

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of International Events

Vol. I, No. 36

Saturday, June 21, 1919

Price 3 Cents

Workers' Control of Industry

THERE is a counter-revolutionary magazine, *Struggling Russia* (which is financed by American banks with Russian money), carrying on a very large campaign of advertising against the Workmen's and Peasants' Republic of Russia. This magazine insists that Bolshevism is "the central world problem."

The conscious capitalist press is now stressing this aspect of Bolshevism. They now recognize that it is not a problem of pro-German agents, of mass murder, of chaos in Russia; nor simply a Russian problem—it is the central world problem of Socialism against Capitalism.

The determining factor in international events is not that Germany has been crushed, or that a number of small nations have emerged to "independence," or that the world is being divided territorially and financially. The determining factor is that out of all this, out of the war and the collapse of Capitalism, has emerged the definite proletarian struggle for Socialism. This struggle for Socialism is no longer a theory isolated in action; it is now a fact of life itself, the most vital problem for Capitalism and the proletariat.

In meeting the problem, Capitalism is fighting for its very existence. And it is unscrupulous in its use of methods. The workers of Russia initiated this world struggle for Socialism; and so international Capitalism, represented by the Allies, concentrates its attack upon the workers of Russia as the resolute defenders of the interests of the workers of the world. Starvation, counter-revolutionary plots, assassination, invasion and terror,—all these means are used in a desperate struggle to crush Socialist Russia.

The apologists of Capitalism try to complicate the problem. They try to make it difficult for the workers to understand.

But the problem is very simple. It is not a problem of democracy, or of communizing women, or of mass murder, or of any of the lies spread so feverishly by the bourgeois press and other agents of Capitalism. The crux of the "Russian problem" is simply this: *workers' control of industry.*

Let us for a moment consider the purpose of the Soviet Government. The political power of Capitalism (and its ally, the nobility) has been crushed. The workers have conquered political power. *The workers are using this power to crush the industrial power of the capitalists,—giving the land to the peasants and the factories to the workers.* A capitalist republic (such as prevails in our own country) recognizes the "rights" of capital as supreme: the whole social system is based upon the supremacy of capital. The Soviet Republic, which is a republic of the masses of the people, recognizes the rights of the workers alone. The basis of the Soviet Republic is workers' control of industry,—industrial democracy. Slowly, painfully, in spite of starvation and alien invasion, the Russian masses are crushing the power of capital, freeing the workers from the tyranny and the exploitation of capital, and constructing a new society of communist labor and fraternity, of workers' control of industry, in which labor shall work for the peace and happiness of the people, and not for the profit of the capitalists.

The Russian revolutionary masses are introducing Socialism. This fact is against the interests of Capitalism, since if Socialism proves a success in Russia the workers of the world will struggle for a similar objective. Capitalism, accordingly, mobilizes against the Socialist workers of Russia in order to crush the workers of the world.

What is Capitalism? Capitalism is a social system based upon private property, upon the private ownership of industry by the capitalists. The workers are deprived of industrial property; they must secure a job in order to live, and these jobs are dispensed by the capitalist owners of industry. The owner of industry is out to make profits; he employs the workers simply in order that they shall produce profits for him. The wages of the workers do not represent all the values produced by their labor; the employers appropriate part of these values, a *surplus value* over and above the value represented in the wages, which becomes the profit of the capitalist class. In other words, the workers are robbed of a portion of the fruits of their labor, out of which booty the capitalists acquire wealth and power.

Capitalist industry, moreover, is an autocracy. Starting with the small employer, up to the great masters of finance, the capitalist class absolutely controls industry.

This autocratic control of industry culminates in the absolute control of the industrial life of the nation—and of the world—exercised by finance-capital, by the great banks and industrial monopolists, by an insignificant minority of the people.

The workers have no say in the management of industry under this industrial autocracy. They have no vote in the management of production, or in the disposal of the goods they produce. They must accept the decisions of the industrial autocrats. They may ease their bondage a bit here and there, by means of

Rush Your Seconds!

Resolved, by the Joint Meeting of the branches of Local Cuyahoga County, (Cleveland), having an average of 1821 members in good standing for the year 1918, that we initiate the following referendum motions, to be submitted to the party membership of the United States:

Resolved, that the act of the National Executive Committee in expelling from the Socialist Party of Michigan from the Socialist Party of the United States, a state with 6,000 members, without giving the state a trial or even a hearing in its own defense, is hereby rescinded and annulled and the Socialist Party of Michigan restored to all the rights and privileges of membership in the Socialist Party of the United States.

Resolved, that the action of the National Executive Committee of the Party in arbitrarily suspending the Russian, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Lettish, Polish, South Slavic and Hungarian Federations from the Party is hereby rescinded and annulled.

Resolved, that the action of the majority of the National Executive Committee, which is largely composed of candidates for re-election in the referendum just closed, in holding up and refusing to tabulate the vote on Referendum B and C, for the election of the National Executive Committee, International Delegates and International Secretary, and calling a National Convention, is hereby rescinded and the national secretary instructed to immediately tabulate the vote and to declare the candidates receiving the highest number of votes elected, in accordance with the National Party Constitution.

Resolved, that the action of the National Executive Committee in preparing to place the property of the Socialist Party in the hands of a Board of Directors, three to be elected for three years, three for six years and three for nine years; these directors not being subject to recall by either the National Executive Committee or the membership of the Party, be reversed and rescinded.

unions; but this slight advantage is offset by the increasing power and tyranny of capital.

Under this system, the workers do not work to live, they live to work. They live to produce wealth and power and pleasure for the masters of industry.

This industrial autocracy of capital controls the government. It controls the press. It controls the schools. It controls because these industrial autocrats have the wealth, and wealth under Capitalism means power. This industrial autocracy is able to purchase the services of a mercenary army of intellectuals, educators, politicians and journalists, whose task it is to deceive the masses and promote the supremacy of Capitalism. Democracy in government becomes a fraud under a system where industrial autocracy prevails.

Out of the industrial autocracy of Capitalism comes the misery and oppression of the workers, wars and all the evils that afflict humanity. Out of this system develops the class struggle of the proletariat to overthrow Capitalism.

As a contrast to this terrible system, the Soviet Republic of Russia looms as an oasis in the desert, as the Promised Land of working class emancipation.

First of all, the government of Soviet Russia is a *working class government*. The capitalists are excluded from participation in this government, since the class interests of the capitalists compel them to exploit the workers; and the Soviet Government is a government of the workers. Where a capitalist government uses its power against the workers and for the capitalists, the Soviet government uses its power against the capitalists and for the workers.

The purpose of the Soviet government is to break the power of the capitalists, and develop the conditions for the introduction of Socialism.

Socialism, in the theory of Marx and the practice

of Soviet Russia, means workers' control of industry. How does this work?

In proletarian Russia, the factories are put in the control of the workers. The system of control starts at the bottom, *with the workers*, not with a bureaucratic state, or politicians, or capitalists. Every factory elects a Factory Committee, from among the workers and the technical staff, which is supreme within the factory. Where the capitalist owner has not been eliminated (in many cases he is temporarily retained as a manager) he is subject absolutely, in all his actions, to the control of the Factory Committee, which regulates the purchase and sale of products, factory conditions, wages, hours, etc.

But one factory is not independent of any other factory,—production is a complicated process that requires centralized management. The various factory committees in a particular locality, accordingly, elect representatives to a Lower Workmen's Council of Control, which regulates the relations of factory to factory in a particular district. These various Councils of Control are centralized into an All-Russian Superior Council of Control, which unifies factory production in all the country. The central organ of industrial control is the Supreme Council of National Economy, which unifies the Workmen's Organs of Control, the peasants' committees of management, and the Soviet Government. In this way are unified production, distribution, wages and conditions of labor.

This is the basis of industrial democracy, of workers' control of industry. All these committees and councils of control *are elected from the bottom up, by the workers*, who are industrial citizens and use the *industrial vote* to control the management of production.

It is on the basis of this workers' control of industry—the end of capitalist industrial autocracy and the profit-power of the capitalists—that the workers and peasants of Russia are constructing a new society.

The "central world problem of Bolshevism," accordingly, is a simple workmen's proposition. It is within the comprehension of every man and woman who works for a living in shop, mill or mine; easily comprehended, in spite of the distortions of a mercenary press. The "central world problem of Bolshevism" means simply the determination of the proletariat to crush the industrial autocracy of Capitalism and introduce the industrial democracy of Socialism,—workers' control of industry.

The Soviet Government itself, which is of a political character while elected industrially by the workers in the factories and the peasants in the fields, is a *temporary* affair. It serves two purposes: 1) to crush the political power and the resistance of the capitalists, Russian or alien; and 2) to develop the conditions for the construction of a *new* industrial government. When the introduction of Socialism in Russia (and the world) is completed, then the Soviet Government, the dictatorship of the proletariat, will disappear, having accomplished its purpose; then the only government which will remain (which is not a government in the old sense) will be the industrial administration comprised in the management and regulation of production for the workers. This final "government" is now being constructed by the Soviet Republic, through the Factory Committees, the Workmen's Councils of Control and the Supreme Council of National Economy.

It is a simple proposition, this workers' control of industry; but it means the end of Capitalism. That is why Capitalism, predatory, reactionary, brutal, represented by the Allies, is determined to crush the Soviet Republic.

This means to crush everywhere the developing proletarian movement for workers' control of industry,—which alone can bring peace, liberty and happiness to the workers.

Capitalism means oppression, misery and degradation for the workers. The democracy of Capitalism (limited to politics) is a fraud, a means for the oppression of the workers. Capitalism and its democracy mean want, unemployment, starvation wages, oppression for the workers; and wealth, ease and luxury for the capitalists.

Industrial democracy, workers' control of industry, means the world for the workers, peace, liberty, happiness.

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of International Events

LOUIS C. FRAINA Editor

Contributing Editors

JOHN REED SEN KATAYAMA
N. I. HOURWICH 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

Aggression Against Mexico

CONDITIONS are being developed which may mean American intervention in Mexico. International capital, particularly American finance-capital, is using all its resources to bring about a state of affairs providing the pretext for intervention.

It is the oil wells of Mexico, particularly, and its other natural resources generally, which are beckoning foreign capital to the conquest of this devastated country.

The Peace Conference has said, in so many words, that Mexico is legitimate prey. Its recognition of the American Monroe Doctrine—an imperialistic doctrine for the aggrandizement of United States capital on the American continents—indicated the general policy; and the exclusion of Mexico from membership in the League of Nations is proof positive of the intention.

Counter-revolutionary generals are financed by banks; bandits in Mexico are supplied with funds and munitions,—all in order to create that "anarchy" which will then become the pretext for intervention,—to make Mexico safe for democracy and preserve civilization!

Workers will do the fighting. Workers will do the dying. Capital will reap the profits. War against Mexico is equally war against our own workers. This is the new world promised out of the war,—a world of deprecation and oppression.

And what else did you expect? All expectations of progress and peace and liberty from Capitalism are illusions. Capitalism is predatory; Capitalism is oppression. Capitalism and Imperialism can assure only war and plunder and oppression. International revolutionary Socialism must become the proletarian answer to this international menace.

Expel the Party!

THE National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, overwhelmingly repudiated in the elections for a new N. E. C., is preparing new expulsions.

At the State Convention of the Party in Massachusetts, which adopted the Left Wing Manifesto and Program, a group of delegates seceded, led by two lawyers. They telegraphed Executive Secretary Gerner, who thereupon telegraphed the N. E. C. members one of whom, James Oneal, thereupon made this motion:

"That the National Secretary secure documentary evidence, in such exists, of repudiation of party policy in Massachusetts, if obtained the National Secretary shall recognize that organization which supports the policy and principles formulated in national convention and by referendum."

Power to expel 6,000 members of the Party, accordingly, is placed in the hands of *one man*, the National Secretary. Two reactionary "Socialists," George H. Goebel and James F. Carey, *both of whom were pro-war*; came to Boston, looked around, and went right home again. Massachusetts has no use for moderates.

The State Committee of Illinois—the citadel of reaction in the Party seems to be the hold-over Executive Committee, elected a long time ago—is out with "constitutional" casuistry to set aside a completed revolution in the Chicago organization,—as if "constitutional" (mis) interpretation would affect the convictions of the revolutionary membership.

The State Committee orders a new county conference, with the seven suspended Federations eliminated, and with limitation to delegates who have been party members two years and one year in the local. Under the conditions of rapid change in the party membership, especially in Chicago, this is a perfect scheme for arranging a nice little conference of a small group of

old-timers who were repudiated completely by the Conference of May 17-18, now declared illegal.

The Left Wing elements of Chicago are not worried about this Tammany manoeuvre, and are against participation in the "rump" conference. This probably means more expulsions.

But since the bulk of the Party is now Left Wing, the moderates must soon expel the whole party. Let them! They'll have a nice batch of expulsion orders, and revolutionary Socialism will have the Party.

Bulwark of Reaction

THE dominant fact emerging out of the convention of the American Federation of Labor is the apparent conclusion of "a temporary partnership between organized labor and the employing element for the suppression of Bolshevism, to accomplish which the former is conceded to be the best equipped." This is the declaration in a news story by Louis Seibold, appearing in the *New York World* of June 16.

This is not at all surprising,—except, perhaps, to the yellow Socialist who all these years has been buttressing the A. F. of L. as a misleader of labor. Two of these yellows—J. Mahlon Barnes and Max S. Hayes—are at the convention, still pursuing their miserable role of equivocation. . . .

The A. F. of L. started as a movement to smash the old Knights of Labor, which in that day was a radical organization. It developed as a craft union organization of the worst sort, actually splitting up labor instead of uniting it. In all its years of supremacy, the A. F. of L. officially through its bureaucracy was the ally of Capitalism against Socialism and against militant labor, supporting Capitalism often while labor was engaged in a death struggle against the employing class. The A. F. of L. was an organization of "labor leaders," whom Mark Hanna designated as his "labor lieutenants." These labor lieutenants of the capitalist class, together with the aristocracy of labor, aspired to petty bourgeois ease and status; and in the pursuit of this object made their offensive and defensive pact with Capitalism. The symbol of this pact was the National Civic Federation, where Samuel Gompers and other misleaders of labor wine and dined with the capitalist oppressors of the workers.

Out of this policy developed the A. F. of L. support of the reactionary war, the "labor leaders" accomplishing excellent service not alone in mobilizing labor for the war, but in preventing labor making "excessive" wage demands while the capitalists were making fabulous profits and hundreds of new millionaires created.

The social condition behind this co-operation of the A. F. of L. and Capitalism is comprised in "organized labor" consisting largely of the skilled workers, who dominate the other unions of unskilled labor, while the bulk of the proletariat is unorganized. The skilled workers occupy a sort of privileged status; they have been corrupted by Imperialism and receive a "share" in the spoils of Imperialism; in return for which "organized labor" protects Capitalism and crushes the revolutionary movements of the proletariat. This is the social condition, equally, that produces the savage war waged by the A. F. of L. upon the I. W. W., which represents the militant proletariat of unskilled labor.

The *World* states that the A. F. of L. "is conceded to be the best equipped" for waging the struggle against Bolshevism. Why? Bolshevism, that is to say, revolutionary Socialism, makes its appeal to labor, and capital must use "labor" in order to wage a successful campaign against Socialism. In the name of labor, accordingly, the A. F. of L. strikes at the heart of labor and protects Capitalism. Capitalism in the United States, class conscious and alert, is using "labor" to fight militant labor and maintain the supremacy of Capitalism.—precisely as was done in Russia, as is being done in Germany and England. Trades unionism everywhere, the aristocracy of labor, is corrupted by Imperialism, betrays the bulk of the proletariat to Capitalism.

It is the task of revolutionary Socialism to crush this "labor" bulwark of reaction, by co-operating with the militant elements of the A. F. of L. in the construction of a new labor movement of revolutionary industrial unionism.

The Labor Movement in Japan

By SEN KATAYAMA

A fine story of the militant Labor Movement in Japan, by a pioneer of Japanese Socialism. Indispensable to the International Socialist.

Cloth—\$1.00 a copy

THE REVOLUTIONARY AGE
885 Washington Street
Boston, Mass.

The Russian Offensive

THE Allies are still at their miserable business of "making peace" while waging war against Soviet Russia,—a war that constitutes aggression against the peace and liberty of the world.

In Paris, the Peace Conference has "recognized" the "Russian Government" of the Czarist Admiral Kolchak.

In New York City, the offices of the Soviet Representative Martens have been raided and all paper seized, while Washington teems with rumors of deportation.

These two facts occurring almost simultaneously indicate a new offensive against the workers of Russia and equally against the workers of the world.

Soviet representative Martens, according to the bourgeois "law of nations," is covered by diplomatic immunity, even if not recognized. But the Allies apparently, decided to prevent German violation of the "law of nations" only in order that they might freely violate it themselves.

There is dispute whether the Allies have actually "recognized" Kolchak as a government. But that is immaterial: the fact is that *the Allies have now put in an official form the aid and co-operation they have rendered the reactionary forces of Admiral Kolchak* in their war against the people of Russia. The Allies, in fact, "recognized" the Czarist gangster Kolchak months ago, by providing him with moral encouragement, with arms, munitions, food, money. The Allies have been waging war against Soviet Russia since November 7, 1917.

Who is this Kolchak? What is his government? In March 1913, the British Government decided to create a "Provisional Government" in Siberia, with Admiral Kolchak at its head, as the only dependable "strong" man in sight. There was an experiment with a "democratic government" at Archangel, but old man Tchailkovsky could not "deliver the goods." The Allies accordingly, centred their support upon the reactionary "government" of Kolchak, which they organized and financed, while informing the world that it was the government of the "Russian people"!

Admiral Kolchak is a monarchist, a believer in "strong government." The Allies made a bluff of exacting "democratic guarantees" from Kolchak, but were met with the Admiral's determination to first crush the Bolsheviki, establish a strong autocratic government, imprison democracy, and then—call a Constituent Assembly!

The "government" of Kolchak would have been easily crushed by the Russian people if it had not been for the Allies. It is the Allies who are waging the counter-revolutionary war against the Russian worker and peasant. The "recognition" of the Kolchak "government" comes at the moment that the "great offensive" of the counter-revolution had collapsed, when the Soviet troops had re-captured Ufa, when it appeared as if the Kolchak government was finally to be crushed. The Allies to the rescue!

But this new offensive against Soviet Russia comes, equally, at a moment when the masses of the Allies are about to protest. Italy and France are aflame with strikes; and there is an intensive agitation for a political mass strike against intervention in Russia, a protest strike which its originators hope to produce in Italy, France and England simultaneously.

Moreover, the "recognition" of Kolchak, that murderer of the people, comes at the moment when the revolutionary proletariat of Norway has decided to break the blockade of Russia, and accepted the Communist International.

This "recognition" comes, again, at the moment that the Soviet troops are conquering, when new revolutionary troops are being mobilized, preparing to make their juncture with the troops of Soviet Hungary.

In the United States, in spite of the reactionary A. F. of L. convention, the proletarian masses are against intervention, are developing a more intense sympathy for the cause of Soviet Russia, which is the cause of the workers of the world.

Soviet Russia has completely exposed the miserable "ideals" of the Allies. It has demonstrated that the Allies represent reaction, that they are strangling the peace and liberty of the peoples of the world. It is for the proletariat to capitalize this demonstration. It is for the proletariat, the natural ally of Soviet Russia, to accept the task of preventing the strangling of the Russian Revolution. The system represented by the Allies, the system of Capitalism and Imperialism, is not simply the enemy of the workers of Russia; it is the enemy of the workers of the world. Peace and liberty cannot prevail as long as this system prevails.

It is the revolutionary task of the international proletariat to break the offensive of international Capitalism against Soviet Russia, which is an offensive against the peace and liberty of the workers of the world.

Clear the Decks!

IV

In his article, "The Socialist Task and Outlook," in the *Call* of May 21, Morris Hillquit admits that the Second International broke down,—although he repudiates the Third Communist International. His final, in fact, is to re-constitute the old International! In speaking of the collapse of the International Hillquit says:

It was the economic organization of the European workers, and the pressure of immediate economic interests (as understood by them) that broke the solidarity of the Socialist International. . . . It was not parliamentarism that was primarily responsible for the mischief. . . . The organized labor movement . . . was a movement for the benefit of the better-situated strata of labor—the skilled workers.

This appears as an acceptance of the revolutionary Socialist analysis, until it is considered in itself and together with the conclusion.

The "labor movement" was not really a labor movement at all, but a caste movement of the skilled workers. The demands of this movement were moderate. It has occupied a sort of privileged position.

Always moderate, this "labor movement" with the advent of Imperialism, became directly counter-revolutionary. Imperialism requires a "satisfied" working class, in order to develop that "national unity" requisite in the struggles of international Imperialism. This "labor movement"—the skilled workers—were given a "share" in the profits of Imperialism; in return for which it had to support the government and accept social-Imperialism. This meant that the "labor movement" had to use its organized power and prestige to maintain the overwhelming mass of the workers, the industrial proletariat of unskilled labor, in subjection.

Out of this circumstance developed a *class struggle within the working class*,—a development ignored by the official representatives of Socialism.

The industrial proletariat of unskilled labor constituted the potentially revolutionary class; and it was the task of Socialism to awaken, articulate and organize this class. The dominant moderate Socialism rejected this revolutionary task; it accepted the "labor movement" as its basis, and united with this movement against the revolutionary expressions of the unskilled proletariat,—as did Morris Hillquit & Co. against the I. W. W.

This "labor movement," hesitant and moderate, imposed a hesitant and moderate policy upon Socialist parliamentarism, emphasized by the fact that the dominant moderate Socialism also expressed the requirements of the "liberal" *petite bourgeoisie*.

The fundamental task of Socialism, accordingly, was to split the "labor movement" of the skilled workers and organize a new militant movement of the unskilled proletariat, the dominant factor in concentrated industry. The official moderate representatives of the International, and of the American Socialist Party, rejected this imperative task. Under the control of the moderates, our party officially has been the protector and the ally of the ultra-reactionary A. F. of L.

Hillquit dodges the issue completely. The "labor movement" was what it was. But the task of Socialism is to represent the fundamental revolutionary interests of the proletariat, to articulate and organize that proletarian class which alone is the carrier of the Revolution,—not to become the expression of reactionary "labor."

Moreover, out of this dependence upon the reactionary "labor movement" and the middle class (why does Hillquit not mention this middle class?) developed certain concepts of the dominant moderate Socialism:

1.—Socialist emphasis on parliamentarism,—accepting that "parliamentary idiocy" of which Marx speaks, that imagines parliaments decide all things and "forgets the rude outside world."

2.—Accepting the bourgeois state as the basis of Socialist action, and making Socialism a movement for State Capitalism.

3.—Becoming absorbed in the petty bourgeois national "liberal" movement, the dominant Socialism accepted nationalism and social-Imperialism.

4.—Repudiating industrial unionism and mass action, the revolutionary expression of the real proletariat of unskilled labor.

5.—Having abandoned the revolutionary task and accepted the bourgeois state as the basis of action, moderate Socialism repudiated proletarian dictatorship, which alone is capable of realizing communist Socialism.

The answer of revolutionary Socialism to this illustration of Socialism was mass action in Europe and industrial unionism in the United States, together with repudiation of the policy of petty bourgeois parliamentarism and reformism.

Hillquit now admits certain things which previously he denied. But his conclusion shows his evasion: "The first task of the post-war International must, there-

fore, be to organize and reorganize all grades and strata of labor on broad class lines, not only nationally, but internationally. Not as trade unions, nor even as mere industrial unions, but as one working class union." How? By means of "Socialist propaganda"!

This is sheer evasion. Industrial unionism implies "one working class union." To speak of "Socialist propaganda" is another evasion, since the whole issue is the character of this propaganda. We must emphasize revolutionary Socialism, fight the official A. F. of L., organize a new labor movement. This is the task of the Socialist Party, of the Left Wing that is revolutionizing the Party.

Clear the decks!

The slogan of the moderates is: Split the Party for petty bourgeois Socialism, for the "labor movement" of social-Imperialism!

The slogan of the Left Wing is: Conquer the Party for revolutionary Socialism, for the militant class struggle of the industrial proletariat!

Repudiation

THE ugliest feature of the action of the N. E. C. in trying to split the Party for moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism, is that the gentlemen responsible for the nefarious act have all been overwhelmingly repudiated by the membership in the elections for a new N. E. C., international delegates and international secretary.

The official vote has been secured from the following states: Texas, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Ohio, Colorado, Indiana, Delaware, New Jersey, Tennessee, Florida, Georgia, Rhode Island, Arkansas, Maine, Kentucky, Minnesota, Michigan, Massachusetts, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The results for international delegates are as follows:

The Left Wing

John Reed	14,006
Louis C. Fraina	11,981
A. Wagenknecht	9,061
C. E. Ruthenberg	8,981
I. E. Ferguson	6,607

The Moderates

Victor L. Berger	2,798
Adolph Germer	2,401
Seymour Stedman	2,100
A. I. Shiplacoff	1,736
J.-Louis Engdahl	1,647
Oscar Ameringer	1,584
James Oneal	1,410
Algernon Lee	1,252
John M. Work	1,142
L. B. Boudin	910

In these same states, for international secretary, the vote is: Kate Richards O'Hare, 10,627; Morris Hillquit, 3,720.

At the N. E. C. session where 40,000 revolutionary comrades of the Socialist Party were either expelled or suspended, James Oneal feelingly and sanctimoniously, spoke about "the confidence that the membership has in the N. E. C., which we cannot betray." Confidence! James Oneal, A. I. Shiplacoff, John M. Work, Seymour Stedman, and Adolph Germer were of the N. E. C. majority: look at the votes they secured for international delegates, and then measure the extraordinary "confidence" that the membership has in these saboteurs of the Party.

Frederick Krafft and George H. Goebel were also of the N. E. C. majority that sabotaged the Party. They were candidates for reelection to the N. E. C. from District Two. In this district the Left Wing candidates swept the field, the results being (the Maryland and West Virginia vote missing, but very small): C. E. Ruthenberg, 5,786; Marguerite Prevey, 4,885; Fred Harwood, 2,774. Fred Krafft received 849 votes, and George Goebel 492. In their own state of New Jersey, Goebel received 167 votes and Krafft 246; while the Left Wing candidate Harwood received 1,158 votes.

James Oneal was a candidate for re-election to the N. E. C. from District One. In three states of this district—Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Maine—Oneal received 688 votes, Morris Hillquit 838; while the Left Wing candidates received: L. C. Fraina, 3,130; N. I. Hourwich, 2,544; E. Lindgren, 1,472.

The N. E. C. speaks of "fraud," but fraud could never have been perpetrated on such a large scale as to give the Left Wing candidates the tremendous majority they have received.

The Party membership in the elections has overwhelmingly repudiated the Old Guard, the representatives of moderate petty bourgeois Socialism. That is clear. And it is just as clear that the moderates, by refusing to abide by the election results, are trying to steal the elections. Comrades, protect the integrity of the Party!

The N. E. C. Speaks

WHILE it is being repudiated by the Party for its criminal actions in trying to split the Party, the N. E. C. "justifies" itself in a declaration to the membership. The declaration is signed by James Oneal, A. I. Shiplacoff, Dan Hogan, Seymour Stedman, George H. Goebel, Fred Holt, Fred Krafft and John M. Work,—four of whom were pro-war, all of whom favored a Wilson peace, and all of whom have been overwhelmingly repudiated by the Party in the elections for a new N. E. C.

This "declaration" is a unique document. It is a tissue of lies and slander. It viciously attacks the revolutionary comrades in the Party. It sets its face as steel against the development of revolutionary Socialism in the Socialist Party. It is a document of desperate men, and of criers after the dead.

The "declaration" says: "Evidence in our possession indicates an organized and systematic attempt, of nation-wide scope, to capture the organization by fair means or foul . . . using the foreign language papers in a disgusting campaign of slander against the Party and its elected officials. The Party and its officials were helpless against this cowardly tirade as we could not know what was taking place." (Our italics.) The Left Wing organized openly to conquer the Party for revolutionary Socialism. It appealed to the membership, by means of constructive criticism and agitation. Its campaign was open. It is dishonest for the N. E. C. to limit the agitation to the language press: there is *The Revolutionary Age*, the *New York Communist*, *The Proletarian*, the *Ohio Socialist*, the *Buffalo New Age*, and other English papers that agitated for the Left Wing policy. The moderates could not succeed against the campaign, of which they were perfectly aware, because they had no arguments and were repudiated by the mass of the comrades in the Party. The "capture of the Party" is simply the party itself asserting its control against the reactionary bureaucrats.

Fair means or foul? Let the membership judge who uses the foul methods: the Left Wing uses agitation, constructive criticism, ideas; the moderates use expulsion, sabotaging referendums, strangling the will of the membership. Eight men split the Party, after being overwhelmingly repudiated by the Party: are they means fair or foul?

Fear means or foul? Let the membership judge: The N. E. C. declaration says: "If constant repetition of phrases, common action with government officials, and systematic sabotage of the Party are 'revolutionary,' then this group [the Left Wing] is correct." Can you conceive anything more foul than stigmatizing the action of the revolutionary comrades of the Left Wing as "common action with government officials"?

The Left Wing was against the "Amnesty Convention" because it considered the convention as an abandonment of the policy of the class struggle. The Left Wing agitated in favor of militant action to release our class war prisoners, in favor of the mass strike to compel the government to act; it was against "amnesty," appeals to the government of the capitalists and co-operation with reactionary bourgeois "liberals." The Left Wing maintains that only the action of revolutionary Socialism can compel the release of our imprisoned comrades. But the N. E. C. "declaration" in speaking of the Left Wing opposition to the Amnesty Conference makes this contemptible statement: "Between betrayal inside the party and suppression by government officials, our imprisoned comrades are made a sacrifice to capitalist reaction."

We urge a revolutionary policy to release our imprisoned comrades—and are accused of using "common action with government officials." We demonstrate that the petty bourgeois policy of the N. E. C. will never release the class war prisoners—and are stigmatized as "making a sacrifice of our comrades to capitalist reaction." These are the "fair" means used by the treacherous N. E. C. against the "foul" means of the Left Wing—of the Party, for the Left Wing is now the Socialist Party!

The N. E. C. "declaration" accuses the Language Federations of trying to "dominate" the Party. In another statement, the N. E. C. speaks of an American Party. The Left Wing is acting in accord with any peculiarity in American social and political conditions: its acceptance of industrial unionism, developed by the American revolutionary movement and which the N. E. C. repudiates, is proof of that. But the fundamentals of Socialism are international in scope: funds must be an international movement. The "Americanism" of the N. E. C. is simply petty bourgeois "Socialism."

The N. E. C. convicts itself. It evades all problems of revolutionary action and of fundamental Socialism. It is desperately using the most desperate and infamous means to preserve the supremacy of moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism, to wreck the Party. Comrades of the Socialist Party, act to protect your Party!

The Control of Government

By Nicholas I. Hourwich

EVERY action, whether in the press or in words, against the "constitutional order" and the "lawful authorities" of the United States is now-a-days severely punished. The prisons are filled with political prisoners, and new laws are being proposed to "preserve our government by law." Not satisfied with the number of political prisoners, the bourgeois press accuses the government of "leniency," almost of criminal favoritism, toward the "seditious elements" and demands more repressive measures and severer penalties. More than one organ of the press recommends that the "citizens" take "the law into their own hands;" which, translated into ordinary human language, means: that instead of the court law there should be a resort to Lynch Law,—burnings, hangings and depredations by mob violence.

Bourgeois justice exists and is directed against the undesirable elements of our class society,—against worker-strikers, Socialists, revolutionary agitators, against all who rise in protest at the infamy of capitalist "order" and parasitism. Bourgeois justice is chiefly directed to preventing the liberation of the working masses from exploitation, misery and oppression.

But the indignant adherents of "severe and strict justice" cease indignating as soon as the role of violators of the "lawful institutions and authorities of the land" is usurped by Capitalism. The bourgeois press in this case, forgetting its duty as the vigilant eye of "law and order," becomes the apologist of the respectable violators of "government by law," and even greets these violations with the joy characteristic of a mercenary guard.

Consider, for instance, what such a "respectable" newspaper as the New York *World*, actually an organ of the Wilson Administration, says in its editorial of June 10:

"What difference will it make in the United States whether Germany refuses to sign the treaty or the Senate refuses to ratify it? In either case the technical state of war will continue. At the worst *Wall Street* has no more to fear from the protesting German Government than from the United States Senator who insist that there shall be no treaty of peace unless they write it."

Let us, first of all, explain the issue in question. In accordance with the Constitution of the United States, which at other times the *World* defends with foam frothing at the mouth, every treaty of the United States with a foreign power can come into force only after being ratified by the Senate. The Senate, having just opened its sessions and comprising a majority of Republicans, refuses, out of purely political considerations based upon opposition to the Democratic Party administration, to ratify the peace treaty as drafted and

submitted to Germany by the "Council of Four" of the Allies.

Whatever, in this instance, happen to be the motives of the Senate majority, the very fact of its refusal to

The Communist International to the Proletarians of the World

The Third Communist International on April 3 addressed the proletarians of the world in the following circular letter, entitled "The Latest Atrocity of the Socialist Government at Berlin:"

The German Social-Democratic Government has recently perpetrated a crime. The government of Scheidemann mercilessly caused Leon Tyshko to be executed. Comrade Tyshko had represented the Polish Social-Democratic Party in the Second International. For more than thirty years Tyshko fought in the ranks of the workers for the Social-Democratic Cause. He was at the head of the heroic Polish proletariat when the first barricade was erected at Warsaw and Lodz. He spent many years in prison because he had come out for the interests of the workers. In 1906 he was sentenced to eight years at hard labor; as soon as he succeeded in escaping from captivity, he resumed his share in the struggles of the Socialists.

The Ebert revolution found him in a German jail, into which the Government of Wilhelm II had consigned him. He was one of the most unselfish combatants and an important factor in the German revolution, standing in the same rank with Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. He was one of the chief leaders of the Spartacus group and later of the German Communist Party. International Socialism had no more unselfish, more energetic comrade than Tyshko, who has now been shot by order of Scheidemann and his cohorts, who yet still dare to call themselves Socialists. Comrade Tyshko was a faithful warrior in the interests of the working classes and of communist ideas. He was executed because he was a mortal enemy of the bourgeoisie. The Communist International is convinced that the day is approaching when the working class of Germany will mete out justice to the hangmen of the Communists, to Scheidemann, Ebert and Noske.

(Signed) The President of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, Zinovieff

ratify the treaty should apparently prove sufficient to make the *World* declare the treaty null and void. A treaty is not a treaty unless ratified by the Senate, in accord with the Constitution. It would seem, therefore, that the *World* proposes making the Constitution a

scrap of paper,—certainly a defiance of "lawfully constituted authority;" and the *World*, moreover, attacks the Senate with ironic remarks to the effect *Wall Street* care very little whether or not the Senate ratifies the treaty!

This attitude of the *World* toward the Senate, of the highest institutions of the American state, in the final analysis, be explained on political considerations; the *World's* adherence to the Democratic Party and its campaign to discredit the Republican major in the Senate. But, upon closer scrutiny, the *World's* position in this case discloses a much deeper and more significant social fact than party rivalry between the Democrats and the Republicans. It appears as another demonstration of the mockery of the bourgeois-parliamentary representative form of government, which is the object of praise as a manifestation of the "higher wisdom" and "eternal justice" by the journalistic and academic mercenary guard of Capitalism, when this praise promotes its purposes.

When a "disagreement" arises between Congress or the Senate and the Socialists,—let the rebels be punished by the law. But when such a disagreement arises between the legislative organ of the government and *Wall Street*,—the attitude changes, and the slogan becomes: "To hell with the Senate! Long live *Wall Street*!"

What does all this mean? It again confirms the correctness of the revolutionary Socialist concerning the substance of bourgeois parliamentarism,—as indicated by Marx and adhered to by the Communists of to-day.

In all so-called parliamentary states, affirms the revolutionary Socialist, the actual power of government is vested in big capital—the capitalists and the banks; parliament—Congress and the Senate—that is, the "law making bodies," exist only in order to deceive the people, to oppress and exploit the people, that is, the working class; and this oppression is carried on "in the name of the people," as it were.

And so long as a legislative body performs this function, inherent in the substance of the capitalist state, the will of this legislative body is heralded as sacred, and every person who violates it as a working class measure is a "seditious person" and "blasphemer." But, as soon as the legislative body becomes suddenly capricious, or its mechanism is out of gear and refuses to work normally in the direction indicated by the capitalists,—the impertinent parliament or Congress is dissolved, its decisions are vetoed or simply completely ignored.

Parliament, or Congress, is nothing but a marionette in the hands of *Wall Street*, that is of finance capital; and it is finance-capital that actually constitutes the "government." This is the Socialist conclusion derived from the utterances of the *World*.

The Party Repudiating the N. E. C.

THE seven reactionary autocrats of the National Executive Committee, who suspended or expelled 40,000 members of the Socialist Party, in an effort to control the Party for a small clique of counter-revolutionary petty bourgeois, reckoned without their host. A blast of indignant protest is sweeping through the Party, which is determined to become revolutionary in spite of all the autocrats in the Party or out of it.

This protest was started by Local Cleveland, which initiated referendums to repudiate the N. E. C. acts. Then the Convention of the Socialist Party of Mass. repudiated the tyrannous acts of the N. E. C. seven,—four of whom were pro-war and against the St. Louis Resolution.

At the same time, the German Federation of the Socialist Party was in convention at Rochester, N. Y. A storm of protest swept the convention when the delegates were informed by a telegram from national executive committeemen Katterfeld and Wagenknecht that seven members of the N. E. C. had usurped the right and power to suspend and expel 40,000 members of the Socialist Party. Resolutions were adopted against the outrage. The German Federation adopted the Left Wing Manifesto and Program, which is the "crime" of the seven expelled Federation. Will the Savage Seven now expel the German Federation?

Local Philadelphia has adopted resolutions stigmatizing the acts of the N. E. C. as "a deliberate and treacherous assault upon the revolutionary rank and file of the Party," and concluding:

"The expulsion of nearly 50,000 members by seven men of the National Executive Committee is an exhibition of bureaucratic stupidity unparalleled even by the processes of capitalist governments.

"We, the members of Local Philadelphia in General Meeting assembled, condemn the outrage perpetrated by the N. E. C. and regard it as a challenge to the self-respect and revolutionary class consciousness of the rank and file. We, therefore, call upon every local of the party to communicate to the N. E. C. that they do not recognize their ukase against the rank and file and that they will, in their actions totally ignore the decisions of the National Executive Committee."

Local Union County (Elizabeth, N. J.) adopted a resolution, 36 against 4, to "protest and ignore the action taken by the N. E. C., and to count the so-called 'suspended' comrades as members of the Socialist Party." Local Union County emphasized its action by further adopting the following:

"Whereas, the trend of world events and the experience of the revolution in action have demonstrated the necessity for a clear cut definition of the Socialist position; and

"Whereas, the growth of opportunism and bourgeois parliamentarism within the Socialist Party has made a re-statement of the revolutionary Socialist position imperative; and,

"Whereas, the tendency of the officialdom within the party has been in contradiction with the revolution-

ary sentiments of the rank and file within the party as manifested in the St. Louis program on the war; be it therefore,

"Resolved, that the Socialist Party local delegates of Union County of the State of New Jersey, herewith endorse the Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing."

The State Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Ohio, through its Secretary, A. Wagenknecht, is carrying on a campaign of education against the traitorous "N. E. C. Seven," repudiating their miserable acts.

Local McKeesport, Pa. resolves: "That we condemn the action taken by the National Executive Committee and demand that the N. E. C. immediately re-instate the suspended organizations, and we further demand that the party membership and the party membership only, shall decide the matter of the suspension of these organizations." Local McKeesport then proceeded to adopt, unanimously, the Left Wing Manifesto and Program.

The N. E. C. has sent Otto Branstetter to "re-organize" the party in Michigan, but is meeting with no results, in spite of Adolph Germer whistling bravely to keep up his courage.

Let the party act. Let it repudiate the reactionary N. E. C. Let it realize the fruits of its conquest of the party for revolutionary Socialism. To the Left Wing—the party, the future, and Socialism!

The Character of the Russian Revolution

By Leon Trotsky

From "The Proletarian Revolution in Russia,"
by N. Lenin and Leon Trotsky

THE liberal and Social-Revolutionist-Menshevik scribes and politicians are much concerned over the question of the sociological significance of the Russian Revolution. Is it a bourgeois revolution or some other kind of a revolution? At first glance, this academic theorizing may appear somewhat enigmatical. The liberals have nothing to gain by revealing the class interests behind "their" revolution. And as for the *petit bourgeois* "Socialists," they do not, as a general rule, make use of theoretical analysis in their political activity, but rather of "common sense," which is simply another name for mediocrity and lack of principle. The fact is that the Milyukov-Dan estimate, inspired by Plekhanov, as to the bourgeois character of the Russian Revolution, contains not a single grain of theory. Neither *Yedinstvo*, nor *Retch*, nor *Den*, nor *Rabochaya Gazeta*, its head seriously affected, takes any pains to formulate what it understands by a bourgeois revolution. The intention of their manoeuvres is purely practical: to demonstrate the "right" of the bourgeois revolution to assume power. Even though the Soviets may represent the majority of the politically trained population, even though in all the democratic elections, in city and in country, the capitalist parties were swept out with éclat,—“so long as our revolution is bourgeois in character,” it is necessary to preserve the privileges of the bourgeoisie, and to assign to it in the government a role, to which it is by no means entitled by the alignment of political groups within the country. If we are to act in accordance with the principles of democratic parliamentarism, it is clear that power belongs to the Social-Revolutionists, either alone, or in conjunction with the Mensheviks. But as “our revolution is a bourgeois revolution,” the principles of democracy are suspended, and the representatives of the overwhelming majority of the people receive five seats in the ministry, while the representatives of an insignificant minority get twice as many. To Hell with democracy! Long live Plekhanov's Sociology!

“I suppose you would like to have a bourgeois revolution without the bourgeoisie?” asks Plekhanov, slyly, invoking the support of dialectics and of Engels.

“That's just it!” interposes Milyukov. We Cadets would be ready to relinquish power, which the people evidently do not wish to give us. But we cannot fly in the face of science.” And he refers to Plekhanov's “Marxism” as his authority.

Since our revolution is a bourgeois revolution, explain Plekhanov, Dan, and Potressov, we must bring about a political coalition between the toilers and their exploiters. And in the light of this Sociology, the clownish handshake of Bublikov and Tseretelli is revealed in its full historical significance.

The trouble is merely this, that the same bourgeois character of the Revolution which is now taken as a justification of the coalition between the Socialists and the capitalists, has for a number of years been taken by these very Mensheviks as leading to diametrically opposite conclusions.

Since, in a bourgeois revolution, they were wont to say, the governing power can have no other function than to safeguard the domination of the bourgeoisie, it is clear that Socialism can have nothing to do with it, its place is not in the government, but in the opposition. Plekhanov considered that Socialists could not under any conditions take part in a bourgeois government, and he savagely attacked Kautsky, whose resolution admitted certain exceptions in this connection. “Tempora leagusque mutantur”—the gentlemen of the old regime so expressed it. . . . And that appears to be the case also with the “laws” of the Plekhanov Sociology.

No matter how contradictory may be the opinions of the Mensheviks and their leader. Plekhanov, when you compare their statement before the Revolution with their statements of today, one thought does dominate both expressions, and that is, that you cannot carry out a bourgeois revolution “without the bourgeoisie.” At first blush this idea would appear to be axiomatic. But it is merely idiotic.

The history of mankind did not begin with the Moscow Conference. There were revolutions before. At the end of the 18th century there was a revolution in France, which is called, not without reason, the “Great Revolution.” It was a bourgeois revolution. In one of its phases power fell into the hands of the Jacobins, who had the support of the “Sans-culottes,” or semi-proletarian workers of the city population, and who set up between them and the Girondistes, the liberal party of the bourgeoisie, the Cadets of their day, the neat rectangle of the guillotine. It was only the dictatorship of the Jacobins that gave the French Revolution its present importance, that made it “the Great Revolution.” And yet, this dictatorship was brought about, not only without the bourgeoisie, but against its very opposition. Robespierre, to whom it was not given to acquaint himself with the Plekhanov ideas, upset all the laws of Sociology, and, instead of shaking hands

with the Girondistes, he cut off their heads. This was cruel, there is no denying it. But this cruelty did not prevent the French Revolution from becoming Great, within the limits of its bourgeois character. Marx, in whose name so many mal-practices are now perpetrated in our country, said that the “whole French terror, was simply a plebeian effort to dispose of the enemies of the bourgeoisie.” And as the same bourgeoisie was very much afraid of the same plebeian methods of disposing of the enemies of the people, the Jacobins not only deprived the bourgeoisie of power, but applied a rule of blood and iron with regard to the bourgeoisie, whenever the latter made any attempt to halt or to “moderate” the work of the Jacobins. It is apparent, therefore, that the Jacobins carried out a bourgeois revolution without the bourgeoisie.

Referring to the English Revolution of 1648, Engels wrote: “In order that the bourgeoisie might pluck all the fruits that had matured, it was necessary that the revolution should go far beyond its original aims, as was again the case in France in 1793 and in Germany in 1848. This, to be sure, is one of the laws of the evolution of bourgeois society.” We see that Engels' Law is directly opposed to Plekhanov's ingenious structure, which the Mensheviks have been accepting and regarding as Marxism.

It may of course be objected that the Jacobins were themselves a bourgeoisie, a *petite bourgeoisie*. This is absolutely true. But is that not also the fact in the case of the so-called “revolutionary democracy” headed by the Social-Revolutionists and Mensheviks? Between the Cadets, the party of the larger and lesser propertied interests, on the one hand, and the Social-Revolutionists on the other hand, there was not, in any of the elections held in city or country, any intermediate party. It follows with mathematical certainty that the *petite bourgeoisie* must have found its political representation in the ranks of the Social-Revolutionists. The Mensheviks, whose policy differs by not a hair's breadth from the policy of the Social-Revolutionists, reflect the same class interests. There is no contradiction to this condition in the fact that they are also supported by a part of the more backward or conservative-privileged workers. Why were the Social-Revolutionists unable to assume power? In what sense and why did the “bourgeois” character of the Russian Revolution (if we assume that such is its character) compel the Social-Revolutionists and Mensheviks to supplant the plebeian methods of the Jacobins with the gentlemanly device of an agreement with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie? It is manifest that the explanation must be sought, not in the “bourgeois” character of our revolution, but in the miserable character of our *petit bourgeois* democracy. Instead of making the power in its hands the organ for the realization of the essential demands of history, our fraudulent democracy deferentially passed on all real power to the counter-revolutionary, military-imperialistic clique, and Tseretelli, at the Moscow Conference, even boasted that the Soviets had not surrendered their power under pressure, not after a courageous fight and defeat, but voluntarily, as an evidence of political “self-effacement.” The gentleness of the calf, holding out its neck for the butcher's knife, is not the quality which is going to conquer new worlds.

The difference between the terrorists of the Convention and the Moscow capitulators is the difference between tigers and calves of one age,—a difference in courage. But this difference is not fundamental. It merely veils a decisive difference in the personnel of the democracy itself. The Jacobins were based on the classes of little or no property, including also what rudiments of a proletariat were then already in existence. In our case, the industrial working class has worked its way out of the ill-defined democracy into a position in history where it exerts an influence of primary importance. The *petit bourgeois* democracy was losing the most valuable revolutionary qualities to the extent to which these qualities were being developed by the proletariat which was outgrowing the tutelage of the *petite bourgeoisie*. This phenomenon in turn is due to the incomparably higher plan to which Capitalism had evolved in Russia as compared with the France of the closing 18th century. The revolutionary power of the Russian proletariat, is based upon its immense productive power, which is most of all apparent in war time. The threat of a railroad strike again reminds us, in our day, of the dependence of the whole country on the concentrated labor of the proletariat. The *petit bourgeois*-peasant party, in the very earliest stages of the revolution, was exposed to a crossfire between the powerful groups of imperialistic capital on the one hand, and the revolutionary-internationalist proletariat, on the other. In their

struggle to exert an influence of their own over the workers, the *petit bourgeois* continued constantly harping on their “statesmanship,” their “patriotism,” and thus fell into a slavish dependence on the groups of counter-revolutionary capital. They simultaneously lost the possibility of any kind of liquidation even of the old barbarism which enveloped those sections of the people who were still attached to them. The struggle of the Social-Revolutionists and Mensheviks for influence over the proletariat was more and more assuming the form of a struggle by the proletarian party to obtain the leadership of the semi-proletarian masses of the villages and towns. Because they “voluntarily” handed over their power to the bourgeois cliques, the Social-Revolutionists and Mensheviks were obliged to hand over the revolutionary mission to show that the attempt to decide fundamental questions of tactics by a mere reference to the “bourgeois” character of our Revolution can only succeed in confusing the minds of the backward workers and deceiving the peasants.

In the French Revolution of 1848, the proletariat is already making heroic efforts for independent action. But as yet it has neither a clear revolutionary theory nor an authoritative class organization. Its importance in production is infinitely lower than the present economic function of the Russian proletariat. In addition, behind 1848 there stood another great revolution, which had solved the agrarian question in its own way, and this found its expression in a pronounced isolation of the proletariat, particularly that of Paris, from the peasant masses. Our situation in this respect is immensely more favorable. Farm mortgages, obstructive obligations of all kinds, oppression, and the rapacious exploitation by the church, confront the Revolution as inescapable questions, demanding courageous and uncompromising measures. The “isolation” of our party from the Social-Revolutionists and Mensheviks, even an extreme isolation, even by the method of single chambers, would by no means be synonymous with an isolation of the proletariat from the oppressed peasant and city masses. On the contrary, a sharp opposition of the policy of the revolutionary proletariat to the faithless defection of the present leaders of the Soviets, can only bring about a salutary differentiation among the peasant millions, remove the pauperized peasants from the treacherous influence of the powerful Social-Revolutionist muzhiks, and convert the Socialistic proletariat into a genuine leader of the popular, “plebeian” revolution.

And finally, a mere empty reference to the bourgeois character of the Russian Revolution tells us absolutely nothing about the *international* character of its milieu. And this is a prime factor. The great Jacobin revolution found opposed to it a backward, feudal, monarchistic Europe. The Jacobin regime fell and gave way to the Bonapartist regime, under the burden of the superhuman effort which it was obliged to put forth in order to maintain itself against the united forces of the middle ages. The Russian Revolution, on the contrary, has before it a Europe that has far outdistanced it, having reached the highest degree of capitalist development. The present slaughter shows that Europe has reached the point of capitalistic saturation, that it can no longer live and grow on the basis of the private ownership of the means of production. This chaos of blood and ruin is a savage insurrection of the mute and sullen powers of production, it is the mutiny of iron and steel against the dominion of profit, against wage slavery, against the miserable deadlock of our human relations. Capitalism, enveloped in the flames of a war of its own making, shouts from the mouths of its cannons to humanity: “Either conquer over me, or I will bury you in my ruins when I fall!”

All the evolution of the past, the thousands of years of human history, of class struggle, of cultural accumulations, are concentrated now in the sole problem of the proletarian revolution. There is no other answer and no other escape. And therein lies the tremendous strength of the Russian Revolution. It is not a “national,” a bourgeois revolution. Anyone who conceives of it thus, is dwelling in the realm of the hallucinations of the 18th and 19th centuries. Our fatherland in time is the 20th century. The further lot of the Russian Revolution depends directly on the course and on the outcome of the war, that is, on the evolution of class contradictions in Europe, to which this imperialistic war is giving a catastrophic nature.

The Kerenskys and Kornilovs began too early using the language of competing autocrats. The Kaledins showed their teeth too soon. The renegade Tseretelli too early grasped the contemptuously outstretched finger of counter-revolution. As yet the Revolution has spoken only its first word. It still has tremendous reserves in Western Europe. In place of the handshake of the reactionary ringleaders with the good-for-nothings of the *petite bourgeoisie* will come the great embrace of the Russian proletariat with the proletariat of Europe.

The Allies in Siberia

War Against the People

It was the claim of the Allies that the Russian masses would acclaim intervention as providing the opportunity to throw off the "vile yoke" of the Bolsheviks. Instead, events are proving that the Russian masses are eager to throw off the vile yoke placed by this counter-revolutionary intervention upon their liberty.

The whole course of intervention proves that it is the desperate purpose of international Capitalism to impose an alien will upon the Russian people. The masses of Russia have had ample opportunity to overthrow the Soviet Government, if they wished; but in spite of starvation, in spite of war from the whole world, the revolutionary masses refuse to make a counter-revolution, refuse to overthrow their government.

Nothing but contemptible dishonesty could now claim that the Russian people welcome intervention. In Siberia, the Allies have crushed the liberty of the masses, have imposed a bayonet autocracy upon the people, have supported the infamous Kolchak and his reactionary coterie. The masses of Siberia, accordingly, are against the Allies and their intervention.

This is proven by an article in the June issue of *Hearst's Magazine*, written by Frederick F. Moore, Late Captain, Intelligence, of the American Expeditionary Force in Siberia, under the title "The Vanishing Army of the Bolsheviks."

Captain Moore makes the unequivocal statement: "Ninety-five per cent. of the people in Siberia are Bolsheviks." It is clear, then, that the Allies' mission in Siberia is to restore the rule of a reactionary minority of 5 per cent.—surely a case of making the world safe for democracy!

But, what is more important, Captain Moore proves the point. The Siberian masses, according to him, have adopted the policy of passive resistance and sabotage. It is an effective expression of the will of the masses. The Captain says:

"The Allies in Siberia have been surrounded by an army without uniforms or other visible military equipment, without any apparent machinery of organization. This army has the ability to vanish without being missed, to reassemble when and where it chooses, to set up a front if it so desires, or, if it sees fit, to dissolve again, concealing itself once more under the wings of the very host which is seeking to overcome it. More-

over, it is to a very large extent an army of passive resistance. . . .

"During the winter just past, this vanishing army entered the cities occupied by the Allies, and, in the guise of refugees, or 'loyal' Russians, received food, clothing and shelter. Under the protection of the Allied guns it spent the period of bitter cold weather in comfort, perfecting its plans for the on-coming spring, carrying on its propaganda of hostility against the Interventionists, and mingling with the troops which had come half way round the world to render it harmless."

This is how this "vanishing army" fights:

"Take the case of one of their earlier engagements with the Japanese. The attack was south of Habarovsk. It was significant that the Japanese took scarcely any prisoners. That was because a few of the Bolsheviks held back the Japanese, giving the main Russian front time to break up. Then, when the Japanese forces moved forward, they passed through the Bolshevik army—without knowing it!—and actually asked it where it was!

"What the Japanese force thought it saw was large numbers of badly dressed peasants, busily at work in the fields."

Overwhelmed by superior munitions and equipment, the Bolshevik masses of Siberia adopt their own forms of fighting. This is how they secure weapons:

"A truck-load of Kolchak's machine-guns at Omsk disappeared while in transit from one barracks to another, and the men who were making the transfer dropped from sight. Some of our officers and soldiers know how the Bolsheviks added to their own supply of pistols. It has been estimated that ten per cent. of the American officers travelling with orderlies had their automatics either taken by stealth or snatched from the holsters in crowded railroad stations. One of these officers expostulated with a thief. 'Here!' he shouted. 'That's my gun!' 'Well, you're wrong,' was the reply in good English; 'it's mine, and you'd better not start any trouble here.' It seemed good advice.

"One story going the rounds is to the effect that an officer of high rank, while pushing his way through a jam of people in a station, followed by his orderly,

was startled by a cry from the latter, whose pistol was gone!

"Gone!" said the officer crossly. 'You ought to know better than to lose your gun! Where did you wear it?'

"Meekly the orderly indicated the position of his holster on his right hip.

"'But you shouldn't wear it so far back,' growled the exasperated officer. 'Keep it well to the front like mine. Look here!' And he slapped his own holster, worn well to the front on his belt. Then the red of chagrin spread over his face. 'Lord!' he cried. 'Mine's gone, too!'"

The workmen of Siberia act as they can against the invaders. Captain Moore says:

"The trans-Siberian Railroad is virtually in the hands of the Bolsheviks—Bolshevik firemen, engineers, conductors, repairmen, signalmen, switchmen, station-masters and, to a large extent, telegraph operators. Not only do these men absorb graft, but trains move only at their will, or if against their will, are wrecked. And if instead of accepting the statement that all of the fighting Bolsheviks are to be found on the 'Ekaterinburg front,' the newspaper correspondents would understand the situation better if they could realize that all Siberia, all Russia, is a front. . . .

This revolutionary sabotage is used all along the line against the Allies, who answer with executions and the Cossacks with flogging and worse. The Soviet as an institution in Siberia has been crushed by alien reaction, but it lives in the hearts of the masses. In a moment, at the appropriate moment, the masses will rise and assert their Communist independence.

Considering this testimony of a non-Bolshevik, what becomes of the Allies' claim concerning "being invited" by the Russian people? Lies, all lies. They cannot shoot the Russian masses into submission, nor can they bribe them into accepting reaction by promises of food. Man does not live by bread alone.

The news that comes from Siberia, in spite of the blockade, indicates an appalling condition of misery and oppression there, under the "civilized" domination of the Allies.

In a criminal war of plunder and aggression, the most criminal episode is the intervention of the Allies in revolutionary Russia. The proletariat of the world must end this abominable crime.

All Power to the Workers!

THESE are the resolutions adopted at a special convention called to express the stand of Local Cook County (Chicago) on questions before the party, and made up of one delegate to each ten members. Nearly 100 branches were represented, with membership over 6000.

"Be it resolved, that the following propositions shall constitute the platform of Local Cook County of the Socialist Party until further action by a future Cook County Convention, and shall be binding upon all officials, candidates, speakers and committees of Local Cook County:

1-a) We favor international alliance of the Socialist Party of the United States only with the Communist groups of other countries, such as the Bolsheviks of Russia, Spartacans of Germany, and so forth, according to the call issued for the Third International by the Bolshevik Party of Russia, and upon the program as presented in this call.

1-b) We demand that the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party and our International Delegates shall take at once some decisive action to cut off our party from the Bureau or Congress of the Second International.

2-a) Socialist Party platforms, proceeding on the basis of the class struggle, and recognizing that the Socialist movement has come into the historical period of social revolution, can only contain an explanation of the class struggle and the demand for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

2-b) A municipal platform of Socialism cannot proceed on a separate basis, but must conform to the general platform, simply relating the attainment of local power to the immediate goal of gaining national power. There are no city problems within the terms of the class struggle, only the one problem of capitalist versus proletarian domination.

The particular evils of national, state and city government are merely illustrative of the central problem, and should be thus presented; they should not be listed the things to be remedied item by item, as the basis of Socialist political activity. The municipal platform

Resolutions Adopted at the Chicago Convention May 17-18, 1919

of Socialism, like all other platforms, can contain only one demand: All power to the working class—local power as the basis for further gains of power.

3) We favor organized Socialist Party activity in co-operation with class-conscious industrial unionism, in order to unify industrial and political class-conscious propaganda and action.

4) We are opposed to Socialist Party association with other groups not committed to the revolutionary class struggle, such as Labor parties, Nonpartisan leagues, People's Council, Municipal Ownership leagues and the like.

5-a) The political action of the revolutionary proletariat is not limited to the use of the ballot; we realize that our primary dependence must be on the mass power and the mass political action of the proletariat; and we realize also, that this mass power and this mass political action are more closely related to the industrial struggle of the proletariat than to routine politics.

5-b) The activity of the Socialist Party in political campaigns shall keep distinct the class nature of our political action, and shall not foster the idea of the Socialist Party as the advocate of an advanced labor progressivism.

6) We favor centralized party organization corresponding to the highly centralized imperialistic control to be overthrown, and to this end make the following recommendations:

a) Organization for quick action and immediate response to new situations by having a National Emergency Committee, composed of three or more members of the National Executive Committee, who shall act as party officials and propagandists with offices in the national headquarters.

b) Control by the party organization of all Socialists elected to public office.

c) Control by the party membership, through the regular executive committee, of all official party public-

ations; not by special committees or trustees not elected by and not responsible to the membership.

d) Establishment of a Central Lecture Bureau, and of a Press and Information Bureau.

e) Standardization of party platforms, propaganda, dues and methods of organization.

The foregoing was offered as a composite resolution; discussed and adopted item by item. The further resolutions dealing with party questions of general application are as follows:

7) Whereas the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of the United States has obscured the class nature of our organization by the call for an Amnesty Convention; and

Whereas it is essential at all times to keep the class nature of our organization clearly defined by non-affiliation with non-working class organization;

Be it resolved: that this Convention is opposed to the action of the National Executive Committee in calling the Amnesty Convention now set for July 4th, and that we recommend that this call be rescinded.

8) Resolved that this Convention go on record as endorsing the I. W. W., and that it will do all within its power to acquaint the American workers with revolutionary industrial unionism.

9) Endorsement of Sunday Schools under direct party control.

10) Recommendation of organization of agitation and literature distribution on the basis of factories and industrial units, with division of county into industrial districts.

11) Resolution providing for calling of County Conventions, with plenary powers, by direct initiative of branches.

The other resolutions of the Convention are in the nature of greetings and remonstrances concerned with the intervention in Russia, the Winnipeg strike, the class-war pogroms, the Lawrence strike (accompanied by contribution of funds); pledge of co-operation in general strike for release of class-war prisoners; greetings to Russian Soviet Republic, Hungarian Soviet Republic, Spartacans of Germany, and the Third Communist International.

The Left Wing Manifesto and Program

By Louis C. Fraina

III

Revolutionary Socialism

AFTER having indicted the dominant moderate Socialism and indicated the social conditions that produced it, the Manifesto proceeds to project the fundamentals of Revolutionary Socialism:

Revolutionary Socialists hold, with the founders of scientific Socialism, that there are two dominant classes in modern society—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; that between these two classes a struggle must go on, until the working class, through the abolition of the capitalist state and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, creates a Socialist system. Revolutionary Socialists do not believe that they can be voted into power. They struggle for the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat. Then comes the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism, of which Marx speaks in his *Criticism of the Gotha Program*: "Between the capitalistic 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 but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

The class struggle is fundamental to Socialism. It is the material basis for realizing the ideal of Socialism.

But the class struggle is not as simple as moderate Socialism makes it appear.

The two dominant classes in society are the proletariat and the bourgeoisie,—the workers and the capitalists. In between these two dominant class divisions there are other minor divisions, which are an important factor in the social struggle.

Moderate Socialism comprises its policy in an attack upon the larger capitalists, the trusts; and maintains that all other divisions in society,—including the lesser capitalists and the middle class, the *petite bourgeoisie*,—are material for the Socialist struggle against Capitalism. Moderate Socialism says, in substance: Socialism is a struggle of *all the people* against the trusts and big capital; and it makes the realization of Socialism depend upon the unity in action of "the people," of the workers, the small capitalists, the small investors, the professions,—in short, moderate Socialism actually depends upon the *petite bourgeoisie* for the realization of Socialism. But these non-proletarian classes are not at all revolutionary, simply "liberal," and moderate Socialism in action becomes dependent upon a liberal progressivism which makes for State Capitalism and promotes Capitalism; and which, moreover, under the conditions of Imperialism is directly counter-revolutionary.

Revolutionary Socialism, in accord with Marx and the actual facts of the class struggle, makes the realization of Socialism depend upon the industrial proletariat. Revolutionary Socialism, moreover, excludes the aristocracy of labor from the revolutionary movement, these skilled workers being united in policy with petty bourgeois progressivism. The realization of Socialism is the task of *one class alone*—the class of the proletariat.

The class struggle of revolutionary Socialism mobilizes the industrial proletariat against Capitalism,—that proletariat which is homogeneous, united and disciplined by the machine process, and which actually controls the basic industry of the nation. In this class struggle, revolutionary Socialism rejects compromise with any other class in society; it is a struggle of the proletariat against all other social groups. The small bourgeoisie and the aristocracy of labor can be forced into line *after* the proletariat has imposed its will upon society, and organized the "state" of proletarian dictatorship.

Moderate Socialism is compromising, vacillating, treacherous, because the social elements it depends upon—the small bourgeoisie and the aristocracy of labor—are not a fundamental factor in society; they vacillate between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat;

their social instability produces political instability; they have been seduced by Imperialism and are now united with Imperialism.

Revolutionary Socialism is uncompromising, resolute, revolutionary, because it builds upon the industrial proletariat, which is actually a producing class, expropriated of all property, in whose consciousness the technological integration of the machine process has developed the concepts of integrated unionism and mass action. Revolutionary Socialism adheres to the class struggle because through the class struggle alone—the mass struggle—can this industrial proletariat secure immediate concessions and finally impose its will upon society, in this way forcing the vacillating aristocracy of labor and the *petite bourgeoisie* to make the decision of aligning with the proletariat.

The class struggle, according to Marx, is a political struggle. It is a political struggle in the sense that its purpose is political—the overthrow of one social system and its government, and the introduction of a new social system and its government. The revolutionary class struggle is political, since its objective is the conquest by the revolutionary proletariat of the power of the state.

The state is the expression of a particular social system and its ruling class. It is organized to impose the will of a class upon society. The state is organized coercion: the bourgeois state is organized to coerce the proletariat. The proletariat must conquer this state, destroy this state, destroy this political power of the capitalist ruling class, and organize a new proletarian state for the coercion of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat.

Revolutionary Socialism does not propose to "capture" the bourgeois parliamentary state, but to conquer and destroy it. Revolutionary Socialism, accordingly, repudiates the policy of introducing Socialism by means of legislative measures on the basis of the bourgeois state. This state is a bourgeois state: how, then, can it introduce Socialism? As long as the bourgeois parliamentary state prevails, the capitalist class is in power: it can baffle the will of the proletariat, since all the political power, the army and the police, the press and industry, are in the control of the capitalists. The revolutionary proletariat must expropriate all these, by the conquest of power, by annihilating the political power of the capitalists, before it can begin the task of introducing Socialism.

Revolutionary Socialism, accordingly, proposes to conquer the power of the state. It proposes to conquer by means of political action in the *Marxian sense*. And political action in the revolutionary Marxian sense does not simply mean parliamentarism, but the *class action* of the proletariat in *any form* that has as its objective the conquest of the power of the state.

Parliamentary action is necessary. On the face of the state, of parliament, the proletariat meets the capitalist on all general issues of the class struggle. The revolutionary proletariat must fight the capitalist on all fronts, in the process of developing that final action which will conquer the power of the state, and overthrow Capitalism. Parliamentary political action, accordingly, is revolutionary: its task is to expose, through the forum of parliament, the machinations of the state and Capitalism, to meet Capitalism on all issues, to rally the proletariat for the struggle against Capitalism. The purpose of *Socialist* parliamentary political action is to emphasize and clarify the revolutionary character of the class struggle.

But parliamentarism cannot conquer the power of the state for the proletariat. To imagine that Socialism can secure a majority in the parliaments is sheer Utopia, a refusal to understand that Capitalism can use the power of the state to disfranchise the workers, if necessary.

The conquest of the power of the state is an extra-parliamentary act. It is accomplished, not by the legislative representatives of the proletariat, but by the *mass power of the proletariat in action*, by the dynamic mass action of the proletariat. The supreme power of the proletariat inheres in the *political mass strike*, in using the industrial power of the proletariat for political objectives.

The Belgian workers secured the franchise by means of the political strike. The Russian Revolution started with the political mass strike, which alone is dynamic, which alone represents power and can mobilize the proletariat for the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism.

Revolutionary Socialism, accordingly, recognizes that the supreme form of proletarian political action is the political mass strike. Parliamentarism is a factor in developing this mass strike; parliamentarism, if it is revolutionary and adheres to the class struggle, performs necessary service in mobilizing the proletariat for the mass struggle against Capitalism.

Moderate Socialism refuses to recognize this supreme form of political action, limits and stultifies political action into legislative routine and petty bourgeois parliamentarism. This is a negation of the mass character of the proletarian struggle, a betrayal of the tasks of the Revolution.

The power of the proletariat to conquer Capitalism lies not in its numbers—which are scattered and can be nullified—but in its control of the industrial process. The mobilization of this proletarian industrial control against Capitalism means the end of Capitalism; and this proletarian industrial control can be mobilized only by means of the political mass strike.

What is the purpose of the final political mass strike, of revolutionary mass action? To conquer the power of the state. How is this accomplished? By destroying the bourgeois parliamentary state and organizing a new state, the state of the organized producers, of the workers in the plants and the farmers in the fields.

The revolutionary proletariat organizes a new state, based on industrial divisions and the industrial franchise.

But the abolition of the bourgeois political state does not immediately dispose of the political state. The proletariat itself needs a state during the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism, a state representing force, with which to coerce the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois state is an organ of coercion. The bourgeois state coerces the proletariat. The proletariat must organize a state to coerce the bourgeoisie, since the proletarian conquest of power will have reserves for action against the proletarian revolution.

This state of the revolutionary proletariat, functioning as a proletarian dictatorship, serves two functions: 1) to completely expropriate the bourgeoisie and crush its power of resistance; and 2) to introduce the new system of Communist Socialism, organized internally and based upon the industrial administration of the industry, communistically organized producers. After this task is accomplished the political state of the proletariat disappears, together with coercion and proletarian dictatorship, then we shall have, under Socialism, not the government of persons, but the administration of things.

The Bolshevik Agitation in Hungary

AT THE time when the reptile press of the Allies was insisting that the Bolsheviks had definitely proven that they were pro-German by signing the Brest-Litovsk peace, the Bolshevik party was actively carrying on its revolutionary agitation among the Austro-German prisoners of war in Russia, among the Austro-German troops, and in Austria, Hungary and Germany.

The work of organizing the Hungarian prisoners was put in charge of Bela Kun, a Magyar Socialist, himself a prisoner in one of the concentration camps. To-day Bela Kun is head of the Soviet republic of Hungary. The origin of the upheaval that turned the ancient Hungarian realm into a stronghold of Bolshevism certainly deserves the adjective humble. It was a four page paper, published in the Magyar language at Moscow twice a week under the title "Socialis Forradalom," meaning "social revolution."

The first number of "The Social Revolution" was issued on April 2, 1918. Its editorial office was in room 201 of the Hotel Dresden, Moscow. The first number carried an article by N. Bucharin, editor of the "Communist," entitled "Why Are We Communists?" Another article, headlined "And You Will

Rebel Yet," addressed to the German and the Austro-Hungarian armies, appeared with the signature of Karl Radek. Bela Kun had a two column editorial entitled "What Is Imperialism?"

The programme of the new paper was announced on page one as follows:

"With the first issue of 'The Social Revolution' a little group of Magyar Communists joins the battle for the international social revolution. We have to struggle on two fronts at the same time.

"We shall fight ruthlessly, without compromise, for the destruction of the oppressor of proletarians and poor peasants: the social order based on capitalist production. But we shall fight none the less ruthlessly against the official Social Democratic parties, which before and during the war have betrayed the cause of proletarian liberation.

"We stand firmly on the basis of class war. Under no circumstances do we recognize a social truce.

"Our creed is revolutionary Marxism. To spread this doctrine, the scientific expression of proletarian class struggle, in a popular form, so as to make it intelligible to all, will be one of the principal aims of this newspaper.

"Our aim is the armed rebellion of proletarians and peasants for the capture of the power of state: social revolution without delay."

The paper contains several articles attacking bitterly the German Majority Socialists led by Scheidemann, as well as the official Social Democratic party of Hungary. The Stockholm conference is assailed as a reactionary bourgeois gathering.

The peace of Brest-Litovsk is denounced in the article by Radek as "the peace of the victorious brigands." He laments the proletarian soldiers of Germany, Austria and Hungary for their submissiveness, for their "treachery toward the Russian revolution," and concludes:

"You will have to rise against your governments, you German, Austrian, Magyar slaves, because nobody else can do that job for you. The German government is the bulwark of reaction in Europe. Germany is the prison of peoples. It is up to you, slaves, it is your duty, to blow up the gates of that prison. Everything else is futile. Revolution or a slow bleeding to death; this can be the only choice. And you will rebel yet."

The New International

By Samson Freiman

IN speaking of the international conference proposed by the Communist Party of Russia (which did not invite the official Socialist Party, but its Left Wing), Alexander Trachtenberg at the time insisted that the Socialist Party itself was worthy of inclusion, since it adhered to the principles of internationalism during the war. No matter whether this statement is insincere or only erroneous, the question which it takes up ought to be set clear to all. It bears on a subject of extreme importance to the success of the Revolutionary Movement throughout the world.

If there is any one formula which is necessary as a means for a successful revolution that formula is, "the confidence of the masses." Conversely, any acts which violate the confidence which the masses have in a revolutionary organization is a direct and open violation of Socialist principles. The success of the Soviet Government of Russia lies, for one thing, in the fact that the Soviets won the confidence of the masses and held it. Perhaps one of the most impressive and suggestive statements that I have read on the Russian Revolution is a statement appearing in the *New York Times* in an article by Arthur Ransome about a year ago. His observation was that the people of the Ukraine—when the situation in the Ukraine was at its worst—having once tasted the fruits of Soviet institutions were loath to let this institution slip from their lives, although it was the Soviet organization which caused all the bitter fighting that took place in the Ukraine and tore that fertile land asunder. In spite of all the immediate misery clearly attributable to the Soviets the masses had recognized the true worth of the Soviets and were willing to pay the price, counting nothing too dear if they could only win back the self-government that was their's under Soviet organization. Experience had been the means of imbedding in their hearts the confidence that is so necessary to the success of the Socialist revolution everywhere.

Milyukov was overwhelmed the moment he opened his mouth and betrayed the masses of the Revolution. Kerensky deceived the masses with honeyed words and lasted only until his deeds bred suspicion and then distrust. All the detestable appeals for the confidence of the populace made by the Ebert government in Germany today are a betrayal of trust which the inexorable demands of proletarian history will repay with relentless severity. A revolution that goes to the very roots of society in building a new structure must meet a great many tremendous difficulties which it cannot overcome unless it has the full confidence of the proletariat. In the face of a world of enemies the Social Revolution can not afford to make any mistakes. Yet our venture is of such a highly experimental nature that it is utterly impossible to avoid a great many errors. Only if the Revolutionists succeed in winning the revolutionary confidence of the masses can they expect to bring their venture to a successful conclusion. Surrounded by enemies that have no conscience, that lie deliberately, that try to bring all kinds of confusion into the ranks of the proletariat, there is nothing to hope for unless the proletariat has full confidence in the revolution. But this confidence which must be implicit is so liable to abuse that a very sharp distinction must be made and firmly adhered to in punishing those that violate the confidence of the proletariat. Compromise breeds deceit and suspicion which destroys confidence. It behooves Socialism to stand clearly and firmly on its own ground, on the bulwarks of the proletarian dictatorship and the Communist State. The development of this confidence may, temporarily, mean "isolation"

from the masses, but that is part of the process.

Friedrich Adler's defense of his assassination of the Austrian Premier tries to justify his act in consonance with the best traditions of Socialist history. The background that he describes as leading him to choose to do his heroic deed is in a great measure the background in which our Socialist Party found itself during America's participation in the war. Assassination was a method of expression to which the individual might resort, but a Party had to find other means of expression, positive *mass means* in order to vindicate its name and traditions.

By its failure to present a clear and positive front of opposition to the government during the prosecution of the war the Socialist Party of America (I speak of the official party, not the membership whose will was baffled) has failed to do its part and does not deserve representation at the conference of the New International,—that is, not until the Left Wing conquers the party. The mere verbal adherence to principles such as are expressed in the St. Louis Plat-

form of the Party are certainly not sufficient proof of the Party's vindication of its honor. In words it went as far as Kerensky in his speeches—perhaps not so far—but its deeds have failed to convince as they have been inconspicuous and not at all in keeping with the tone of its program. The official policy of the party was bourgeois pacifism, not revolutionary Socialism. It was well enough for Max Eastman to justify this policy of words by the official Party, but I fear that his defense is meant more as an apology for his own failings. His argument is not convincing. In fact, he exemplifies the general action of the Party bureaucracy in his personal acts. In a measure, we might pardon Eastman for accepting his horn of the dilemma in starting the *Liberator*, yet we cannot close our eyes to the fact that the first issues of the magazine were a betrayal of the Socialist cause. Of course under the mask of Eastman's words it might have been found that he was camouflaging his language in order to issue his magazine during the hard months of the war. But that is just the policy that leads to ruin. Diplomacy has always been the tool of the masters. The successful avengers of oppression have been frank and uncompromising under all conditions. The true representative of the proletariat expresses himself in unequivocal language.

The St. Louis platform was never really carried out by the bureaucracy, nor was it meant in sincerity. It degenerated into petty bourgeois pacifism and nationalism. Both Berger and Hillquit finally sponsored the Majority Report. It is interesting to recall some events leading up to the adoption of the St. Louis Program.

After the break in diplomatic relations between the United States and Germany, the leaders of the Socialist Party abandoned their opposition to the calling of a national convention and hastily issued a call for a Party Convention in April instead of June or September, as had been proposed by those who had been clamoring for a convention. Naturally the election of delegates and the convention policy agitated the entire Party membership. Leon Trotzky was at that time in New York. At a general membership meeting in Local New York of the Socialist Party to discuss our attitude on the war, a very lively debate occurred between Fraina of the Left Wing and Hillquit of the moderates. The minority committee report of Fraina and Trotzky was defeated by the Hillquit report which was the nucleus of the St. Louis Resolution. Apparently, Hillquit's resolution covered the same ground as the minority resolution except that it was couched in language to protect it from legal prosecution, to make it quite unintelligible to the masses. It was a resolution without teeth.

The fight of New York was practically repeated at a similar meeting held in Essex County, New Jersey. After securing the approval of the State Committee to the Hillquit resolution with a few minor changes. George H. Goebel presented the resolution to the Essex County Local. An opposition resolution following the lines of the Fraina-Trotzky resolution in New York was also presented. A heated debate occurred and the Left Wing finally won the day, but only because the German nationalist group of the extreme right voted with the Left. When the Majority Resolution at St. Louis carried, there was no intention of carrying it out by the Party leaders that sponsored it. If the Party deserves representation at the meeting of the New International then Victor Berger also deserves the recognition that Lenin has accorded to the Left Wing groups of the Party, which have now conquered the party for revolutionary Socialism.

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'etat 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.

See 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.