decide. It is an issue in the proletarian class struggle against Capitalism, and in the capitalist class struggle against the proletariat: and the issues of the class struggle are decided by power alone.

The capitalists control the government. They control the courts and the judiciary. They control the press. And all three are united against Mooney, against the workers, against Socialism. They have the power. Power must be met with power. The workers must break the power of the capitalists.

The answer to the workers to the tyranny of capital must be the mass power of the proletariat in action,—the general mass strike, the political strike against the state, to impose the workers' will upon the state.

The political strike is the most efficient weapon of the proletariat, equally in the immediate struggle against Capitalism and in the final struggle to introduce the dictatorship of the proletariat in order to realize Socialism.

A general strike for Tom Mooney would be a political strike,—a new departure in American labor history. It would be a potentially revolutionary mass movement, since it would break the old tradition of passive acceptance of the decisions of the state and introduce the new militant era of aggressive mass action to impose the will the proletariat upon the state and society. Break the old tradition, awaken the consciousness of power in the proletariat, and great events would come.

A revolutionary act of real importance,—this is the fact comprised in a successful Mooney general strike. This general strike would threaten vested interests in two directions: the vested interests of the bureaucracy in the American Federation of Labor, and the vested interests of Capitalism, the supremacy of which depends upon the passivity of the workers.

These vested interests, accordingly, equally of "labor" and of capital, are united against a general strike for Tom Mooney. As usual, the labor misleaders of the A. F. of L. are coming to the rescue of Capitalism, betraying labor, crushing the development of a militant spirit among the workers.

It has been apparent all along that the vested interests of the bureaucrats in the A. F. of L. were sabotaging the Mooney case. They hesitate; they intrigue; they accepted in order to sabotage. These bureaucrats did all in their power to prevent a militant answer of labor to Mooney's appeal. The Mooney case became identified with the mass movement in the A. F. of L. to transform the organization and impose upon it a more militant policy; and in order to preserve the order and their power, the bureaucrats and misleaders sabotaged Mooney in order to sabotage the up-surging militant spirit in the unions.

The A. F. of L. officials have made it clear again and again that they were against a general strike. Now comes the convention of the A. F. of L. with its decision not to support this strike.—in other words, to abandon Mooney and all class war prisoners to the mercy of the bourgeois courts, bourgeois justice and the bourgeois government.

This is sabotage. This is a betrayal, not simply of Mooney, who relatively is unimportant, but of the heroic cause of militant labor. The decision of the

A. F. of L. is an act of treason to the workers and a surrender to Capitalism.

But the tyrants of capital do not depend upon their labor lieutenants in the A. F. of L. alone.

Capital has been consciously mobilizing public opinion in order to make the Mooney strike a fizzle. The discovery of alleged plots to "seize" the government, the dynamite "plots" and explosions,—all are part and parcel of the campaign to mobilize "public opinion" against militant labor and to terrorize labor into abandoning its plans for a general strike.

Capitalism is in dread of the proposed Mooney general strike. It realizes the potential revolutionary significance of the movement, and is organizing to crush it.

There are no arrests being made of the "bomb plotters." Apparently, that is unimportant—to capital.

The Final Call—Act!

The National Conference of the Left Wing of the Socialist Party meets Sunday, June 22, in New York City.

Considering the reactionary acts of the N. E. C., it is absolutely necessary that every Left Wing local should send delegates.

The future of revolutionary Socialism in our party, in large measure, depends upon this Conference.

Comrades, act! Send your delegates! Communicate with Max Cohen, 43 West 29th St., New York City.

On the referendum to elect international delegates of the Socialist Party, Texas, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Ohio and the District of Columbia give the following returns:

John Reed, 4312; Louis C. Fraina, 3364; C. E. Ruthenberg, 3256; A. Wagenknecht, 2515; I. E. Ferguson, 2039. These are all Left Wing candidates. The moderates: Victor Berger, 1123; A. Germer, 1053; Algernon Lee, 438; John M. Work, 473; Seymour Stedman, 829; A. Shiplacoff, 674; James O'Neal, 365.

The full returns are, from the District of Columbia and 15 states—Texas, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Florida, Rhode Island, Maine, Kentucky, Arkansas, Minnesota, Michigan and Massachusetts:

John Reed, 11,991; Louis C. Fraina, 10,441; A. Wagenknecht, 7938; C. E. Ruthenberg, 7,779; I. E. Ferguson, 4,577; Victor Berger, 2,262; A. Germer, 1961; Seymour Stedman, 1,618; A. Shiplacoff, 1337; James O'Neal, 1,143; Algernon Lee, 1003; John M. Work, 930.

In 14 of these states (Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia not in) the vote on International Secretary is: Kate Richards O'Hare, 7,317; Morris Hillquit, 2,422.

The vote in Local Buffalo, New York (expelled for being Left Wing) on international delegates is: John Reed, 307; Louis C. Fraina, 285; C. E. Ruthenberg, 271; I. E. Ferguson, 67; Victor Berger, 61; Kate O'Hare gets 145 votes and Morris Hillquit 80.

For National Executive Committee in District One—three states, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine, the vote is: Louis C. Fraina, 3130; N. I. Hourwich, 2,544; E. Lindgren, 1,472; L. Lore, 940; Morris Hillquit, 838; James O'Neal, 688; A. Shiplacoff, 319. Local Buffalo for N. E. C. votes: L. C. Fraina, 259; N. I. Hourwich, 205; E. I. Lindgren, 150; Morris Hillquit, 83.

These are partial results, indicating a Left Wing sweep, that a reactionary N. E. C. is trying to sabotage for the moderates.

But the explosions are being used as a pretext to deport radicals, as a means of mobilizing sentiment against militant labor, as a means of breaking the Mooney strike. The newspapers report that another explosion is scheduled for July 4: how do they know, and is it not a move to terrorize people and break the strike?

Capitalism visions dark days ahead. It visions social storms of great fury, and is preparing itself.

This preparation is sinister. It consists of plans for using terror against the working class, for using armed force in strikes, for a more ruthless use of the courts against labor, together with the cowering of labor into accepting a passive policy of dependence upon the benevolence of the state.

The sinister conspiracy of capital against militant labor must be broken. It must be broken by a more intense revolutionary agitation, by a more aggressive policy of Socialism. It must be broken by making a success of the Mooney strike, if not on July 5, then

after: the struggle to get the masses in action must never cease.

This means, moreover, broadening the scope of the Mooney strike. It must become a strike for the release of all class war prisoners, who are prisoners of the class war against Capitalism. Mooney is a symbol of the class war; and the Mooney strike must become a symbol of class power and militancy, to release all the prisoners of the militant working class.

These class war prisoners were captured in the front lines of the war against Capitalism. They were at the posts of danger, they struggled valiantly; and they were imprisoned consciously and calculatingly to weaken the power of the workers, to strengthen the power of the capitalists. They must be released.

The moderates, in the A. F. of L. and in the Socialist Party, urge a campaign for "amnesty." The labor lieutenants of the capitalist class in the unions urge faith in the government and in the courts. The moderates imagine that the mobilization of bourgeois liberal public opinion will compel an "amnesty."

All that will not accomplish anything. The issue is an issue of the class war, and power alone decides in the class war as in ordinary war. You cannot depend upon the courts. You cannot depend upon public opinion. You can depend upon your own mass power alone. You must not ask the government, you must compel the government to release our class war prisoners.

Ask the government that imprisoned our worker-comrades to release them? Depend upon this reactionary government of the capitalists to free the enemies of the capitalists? Charity is not a factor in the social struggle. Justice is a weapon in the struggle of class against class. Mercy is the lying fraud of a ruling class intent upon maintaining its own ascendancy.

All that is paltering with the issue. Paltering is very pleasing to the capitalists, but disastrous to the workers.

Power! That is the requirement of the militant proletariat. Power is the means that will break the power of the capitalists. The power of the proletariat alone will compel concessions and ultimately unconditional surrender.

The mass strike, the political strike, means power. It means the consciousness of class and the power that comes of this consciousness. The political mass strike will weaken the power of the state, make the power of the capitalists totter. There is no other method. The class struggle is not waged with words, but with deeds; it is not a pink-tea affair, but an implacable war to the end. In this war the workers must use force,—the force of their control of industry, the force that comes out of mass power, out of mass action.

The class struggle is flaring up implacably. Under the oppression of Capitalism, the workers are compelled to get into action. Illusions are being broken. New fetters are being forged for the proletariat, a new tyranny organizing itself. Capitalism is resorting to the most desperate means to preserve itself. It imprisons, it shoots, it destroys peace, happiness, democracy, that it may reign in plunder and in power. The workers must act against this evil system of things.

The class struggle is flaring up implacably. In the midst of war and death and tyranny, the proletariat is acquiring a new consciousness and new purposes. It stirs, uneasily, unaware of its strength; but it stirs. And capital trembles. Capital realizes that should this stir become conscious, definite action, it would mean the end of the world,—for Capitalism. But it would mean a new world for the workers.

The issue of the class war prisoners is an issue of the class struggle. On this issue, and all other issues, the militant proletariat must wage war against Capitalism. It must wage this war, consciously, unceasingly, implacably.

The proletariat must wage the class war with new means, with more militant tactics than used of old. The strike must broaden its character; the workers must realize that they need power, class power in order to conquer Capitalism. Class power comes out of class action; and the unifying centre of class action is the mass political strike.—Socialist mass action to conquer the power of the state and of Capitalism.

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of International Events

LOUIS C. FRAINA Editor

Contributing Editors

JOHN REED

SEN KATAYAMA

N. I. HOURWICHI

I. E. FERGUSON

LUDWIG LORE

EADMONN MACALPINE

C. E. RUTHENBERG

ISSUED EVERY SATURDAY

By LOCAL BOSTON, SOCIALIST PARTY

H. G. STEINER, *Business Manager*
885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Subscription \$1.00 for six months (26 issues)
Bundle orders 2c a copy

Another Peace of Aggression

THE terms imposed upon Austria by the Allies are terms of a victorious Imperialism, bent upon aggrandizing itself and maintaining its supremacy. The Austrians are bellowing in protest; but to what avail? They accept Capitalism and reject the Revolution: Capitalism must exploit and oppress them. Dr. Renner, the "Socialist" head of the Austrian Peace Delegation, was all urbanity at Paris, making a "favorable" impression upon the diplomats. But urbanity does not accomplish results for the proletariat. Dr. Renner is the Austrian Scheidemann, who during the war used all means to uphold the war and the government. He is a social-patriot, and the evils of his policy are now becoming apparent to the Austrian proletariat. The Peace Conference in Paris, while it reveals the malignity and incompetence of Capitalism, equally reveals the degenerate character of the dominant moderate Socialism. In the revolutionary class struggle alone lies the hope of the proletariat and of Socialism.

But the revolutionary class struggle is flaring up in Europe. Peace—"progressive" or reactionary—cannot still it. The Junker government of Poland is mobilization against the Communist—trying to disguise its utterly reactionary character. In Germany, a new Spartacan revolt is in preparation. Austria itself may break loose in a new revolution. In France, in Italy, in England, the proletariat is awakening, seething with an unrest that may soon become conscious revolutionary action. The Socialist Party of Norway has affiliated with the Communist International.

Peace is aggression, since Capitalism is aggression. Communism is the proletarian answer to predatory Capitalism. Moderate Socialism and Capitalism must make way for the revolutionary conquest of power by the proletariat.

Mass Action in the Unions

IT is becoming characteristic of the large strikes now in action that they are not only a revolt against the employers, but equally a revolt against the old unions, and the reactionary officials in control of these unions.

These strikes are mass movements, developing out of the upsurge of the membership itself, imposing its will upon the unions. Invariably, the old unions and the labor lieutenants of the capitalists in these unions act against the strike, practicing sabotage.

The great strikes in England were revolts against the old unions and their officials. Indeed, so marked was this particular characteristic of the strikes that the British government seriously considered proposals for strengthening the "prestige" of the union officials among the masses,—the "labor lieutenants" had become a recognized bulwark of Capitalism.

The Seattle general strike was equally a mass movement, opposed by the old union bureaucracy. The American Federation of Labor officials even boasted of the fact that the strike was largely broken because the international unions refused moral or financial support.

In Winnipeg and Toronto, and other cities of Canada, the great general strike is as much a revolt against the old unionism as it is against the employers. Charters are being revoked: union officials, in Canada and the United States, are actively sabotaging the strike. The mass movement behind this general strike, which is unified about industrial unionism, started as a bolt from the regular convention of the unions, and an agitation to re-organize into industrial unions.

This development is most important. It deserves

the consideration and study of every militant in the movement. Out of it may come a revolutionary labor movement.

The old unions, dominantly, are reactionary, their officials corrupt. But there is unrest in these unions; a membership, often betrayed, is becoming aware that things are wrong, and is acting. We must direct and organize this mass movement in the old unions. The old unions must be split, precisely as they have been split in Canada; and a new labor movement forged out of those elements in the A. F. of L. which are unskilled and potentially revolutionary.

The problem of unionism is a crucial problem. The reconstruction of the unions is a necessary task of revolutionary Socialism, in accord with mass action and proletarian dictatorship.

Industrial Democracy

THE convention of the American Federation of Labor is, if possible, still more reactionary than usual. The Stone Age minds of the delegates, who represent the bureaucracy much more than the membership, are perpetrating a series of reactionary acts that make one stagger.

Accepting *in toto* the infamous peace treaty, rejected even by conservative labor in Europe; repudiating "industrial amalgamation" of the crafts, the A. F. of L. degeneration of industrial unionism; dodging the government suppression of "civil rights," sabotaging the Mooney strike, and suggesting "memorializing" Congress for more "labor laws,"—these constitute the spirit and the acts of the convention. Reactionary and petrified, is it any wonder that President Wilson fulsomely greets the convention?

Gompers, as usual, performs the task of indulging in progressive camouflage. In his opening address, this Old Man of the Sea said: "The day of autocracy, both industrial and political, is gone. The day for readjustment and reconstruction is at hand. Those who oppose the new order are reckoning without their host. We are making no unjust demands, but we are going to insist on an opportunity to live full, rounded lives, worthy of the civilization of our times."

Having applauded these pious wishes, the convention then proceeded to wreak its reactionary will upon labor and the unions.

Gompers proposes reconstruction—in words. Capitalism equally proposes reconstruction—in words. What are the deeds that Gompers proposes? Nothing but making labor an appendage of the predatory democracy of Capitalism.

Reconstruction implies limiting, at least, the prerogatives and power of the capitalists. But the A. F. of L., as expressed in its officials, is actually strengthening Capitalism by mobilizing the workers against the class struggle and accepting the Wilsonian program. The A. F. of L. is not even accepting the "reconstruction" program of the British Labor Party,—which is surely moderate. These Stone Age minds are still wrapt in the past; they still consider craft disputes more important than the mass struggle of the workers against Capitalism. They are protectors of Capitalism and betrayers of the proletariat.

Industrial democracy under Capitalism is a fraud. Gompers may use the term, but in his mouth its only meaning is reactionary. Recognition of the unions, collective bargaining, labor laws, being fawned upon by a treacherous government,—all this does not constitute industrial democracy, but its opposite.

Industrial autocracy must be broken. How? Gompers offers no real answer. The A. F. of L. has no answer, since officially it is part and parcel of the system of industrial autocracy, and serves the autocracy of Capitalism.

Industrial autocracy is based upon the private ownership of the means of production and distribution. Industrial autocracy means capitalist control of industry; industrial democracy means workers' control of industry. The realization of industrial democracy, accordingly, implies breaking the power of the capitalists, ending private ownership of industry, and placing industry in the control of the workers, organized industrially and communistically. All else is visionary, treachery to the ideals of the militant workers.

The A. F. of L. bureaucracy is still reactionary. It will persist in its reactionary policy,—these labor lieutenants of the capitalist class must promote the supremacy of Capitalism. These betrayers of labor have learnt nothing and forgotten nothing. But the world is developing. New forces and new ideas are coming to the front, producing a more conscious class struggle against Capitalism. These forces and ideas are becoming expressed in a mass movement to either transform the A. F. of L. or secede from it. Socialism must assist in the development of this new, aggressive movement of labor.

Strangling Russia

THE most contemptible thing about the war waged by the Allies against Russia is the deceit and the hypocrisy that accompany it. It is a counter-revolutionary war,—against the Russian masses, against democracy, against civilization and humanity. Nor is this war against Russia accidental or incidental. It is to the Allies much more important than the war against Germany, since Soviet Russia menaces the whole system of international Capitalism. In other words, it is a class war between the reactionary capitalists of the world and the revolutionary workers of Russia. This class character of the war against Russia is now becoming apparent to all, events being conclusive. The *New York Times* of May 29 admits the class bias of the war against Soviet Russia:

It is becoming increasingly difficult not to take sides, at least passively, in the Russian civil war. In the world war against Bolshevism, just as in the world war against Germany, there is neither satisfaction nor profit for those who stay out until the issue is decided.

The war against Germany was a class war between the capitalists of two imperialistic belligerents for the financial control of the world. The victory of Germany would have proven very disastrous to the Allies. German Imperialism would have become dominant in the markets of the world, the Imperialism of the Allies being weakened accordingly. The issue was vital, and the original European war developed into a world war.

But the victory of Soviet Russia has infinitely more serious consequences than the victory of Germany. A German victory would have not destroyed the Capitalism of the Allies, however much it might have weakened it; the "rights of property" would still prevail. But Soviet Russia symbolizes the purpose of the militant proletariat to end Capitalism, to convert private property into communal property. The world of Capitalism, accordingly, attacks Soviet Russia in order to preserve its very existence. The war of the Allies against Soviet Russia is a class war of the capitalists of the world against the workers of Russia.

It is, moreover, a war against the workers of the world, since the social ideals of the Russian Revolution are universal ideals; and in this war the Russian masses are waging the struggle of the workers of the world for emancipation.

What becomes, then, of the alleged reasons for the war against Russia? Lies, all lies. Every single argument against Soviet Russia is a fraud. Capitalism cannot admit openly that it fights the Russian Bolshevik Republic in order to maintain the ascendancy of Capitalism; so it manufactures lies concerning tyranny, the community of women, etc., all in an effort to mobilize public opinion against the Soviet Republic.

The most frequent accusation is that anarchy and chaos prevail in Russia. Let a non-Bolshevik answer. Isaac Don Levine, adherent of Kerensky, recently went to Russia to study conditions. In a dispatch to the *New York Globe*, from Moscow, May 19, Levine says:

"There is no anarchy either in Petrograd or Moscow, and there is no chaos in Soviet Russia. Never since its inauguration has the Soviet Government been more powerful than it is today. . . . When one penetrates Soviet Russia one is struck by the fact that whatever Bolshevism may be it is not anarchy. After having passed some time within the frontiers of the Communist Republic one is surprised at the situation here, for it is absolutely the opposite of what the American people imagine it to be." There are no policemen in Moscow and no lights at night, yet the streets are safer than New York or Chicago. "Before coming to Russia I was informed that the Soviet government was tottering and would soon fall. The newspapers here publish the wireless dispatches sent from Paris to America. These are absolutely contrary to the facts, and even people most violently opposed to Bolshevism cannot find anything to support such assertions. On the contrary, numerous signs show that the Soviet government has grown considerably in the last few months."

That very effectively disposes of the "chaos" in Russia. In fact, a new social system is being constructed in Russia: the masses are in control, and a new life, a new civilization, a new humanity, are in process of becoming. The proletarian dictatorship, the Soviet Republic, is not breaking down, but building up. That is precisely why the Capitalism of the Allies is eager to strangle Russia, since if Socialism there proves successful, it would inspire the worker of the world to set for their own Socialism.

There is a terrible scarcity of food in Russia, truly. But, in the first place, this characterizes every European country—a result of the war; and, in the second place, while other European countries may purchase food in the markets of the world, Soviet Russia may not. The Allies blockade Russia, deliberately trying to starve it into submission.

The war against Russia is brutal, reactionary, vile, an attempt to strangle the Russian Revolution and Socialism.

Clear the Decks!

III

THE moderates in the Socialist Party, while desperately using terror and expulsion to crush the Left Wing, as desperately refuse to discuss the fundamental theoretical implications of the tactical controversy. In this refusal, they tacitly admit defeat. They cannot afford, considering the party temper, to oppose the implications of their petty bourgeois reform policy to the revolutionary implications of our Communist proletarian policy.

Accordingly, the moderates indulge in sneers and operation. In his article in the *New York Call* of May 21, "The Socialist Task and Outlook," which has become the "life saver" of the moderates, Morris Hillquit says:

The "Left Wing" movement as I see it, is a purely emotional reflex of the situation in Russia. . . . The "Left Wing" movement is a sort of burlesque on the Russian revolution.

This answers no argument and solves no problem—which is characteristic of the opportunist policy. We plead guilty to an emotional response to the Russian Revolution; we acted, to the extent of our power, in solidarity with our revolutionary comrades in Russia: *which is more than can be said of Hillquit & Co., who were deliberately, coldly, traitorously silent, until the upsurging temper of the Party compelled them to become "me too" acclaimers of the Russian Revolution.* But our response is equally a response of the mind, of theory. . . .

The *New York Call*, having heard the voice of its master, develops the argument of "initiation" in its issue of June 5:

A striking thing about the pretended "Left Wing" organization within the Socialist Party is the effort to duplicate every phase of the experience of the Russian Socialists. . . .

Socialists have always held that the workers of each country must work out their own policies and that these policies will vary according to the nature of the economic, social and political conditions of each country. Lessons can be learned from other countries, to be sure, but policies cannot be copied everywhere.

This appears formidable, but in reality is cheap.

The heart and soul of the Left Wing policy, and of Bolshevism, are mass action and proletarian dictatorship.

Proletarian dictatorship was first formulated by Marx. In this, the Left Wing "imitates" Marx, and not the Russian Revolution.

The tactic of mass action, as a revolt against petty bourgeois parliamentarism and the answer of militant Socialism to the concentrated industry of imperialistic Capitalism, was developed prior to the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat in Russia.

The Russian Revolution has made reality of the theory of proletarian dictatorship and mass action, while revealing the *general forms* for the realization of the theory in practice,—and of Socialism. The Russian revolution is the final, unanswerable argument against petty bourgeois parliamentary Socialism, in favor of proletarian revolutionary Socialism.

Imitation? The Communist International calls for an acceptance of the Left Wing—of that revolutionary Socialism which is conquering power for the proletariat. Or shall the party cling to the Socialism of the Ebert-Scheidemann Social Democracy? . . .

Our task is not the immediate seizure of power: revolutions come, they are not manufactured; our task is to reorganize the Party so that it shall become a revolutionary factor in the immediate struggles of the militant proletariat, and prepare for the final revolutionary struggle that is coming.

The accusation of "imitation" recoils upon its makers. These moderates imitated the policy and practice of the German Social-Democracy, apishly and disastrously. They never tried to develop tactics in accord with American conditions,—except in the matter of playing cheap politics.

The American proletarian movement has made a real contribution to international Socialism,—the theory and practice of revolutionary industrial unionism. In accord with the giant character of industrial concentration in the United States, industrial unionism proposed to organize the workers in concentrated industrial divisions, in the integrally constructed industrial unions. In this industrial unionism, moreover, there was implicit, if not fully formulated, the theory and the practice of mass action and proletarian dictatorship. But the Socialist Party, under the control of the moderates, consistently and persistently sabotaged industrial unionism in favor of the reformist parliamentary policy of the German Social-Democracy. Who are the imitators? . . .

The Left Wing in the Socialist Party is not a product of today only. It has its past, as well as its future. The Left Wing has always existed in the Party, united largely around the question of industrial unionism.

Conditions vary, and the application of theory and practice varies in immediate expression. But the tendency is fundamental. The tendency of proletarian

dictatorship and mass action,—it is upon that that Socialism must build its immediate policy. An actual revolution is not necessary in order to build our movement upon the basis of mass action and proletarian dictatorship, since mass action and proletarian dictatorship have their *immediate* as well as ultimate implications.

The acceptance of the Left Wing program implies a reconstruction of the *immediate* tactics and policy of the Party. We shall not wait for the revolution: we shall engage actively and aggressively in the *immediate mass struggle* of the proletariat, out of which will emerge the dynamic force and consciousness for the realization of proletarian dictatorship, of Socialism.

Moderate, petty bourgeois "Socialism" in the Party evades all actual problems of Socialism and the Revolution. While it prates childishly of a revolutionary crisis not being imminent, an actual crisis is upon us, and the moderates are helpless, hopeless, incompetent. They reject, not only the Revolution, but the revolutionary struggle: they repudiate the Communist International; they cling to the old tactics and the old reformism; they castrate Marxism and abandon revolutionary Socialism.

Clear the decks! Let us clear them now!

The slogan of the moderates is: Split the Party for petty bourgeois Socialism, for the abandonment of the immediate revolutionary struggle!

The slogan of the Left Wing is: Conquer the Party for revolutionary Socialism, for the immediate and ultimate revolutionary struggle against Capitalism!

The California Convention

By Alanson Sessions

THE California State Convention of the Socialist Party, held on May 30th, 31st and June 1st at San Francisco, resulted in a more or less definite decision to affiliate with the Left Wing movement of the American Socialist Party. The greater part of Sunday, June 1st, was spent in a discussion of the practicability of the Left Wing Program. It is unfortunate that a clear-cut decision was not taken before the adjournment of the convention. While Left Wing sentiment seemed to be dominant, a vote on the subject was either adroitly avoided by the machinations of the Right or overlooked by the Left.

The first two days of the convention were occupied in the discussion of methods of organization and propaganda and of the nature and future of the Socialist press. But from the outset it was clear to all that such discussion was futile until the momentous question of basic party policy was determined. The subject of organization and propaganda must be confused and incoherent if the party does not know precisely where it stands with relation to the Left Wing. It was to be expected, therefore, that the first two days of the convention would be wasted in tiresome verbosity.

The third day proved that the majority of the membership is Left Wing by sentiment, if not by intellectual conviction. Most of the delegates felt that there is a dire need for a radical alteration in tactics, but few of them had done any serious and consecutive thinking on the subject. Taylor, state secretary, and Dolsen, one of the most prominent of the party organizers, are both Left Wing. Others like Lillian B. Symes and Cameron King, recognized as big figures in the California movement, were emphatically Right Wing in their attitude. King especially, bitterly attacked the Left Wing Program and denounced "frenzied Fraira" as a phrase-monger and a vulgar disrupter.

King based his argument principally on the fact that a revolution in the United States is not likely for many years to come. This being the case, he contended, it was idle to agitate for a dictatorship of the proletariat and an application of Russian tactics to American conditions. The leader of the Left Wing, Comrade Coleman, in answer to King, argued that the possibility of an immediate overturn in this country was something quite beside the point—that the Left Wing wished only to make the party strictly revolutionary in its aims and tactics and to prepare thoroughly for the revolution when it comes.

There is little doubt that the referendum vote on the Left Wing and Right Wing issue will result in favor of the former. The leaders of the Left, however, recognize the fact that many of their supporters are not well-grounded, and they are carrying on a strenuous campaign of education among their ranks.

It is interesting to note although the Left Wingers have been denounced by the Right Wingers as hysterical, etc., at the California convention the exponents of the Left Wing were far more scholarly and unhysterical than their opponents. Cameron King, for instance, did not hesitate to resort to epithets and personal denunciation in his speeches, while Coleman's talk was a dispassionate, impersonal analysis of the situation.

This convention is a preliminary convention to a larger and more representative one which will be called in the near future.

Dictatorship and Minority

THE petty bourgeois characteristics of moderate Socialism are clearly apparent when they try to discuss the problems of revolutionary Socialism. Then they indulge, with pseudo-Marxian trimmings, of course, in all the stupid arguments of the *petite bourgeoisie*.

Consider proletarian dictatorship. The petty bourgeois apologists of Capitalism stigmatize it as "dictatorship of the minority," as a violation of the rights of the "majority." Now comes the *New York Call*, in its issue of June 8, and stigmatizes the Left Wing conception of proletarian dictatorship as having "all the characteristics of the doctrine of the 'militant minority' as it was worked out by the French Syndicalists"!

The *Call* says that the Left Wing "attempt to establish a dictatorship within the Socialist Party is a resurrection of the 'militant minority.'" Is it? The Left Wing has used agitation to convert the party membership to its policy. It has urged an Emergency National Party Convention to discuss problems of policy and tactics. It has used the referendum of the Party to "get across" its policy to the membership. In the measure that certain groups have taken the initiative in this agitation you have a "militant minority" but not in the petty bourgeois sense used by the *Call*, since our purpose has been to convert the *mass* of the members in the party.

But the moderates are using the tactics of the militant minority. A small minority, the National Executive Committee, sabotaged the call for an emergency convention; a minority, the bureaucracy of Local New York and the State Executive Committee, expelled the Left Wing locals and comrades. A small minority, the N. E. C. expels and suspends 40,000 members of the Party and refuses to recognize the will of the masses of the Party as expressed in the referendum to elect a new N. E. C., international delegates and international secretary.

This is the "militant minority" in action, become a murdering minority of the Party. . . .

The revolutionary Socialist concepts of mass action and proletarian dictatorship are not derivatives of Anarcho-Syndicalism, but of Marxism. Anarcho-Syndicalism is petty bourgeois, as is parliamentary Socialism against which it revolts, and counter-revolutionary. In theory and in practice (as proven by events in Russia) *Anarcho-Syndicalism is not compatible with proletarian dictatorship*. Proletarian dictatorship implies the conquest of the political power of the state and the construction of a transition "proletarian state" on the basis of which to introduce Socialism; two concepts repudiated by Anarcho-Syndicalism.

Is the theoretical scholar of the *Call* ignorant, or is he a sophist? . . .

This scholar insists that "the Russian revolutionists in the second revolution were cautious enough to wait until they were sure that they represented the feelings and desires of a minority," and implies that the Left Wing of the Socialist Party is acting to the contrary. This is conscious subterfuge. Prior to the second Revolution the Bolsheviks were a militant minority urging mass action and proletarian dictatorship upon the masses,—revolutionary agitation for a revolutionary mass policy. That is precisely our task—agitation. We must revolutionize the Party, convert it into a "militant minority" (or in Marxian terms, "the most advanced and resolute section of the working class") in order to carry on a revolutionary agitation to develop a revolutionary mass policy of the proletariat.

Mass action and proletarian dictatorship exclude the Blanquist tactics of the "militant minority" in the Anarcho-Syndicalist sense.

Revolutionary Socialism builds upon the *mass-power* of the proletariat. Moderate Socialism "builds" upon the bourgeois state, upon votes, upon bourgeois liberal public opinion. Petty bourgeois Socialism makes the introduction of Socialism the task of a "minority" of parliamentarians; revolutionary Socialism makes it the task of dynamic mass struggles of the proletariat,—the conquest of power by the masses.

Socialism cannot conquer without the masses. But, equally, there is no Socialism without the mass struggle of the proletariat,—and this mass struggle is repudiated by the moderates.

Proletarian dictatorship implies a recognition of the mass character of the struggles of the working class,—of mass action. It accepts parliamentary political action in order to arouse the masses, but rejects the idea of using the bourgeois state to introduce Socialism. Proletarian dictatorship is the unifying concept of revolutionary Socialism.

The Socialist Party must rally the masses for the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism. In order to accomplish this, it must reject its petty bourgeois policy, revolutionize itself, develop a consistent and aggressive policy. That is the task of the Left Wing: Conquer the Party for revolutionary Socialism and then rally the masses for the struggle against Capitalism,—the means being mass action and proletarian dictatorship, in their immediate and ultimate implications.

An Appeal to the Workers of the Allies

By G. Chicherin

People's Commissar on Foreign Affairs of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

(Translated by W. J. SIDS)

WE call to the workers of the Allied countries to bring pressure to bear on their governments not to crush and stifle the Russian revolution. At the time the armies of the Allies and the White Guard, supported by the Allied governments, began the attack on the Russian Soviet Government, they stated that it was necessary in the interests of France, and it was declared to be a blow at Germany. However, even at that time of the war those armies operated rather like allies of Germany. Though they were fighting separately from the German forces, their enemy was the same: the Russian revolution. The attack of the Allied forces prevented the Russian revolution from defending itself against the incoming German soldiers, and even took away the strength necessary for protecting the revolution from invasion.

These warring powers, which, in the course of the world war, shed the blood of many millions of proletarians in order to annihilate each other, together attacked the revolution of the Russian workers and peasants. From that day when the German people freed themselves from the yoke of the Kaiser and consented to an unconditional surrender to the conquerors, the war of the Allies on Russia could no longer be called a war against Germany. Therefore, the hirelings of the capitalist press have been busy piling up the most abominable accusations against the Russian revolution.

But if even German Imperialism had to fall, the masses of the people understood that it served the interests of the enslavers of the masses; and the military power of the entente nations will be too weak to dest-

roy the revolution, for the general awakening of the masses of the workers and soldiers will not permit them to come out in the role of executioner of freedom for the destruction of revolution.

In Bessarabia and Ukraine these armies have refused to become the unthinking instruments of oppression. In London and Paris the workers have also come out against the suppression of Russian freedom.

Workers of the Allied countries, do not believe your governments. They are deceiving you. Though they are sending no more troops to Russia, they are continuing the blockade.

They have established a regime of the most unbridled reaction in Poland, and, under their orders, the Polish working masses are being shot down. Your governments are supporting the Boyar (Junker) government in Rumania, and are making it possible for the military party in Finland to establish itself into a government.

Poles, Rumanians, Finns, Germans,—the reactionaries, the monarchists of Southern Russia and Siberia, living in wealth and luxury,—that is who is conducting a desperate struggle against Soviet Russia, cut off from the grain regions, deprived of the most necessary

provisions, and suffering from the torments of famine and unemployment.

The Allied governments call the Russian revolution the work of the dregs of humanity. They shamelessly declare that "these culprits must be summarily dealt with," and at the same time declare that they have abandoned all intention of intervention.

They wish to make the workers of their countries believe that they are hurrying aid to Russia in its misfortune by sending food. They would be willing send their regiments against us, were they assured that the soldiers would not refuse to obey. They do not spare materials or ammunition in trying to help the most savage reaction and the most terrible monarchists and exploiters in their struggle against the revolution of the workers and peasants of Russia.

And these governments still wish to make us believe in their sincerity and they do not reveal their perfidy to the workers of their countries.

Workers of the entente nations! The workers and peasants of Russia will not lay down their arms while the enemy is not driven from their territory. They are not afraid of any sacrifices, they will bear the pangs of hunger and want with unshaken bravery, and they ask you not to weaken the pressure on your governments until you make them abstain from any direct or indirect attempt at attacking the Russian revolution.

Make your governments stop their infernal game and treacherous attempts. Let them not crush the freedom of the Russian workers and peasants.

The Crisis—Capitalism in Collapse

By B. G.

THE censorship during the war directed its efforts to presenting in a rosy light the terrible situation in Europe. Every attempt to pierce through the lies to the facts and indicate the approaching catastrophe was mercilessly suppressed by a war government. No wonder, then, now that war is over, the capitalists of the United States are becoming alarmed. It seemed sufficient to them that Germany sign the peace treaty of the Allies, and again there would begin, as of old, the struggle between the capitalists of different nations for the markets of the world. The only difference they conceived was that Germany would be eliminated from the competitors, would not be a serious interfering factor in the struggle between the capitalists of France, England, Italy, Japan and the United States. The dread of being forced out of the world's markets haunted the American capitalists; and as soon as the armistice was signed, Europe was flooded by an army of American capitalists and financiers eager to "study conditions" and prepare for the future.

What these American financiers and capitalists saw in Europe was not exactly what they had expected. The war has so dislocated the industrial life of Europe, that it will not be able to become "normal" again without the aid of the United States. This aspect of the problem was recently considered in a speech by Frank A. Vanderlip, head of the National City Bank, a nerve-centre of American Imperialism. Mr. Vanderlip, who just returned from Europe and spoke before the plutocratic Economic Club, began by pointing out that his pessimism is based on facts secured while in Europe. He was all over Europe, met the ministers of finance of almost every European country and other public men, and his facts and observations are undeniable.

The essence of Mr. Vanderlip's speech, which is worthy of analysis, may be summarized thus: "We must save Europe from a catastrophe, otherwise we may reach us." The factors producing this catastrophe, according to this American financier, are three: 1) financial disorganization; 2) dislocation of transport; 3) the labor problem.

The war has produced a larger output of printing machinery, and this machinery is working feverishly producing paper currency. The result is that even such a powerful country, financially, as Great Britain has one-and-one-half milliards of paper currency against the 28 million pounds of sterling in gold. In other words, Britain has 54 credit-paper bonds for every pound sterling in gold (about five dollars.) In France the amount of paper currency during the war increased from 6 milliard francs to 36 milliards, that is, 6 times as much. The circumstance that the paper bonds are not guaranteed by a sufficient amount of gold tender results in depreciation of the value of money. European money is falling heavily in value on the world's stock exchanges. The influence of this depreciation is felt particularly in foreign trade transactions, when a franc or pound sterling does not circulate according to its nominal value but on the basis of a fluctuating rate of exchange.

There is no hope that Europe can exist without foreign trade. Europe needs machinery to start production and food products to feed the people, all of which is at this moment available only outside of

Europe. Even as concerns bread Europe cannot get along on its own supply. Rumania, which before the war exported a million bushels of wheat, now can scarcely feed its own people. The area of cultivated land in Poland has decreased one third; there are no horses or domestic cattle. People are taking the place of field horses in tilling the soil. There is a terrible scarcity of seeds.

But even if all the necessary products should come from other side of the ocean, they would scarcely get beyond the ports, since all the transportation systems are demoralized. There are not sufficient locomotives, wagons and horses to move merchandise from the railway stations to the interior of the country. The neces-

The Yellow Streak

DIFFERENCES of opinion and outlook do not make some persons "red" and others "yellow." But it becomes pardonable to characterize that Socialism as "yellow" which uses the name and language of Socialism in assaults upon the revolutionary proletariat. It is an attribute of "Yellow Socialism" also to intensify its own eminent respectability by outdoing the regular capitalist editors in reviling the Socialism which looks to proletarian mass assertion for its results, not to liberalistic intercession.

The Chicago *Herald and Examiner* of June 3rd carried an interview with Seymour Stedman, member of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, in connection with alleged bomb explosions. "I am very, very glad we expelled the extreme radicals of the Left Wing from the Socialist Party a week ago. Their attitude and their actions bring disrepute upon all Socialists who believe in orderly political action and are opposed to violence. . . . There are a great many foreigners in the Left Wing who do not understand our political machinery or our political and economic methods. Some of them I do not trust at all. They are not citizens, they cannot vote, and their ideas of what action to take are not our ideas at all. . . . I am very sure these things have not been done by any true Socialists of the type with which I am associated."

Making all due reservation for inaccuracy of quotation, the fact that Stedman would choose such an occasion for furnishing the capitalist press with the foregoing copy, and with a disavowal of Bolshevism, constitutes a cowardly, dastardly attack on many thousands whom Stedman has heretofore greeted as "comrades." There is the repeated innuendo that these alleged bomb explosions might be related to the activities of the Left Wing—not to "real Socialists" of the Stedman variety.

This is the yellow streak with a vengeance. It out-bergers Berger. Stedman must be presumed to know the gulf between Marxian Socialism and individualistic Anarchism; between the tactic of terrorism and the tactic of mass action. Either his ignorance is abysmal, or his cowardice. Let him make the choice.

sary materials must be obtained outside Europe, and only then can Europe get on its feet again. All this would be but half the trouble, if there had not occurred a sharp change in the disposition of large masses of the people. War has lowered the people's morale. This is particularly true in Belgium, where during the four and a half years of the war a considerable part of the population was forced to go idle. In Belgium alone 800,000 men receive allowances from the unemployment fund.

And the situation is no better in England. There a million workers receive allowances from the unemployment fund. "In England, in accordance with the data of the capitalists, there is a minority, from ten to fifteen per cent of the population, which says that the right of private property must be abolished. This minority stands for Communism. Such an easily combustible material can be found in all countries. Leave these social elements without defense, leave them idle and hungry, and the result will be such a social break up which may become a plague, a source of contamination."

Unemployment in Italy is so great that the government is afraid to demobilize the army, not knowing where to find work for those it may discharge. And in neutral countries the situation is far from being normal. Take Spain, for example, where Bolshevism has secured such a footing that it dictates the policy of the Spanish government and the political attitude of different papers.

In short, the whole of Europe is a seething volcano, which may at any moment sweep the fiery lava of revolution over Europe and the world. Unemployment and hunger may "bring into action such forces as will prove more destructive and devastating than the war." And Mr. Vanderlip is right. The war has opened the eyes of even the most backward workers. What benefit is it if the wages rose twice and even thrice, if this means all the same a half-starved existence and large unemployment?

These are the facts. Shall we wonder, then, that the workers attempt to reconstruct modern society on entirely new foundations?

In order to stave off the ever growing revolutionary movement, Mr. Vanderlip proposes that the American capitalists should go to the help of their European brethren, open unlimited credits, demanding no guarantees and disregarding the hope of receiving payment in the near future. Only in this way, according to the financier, will the American capitalists save the European capitalists—and themselves.

It is doubtful if the American capitalists will prove sufficiently farsighted and adopt Mr. Vanderlip's proposal. But even this proposal would not save the situation. The "10-15% of the discontented, the Communists, are coming, as a matter of fact, to comprise the majority of the people. On no account will they allow the former social structure, with its ruthless exploitation, slavery and misery, to be restored. Degeneration, starvation, misery and destruction are inevitable accompaniments of Capitalism. The Socialist prophecy that the war would signalize the end of Capitalism seems being realized. To Communism—the world and the future!

The N. E. C. Declaration of Party Principles

A Criticism

THE session of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party which tried to split the Party, adopted a declaration which opens:

In order to dispel all possible misunderstanding, which recent insidious agitation within our ranks is endeavoring to create between the party membership and its National Executive Committee, the latter takes this occasion to summarize briefly its views of the party's attitude on the main questions which at this time engage the attention of the Socialist movement at home and abroad.

In these hypocritical terms, Morris Hillquit (who submitted the draft of the declaration), offers his insight into "the party's attitude." He knows and every one knows that what follows is his own jugglery with the crucial issues upon which the party membership has been officially denied the chance to express its attitude. The N. E. C. policy of evasion and suppression has been finally ferreted out by the Left Wing victory—and the repudiated N. E. C., under Hillquit's dictation, now tells us "the party's attitude"!

Through all its collective expressions in recent years, and particularly by its declarations at the St. Louis Emergency Convention, the Socialist Party of the United States has aligned itself with the most advanced portion of the international Socialist movement, and the National Executive Committee has faithfully endeavored at all times to voice this position.

Here, then, is the thematic opening of the declaration of principles—or lack of principles. Behold the St. Louis abrupt answer, and what more can you ask? Let us make abrupt answer:

The St. Louis platform was adopted April 1917. It is now June 1919.

The N. E. C. never did the least thing to develop the implications of the St. Louis platform. Perhaps there was not much to be done; perhaps the cost would have been all out of proportion to the achievement. The situation was most difficult. But the party officialdom could have maintained a solemnly insistent silence.

The highest claim to be made by the N. E. C. is that out of the eight members in attendance at the August 1918 meeting, four prevailed upon four others not to insist upon a record vote on the anti-war stand,—these four who wanted to repudiate the declaration against the war being now four out of the seven who have expelled 40,000 revolutionary comrades from the party.

The platform of last Summer put the party on the basis of the Interallied Conference: pro-war on terms of the Wilson program; in favor of Socialist communication across the fighting lines if the German labor spokesmen would first admit defeat and guilt—all a pale imitation of approved jingo etiquette.

Hillquit and Stedman were leaders in the People's Council; in fact the whole People's Council business was semi-officially the affair of the Socialist Party. The People's Council policy was a policy of the worst petty bourgeois pacifism, urging a Wilsonian peace—exactly the same as Gompers' National Alliance. It wanted to reform the peace, just as it now wants to reform militarism generally.

An anti-war declaration was not of itself a declaration of revolutionary Socialism. Even the Zimmerwald and Kienthal Conferences, out of which came the voice of oppositional Socialism during the war, were analyzed at the recent Moscow Congress of the Communist International as made of confused elements. To be anti-war was not to be part of "the most advanced portion of the international Socialist movement." The Independent Labor Party, the French *Minoritaires*, the German Independents—these and other were boldly critical of their own Imperialism. They gave voice also to the war-weary revival of pacifism. The revolutionary Socialist position was the clear call to the class war against the imperialist war.

The vitality of the St. Louis platform consists, first, of its promulgation in April 1917, second, in staunch insistence upon its terms, in speech and action, by individual Socialists. The N. E. C. is conspicuously out of the reckoning in calculating the credit, the very high credit, which goes with the party stand on the war. Indeed, when its most conspicuous member came into the courtroom on this platform, he made a caricature of it and of the convention which adopted it.

Finally, as to this "most advanced" stand of the party, the Congressional platform issued by this same Committee last Summer, far from voicing an advanced Socialist position, is not a Socialist platform at all. Its "most advanced" sentences were lifted outright from Sidney Webb's British Labor Party Program—which has since exploded of its own gaseousness.

* * *

1. The Socialist Party at all times consistently and uncompromisingly opposed the war. Now that the war is over, the party strenuously objects to the imperialist features of the alleged peace treaty drawn up at Paris,

and to the reactionary alliance of capitalist governments masquerading as a League of Nations. It demands the immediate repeal of all repressive war legislation, complete amnesty for all political prisoners, and restoration of full peace-time civil liberties.

Now isn't it clever to call the Paris treaty an "alleged" peace treaty? Very clever. We must be indignant. Socialists could not expect anything so wicked from Wilson-Lloyd George-Clemenceau-Orlando-Mikado Democracy!

And the League of Nations! How shocking! "Demanded" in the platform written by this same N. E. C. last August—under camouflage of "Confederation of Peoples," with labor representation (Gompers as well anybody else, so far as appears from this "demand"). Of course last Summer it was not to be anticipated that these democratic plenipotentiaries would get together for any purpose except to destroy finance-Imperialism and militarism—and autocracy! So note now, our innocent surprise!

In this predicament, "imperialistic features of the alleged peace treaty," "reactionary alliance of capitalist governments"—we "demand"—what? Repeal the Espionage Law, free our prisoners! There you have the world statesmanship of Hillquit et al., self-appointed trustees of the American Socialist Party!

And we must not overlook the "restoration of full peace-time civil liberties." Class war? The N. E. C. never heard of it! We have a very nice Constitution; we have never had laws nor prosecutions against working-class propaganda; we have no flood of new laws against real Socialist agitation. It was all a war emergency, and now that the war is ended let our "liberties," be restored. What a joy to read the plain, honest sentences of the Manifesto of the Communist International, after the sickening diet of these Hillquitian sophistries, evasions, hypocrisies.

* * *

2. It supports wholeheartedly the Soviet Republic of Russia and the Communist government of Hungary, and vigorously protests against intervention in those countries on the part of the government of the United States by military means.

Indeed, the party membership does respond wholeheartedly to the struggles and successes of our comrades of Russia and Hungary. The party does protest against intervention. But if we may presume to read "the party's attitude," in comparison with that of the N. E. C., it is that we shall make ourselves one with the fighting armies of the world Social-Revolution, in so far as we may; not merely that we shall voice an empty "support" and "protest". Yet there is virtue and great value in the clear statement of our attitude and relation to the fighting groups of Europe. And has the N. E. C., these past years, given voice to the party response to the world-sweeping proletarian revolution? The further clauses of this statement are all the citations needed.

But first, Committeeman Krafft demanded that he be recorded as voting against clause 2! His government had the power to make war, and after his government acted there was nothing left for him but acquiescence—and he did not intend to trap himself into jail by protesting the Russian intervention!

* * *

3. In Germany, Austria and countries similarly situated, its sympathies are with more advanced Socialist groups in their efforts to force their governments into a more radical and immediate realization of the Socialist program.

"The more advanced Socialist groups"—what a clumsy, paltry dodging of the issue. But the side-stepping results in a tumble; it is a sympathy with Socialist groups who want to force "their governments" into a more immediate realization of the Socialist program. In plain terms, the N. E. C. stands with the Socialists of Europe who stand with their capitalist governments, trusting, however, that these governments will be so radical as to introduce some government ownership of natural monopolies and some pensions. The N. E. C. has not yet heard of the Socialist groups which insist that "the realization of the Socialist program" means, in the first instance, the conquest of power by the proletariat.

* * *

The next clause, the most important, shows how completely unprincipled is this statement of principles.

4. It recognizes the necessity of reorganizing the Socialist International along more harmonious and radical lines. The Socialist Party of United States is not committed to the Berne Conference, which has shown itself retrograde on many vital points and totally devoid of creative force. On account of the isolation of Russia, and the misunderstanding arising therefrom, it also is not affiliated with the Communist Congress of Moscow. The National Executive Committee believes that the international of the future must consist of organiz-

ations that are committed against imperialist wars. It should be the aim of the Socialist Party of America to stimulate and hasten the reunion of all radical and vital forces of Socialist and labor in all countries.

Behold the American International to which all must aspire—and to which all who are radical, may come! We had suspected that the Communist International represented the "most advanced" position of the international Socialist movement. But we have been in error. It is the American International which is most advanced, and our Bolshevik comrades have simply misunderstood! The "isolation" explanation was a Shiplacoff amendment to the Hillquit version. An isolation which has not precluded us from knowing exactly the program and purposes of the Communist International—and which has not precluded the Bolsheviks from discriminating between the official American Party and "the elements of the Left Wing of the American Socialist Party."

As to the Berne Conference, the N. E. C., upon an emergency justification, itself selected three delegates to represent the party. There was protest against this action at the time. But it is unnecessary now to realize minutely the situation of last January. The delegates were refused passports. Later O'Neal went abroad as special representative to the Bureau of the Second International, to secure information—and with dues in his pocket for the Second International! Long before O'Neal started for Europe, the repudiation of the resurrected Second International at Berne by the parties of Italy, Switzerland, Serbia, Rumania, Norway, Denmark and the Left Wing Socialists of Sweden was known. The issue was already clearly and sharply defined as a choice between the two internationals—between the International of social-patriotism and social reform and the International of social revolution. Not until May 29th, 1919, the day of the discussion of this "clause 4" at Chicago, did the N. E. C. interpret its own action as not committing the American party to the Berne Conference.

Very well. On May 29th we have the assurance that we are not committed to the Berne Conference, that the infamy of which compels our opportunists to hedge against their own previous indecision. Does the N. E. C. then go on to draw the implication against further association with the Second International, and definite commitment of the party to the Third International? Not at all. We must have unity—unity between the Socialism which seeks to reform capitalism, in multifarious aspects, and the Socialism now in the midst of the world struggle for the overthrow of imperialistic Capitalism!

Note also O'Neal's contribution to this maze of wordy nothingness. "The International of the future must consist of organizations that are committed against imperialistic wars." A most awkward attempt, again, to capitalize the St. Louis platform as an eternal claim to "most advanced" Socialism. As if any Socialist party, at any time would recognize its support of war as "imperialistic." The German Social-Democracy supported the Hohenzollern regime against the Russian barbarism; and the American pro-war Socialists supported the Wilsonian hypocrisy in behalf of Russian freedom. And so on. The war stand is but one test of Socialist internationalism, and a mighty crucial one at that. But the reversion to nationalism in 1914, as evidenced by Socialist support of the various nationalistic war claims, was not really a reversion; it was only the tearing away of a veil of phrases from the true character of the Socialist International of the Second International. The Socialist International exists no longer as an occasional talkfest of clever parliamentarians, calling themselves representatives of the proletariat. The Socialist International lives today as a fighting army. Outside the Communist International there are only different aspects of "Socialist" servitude to imperialist democracy.

Consider this anti-war test of Socialist purity as the pronouncement of Krafft, Goebel, Hogan and Holt! How these Socialist "internationalists" winced under the castigation of "social patriots," which was finally eliminated from the document! What hypocrisy, what pretense!

* * *

5. In the field of domestic policies the Socialist Party is utterly opposed to the narrow spirit and policies of the American Federation of Labor as voiced by its reactionary leadership. It wages no war on the rank and file of the Federation, and will loyally support its active struggle against the employing class as heretofore, but the party will omit no opportunity to point out to the workers of the A. F. of L. the inadequacy of the latter's policies and leadership.

This statement was carefully combed for any word or phrase that might appear offensive to the A. F. of L. It condemns Gompers and Morrison, and a few others, and coquettes with the A. F. of L. in the same ridiculous fashion as during the past two decades.

The Hillquit draft carried no suggestion of the fundamental discrepancies of craft unionism in antagonism

(Continued on page seven)

Industrial Unionism in Canada

THE background of the general strike in Winnipeg, Toronto and other cities of Canada is an intensive agitation in the old unions for industrial unionism vividly pictured as a campaign for the One Big Union.

That this agitation is producing results is evident. But it is just the beginning of things, a preparation for larger action.

At the Western Labor Conference, (a bolt from the regular convention of the unions of Canada) to discuss the adoption of the industrial union form of organization, a Central Executive Committee was elected to carry on the work, temporarily. In a declaration recently issued, this committee says:

"It appears that many opponents, who *know better*, and other workers who are honest but do not know, think that by Industrial Organization we shall throw the workers together promiscuously without regard for the industry; bottle washers, boiler makers and musicians, for instance. Such a contention is ridiculous on the face of it. *Craft organization is according to craft, i. e., painter, plumber, machinist, sheet metal worker, etc.* INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION MUST BE ACCORDING TO INDUSTRY, i. e., SHIPBUILDING, BUILDING TRADES, MINING, TRANSPORTATION, PUBLIC SERVICE (Civic Employees). These will be subdivided according to trades, necessarily, but will discuss together all common questions, and vote and act on them together.

"Do you see the difference?"

"Instead of one trade acting, or coming out on strike, by itself, it will and can only act, together with other trades of the same industry."

"When we DO write a constitution for the new Industrial Organization, it must be drafted upon the lines of industry as they at present exist, and to that extent workers will be organized according to their association in the product of their joint labor, and not by the "craft" they follow. The "craft" (the work of the "skilled workman") is being wiped out by the machine.

"Industrial Organization is an advance upon the old and now obsolete "craft" form, because it places the workers in a position whereby they can function effectively in defense—and for such concessions that market conditions will allow.

"One Big Union of the workers would be impracticable unless cast in the same mould as the industrial system in which we live and work.

"If we are prepared, as members of the working class, to recognize each other as comrades of one body, of one class, then the next logical step is to so organize as to place our forces in the same relation to employers as they are to us."

Stanley Frost, writing in the *New York Tribune*, presents an interesting picture of the O. B. U. movement in Canada. Writing from Winnipeg, June 5, Frost says (remember, this appears in a capitalist paper):

The One Big Union is frankly revolutionary. Its speakers, its resolutions and its press all proclaim the fact. What it does not frankly say is that it aims to introduce into America the Soviet idea, to seize the power that is now held by the government and put it in the hands of committees of workers only. It is the old idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of which we have heard so much from Russia—it is Bolshevism by a new name.

Watch the Winnipeg developments. There was a demand for collective bargaining of a kind that would permit the paralyzing of a whole city, province or nation at the demand of a single shop force. But when the strike leaders were asked whether they would stop the strike if the principle of "collective bargaining"

The One Big Union in Action

were granted they refused. They wanted the strike, anyway. So it came.

They took particular pains to call out the police, the firemen, the postmen and all civil servants, in a deliberate effort to paralyze the government. The strike committee then assumed control, issued orders for policing, for sanitation, for the distribution of food. It tried to be the government and it boasted that it was. For a few hours Winnipeg had the Soviet idea—Bolshevism—in full force.

The government struck back at its deserting employees and the strikers called for sympathetic strikes in other cities in defence of the civil employees. Thus the whole fight was made, by the strikers themselves, on the right of labor to paralyze the government—on its right to start a revolution.

None of this is denied even yet by the strike leaders. They do deny that this was to be permanent, and claim that their Soviet was intended to function only during the emergency of the strike. But the principle for which they were fighting is the power to install a Soviet at any time. And the "One Big Union Bulletin," the organ of the new Bolshevism, naturally defends the Russian Revolution. It said on April 18:

"The Russian revolution was the most free from trouble of any in the world. So it is in Germany to-day; the so-called atrocities of the Spartacides are mere press fabrications. The working class took control of Hungary without any trouble."

The things that the One Big Union leaders openly advocate are revolutionary. When the Federation of Labor of British Columbia voted for the "O. B. U." principle it adopted resolutions which say in part:

"RESOLVED, That this convention lay down as its future policy the building up of an organization on industrial lines for the purpose of enforcing, by virtue of their industrial strength, such demands as such organizations may at any time consider necessary for their continued maintenance and wellbeing, and shall not be as heretofore for the purpose of attempting to persuade legislative assemblies to amend, add to or take from the existing statutes allegedly called labor laws."

The resolution further demanded a five-hour working day, the "equal division of profits," and the appointment of a "central revolutionary committee."

The plan is very cleverly outlined in the "One Big Union Bulletin," and the resemblance to the I. W. W. programme and the Bolshevist doctrines stands out in almost every line. Here is the organization, its purposes and the methods it advocates, as set forth by its own advocates:

"The principle upon which industrial unionism takes its stand is the recognition of the never ending struggle between the employers of labor and the working class. . . . It must educate its membership to a complete understanding of the principles and causes underlying every struggle between the two opposing classes. . . . This self-imposed drill, discipline and education will be the methods of the O. B. U. . . ."

"In short, the Industrial Union is bent upon forming one grand united working class organization and doing away with all the divisions that weaken the solidarity of the workers in the struggles to better their conditions. . . ."

"Revolutionary industrial unionism—that is, the proposition that all wage workers come together on "organization according to industry"; the grouping of the workers in each of the big divisions of industry as a whole into local, national and international industrial unions, all to be interlocked, dovetailed, welded into One Big Union

for all wage workers; a big union bent on aggressively forging ahead and compelling shorter hours, more wages and better conditions in and out of the workshop, and as each advance is made holding on grimly to the fresh gain with the determination to push still further forward—gaining strength from each victory and learning by every temporary setback—until the working class is able to take possession and control of the machinery, premises and materials of production right from the capitalists' hands, and use that control to distribute the product entirely among the workers. . . ."

"Revolutionary industrial unionism embraces every individual, unit, section, branch and department of industry. It takes in every creed, color and nation. From Scandinavia to New Zealand, from Moscow to Vancouver, it appears to every worker and forges a mighty weapon of freedom." And here are a few of the working principles as laid down:

"Right never did prevail and never will without the aid of might.

"Existence is a perpetual struggle; the weak go to the wall. It isn't the few who go to the wall, but the weak.

"The greatest power in the world is the power to produce, but it "cuts no ice" except when it is withheld.

"What would happen if labor withheld its power to produce?"

"Capitalists, priests, politicians, press hirelings, thugs, sluggers, hangmen, policemen and all creeping and crawling things that suck the blood of the common working man would die of starvation.

"The New Morality says:

"Damn interest!

"Damn profits!

"Damn rent!

"Damn agreements!"

So much for the O. B. U. idea and purposes. This is the thing that is growing daily in strength just across our border, and as one of its leaders pointed out, "there are twenty-three railway lines crossing the border—and some roads."

The agitation along these lines has been going on in the Northwest on both sides of the border, for the last four or five years, but the One Big Union as such is brand new, and sprang from what was practically a bolt from the Trade and Labor Congress of Canada three months ago.

The bolter held a convention of their own in Calgary, and it became plain that they had with them only the more radical element of the Western section of organized labor. A committee was appointed to draw up a platform, which is to be submitted to another convention within a few days. The names of the committeemen show the geography of the movement so far: V. R. Midgeley, Vancouver, the biggest man apparent in the movement at present; A. Pritchard, Vancouver; R. J. Johns, Winnipeg; Joe Knight, Edmonton, and J. Naylor, Cumberland, B. C.

The movement is making a bitter fight against the old-line labor organizations, charging that they have sold out to the employers, that they hold the men back from seizing advantages when they could do so by breaking agreements, that they spend great sums in useless officials, and that they are generally "archaic."

This is the One Big Union.

It has set out to beat the government, the old labor organizations, and the public, and it has made progress at all three aims.

Its leaders have the Russian revolution in mind.

They have in mind also the invasion of the United States.

The I. W. W. Convention

of uniformed theorizing, instead of in terms of its actual functioning. And, on the other hand, those who think they can dispose of the I. W. W. by sweeping aside the theorizing of these writers, miss whole vitality of the I. W. W. as a living force in the American labor movement.

Meanwhile the Convention, oblivious of the vagaries of its own theorists, calmly votes the general strike not alone for the 6-hour day and 5-day week, and for abolition of all piece work, but also proposes the general and intermittent strike for freeing political prisoners, for free speech, free press and free assembly, for abolition of all fee-paying employment offices, and for withdrawal of troops from Russia.

The prevalent fallacy in the discussions of Socialism versus the I. W. W.—and this works both ways—is the glib assumption that the I. W. W. is the organized expression of a creed of I. H. H. -ism. The truth of the matter is that the I. W. W. is a new departure in unionism, responsive to an advanced stage of Cap-

italism, and of pioneer instinct and calibre. It is the unionism of the common level of labor which comes with the advance of the machine process. Roughly speaking, it is the unionism of unskilled labor. Inherent in this unionism is proletarian class consciousness and the proletarian mass instincts. It is the array of the workers, as a mass, against the industry, as an impersonalized system.

This Convention re-affirmed, in a ringing declaration, the world-known Preamble of the I. W. W. But class-consciousness is implicit, not in the declarations of the I. W. W., nor yet in its form of organization, but in the fight made on a mass basis by proletarians who have no craft-privilege to intrench or to contract about. And there need be no fear that the I. W. W. will become respectabilized by successes in terms of hours and wages and working conditions. Imperialistic, militarized Capitalism is daily stimulating a revolutionary response even in the old trade unionism, let alone lulling the I. W. W. into amiable conservatism.

(Continued from page 8)

not raised any theoretical controversy within the I. W. W., as in the Socialist Party. There is a warm response to the revolutionists, as by messages of greeting to the Soviet governments of Russia and Hungary—and to the Sinn Feiners. It was decided to send a representative to the Communist International, upon official invitation. And there is distinct aversion to anything coming out of the Berne Conference. But these things are instinctive, not arising from any reasoned association of I. W. W. theories with the theoretical descriptions of the European revolutions.

Those who are so near-sightedly insistent upon the anti-political character of the I. W. W. make their arguments entirely upon the basis of texts taken from the editorial spokesmen of the I. W. W. All of these weighty answers to I. W. W. writers, who happen to be young men more endowed with honest organization enthusiasm than with the acumen of scientific research, are beside the point. These I. W. W. writers need to be called to task for interpreting the I. W. W. in terms

The Left Wing Manifesto and Program

By Louis C. Fraina

II

Moderate "Socialism"

HAVING indicated the collapse of the dominant moderate Socialism, of the Second International, upon the declaration of war on August 4, 1914, and during the war, the Left Wing Manifesto proceeds to trace the development of moderate "Socialism."

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Social-Democracies of Europe set out to "legislate Capitalism out of office." The class struggle was to be won in the capitalist legislatures. Step by step concessions were to be wrested from the state; the working class and the Socialist Parties were to be strengthened by means of "constructive" reform and social legislation. . . . No more were the parliaments used as platforms from which the challenge of revolutionary Socialism was flung to all the corners of Europe. Another era had set in, the era of "constructive" social reform legislation. Dominant moderate Socialism accepted the bourgeois state as the basis of its action and *strengthened* that state. . . . The goal became "constructive reforms" and cabinet portfolios—the cooperation of classes," the policy of openly or tacitly declaring that the coming of Socialism was a concern "of all the classes," instead of emphasizing the Marxian policy that the construction of the Socialist system is the task of the revolutionary proletariat alone. "Moderate Socialism" accepted the bourgeois state; and through its leaders was now ready to share responsibility with the bourgeoisie in the control of the capitalist state, even to the extent of defending the bourgeoisie against the working class—as in the first Briand ministry in France, when the official party press was opened to a defense of the shooting of striking railway workers at the order of the "Socialist"-bourgeois coalition cabinet.

It is absolutely necessary to clearly understand the differences between moderate Socialism and revolutionary Socialism in order to understand the development of contemporary Socialism. All the issues in dispute are simply manifestations of one central issue—the castration of fundamental Socialism by that moderate, petty bourgeois "Socialism" which everywhere is actually or potentially counter-revolutionary.

Socialism appears upon the stage of events as a revolutionary movement. It appears as a revolutionary movement, not out of the consciousness of Marx, but out of the compulsion of life itself. Socialism was conceived as a class movement of the revolutionary proletariat, as the most consistent and resolute expression of the working class movement for emancipation.

Considering itself as the expression of the mass movement of the proletariat, Socialism necessarily was affected by the prevailing social conditions. After the Franco-Prussian War and the collapse of the first International, social conditions determined organized Socialism as a *movement* of the aristocracy of labor (skilled workers) organized in the trades unions, and the middle class. In other words, Socialism in action developed into a petty bourgeois liberal reform movement, with nationalism as an inevitable accompaniment.

The emergence of this new movement was characterized by the formation of the Social-Democratic Party in Germany,—the unity of the Eisenachers and the Lassalleans. These factions were unified and the party organized on the basis of the Gotha Program. In this unity, fundamental revolutionary Socialism was abandoned, the Gotha Program being mercilessly criticized by Marx, particularly in its conception of the state as the means for proletarian emancipation. This Program evaded completely the revolutionary task of the conquest of power, of that fundamental problem which Marx, in his Criticism of the Gotha Program, characterized as follows: "Between the capitalist society and the communistic, lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds to a political transition period, in which the state cannot be anything else than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." Evading the actual

problems of the Revolution, Socialism developed into a peaceful movement of organization, of trades union struggles, of parliamentary action, of conceiving legislation and the bourgeois state as the means of introducing Socialism.

The period 1875-1900 was a period of feverish industrial expansion on the basis of the national state. In this period there was a joint movement which affected the ideology and the practice of the Socialist movement; on the one hand, the organization of the skilled workers into trades unions, which secured certain concessions and became a privileged caste; and, on the other, the decay of the industrial middle class, crushed by the iron tread of industrial concentration. As one moved upwards and the other downwards, they met, formed a juncture, and united in a struggle to use the state to improve their conditions. This necessarily meant the use of a political party; and in Europe the party chosen was the party of Socialism, upon which the trades unions and the middle class imposed a petty bourgeois policy of reform legislation and State Capitalism.

The ideal of this middle class crushed under the iron tread of industrial concentration was state ownership and control of the large aggregations of capital, of the trusts. Unable to wield real economic power, the middle class tried through state beneficence, by means of legislative measures, to crush trust capital and reassert its independence. This policy was doomed to disaster, since industrial concentration, being an economic necessity of Capitalism itself, could not be prevented by the state.

The aristocracy of labor, having secured concessions and a privileged status because of its skill, was equally menaced by this industrial concentration, which expropriated the skilled workers of their skill. These privileged workers menaced by industrial development combined with the middle class to secure legislative measures of reform on the basis of Capitalism.

Out of this unity of the aristocracy of labor, the privileged unions, and the middle class, the small producers, arose the general campaign for legislative reforms and for State Capitalism. The dominant organized Socialism became the expression of this bourgeois policy, abandoning fundamental Socialism and the revolutionary class struggle. Bourgeois liberal ideals were absorbed by the Socialist spokesmen and became, largely, the official Socialist policy, with parliamentarism the means of struggle.

This development meant, obviously, the abandonment of fundamental Socialism. It meant working on the basis of the bourgeois parliamentary state, instead of destroying that state; it meant the "co-operation of classes" for State Capitalism instead of the uncompromising proletarian class struggle for Socialism. Instead of the revolutionary theory of the necessity of conquering Capitalism, the official practice now was that of *modifying* Capitalism gradually, of a peaceful "growing into" Socialism on the basis of legislative reforms,—in the words of Jaures, "we shall carry on our reform work to a complete transformation of the existing order."

But instead of modifying or transforming the existing order of Capitalism, the legislative reform policy of the dominant moderate Socialism *strengthened* Capitalism. Out of this fact, and out of the fact that concentrated capital was mobilizing the typical proletariat of unskilled labor, developed mass movements

against parliamentarism and the dominant Socialism.

Syndicalism was a departure from Marxism, theoretically unsound, although its life-impulse was a factor of prime importance, becoming a distorted expression because of the opposition of parliamentary Socialism. But the Left Wing theory of mass action and the American concept of industrial unionism were in absolute accord with Marxian Socialism,—a tactical supplementary to Marxism.

The struggle against the dominant Socialism became a struggle against its perversion of parliamentarism, against its petty bourgeois conception of the state. Industrial unionism and mass action equally realized the necessity of dynamic extra-parliamentary action in order to wage the immediate struggle of the proletariat and ultimately realize the Social Revolution. There was another fundamental point of agreement—the necessity of weakening the bourgeois parliamentary state, of destroying it in order to realize Socialism. The experience of the revolutionary proletariat in Russia and Germany, abundantly confirms, while supplementing, this theory of revolutionary Socialism.

The clash between the dominant moderate Socialism and revolutionary Socialism, accordingly, developed into this: moderate Socialism emphasized the necessity of legislative activity, of using the bourgeois parliamentary state to realize Socialism; revolutionary Socialism rejected legislative measures as a means of realizing Socialism, considered parliamentary action as simply a means of agitation, emphasized that the parliamentary political state should be weakened and finally overthrown by means of revolutionary industrial and mass action in order to realize Socialism. The one was petty bourgeois and moderate; the other proletarian and revolutionary.

Revolutionary Socialism emphasized that the policy of parliamentary reform promoted State Capitalism, and that State Capitalism was directly counter-revolutionary; moderate Socialism maintained that every extension of the functions of the state, of state ownership or control of industry was a "step toward" Socialism. Imperialism solved the controversy, unanswerably, by making State Capitalism the mechanism of Imperialism.

Imperialism develops out of the concentration of industry and the domination of industry by finance-capital—the unity of industrial and bank capital. Imperialism requires the centralized state, capable of unifying the forces of capital, of maintaining the discontented class groups in subjection, of mobilizing the whole national power in the international struggles of Imperialism. *State Capitalism is the particular form of expression of Imperialism*,—the final stage of Capitalism. What the parliamentary policy of the dominant moderate Socialism accomplished was to strengthen the capitalist state, to promote State Capitalism, and, accordingly, to strengthen Imperialism!

The dominant moderate Socialism, expressing the middle class and the aristocracy of labor (two groups which are aggrandized by Imperialism and converted into consciously counter-revolutionary agents) developed into the existing system of Imperialism. Upon the declaration of war, accordingly, this dominant moderate "Socialism" accepted the war and the policy of the imperialistic governments, betrayed the proletariat and revolutionary Socialism. Moderate Socialism is a traitor to Socialism and a betrayer of the proletariat in war and in peace, and particularly during the Revolution. Moderate Socialism is the expression of the national liberal movement, which is fundamentally reactionary, the movement in theory of the middle class and the aristocracy of labor, which have been bribed by Imperialism into nationalism and reaction. It is the worst enemy of the militant proletariat and Socialism.

The N. E. C. Declaration of Party Principles

(Continued from page 5.)

with imperialistic Capitalism, and by insistence of Committeeman Hogan the following sentence was added:

It will continue to agitate in favor of the industrialization of all national and international unions, striving always to have the closely related crafts united in the various industries, and finally, all industries in a confederation which co-operating with the political power will effect the transition from economic autocracy to industrial democracy.

Which is, at any rate, a nice, sonorous sentence. But there is no question of Hogan's sincerity in adding his amendment. Only it is a principle of words, not of action. If the party is to "continue" an agitation for the confederation of unions, on the industrial basis, and for common union and political action, this agitation must some time ago have begun. We are not aware of it. Nor did Hogan or anyone else give the least indication of a first step toward this consummation, in terms of something actually to be done.

On the contrary, practically all of the majority committeemen scoffed at the idea of a political party having anything to do with industrial unions, except to say a kind word about it. The adoption of Hogan's amendment, which was sincerely offered and certainly looks in the right direction, was rank hypocrisy on the part of the others.

* * *

6. Certain abuses have recently crept into some locals of the party due to an over-valuation of the importance of practical politics within the economy of the Socialist movement. These abuses must be corrected wherever possible, and Socialist politics restored to the position of an instrument of propaganda and large-scale constructive working class action. But the political activities of American Socialism must neither be abandoned nor emasculated. The Socialist Party is and remains essentially a political party, and is concerned with the whole political life of the nation, just as it is with its economic problems and movements.

Words, words, words!

And Stedman—who approves this statement—pines

for a whole Socialist Party like Milwaukee! Therefore moves the expulsion of the Michigan states organization, as too purely of a propaganda character!

Think of this N. E. C. protesting against the emasculation of the political activities of American Socialism! And need we recall how our politician-Socialists have functioned in public office during the past two years?

"Large-scale constructive working class action"—what more could anybody ask? Massive phraseology, indeed. It satisfies all the reasonable requirements of the vocal organism.

"The whole political life of the nation" and also the "economic problems"! . . . And this is the party of the class struggle, the party which is concerned precisely with the overthrow of the whole political life of the private property system. This is the party which calls the proletariat into action against the political domination of capital, the party of the class war and the Social Revolution. And this is its declaration of principles!

The I. W. W. Convention

By I. E. Ferguson

HOW is the I. W. W. really getting along? Has the I. W. W. lost its nerve and become conservative? After the terrific onslaughts of the past three years, is it still an organization? Or nothing more than a bogey for capitalistic propaganda? Will the I. W. W. persist as a real organization, or become merged as an idea in the general labor movement of the United States? . . . There have been rumors and rumors, questions and challenges, judgments and prophecies. Let the Convention now answer.

The Eleventh Annual Convention (with some gaps since 1905), was held May 5th to 16th at Chicago. Since 1916 a national convention of the I. W. W. has been impossible. The governmental, press and ku-klux attacks worked havoc with the organization efforts of many years. Raids, trials, official stealing of supplies from persons, from the offices, and especially from the mails; conscription, deportation, wholesale herding of members into bull pens without charges, imprisonment under the most severe penalties of the experienced officials and organizers, lynchings and murders,—the expectation would be that no organization could survive such a siege with a shred of solidity. Or rather, make a showing in the midst of the siege.

The Convention opened quietly. The Chicago papers had whipped themselves into the usual hysteria. In spite of the staunchness of Mayor Short of Sioux City, the Agricultural Workers Convention had been raided, the delegates scattered, and the minutes seized. Just a week before the Metal Miners had been forbidden public meeting in Salt Lake City. They held their convention privately, using numbers instead of names in the minutes, to guard against the blacklist. The Chicago police chief made the usual threats. The City Council was spurred into passing a resolution against permitting the Convention. But Mayor Thompson remained silent. The Convention took its way. The ku-kluxing was confined to the rooms of some of the delegates; it was disavowed by the city police and federal authorities.

The dominant theme of the Convention was the conflict between organizing for legal defense and organizing for industrial unionism. The argument may be summarized in this fashion: The I. W. W. has become too much an organization for the defense of its members in the courts. This has stopped the organization of industrial unions. We must get back to our real business, let the courts do what they will. First the Espionage Law, and now the "criminal syndicalism" statutes—there is no end to these prosecutions. If we allow ourselves to throw all our energies into legal defense, we cannot organize unions—and our only real defense is outside the courtroom. It is economic, not legal.

On the ninth day the question came up directly: shall we make legal defense? This was the one session which broke away from the driving economy of the eleven days. The Convention was a business affair. There was crisp talking, quick action, no speech-making. But each delegate was asked to take the floor on roll call to express his ideas about legal defense. Some were absolutely opposed to legal defense as useless, a waste of funds, and a diversion from organization work. Many were opposed to legal defense for themselves, but preferred to let others make their choice according to the actual circumstances as they arose. The "silent defense" at Sacramento had made its marked impression. Though agreeing in principle, others cautioned that an absolute rule against legal defense would be unfair and a discouragement to those active in organization work. To wait for a revolution to take a man out, meanwhile leaving him without organization support, would be ungrateful. Also, it would destroy incentive to work. Economic defense is best, but we have not yet any general control of economic power. Legal defense, it was further argued, is very good propaganda.

A letter was read from Haywood, dealing mainly with this question. A few sentences are quoted: "Those who are manning the ship now know the course she started on, and if we expect to make port, here is what we must sail by: 'An injury to one is an injury to all.' I repeat this now to prevail upon the delegates to take no action that will prevent a complete defense for any member who

is unfortunate enough to be enmeshed in courts under the influence of Capitalism. . . . Why not review the defense, the many defenses the I. W. W. has made and ponder a moment; consider the magnificent results; remember, every fight made has counted for organization. . . . Are you going to say that the court is one battlefield upon which we will not fight?" The letter instanced some of the most striking cases and their results, the Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone defense, the Ettor, Giovanitti and Caruso case, and some others, and concluded with a plea for a defense for every indicted member.

The upshot of the discussion was to leave the question to the decision of the members, on referendum. A vote against legal defense will become effective ten days after the referendum, except as to those already under indictment.

But there was a general sentiment against giving indicted men, or those out on bonds, control of the organization. It was voted to discontinue all publications which dealt with personal testimony at the trials. With few exceptions the names of indicted men were kept off the party ballots, even Haywood getting few votes as nominee on the referendum for the editorship of *The New Solidarity*. (Later, provision was made

for employment of Haywood on the road for the *One Big Union Monthly*, and for general organization help.)

The defense work was separated from organization work, and made subordinate. The sharpest contest of the Convention came on the proposal to bar all indicted men from party offices. The Resolutions Committee split even on this question, one not voting. The final vote was by roll call, with the resolution defeated by a fairly narrow margin.

Closely related to the above, a two-year limit of continuous office holding was voted, except as to editors. This rule against successive terms in office was explained as intended "to drive them back to the masters in order to retain the proletarian psychology. As long as they are insecure they will fight. Office-holding tends toward conservatism and to the building up of a machine. This rule will develop executives, instead of forcing us to grab up inexperienced men in emergencies."

This jealousy of the officialdom hardly seems warranted when we learn that the pay for the highest office in the I. W. W. is \$4 per day. There is the suggestion that the many jailings left the organization temporarily rudderless, and this is to be avoided by a wider diffusion of responsibility and control. The fundamental idea is to have the men on the job rule the organization; to avoid official cliques.

Many constitutional changes were made on this basis. In fact, the entire constitution was rewritten. Delegates to the national convention must be elected from those on the job, the officials being barred as delegates, or simply allowed voice without vote. This was a gathering of about fifty men direct from the job, and there was constant insistence on the main issue, organization on the job. The Convention went on record against workers councils at this time; also against propaganda organizations within the I. W. W. organization, both being considered as diverting energy from the main purpose.

Another evidence of the determination to build real industrial unions was the hostility shown toward the General Recruiting Union. This union has served as a sort of clearing house for new members, where there is no industrial union branch established. By lax administration recruiting charters have been granted; also members have not taken transfers out of the recruiting branches after shifting their occupations. Provision was made for enforced transfers, and for limitation of recruiting charters. Also the "universal delegate system" was adopted, calling for universal credentials, whereby any "job delegate" can initiate new members directly into the appropriate industrial union, no matter what union the delegate himself belongs to.

The existence of three separate unions of transport workers was criticized as contrary to the basic principles of the I. W. W. and in some other instances the question was raised as to when an industrial union is really an industrial union. As to the transport workers, the Convention ordered that the three divisions hold a special conference and get together. It may be added that there appears to be a prospect for the formation of an International Marine Transport Workers Industrial Union.

That there is virile new blood in the I. W. W. is indicated by the change from a three-years to a two-years qualification for office. One of the most conspicuous figures in the I. W. W. at this time, and one of the three whose names are on the referendum for General Secretary, is A. S. Embree, the general of the recent Butte strike—a two-years member. The other nominees of the Convention are Thos. Whitehead, Acting General Secretary, and R. V. Lewins, another of the forceful new figures in the organization.

The revolutionary wave in Europe has brought its response within the I. W. W., several new branches having already been formed among the Russians, Ukrainians, Finns, Hungarians and Chinese. Organization is also going on among a half dozen other foreign-language groups, aided by several new papers. But reluctance to organize is reported among those who consider their residence here temporary, planning to return to proletarian governed lands "where democracy is not a scrap of paper but a real thing."

But the proletarian revolutions abroad have

The Most Important Book of the Year—Just Out!

The Proletarian Revolution in Russia

By N. Lenin and Leon Trotzky

Edited, with an Introduction, Notes and Supplementary Chapters

By Louis C. Fraina

This unique book traces the course of the great Russian Revolution from March 1917 to October 1918, in the words of the two masters of the Revolution.

It consists of a mass of articles and pamphlets written during the Revolution, covering every important phase of the Revolution, arranged to make a consecutive story.

CONTENTS: Part One—The First Stage of the Revolution, by N. Lenin (March 12 to May 18). Part Two—The General Program of the Bolsheviks, by N. Lenin (tactics, program and general policy). Part Three—The Struggle for State Power, by N. Lenin and Leon Trotzky (May 18 to the "uprising" of July 16-17). Part Four—The Revolution in Crisis, by Leon Trotzky (written at the end of August, analyzing the Bolshevik defeat in July, the Moscow Conference and the problems of the future). Part Five—The Proletarian Revolution Conquers, by Louis C. Fraina (September to January—the coup d'état of November 7, the Constituent Assembly; includes articles of Lenin and Trotzky and documents). Part Six—The Revolutionary Struggle for Peace, by Leon Trotzky and N. Lenin (December to Brest-Litovsk). Part Seven—The Soviet Republic and its Problems, by N. Lenin (May, 1918). Supplementary—Foreign Relations (July to October, 1918; Lenin, Trotzky and Chicherin).

477 Pages—More than 200,000 Words.
Paper Cover, \$1.00; Library Edition, Cloth, \$1.50.

The Social Revolution in Germany

By Louis C. Fraina

A fundamental study of the great struggle in Germany, which is at the same time a study in revolutionary Socialism. Indispensable to an understanding of the character of the European Revolution. Including two articles by Karl Liebknecht and Franz Mehring. Popular, Comprehensive, Incisive.

112 Pages; 25c a Copy.

Revolutionary Socialism

By Louis C. Fraina

What is Bolshevism, this "left wing" Socialism which is shaking Capitalism? This book provides a thorough analysis of the concepts and program of revolutionary Socialism. It considers Socialism and the War, Imperialism, Socialism in Action, the Death of Democracy, the collapse of the dominant Socialism upon the declaration of war, Socialist Readjustment, Class and Nation, Problems of State Capitalism, Unionism and Mass Action, and Proletarian Dictatorship.

Sen Katayama, the Japanese Socialist, declares this book the finest interpretation of the new development in International Socialism.

258 Pages; 75c a Copy.

Address all orders

THE REVOLUTIONARY AGE

885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

(Continued on page 6)