

The New York COMMUNIST

Vol. I, No. 6

New York, Saturday, May 24, 1919

Price 5 cents

Clearing the Decks

MORRIS HILLQUIT has emerged from his long retirement with an article in *The Call* for May 21st, entitled, "The Socialist Task and Outlook". Because of his position in the Party, this article must not be taken as the expression of an individual. It is published in *The Call* in just the manner that the pronouncements of James M. Beck are published in *The Times*. It may be regarded as a semi-official declaration, formulated after consultation with Party "leaders" of all shades of opinion, of the position—or lack of position—of the element which still controls the Party machinery.

Careful reading of this document impresses one immediately with the power of the Left Wing agitation in the Party, and its profound roots in the revolutionary feeling of the rank and file. Morris Hillquit is a clever politician; he knows how to gauge the temper of the Party membership, as he has demonstrated at St. Louis and elsewhere. His legal training and his experience in Party affairs fit him better than anyone else to lead the Centre, into whose hands the Right Wing is willing to deliver its power, now that it is unable to maintain itself before the wrath of the rank and file.

We had expected something better from Comrade Hillquit. The document runs away from all important questions; it endeavors to create the impression of dissatisfaction with the behavior of the Party, while it carefully avoids any specific statements; it formulates no definite position; it censors Socialist parliamentarism in one phrase and defends it in the next, forgetting to call attention to the actions of our Congressional representative and lesser parliamentarians; it makes provision for a change of front as pressure is applied, a truly opportunistic position. Now as ever, Hillquit is attempting to carry water on both shoulders; he flirts with the revolutionary sentiment that is now dominant in the movement; he coquettes with Proletarian Dictatorship in Russia and Hungary, while spurning it nearer home; he implies a mild reproach to the majority Socialists of Germany; he mentions the St. Louis platform and immediately sheers away, fearful of this test if applied to the "leaders" of the Party.

Unlike many of our local "Socialist" spokesmen, Comrade Hillquit admits that the Second International broke down before the supreme test of the war. But it was not the Socialist movements that were at fault, "It was the economic organization of the European workers, and the pressure of their immediate economic interests (as understood by them) that broke the solidarity of the Socialist International", says Comrade Hillquit. "It was not parliamentarism which was primarily responsible for the mischief." He goes on to speak of "excessive parliamentarism," but "on the whole the Socialists in Parliament expressed the sentiments of their constituents pretty faithfully."

This in other words is Meyer London's justification for his acts in Congress. "I was not elected by a purely Socialist vote, and I must obey the wishes of my constituents," said London in effect when he was questioned. According to the Communist Manifesto the Socialists "are, on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement." But now we learn that the economic organizations, which are organized primarily to safeguard the wage status of the workers, are responsible for the breakdown of the revolutionary movement.

If Comrade Hillquit's line of argument is correct, how does it explain the continuous flirtation which the Socialist Party, of which he is an executive officer, carried on with the A. F. of L. until Gompers made it impossible? The economic organizations in Europe broke down in 1914. During the two years following the A. F. of L. flirtation continued, and the Socialist Party made no attempt to point out the necessity for "one working-class union."

Comrade Hillquit says, "The first task of the post-war Socialist International must, therefore, 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."

But how is this to be done? According to Comrade Hillquit's own statement "the organized labor movement . . . was a movement for the benefit of the better-situated strata of labor—the skilled workers." In other words, the "economic causes"

Call for a National Conference of the Left Wing

Call for a National Conference of the Left Wing of the American Socialist Party, issued by Local Boston, (Louis C. Fraina, Secretary); Local Cleveland, (C. E. Ruthenberg, Secretary); and the Left Wing Section of the Socialist Party of New York City, (Maximilian Cohen, Secretary).

The international situation and the crisis in the American Socialist Party; the sabotage the party bureaucracy has practised on the emergency national convention; the N. E. C. aligning our party with the social-patriots at Berne, with the Congress of the Great Betrayal; the necessity of reconstructing our policy in accord with revolutionary events,—all this, and more, makes it necessary that the revolutionary forces in the Socialist Party get together for counsel and action.

This call is therefore issued, for the holding of a National Conference of the Left Wing of the American Socialist Party, to discuss:

1.—The crisis in the party, and action thereon; the conquest of the party for the party, for revolutionary Socialism.

2.—The New International; ways and means to prevent the party aligning itself with the "International" of the social-patriots, of the Ebert-Scheidemann gangsters, and the wavering centre; affiliation with the Bolshevik-Spartan Communist International alone.

3.—The formulation of a declaration of principles and purposes of a national scope of the Left Wing of the American Socialist Party.

4.—Forming some sort of a national council or bureau of the Left Wing for propaganda, securing of information and spreading information.

5.—To express and draw together the revolutionary forces in the party; to consider other means of furthering the cause of revolutionary Socialism.

This call is issued to locals of the Socialist Party, branches and Left Wing groups within the party. The test of admission, provisionally, will be acceptance of the Manifesto of the Left Wing of the Socialist Party of Greater New York.

Left Wing locals are invited to send delegates officially. Where a local officially refuses to participate, branches or minority groups in the party accepting the principles of the Left Wing should send delegates.

Representation—one delegate for every 500 members. No local or group should send more than four delegates. Locals or minority groups with less than 500 members are entitled to one delegate.

The conference will be held starting Saturday, June 21, in New York City. Each delegate will be taxed \$25 for a central fund, out of which will be paid the expenses of all delegates.

Left Wing Locals and Branches, act! Send communications to Maximilian Cohen, 43 West 29th St., New York City.

of the collapse of the Second International were, "the economic organization of the European workers, and the pressure of their immediate economic interests (as understood by them)".

What guarantee is there in the whole vague program outlined in Comrade Hillquit's letter—summed up in the phrase "Socialist propaganda"—which leads us to believe that the skilled workers are going to forget their "immediate economic interests"?

That there is a fundamental difference of principle between the Left Wing and the dominant "moderate Socialism" which controls the Party, is nowhere more clearly indicated than by Comrade Hillquit's phrase, "In countries which have passed, or are passing, to a régime of Communist or Socialist government . . ." This is a recognition of a distinction between the two; this is an implied differentiation between two forms of the Cooperative Commonwealth, which we do not admit.

What is the nature of this distinction? The following quotation indicates Comrade Hillquit's conception of it:

"Shall the socialization of industries and national life be attempted by one master stroke, or shall it be carried out gradually and slowly? Shall the working class immediately assume the sole direction of the government as a working-class govern-

ment, or shall it share governmental power and responsibilities with the capitalist class, at least, 'during the period of transition'?"

So far as we know, no Socialist leader advocates "the socialization of industries and national life—by a master stroke". Lenin has carefully pointed out that this socialization, on the contrary, must be carried out "gradually". But this is beside the point. The question at issue is *not* socialization of industry, but the *class* under whose rule this socialization shall be carried out. In this respect the final question is pertinent: "Shall the working class immediately assume the sole direction of the government as a working-class government, or shall it share governmental power and responsibilities with the capitalist class, at least, 'during the period of the transition'?"

To this question there is but one answer for a scientific Socialist. In the words of Marx (Gotha Program) "This corresponds to a political transition-period, during which the government cannot be anything else but the dictatorship of the proletariat."

It is true that Comrade Hillquit declares that the Socialist International must support the dictatorship of the proletariat in all countries in which the working class seizes the power; but he still further emphasizes his doubt of this course of action, and implies a serious criticism of Bolshevik and Sparticide tactics, when he says:

"Whether we approve or disapprove of all the methods by which such proletarian government has gained or is exercising its power is beside the question."

The Socialists of the world must not support intervention in Russia, or actively oppose "that government" (the Soviet Government) "in the face of its life-and-death struggle with international capitalism and imperialism." The same with Hungary. But he does not say that we must support the Soviet Governments of Russia and Hungary—which is our Left Wing position.

In countries like Germany, however, "in which the struggle for mastery lies between two divisions of the Socialist movement, one class-conscious and the other opportunist, one radical and the other temporizing," we must support the class-conscious, radical movement. But in America, where the same struggle over principles and tactics is going on in the ranks of the Socialist movement, we must support the opportunists and the temporizers!

Comrade Hillquit admits the necessity for the Third International, but he is by no means specific as to the reasons. He admits that the Second International is broken, but the inference is that he would put together the pieces and give it a new name. He repudiates Berne, half-heartedly, and he also repudiates Moscow, as not having advanced "the process of reorganization of the Socialist movement of the world." He continues, "The task of organizing the Third International is still before us. It must be accomplished on the basis of principles and conduct, not on that of personal likes and dislikes. It is the common task of all international Socialists." If this is Comrade Hillquit's position, why did he not oppose the National Executive Committee's acceptance of Berne? Why did he wait until Berne had discredited itself even in the eyes of Liberals, until it had shown itself as an offshoot of the conference taking place in Paris?

He carefully refrains from stating what he considers should be "the basis of principles and conduct" for the Third International. Yet it is just this that is dividing the Socialist movement the world over. Does Comrade Hillquit think the acceptance of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat should be one of the requisites for admission to the Third International, and if so, will it be sufficient to accept it abroad and accept the principle of "sharing governmental power and responsibilities with the capitalist class, 'during the period of transition'" at home?

When Comrade Hillquit uses the term "international" to qualify "Socialists," does he mean it as a synonym for "Revolutionary"? Would he exclude Scheidemann and Ebert from the Third International? If so, would not he then exclude all other "Socialists" whose acts during the war were dictated by the same opportunism as actuated these

(Continued on page 7)

The New York COMMUNIST

Official Organ of the Left Wing Section,
Socialist Party
Owned and Controlled by Local
Greater New York

JOHN REED - - - - - Editor
EADMONN MACALPINE - - - Associate Editor
MAXIMILIAN COHEN - - - Business Manager

Editorial Board

N. I. HOURWICH M. ZUCKER
B. D. WOLFE J. WILENKIN

Published Every Week.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

1 Year ----- \$3.00
6 Months ----- 1.50
3 Months ----- .75



Single Copies, 5 Cents

Bundle Orders of 10 or over, 3½ Cents a Copy.

43 West 29th Street - - - New York City

Beginnings of a Right Wing Formulation of Principles

OUR chief quarrel with the Ring Wingers has been that they have refused to state their position. For years the American Socialist Party has been a formless movement, ranging from Syndicalists to Single Taxers, and expressing itself by programs which were designed to express the "common denominator" of the membership, in such a way as to offend nobody, and attract everybody—from small property owners to migratory workers.

Alone of all Socialist movements of the world, this movement of ours has been able successfully to crush all attempts at definite formulation of principles and tactics, and the creation of clearly-outlined currents of Party opinion.

When called upon to define their position toward new theories of working class organization and action, our "leaders" have remained silent, surrounding themselves with an inky vapor through which they give vent to oracular generalities calculated to deceive the rank and file. If the membership displays sympathy with these new ideas, our "leaders" hasten to profess an eagerness for the same ideas, being careful, however, to remove the vital organs of the animal; or if they cannot do that, and must take an uncompromising position such as was laid down in the St. Louis Resolution, carefully refraining from acting on it.

Publicly they proclaim their sympathy with the Russian Bolsheviks and the German Spartacans, at the same time flirting with the Berne Conference, and strenuously opposing the Left Wing movement in our own Party, whose aim is identical with that of the European Communists.

Publicly they join in the denunciation of "social reformism," and endorse the abolition of immediate demands in Party platforms; but at the same time they participate in a Non-Parisian League, help to organize a Labor Party, and join in the call for a national Amnesty Convention in which bourgeois liberal groups will be represented.

The Right Wing has refused to state its position. This has forced the Left Wing to state it, at the same time stating our own in no uncertain terms. The Party membership, educated by the War and the Revolution in Europe, can no longer be put off by "reorganizations" and the primitive thuggery which up to now has been the Right Wing's only answer to our challenge. The Right Wing is beginning to find it necessary to formulate its own principles, and this it is now doing, interspersed with petty personal attacks upon Left Wingers, in *The Socialist*.

In the second number of *The Socialist*, for example, there is an article endorsing the Communist International, summoned to meet in Moscow, but—after all, perhaps the Second International is not so bad as it is painted. After all, we do not know anything about it, except from reports in the capitalist press! In the same number Louis Waldman outlines his conception of municipal, state and national ownership of industry, under democratic control, as Socialism! In *The Socialist* of May 13th we find a defense of "democracy," which is answered on this page; also an editorial upon "Co-operatives," in which occurs the following sentence:

"With proletarian organization and proletarian control, the cooperative is a far more effective weapon for accomplishing the revolution than is a reliance upon a vague and ill-defined mass-action."

In almost every paragraph of *The Socialist* are similar statements, the cumulative effect of which is

to outline the Right Wing position—a position which more and more clearly defines a group in substantial agreement with the "parliamentary" Socialist groups which dominated the Berne Conference.

We welcome this emergence of a clear-cut "sausage Socialism" in our midst. It simplifies our task.

"Illegal"

ONE of the Right Wing's most impressive arguments against the Left Wing is that the adoption of our Manifesto and Program will make the American Socialist Party an "illegal" organization. In the last number of *The Socialist*, for example, there is an article by Claessens, pointing out that in Buffalo, where the Party Local has joined the Left Wing, the Manifesto and Program are being used in the courts to outlaw Party members.

Is it possible that the Right Wing is taking this opportunity to display its *real sentiments* concerning the St. Louis Resolution—which, it will be remembered, also made the Party "illegal"? Is it possible that the Right Wing, in the face of such grave events as the imprisonment of "Gene" Debs, proposes that the Socialist Party repudiate his position, because it makes the Party "illegal"—as, in view of the Supreme Court decision, it undoubtedly does?

We do not wish to put in the mouths of these people words which they do not say. But in the end, to what does this panic cry of "illegality" reduce itself?

Is the Socialist Party merely a vote-getting machine, competing with the Republicans and the Democrats for control of the political State? Or is it a movement of the working class to overthrow the capitalist system?

Do the Right Wingers repudiate Marx's definition, that the modern capitalist State is "nothing less than a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and that not less so in a democratic republic than under a monarchy"?

If the State is merely the political expression of the capitalist system, and the Socialist Party proposes to destroy capitalism, how can Socialism be "legal"—except insofar as its working-class strength, backed up by action on the industrial field forces recognition of its political representatives?

The Socialist Party is "legal" only so long as it suits the capitalist State to permit its legality. At the present time the American capitalists have determined to outlaw all attacks upon the State. The carrying of the red flag is "illegal" in this State; Victor Berger's party is "illegal" in Wisconsin; the New York *Call* is "illegal" in the eyes of the Post Office, several times each week; and on May Day peaceable protest meetings were practically outlawed by the authorities, who deliberately permitted gangs of thugs to break them up—an act which was upheld by the Secretary of the Treasury in Washington, in an official communication.

The new session of Congress will pass a law declaring "illegal" all propaganda or actions "inciting to the overthrow of the Government." As we understand the terms of this law, it can be interpreted to include any and all attempts to point out the essential class character of the capitalist State—an institution which, according to Marx himself, cannot be used by a proletarian majority to introduce Socialism.

Are we to have a Socialist Party which frankly abandons, or postpones, its revolutionary objective—an opportunistic movement, anxious above all to conform to the "legality" which a capitalist government ordains? Or shall we lay down a set of revolutionary principles which must not be lost sight of, and to which all our actions must conform, no matter how seriously our tactics must be modified by circumstances?

In being "legal," we must remember that the Socialist movement will be entirely at the mercy of the capitalist government; in holding fast to Socialist principles, we pin our faith to the growing class-consciousness of the working class, which will create its own "legality," and enforce it by its own proletarian power.

Democracy

WE are pleased to find that at last *The Socialist* has risen to the dignity of an editorial page.

While we recognize that we must give *The Socialist* time, we did expect something better than the whines about "Discrimination" and "Hatred;" we sought to find it in the official pronouncement on "Democracy."

"Democracy," says *The Socialist*, "the rule of the majority, with full and free opportunity for the minority to express its opinions and to agitate for its ends, still remains the best method of conducting human affairs."

This like all the other cant about democracy, sounds well on paper, but as our friends use the phrase "still remains," they are apparently of the

opinion that this "method of conducting human affairs" is, or has been in operation somewhere. We would be glad to find where this elysium is or has been. In reference to national governments no such idealistic plan has even been tried, much less become the recognized method of administration. In political parties and societies where there is no responsibility for actual governmental administration, this method, so far as we are aware, has never been practised.

But let us put the theory to the test of practise. Is democracy the method of procedure within the Socialist Party? Is it the way in which those for whom *The Socialist* speaks, conduct the affairs of Local New York? Is it in the name of the "full and free opportunity for the minority to express its opinions and to agitate for its ends" that the Executive Committee has ordered the "reorganization" of the Branches which do not bow to its will? Was it under the influence of such high sounding ideals that the editor of *The Socialist* fathered the heresy-hunting resolution at the State Committee?

The Socialist's belief in democracy, like *The Call's* belief in the freedom of expression, is so much hypocritical cant. Both these publications are afraid of their own real beliefs, they are afraid openly to embrace the tactics they are logically driven to employ. Let us be under no misconception about these things. THE COMMUNIST is not in love with dictatorship or with any form of tyranny, any more than the workers and peasants of Russia are in love with the suppression of counter-revolution, but we recognize that democracy and freedom are mere shams under the existing form of society, and that during the transition period from Capitalism to the establishment of the Cooperative Commonwealth, all opposition to the will of the class-conscious workers must be stamped out or rendered innocuous.

We see from actual experience that political democracy will not and can not work. We recognize that under the cover of these lofty phrases Capitalism establishes the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. We hold that the half-truths of this idealistic language are so many traps and pitfalls for the working class, and we ruthlessly strip these phrases from our own movement. In society today the class struggle is raging, in some parts of the earth it has burst into open flame and the contest of ideas is being fought through the mouths of machine guns, through the power of the bayonet, through the ravages and the bloody horrors of war, in other parts it is comparatively quiescent, appearing in the form of strikes, lockouts, unemployment demonstrations. . . . To this struggle there can be only one end—the victory of the workers and the establishment of Socialism. When Socialist society is firmly established, when the opposition is once and for all defeated, then we can experiment with ideal democracy and the beautiful conceptions of society that many of us cherish. But until then we must struggle unhampered by any illusions as to what is the real nature of present day society, or any attempt to put into practice the pleasant theories evolved in the quiet studies of bourgeois idealists.

It is the duty of Socialists to point out to their worker brothers and sisters the brutal realities of capitalist society, and the necessity of the struggle against it. The beauties of Jeffersonian democracy have nothing whatever to do with the affairs of today. Governments are not wilfully less idealistic today than 140 years ago. They are facing different conditions and they act in accordance with the conditions that confront them. The ideals of American democracy were evolved upon the prostrate bodies of the negro race.

In the present crisis in the American Socialist Party let us also face the facts. We of the Left Wing are dissatisfied with the administration of the Party, local, state and national. We have protested in vain and we are now determined upon a showdown. We are out to capture the Party, to weld it to suit our purpose—the historic purpose of Socialism—and to rid it of the disease that has crept into its vitals. For this purpose we have stated our position as to what are the duties and purposes of the Socialist Party, and on this position we are appealing to our comrades throughout the Party. All over the country the men and women of the movement are lining up solidly behind that position.

Democracy is not the essential question at stake. We are not appealing to the membership about the lack of democracy manifest in the administration of the Party. That we consider a minor question and in due time we will indict our officialdom before the bar of Party opinion. The issue is clear cut and no amount of sneers at our personal courage, integrity or ability, nor covert hints to the American Government as regards the desirability of our arrest and incarceration, will deter us from stating that issue—whether the American Socialist Party is to be the party of revolutionary Socialism or whether it is to be the party of bourgeois liberalism, petty reforms and idealistic phraseology.

That is the issue on which we appeal to the membership over the heads of the Party bureaucracy. That is the issue upon which the Left Wing organization is based.

The Party Congressional Platform for 1918

By Bertram D. Wolfe

THE Left Wing holds it to be axiomatic that Socialists cannot be made except by teaching Socialism. All that most non-Socialists ever see of Socialist doctrine is that which is contained in our "Socialist" platform, official resumés of Socialist doctrine, and interpretations of current issues. It follows that upon the nature of our platform depends very largely the type of our converts. A revolutionary platform will not attract the bourgeoisie, and a petit-bourgeois platform will never attract the militant section of the working class.

Now the 1918 Congressional Platform of the American Socialist Party is the unadulterated work of its "theoreticians," its "leaders," unhampered by any suggestion from the rank and file. Written without a convention, adopted without a referendum, heralded by the Congressional candidates that ran on it for office, welcomed with fulsome praise by the petit-bourgeois organs, "The Nation," "The Dial" and the "New Republic," fathered and mothered in the People's House under the direction of two bureaus of "Socialist" research—surely this must be a model platform for a Socialist party.

Before we examine its 57 planks, let us sum up the conditions out of which it grew and into which it was launched upon an expectant world. The platform is dated 1918. We may presume that it written in that year or the year previous. Internal evidence proves that it was written after the Russian revolutions had taken place, including the proletarian revolution. The program was launched in the midst of "a dying social order." (p. 24.) The Capitalist system was tottering. In Russia, the proletariat had raised the standard of international revolution and called upon the workers of the world to unite around it. The war could only end in a relapse into barbarism or a world revolution. "Reconstruction" of the capitalist order was an impossibility.

And the 1918 platform? What else could it be but a summons to the proletariat to fulfill its historic mission? I have looked in vain through its 24 pages of 19-point type for a single mention of Socialism. The word does not occur once. The spirit of the class struggle—nay the very word "class struggle" is missing from its pages. Surplus value—not a suspicion of it. Historic materialism—the program never heard of any such doctrine. Historic materialism, class struggle, surplus value—are these not the three aspects the trinity, the union of which is the Socialist movement, its aim, its science, its tactics? What else is there to Socialism? What is there of Socialism in anything else?

Marx severely criticised the Gotha Program of 1875 because it erroneously declared that labor is the source of all wealth instead of saying the source of all value. He could not criticise the 1918 platform on that score, because it does not hint that labor is the source of anything.

STATE CAPITALISM.

The Russian revolution was proving, the Paris Commune had proved in practise, what Marx and Engels had taught in theory—that the Bourgeois State must be captured and destroyed, that the Proletarian State, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat must take its place—and that the proletarian state would die a natural death.

The 1918 Platform assumes the eternity of the State—nay more, the eternity of the present, the bourgeois state. On the first page and in bold type, the 1918 Platform announces what it believes to be "the greatest of all issues with which the world stands faced *the state is dominating industry. Who shall dominate the state?* On the answer to this question depends the future of mankind."

Engels has patiently explained that "the modern State, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the ideal personification of the total national capital." Yet the 1918 Platform does not see the difference between State-Capitalist and Socialist measures, between Wilson's Parcel-Post banks and Lenin's, between government ownership through bourgeois dictatorship and government ownership through the proletarian dictatorship. The first step in the Social Revolution is the seizure of the political power by the proletariat. The 1918 platform doesn't mention the first step, but "demands" that the present State take over the railroads, mines, power, natural resources, large scale industries and the like. Says Engels: "The more it (the present State) proceeds to the taking over of productive forces, the more does it actually become the national capitalist, the more citizens does it exploit." Engels merely says that the State "will have to" undertake the direction of industries, the 1918 platform "demands" that it do it. Surely, its authors are more revolutionary than Engels.

Space forbids an analysis of the "revolutionary" methods by which the Socialist party "de-

mands" that the State take over industries. We can only note in passing that "this process shall be undertaken as speedily as is consistent with *public order and security*"; that the Socialist Party "demands that the compensation, if any (we wonder why the doubt?), paid to the original owners is in no case to exceed the original cost of the physical property; and finally, we are so thoroughly bitten by the parliamentary bug of investigation commissions which publish reports, that when we come to the State ownership of electric power, our revolutionary program of expropriation culminates in a "demand" which must be quoted in full lest we miss some of the inspiration it contains:

"The Socialist Party demands *immediate* appointment of a Federal Power Commission with adequate representation of labor (Sammy Gompers take notice) *to make an exhaustive* (and no doubt exhaustive) *investigation* into the subject, *and to recommend legislation to Congress* which will embody a comprehensive power development policy."

REFORMS IN THE STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT.

When we come to the heading, "The Structure of Government," we begin to pick up hope. "The present structure of government is totally inadequate to assume the additional burden of industrial control." Perhaps we have been hasty in our judgment; perhaps the program warns that none of these things can be accomplished until the state has been revolutionized and the proletarian dictatorship established. Let us examine the measures proposed for the revolutionizing of the State. The system of checks and balances has destroyed efficiency, we complain. Then, in the interests of "democracy," we select the most inefficient branch of the government—Congress—and demand that the other two branches be made responsible to it.

Not content with that, the program sets out to show Capitalism how to perfect bourgeois democracy. Here follow a startling series of "demands;" abolition of the Senate, democratization of Congressional procedure, direct election of the President and Vice-President, etc., etc., culminating in two super-revolutionary measures that will make Lenin look to his laurels, namely: "the terms of Congressmen to begin soon after election" and "self-government for the District of Columbia."

As I write, out of the past comes an insistent echo of Marx's thunderous denunciations of the Gotha platform: "But the platform applies neither to the latter (revolutionary dictatorship) nor to the future organization of communist society."

"Its political demands contain nothing but the old democratic litany known to all the world, 'universal suffrage,' 'direct legislation' (for the district of Columbia?), 'popular rights,' 'protection of the people,' etc. They are a mere echo of the middle class Populist party."

Next comes a section on "Civil Liberties"—utterly ridiculous if addressed to the present reactionary bourgeois State. The outstanding feature of this bourgeois bill of rights is a "demand" that "mob violence be suppressed through the power of the federal government." A most dangerous demand to be made upon a reactionary government by a revolutionary party which depends upon mob violence (mass action) as a necessary weapon to overthrow the present State! Never fear, you needn't demand that the government suppress mob violence! It surely will, and American Noskes rallying around these very slogans of the 1918 platform will lead the suppression.

TAXATION.

The next section deals with taxation. It contains a heartrending preamble to the effect that capitalism, poor capitalism, is tottering as a result of the "colossal war debt" and that (the Socialist party and the 1918 platform to the rescue!) we are going to show capitalism how to solve the problems of the public debt and the "ever menacing problem of wealth concentration." (Which Marx foolishly thought inevitable under the present system—inevitable and the inevitable cause of the Revolution.) "To this end we favor"—for we are treading on bourgeois ground and therefore we no longer demand—"an excess profits tax of *approximately* 100 per cent (a manifest impossibility under Capitalism); a progressive income tax; a progressive inheritance tax rising to 100% in large estates; taxation of "the unearned increment of land" (is there an earned increment?); "and a more adequate corporations tax." I will forbear to inquire what the authors of this great document meant by "more adequate"; by "a comfortable and secure livelihood" which is not to be touched by the income tax or by "approximately 100%." But I trust I will be pardoned if I quote the words of the now obviously antiquated Marx, who seemed to believe that: "Taxes are the foundation of the governmental machinery and of nothing else. An income tax presupposes the different sources of income of the different social classes, hence capitalist society." Poor

Marx seemed to think that taxation under Capitalism was no concern of the revolutionary proletariat. But since 1918 we know better!

Of course, modern finance is based on credit, and if that should break down, Heaven help us! the financial system might collapse; hence "our" program must needs concern itself with restoration of "our" shaky credit system, therefore we elaborate a plan upon which I need not comment, except to note that we have succeeded in finding a scheme whereby, under Capitalism, we can eliminate entirely the necessity of maintaining a gold reserve! Isn't that a splendid contribution to the saving of "civilization," at a time when it is threatened by the over-capitalization of a pitifully inadequate gold supply!

Upon the Non-Partisan League platform, which has found its way into the 1918 program under the head of "Agriculture," I shall not dwell, except to quote our revolutionary demands for "Public insurance against diseases of animals, diseases of plants, insect pests, hail, flood, drought, storm and fire;" and to delay any further analysis until we come to the general subject of sops and palliatives.

There is a chapter on "Conservation of Natural Resources" in which we "urge,"—in place of "demanding"—for we modestly feel that we are not experts in conservation as we are in high finance, and must therefore confine our services to mere advice. There is a chapter on Criminology which seems to be a combination of Enrico Ferri and August Claessens, with the caption, "Prisons." There is a section on the Negro, which, peculiarly enough, demands "industrial citizenship" for the Negro (we vaguely wonder why the white wasn't included). Why does the program want to give him "political citizenship," and exactly what do our "leaders" mean by "educational citizenship" for the same oppressed Negro? If it is worth anything, we should like it too; if not, why "wish" it on the down-trodden black man?

We will not turn back to the one section which mentions the proletariat, entitled "Labor Legislation." It is a compound of old Bismarckian formulae long ago introduced into Germany, such as minimum wage, unemployment insurance and the like,—and this brings us to the subject of sops and palliatives in general.

I have used the familiar division of reforms into "sops" and "palliatives" because in these two words are implied the nature and purpose of two distinct kinds of "reforms." "Palliatives" are reforms handed down by the bourgeoisie organized as the ruling class, to make industry more bearable in order that labor power may not thereby be impaired. Of such nature was the shortening of the working day to prevent the rapid deterioration of labor-power resulting from the long working day of the early capitalist epoch.

If a dog demands meat, and his demand becomes more and more insistent until he threatens to take it out of the calf of your leg, and you do not wish to give him meat, you may dip a piece of bread in gravy and throw him that—a "sop."

As the working class becomes more and more conscious of its revolutionary aims, sops are thrown more and more frequently, to divert the workers from these same revolutionary aims. If the Socialist party, the most advanced section of the working class, turns aside for these sops when the goal is close at hand; if it goes further and issues a platform declaring that it is fighting for these sops, and neglects to mention anything but sops among its demands; if finally, it pretends to have won what capitalism has in self-defense handed down to it—it thereby diverts the working class from its class-conscious revolutionary aims, plays into the hands of capitalism, falling for sop and palliative alike, ceases to teach Socialism and make Socialists, and produces the 1918 Congressional Platform of the Socialist Party.

"INTERNATIONALISM" IN THE PLATFORM.

There remain two more things to consider: "International Reconstruction" and "Conclusion," in which last we may perhaps expect to find a statement of Socialist principles.

The very title, "reconstruction," is an index to the bourgeois character of the platform's attitude. Capitalism is on the verge of collapse. In Russia a portion of the mighty edifice has been overthrown. The most truly advanced section of the working class in other countries is preparing to tear it down section by section till the whole edifice is destroyed. The revolutionary American proletariat, organized into the American Socialist Party, seeing Capitalism's desperate straits, will help to stave off the collapse of "civilization," will reconstruct the shaky structure, will keep alive the dying order.

And so the Platform demands a League of Nations. Of course, we call it a "Federation of Peo-

(Continued on page 8)

Why Political Democracy Must Go

By John Reed

THE history of Socialism in America is of the most absorbing interest. Every new theory of cohorts for a descent upon the 3d, 5th wings of the factory system, had its immediate repercussion in the New World. The present Left Wing movement in the Socialist Party, with its reflex of the new tendencies of European Socialism, is, in that characteristic, not exceptional.

For example, in 1826 the Englishman, Robert Owen, moved to America and started his New Harmony colony. About the same time Albert Brisbane (father of Arthur Brisbane, Mr. Hearst's right-hand man), introduced into America the philosophy of Fourier, to which he converted Horace Greeley; this resulted in a series of communistic experiments in co-operative industry and agriculture. Greeley abandoned pure Fourierism, and tinkered with "profit-sharing" and other varieties of cooperation, that led to the great movement for producers' and consumers' cooperatives in New England, which culminated and then died down in the eighties.

The characteristic of native American social ideas was their intense individualism. The economic reason for this was, the historical condition of American social development, which identified the concentration of labor and capital in cities with the loss of individual liberty characteristic of a population largely agricultural and scattered thinly over a great area.

One of the earliest native social philosophies was transcendentalism, which took various forms, including the esthetic individualism of Thoreau; the intellectual individualism of Emerson—whose ideas, however, were considered so dangerous to society that he was not permitted to lecture at Harvard University; the "associationist" cooperative activity of Channing, grafted onto Fourierism; and finally, the revolutionary ideas of Orestes Brownson.

Brownson, of the above, was the only real member of the working-class. It is interesting here to quote from his article, "The Laboring Classes," published in 1840, an account of the factories of New England, where the workers were mostly women:

"The great mass wear out their health, spirits and morals without becoming one whit better off than when they commenced labor. The bills of mortality in these villages are not striking, we admit, for the poor girls when they can toil no longer go home to die. We know no sadder sight on earth than one of our factory villages presents, when the bell at break of day, or at the hour of breakfast or dinner, calls out its hundreds or thousands of operatives."

Read this, and then go to Lawrence, or Providence, or Fall River today. The only difference is that now the workers are foreign women, while then they were Americans.

Brownson had had never seen the Communist Manifesto. Yet in 1840 he advocated the overthrow of the capitalist state, and declared any means justifiable. It is startling at this time to read what he says:

"And is this measure to be easily carried? Not at all. It will cost infinitely more than it cost to abolish either hereditary monarchy or hereditary nobility. It is a great measure and a startling. The rich, the business community, will never voluntarily consent to it, and we think we know too much of human nature to believe that it will ever be effected peaceably. It will be effected only by the strong arm of physical force. It will come, if it ever comes at all, only at the conclusion of a war, the like of which the world has yet never witnessed, and from which, however inevitable it may seem to the eye of philosophy, the heart of humanity recoils with horror."

"We are not ready for this measure yet. There is much previous work to be done, and we should be the last to bring it before the legislature. The time, however, has come for its free and full discussion. It must be canvassed in the public mind, and society prepared for acting on it."

Another direction taken by native American social theories was reform of the systems of exchange and banking.

Josiah Warren, the "first American anarchist," opened a series of stores where goods were sold at cost, and the labor of the salesmen was paid for by an equal amount of labor by the purchaser. He founded several colonies, which were based on the principle that price should be determined by labor-cost. He was followed by William Beck, with his "ticket-system" of doing away with banks, and the substitution of purchasing power for currency. Then came William Weitling, the German immigrant, with his plan for a "bank of exchange," in which price would be fixed by "labor-time." This was a compromise with the ideas which he had first brought from Europe in 1847—*common ownership of all property and centralized management of production and exchange*. The reason for this change is very significant. Both in Europe and America the merchant-capitalist was the dominant enemy of the working class. But in Europe it was realized that a social and political revolution was necessary to get rid of him (indicated by the Revolutions of 1848), while in America the workers

stroy existing political institutions.

The first appearance in this country of Marxian Socialism was in 1852-3, when Joseph Weydemeyer, a friend and disciple of Marx and Engels, came to New York and organized a short-lived revolutionary society known as the *Proletarierbund*. Then he attempted to spread his ideas in the ranks of the trade-unions forming at the time, and organized an association among the German workers called the General Workingmen's Alliance, which began the publication of a Communist paper called *Die Reform*. The movement spread. A similar organization was started among the English-speaking workers. But the growing wave of trade unionism finally overwhelmed it, and Marxian Socialism, with its conception of the class struggle, its recognition of trades-unionism and political action, disappeared until after the Civil War.

The First International, founded in London in 1864, for which Karl Marx wrote the inaugural address, began with an organization of British trade-union leaders to prevent the importation of strike-breakers into England from the continent. It developed into a sort of general Workers' Union, in whose ranks two theories battled; that of Mazzini, advocating the harmony of the interests of capital and labor (from which the philosophy of the A. F. of L. is directly descended), and that of Marx, who emphasized the class solidarity of labor in all lands. Not until the Bakuninites almost captured the movement in the early seventies did the actual program of Socialism become the leading issue. The early philosophy of the International was based on the economic organization of the workers into trade unions and cooperatives, to precede the seizure of the political state. It took ten years for this idea to become firmly established in America.

On the other hand, the Lasallean agitation of 1863 in Germany was immediately reproduced here. Lasalle emphasized political action, the political capture of the State *first*—this capture to be followed by the organization of the working class into co-operatives assisted by State credit.

In 1865 there was formed in New York the General German Workingmen's Union, which subsequently became Section I of the International. Its original declared:

"Under the name of the General German Workingmen's Union are united all Social-Republicans, particularly those who regard Ferdinand Lasalle as the most eminent champion of the working class, for the purpose of reaching a true point of view on all social questions. . . . While in Europe only a general revolution can form the means of uplifting the working people, in America the education of the masses will instill them with the degree of self-confidence that is indispensable for the effective and intelligent use of the ballot, and will eventually lead to the emancipation of the working people from the yoke of capital."

Seven years before this, however, there had been established a Marxian organization, the Communist Club, based on the *Communist Manifesto*, among whom were many members afterward prominent in the American International, and who conducted a voluminous correspondence with Marx, Engels and Becker.

In 1868, the Communist Club and the Workingmen's Union united to form a political party, the Social Party of New York and vicinity. It is interesting to note here that this party was, out of deference to the English-speaking workers, a distinctly social reform party, advocating progressive income taxes, abolition of national banks, right of issue of paper money reserved to the Government, an eight-hour law, etc. The campaign of 1868 proved it a failure. In December of 1869, it joined the International, and began work of Socialist study and general Socialist propaganda, on the basis of Marx's *Capital*.

In the next two years a number of new sections of the International were organized, consisting mostly of foreign immigrants. There was a French section, a Bohemian section, and several Irish sections. But besides the foreign immigrants, there was another group, Americans, who joined the International. This was made up of intellectuals, inheritors of the traditions of transcendentalism and Fourierism in the forties and fifties. They had formed an organization called the New Democracy, whose platform advocated electoral reforms, such as the referendum, and State Socialism.

In 1870 the New Democracy disbanded, and its members joined the International as sections 9 and 12, of New York. Section 12, under the leadership of two sisters, Victoria Woodhull and Tennessee Claflin, well-known advocates of "social freedom," quickly became famous. It turned its attention to

language," woman suffrage, "freedom of sexual relations." This imperilled the very successful propaganda of the Central Committee among labor organizations. Section 12 pursued its activities in the name of the International, refusing to recognize the authority of the Central Committee, and appealing to the General Council in London to become the leading Section in America—which was rejected. Finally the foreign sections decided to put a stop to the activities of Section 12. The delegates of fourteen sections met and dissolved the Central Committee, reorganizing under the name of the Federal Council, and excluding Section 12 and a few sympathizing sections, which they offered admittance on the basis of the following propositions:

"1. Only the labor question to be treated in the organization.

"2. Only new sections to be admitted two thirds of whose members are wage laborers.

"3. Section 12 to be excluded, as strangers to the labor movement."

Section 12, being entirely composed of intellectuals, refused. The German sections called a national convention to legalize their coup d'etat. The General Council in London made an investigation, and in 1872 Section 12 was expelled from the International. But Section 12 and its followers refused to accept the decision, and called a national convention of its own, in which were represented thirteen Sections, mostly English-speaking. This convention denounced the interference of the General Council in American affairs, and declared its intention to appeal to the General Congress of the International, at the Hague, in 1872.

Although Section 12 and its adhering Sections opposed the Marxians, they did not ally themselves with Bakunin and his faction—although at the Hague Congress Bakunin supported the delegates of Section 12, who were expelled with him from the International. The new organization dominated by Section 12 turned its attention to politics. At the same time, the convention of the regular International in America proclaimed as its intention "to rescue the working classes from the influence and power of all political parties, and show that the existence of all these parties is a crime and a threat against the working classes." It did not recognize that the time was yet ripe for political action.

In the Hague Congress, Sorge, representing the orthodox Marxian organization in America, gave as his reason why the native American Sections were not entitled to representation, *that the native Americans were practically all speculators, while the immigrants alone constituted the wage-earning class in America*.

The headquarters of the International was transferred to New York in 1873. From then strife developed within its ranks, until the convention of 1874, when the two opposing conceptions of political action pure and simple, as against the organization of trade-unions as a basis for political action, again split the American International, and the political actionists permanently withdrew, and started the Social Democratic Party of North America. At the same time, the Labor Party of Chicago was formed.

In Europe, too, the workingmen were building up political parties in place of federations of the International. And this had its effect upon the American labor movement. But the chief reasons for the tendency toward political organization were the disastrous effects of the panic of 1873, which practically destroyed the American trade union movement, and a desire to make Socialism more attractive to the American workers—that is, to the small property holders.

But at the same time the American workingmen were perfecting the first of their powerful economic organizations, the two even then beginning their struggle for mastery on the industrial field—the Knights of Labor and the craft union movement. Politically, the rank and file of both these organizations were entirely impregnated with petit-bourgeois psychology. The Pittsburgh General Labor Convention of 1876 was captured by the Knights of Labor, who endorsed Greenbackism, from cheap money to the protective tariff, and thus cut adrift from the Socialists, who withdrew from the convention.

The result was to unite the Socialist factions, which came together and adopted a declaration of principles taken from the General Statutes of the International, and organized the Workingmen's Party of the United States, which immediately plunged into politics.

My purpose in thus reviewing the early history of the American Socialist movement in detail, is to call attention to the nature of its action in the American political structure. Of course it is obvious that the influence of Socialism upon the American state up

Left Wing Notes

THE Left Wing organization has decided to support the following nominee and asks all revolutionary Socialists to do likewise:

For Executive Secretary of Local New York: Maximilian Cohen.

In view of the referendum on the State Executive Committee resolution to expel all branches and locals that have joined the Left Wing Section, all the branches and locals throughout the State should make arrangements to have Left Wing speakers state our case.

Left Wing speakers can be secured by communicating with Maximilian Cohen, Secretary of the Left Wing Section, 43 West 29th Street, New York City.

All Left Wing communications of this column should be addressed to Maximilian Cohen, 43 West 29th Street, and should reach him not later than Tuesday morning for insertion the same week.

Appeal for Funds for The N. Y. Communist

COMRADES: The Left Wing is in need of funds for the issuance of its paper; we have no dues paying membership and are solely dependent upon the voluntary contributions of comrades for our support. If you think our movement is necessary, if you feel that we must have public expression, you must come to our support. In the present crisis, more than ever before, we must keep in the field, our paper must be published. WE NEED FUNDS.

A Joint District Meeting of the 8th A. D., Socialist Party, will be held at 122 Second Avenue, Thursday evening, May 22d, at 8 P. M. Very important business will be taken up.

At the last meeting of the Left Wing caucus of the Central Committee, Local Bronx, Benj. Gitlow, H. Bourgin, A. Winick, Dr. Glouberman and Roman Bluegrass were endorsed as the candidates for the City Committee from Local Bronx.

Owing to an error in the minutes of the City Committee of May 14th, Comrade Lore's name was inserted instead of Comrade Lovestone's as one of the delegates to the Left Wing National Convention. A donation of \$50 from Local Queens to the Left Wing was erroneously recorded as \$5.

The following locals have joined the Left Wing:

to 1880 was necessarily small, because the movement itself was overshadowed by other political movements. Still, at a time when movements in Europe very similar in size and importance were having an important effect upon the policies of various governments, the effect in America was absolutely nil.

Why? I have tried to point out in this series of articles the disastrous effect of political democratic ideology upon the growth of class-consciousness. Even after the capitalist class in America had learned that government is not carried on in legislatures, but in banks and Chambers of Commerce, the workers still believed that political democracy could solve the problems of the wage-earners. This belief affected and modified the revolutionary theories imported from Europe. And when it did not, the class-conscious workingmen's organizations soon found that the capitalist political parties, with their appeal to small property holders, were easily able to capture the labor vote from the Socialists.

And finally, although, as Sorge stated at the Hague Congress, "the foreign immigrants alone constituted the wage-earning class in America," they found themselves unable in any way to bring influence upon the government or the ruling classes—because they were foreigners.

This is as true today as it was in 1876—if not more so, on account of the war. The foreign workers in this country are virtually excluded from all participation in the government, although they constitute the majority of the American working class. Although naturalized citizens, the latest immigration laws nullify this advantage, because under them citizenship can be revoked upon conviction of having revolutionary ideas. Their organizations are powerless; their press is muzzled; the courts convict them of political offenses upon the slightest evidence, and Organized Labor—as typified in the A. F. of L.—bars them from the advantages of even the inadequate labor organizations formed to defend the workers' economic interests.

The present outlawing of Socialists in politics, because they are Socialists, indicates the answer of the democratic State to the political action of the class-conscious workers.

[To be continued]

Help Your Comrades!

At least one hundred workers who participated in the Cleveland May Day Demonstration, have been railroaded to prison. So far as the ten, fifteen or thirty days that comrades must serve in the workhouse, those who are outside cannot help them. But we can see to it that not a single man or woman remains in the workhouse to work out the fine and costs which are part of all the sentences.

Under the unjust laws now existing, a man or woman who is poor and cannot pay fine and costs must remain in the workhouse to work out the fine and costs at the rate of sixty cents per day. In other words every sentence which includes a fine of \$25.000 and costs means that the prisoner will have to serve fifty or sixty additional days to work out that part of his or her sentence.

This must not be. The fines must be paid. In addition, the families of some of those who are in prison will be in need before their sentences expire. We must help them. They must not suffer. Send donations to C. E. Ruthenberg, 1222 Prospect Ave., Cleveland.

Locals Sandusky, Toledo, Youngstown, Akron, Hamilton and Zanesville, all of Ohio.

The United Lettish Singing Society held an entertainment at which \$33 was collected for the Left Wing.

Local Utica, N. Y., has adopted the Left Wing Manifesto and Program and revised its platform to conform with Left Wing principles.

Lettish Branch No. 1, of Local Bronx (185 members in good standing) has passed a resolution condemning the New York State Committee for having adopted "artificial means to attempt to throw out a considerable number of the Party members in the State of New York, which of necessity would force a split.

"Resolved, That members of the State Committee voting for the aforesaid resolution, do not and can not represent the wishes of the Party, therefore we call for a referendum to recall the following delegates: Samuel Orr, Esther Friedman, Marie McDonald."

Left Wing Branches in the Bronx are requested to second this resolution.

The 17th A. D. (unreorganized), will hold a discussion meeting on the Left Wing Manifesto on Thursday, May 22, at its headquarters, 1538 Madison Avenue. On Friday, May 23, Dr. Fredrick Blossom will lecture at the headquarters on Industrial Unionism versus Craft Unionism.

TO THE JEWISH LEFT WINGERS

A send-off party will be held this Saturday evening at 8:30 P. M., for the Left Wing delegates to the Jewish Socialist Federation Convention, at the

Local Kings at its Central Committee, May 17th, joined the Left Wing and adopted the following resolution by a vote of 68 to 21:

Whereas, we desire to clearly place ourselves on record for, and openly and actively align ourselves with the revolutionary proletariat the world over, as at present expressed by the policies and tactics of the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviki), the Communist Labor Party of Germany (Spartacans) and other parties in harmony with them, be it

Resolved, That we, Local Kings in Party Membership meeting assembled this 17th day of May, 1919, adopt as our official expression the Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing Section of the Socialist Party, Greater New York; and be it further

Resolved, That we pledge both financial and moral support to the Left Wing propaganda and organization, working to the end that the National Organization conforms with the policies of this Program; and be it further

Resolved, That all delegates, committees and officials of Local Kings adhere strictly to this Manifesto and Program; and be it further

Resolved, That Local Kings will not countenance or compromise with any half way measures, but that the change in policies and tactics must be complete, even if it necessitates the severance of relations with those constituting the right.

headquarters of the 8th A. D., 122 Second Avenue. All Left Wingers are invited! Admission 50c.

Arrangements are being made for a monster picnic on Sunday, June 29, for the benefit of the I. W. W. defense. Other organizations are being asked to keep that date open, so that there may be no conflict. The affair will be held at Liberty Park, Evergree, Brooklyn.

At a meeting of the City Committee held on the 5th day of May it was decided to call a City Convention and that the basis of representation shall be:

"One delegate for every 50 members in good standing or major fraction thereof; that branches shall elect delegates directly."

You are therefor requested to send out a call to the branches instructing them to elect delegates to the convention on the basis decided by the City Committee.

The convention will be held on June 14th and 15th in the People's House and the order of business will be as follows:

Consolidation of Locals into a Greater City Local. Taking action on Party Ownership of Press.

Taking action on the Left Wing.

Taking up the question of the re-organization of branches in Local New York.

Send the names of the delegates elected and the branches they represent to the secretary at the Queens Labor Lyceum, Myrtle and Cypress Avenues, Ridgewood, L. I.

A class in public speaking is being formed by the 17th A. D. The work will consist mainly of practice in the open air under the instruction and criticism of Henry Engles. There will be no charge. All members are urged to join.

The South Slavic Branch, New York, unanimously joined the Left Wing of the Socialist Party.

The Telescope

IF *The Socialist* pays a little more attention to the details of the make-up of THE COMMUNIST it ought soon to be a fairly presentable looking paper.

We are pleased to see that our stuff is striking home—the 6th A. D. is quite riled at "The Pink Terror" which is exactly what was intended. We aim to please.

Unconscious humor—The 6th A. D. resolving against THE COMMUNIST.

"Where were these strong men on May Day?" asks Joe Gollomb. If all accounts are true at least one strong man was up on the top floor of *The Call's* new building listening to the "crescendo of the cries of the women and children" who were being clubbed on the floors below by the uniformed thugs. Discretion is the better part of valor, Joe.

And we suppose the rest of them were out on the barricades along with Louis Waldman.

So Buffalo wouldn't stand for Claessens. Well it has been a long lane but it has turned at last.

The dread spectre of economic determinism now stalks through the ranks of the Right Wing. Listen to the voice of fear—"Who is the next to be proscribed?" asks *The Socialist*.

But there's always jobs in the Labor Party for advocates of municipal ownership.

Pathetic Figures: No. 1, Abe Beckerman reorganizing the 3rd, 5th and 10th A. D.

"I do not pretend to deal in any exhaustive fashion with the whole broad subject of Socialist principles and policy," says Algernon Lee in *The Socialist*. We hope that this new policy of candor will soon prevade the Rand School.

The Executive Committee's Statement

By Maximilian Cohen

The following letter was sent to "The New York Call" in answer to the Local Executive Committee's ukase which was published in that paper. In spite of its belief in the freedom of the press, which led it to publish such letters as Shaplen's defense of Kolchak, "The Call" refused to publish this letter, which is one side of the controversy now raging within the Socialist Party:

EDITOR of *The Call*: Permit me to answer the statement issued by the Executive Committee of Local New York, and printed in to-day's issue of *The Call*, pertaining to the Left Wing controversy. In view of the gravity of the crisis precipitated by their illegal acts, and in view of their statement which is nothing more than a tissue of lies concocted for the purpose of fooling the membership as to the actual situation, I feel that you will be fair enough to grant me space in which to reply.

In the first place, the Executive Committee is absolutely without any authority to re-organize any branches in New York, until the referendum issued by the State Committee has been passed, and then they not only have that right but also the right to automatically expel them. *Why then does the Executive Committee proceed to deprive Branches of the right to vote on this referendum by "re-organizing" them now?*

Their only semblance of an excuse for their wholesale "re-organizations" is that at "the last Central Committee meeting, Comrade Karlin, who was not chairman, moved that, when the Central Committee adjourns, it adjourn subject to call by the Executive Committee, and that the Executive Committee be empowered and instructed to re-organize Local New York and put it on a working basis. This motion was adopted." *This is a deliberate lie.*

No such motion was ever put much less carried, for one reason, the meeting had been adjourned by the chairman; secondly, the room was in an indescribable turmoil with a police-captain driving the delegates out. What really occurred and this will be corroborated by most of the unbiased members and delegates present, was, that during the height of the confusion Comrade Karlin, after consultation with the group around him, suddenly arose and cupping his hands over his mouth shouted above the din, that there would be no further meeting of the Central Committee until the Executive Committee decided to call for same. We noticed the recording secretary writing furiously at this time and predicted among ourselves that they would claim that this motion was passed. As a matter of fact it was a physical impossibility for any one either to put a motion or have the vote counted. Fights were going on simultaneously all over the hall. Members and delegates mingled indiscriminately, voices were shouting, hisses and epithets, and they have the audacity to claim that such a motion was passed at this time! Why, in their sheet, *The Socialist*, they went further and purported to give the exact vote by which this motion was passed—71 to 36 are the figures given. *This then is their basis for the "Re-organization" methods.*

I leave it to the comrades to judge the merits of their case.

In their statement they give an account of the rupture in the 17th A. D., showing how it led up to the fillibuster at the last Central Committee meeting. Aside from misstating the facts, distorting others, and omitting important ones, it is a fairly accurate account. The Executive Committee does not state why a branch could not withdraw and elect officers and delegates the same night, although there is nothing in the by-laws prohibiting such action. The by-laws only relate to the annual nominations and elections. In recalling delegates and officers, the clause says nothing about such procedure. *As a matter of fact this has been the procedure for years!* But when the Left Wing became a factor in the 8th A. D., and had an overwhelming majority in the branch and they proceeded to use their legitimate power to recall those pets of the Right Wing Machine, Waldman, Lee and Block, and elected three Left Wingers in their place, the Central Committee refused to seat the new delegates on the grounds that a special meeting should have been called, nominations made, then and elections at the next meeting. The Left Wing in the 8th A. D., sure of their majority, complied with the unfair ruling, and at a subsequent meeting, having duly notified the members of the branch, recalled the old delegates and nominated new ones. Elections were held at the following meeting.

Now, then, the 17th A. D., realizing that if they recalled and elected delegates on the same meeting night they would be subject to the same treatment, and further realizing that their normal majority would be sure to be diminished by the colonizing of their opponents, decided to recall all their officers and

delegates (excepting three), all to act, however, until new elections took place. The first meeting was packed by the Rights and the motion to recall was lost by nine votes; at the next meeting they succeeded in recalling them (with the stipulation referred to above). They could have elected new officers and delegates right then, if they were so minded, so the charge that they wantonly dissolved the branch is pure bunk. They merely wanted to make sure that the Central Committee would seat their delegates.

The Right Wing was faced with the immediate loss of their majority in the Central Committee. Action, and quick action was necessary. Other branches were in the process of recalling their delegates and electing Left Wingers in their places. With the exception of the Finnish Branch (counter-revolutionary and social-patriotic in all their actions for the past year and a half), most of the language branches were going to the Left. I mention these facts to show the desperate situation the Right Wing was facing. What did they do?

Comrade Julius Gerber (whose heart was bleeding with righteousness and wrath), issued a secret call for an organization meeting of his trusted cronies on Monday, April 21st, at his office. In his letter (published in full in the N. Y. COMMUNIST, May 1st), he says, "Tuesday evening, the Central Committee meets. At this meeting the die will be cast as far as Local New York is concerned." Further on he continues, "I have for myself, decided as to my course and my action." At this secret meeting this gang decided to push through by hook or by crook, the concurrence by the Central Committee with the action of the Executive Committee, in illegally re-organizing the 17th A. D., with methods that would put the Tammany machine to shame. The only thing lacking now was official sanction by the Central Committee. Then they could sanctimoniously claim that the entire action was legal and binding. That this was but the prelude to a series of wholesale such "re-organizations" we were certain, and I openly charged them with it in the Central Committee, which they dared not refute.

It is true that the Left Wing delegates had a "steering committee" and we never hid that fact; in fact we openly stated so, and even gave I. Phillips and Gerber copies of our rules. We entered the meeting at ten minutes after eight and found, contrary to the usual custom, most of the delegates in their seats and the meeting already opened; that meetings were never opened before eight fifteen is a well-known fact. We were surprised, but on the vote for chairman realized that the meeting was packed and something was to be jammed through. We were not wrong in our surmise, when immediately after Comrade Lee blossomed out as a delegate from the 16th A. D. (after having been repudiated by his own branch), Comrade Gerber called off the credentials of delegates from the illegally "re-organized" 17th A. D. Cries from all over the house for the reading of the credentials from the legitimate branch caused that worthy to bow to the storm. He read them apologetically and with sneers. Thereupon, as pre-arranged, Comrade Beckerman rose, was granted the floor, and moved that the Central Committee concur with the action of the Executive Committee in "re-organizing" the 17th A. D.

Granted the floor next, I moved an amendment that a committee of seven be appointed from this body, three from the Right, three from the Left and an impartial chairman selected unanimously, who should investigate the case of the 17th A. D. and report back to the Central Committee at the next meeting. This amendment, eminently fair and just, was defeated. Later on, when I appealed to the delegates to hear a committee of three bearing credentials signed by 96 members of the 17th A. D., my appeal was again lost. *Did not this prove that the Right Wing was out for its pound of flesh?*

So much for events. Now let us analyze their theoretical position, viz.: "Do not be deceived. The question at issue is not merely one of revising our party's platform or its tactics. Differences of opinion on these matters are always in order. The constitution and by-laws of the party give ample opportunity for discussing such questions and deciding them by the will of the majority. Your Executive Committee has neither the right nor the desire to interfere in such matters. On the contrary, it is striving to maintain the normal conditions for free and fair discussion and decision."

This quotation is from their statement in to-day's *Call*. It sounds plausible. To the uninitiated it may even seem eminently fair. But is it? Let us see.

Any sane Socialist knows that the organization of the Left Wing was due to the inertia and actual blocking by the officials of every attempt of the

rank and file to express itself ever since the St. Louis Resolution was adopted by the rank and file. Permit me to enumerate them chronologically: (1) The Meyer London re-nomination. (2) The Socialist Alderman and the Third Liberty Loan. (3) The Socialist Aldermen and the Fourth Liberty Loan. (4) The Socialist Aldermen and the Victory Arch appropriation. To say nothing of every attempt to consolidate the locals of Greater New York being blocked by the officialdom. To say nothing of the resentment of the rank and file against the N. Y. *Call's* attitude towards the Bolsheviks in Russia and the Spartacans in Germany, which again was crushed by the officialdom, without redress by the members because the *Call* is not party owned or controlled.

These well-known incidents give the *lie direct* to their claim that the regular party channels are open.

Slimily and hypocritically they prate of petty platforms and tactics not being the main issue; giving the impression that they are in favor of a radical revision along the lines laid down in the Left Wing Program. Here, we must call Comrade Gerber and Comrade Waldman to testify. Comrade Gerber in his letter to his cronies, for that secret meeting before the Central Committee meeting of April 22nd, lets the cat out of the bag; he says: "While the control of the party by these irresponsible people will make the party an outlaw organization, and break up the organization." And yet what would these "irresponsible people" do? Merely carry out the letter and spirit of the Manifesto and Program within the party. Get that! What has Waldman to say on this subject of revision of party policies and tactics? The following, delivered at a speech in the Bronx and reprinted in the current issue of the *Socialist*, the official organ of the Right Wing: "Industry must be under collective ownership. If an industry is municipal-wide the municipality is the collectivity which is going to be possessed of the ownership of that industry. If an industry is state-wide, in its nature, the state is going to be possessed of that industry. If an industry is national in its character, such as railroad, water-ways, coal-mines, telegraph and telephones, the nation will own it."

This is the kind of Socialism advocated by the Right Wing. They talk about revising party policies and tactics quite glibly, but only with the intention of side-tracking the revolutionary sentiment of the rank and file who are clamoring for a thorough-going change on the basis laid down by the Left Wing Manifesto and Program. They do not wish to revise the party's policies and tactics if they can help it; certainly they are not for the abolition of social reform planks; they are not for repudiating the Second International, they are not for affiliating with the Third International, called by the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviks). They are not for making revolutionary industrial unionism, a part of its general propaganda. The quotation from Waldman's speech distinctly states what their conception of Socialism is: nothing more or less than State Socialism in its most pernicious forms. They believe in preserving the capitalist state and utilizing it for the inauguration of Socialism. They are opposed to the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as a principle and violently opposed to it as the tactic of the revolution. *They are the exact counter-parts of the Ebert-Scheidemann moderate Socialists of Germany.*

Bourgeois parliamentarism is their means and State Socialism is their goal.

Comrades! The Left Wing organization is the organization of the rank and file. It is your answer to the politicians, the officials, the traitors and the betrayers in our party, who seek to maintain themselves and their clique in control, despite the fact that the membership clamors for new policies, new tactics, new spokesmen.

Now a word as to the heinous crime of having an "organization within an organization." The Right Wingers claim that the rank and file have no control of such an organization. *Our answer is that the rank and file have control, but the machine politicians have not.* That is why they are opposed to it so bitterly. But let us put the question this way. Have the rank and file an opportunity of controlling "organizations outside of the organization" such as the N. Y. *Call* and the Rand School?

We accuse them of having organized "organizations outside of the organization", which are most harmful to the Socialist movement. We accuse the Right Wing of controlling them and seeing to it that the rank and file have no say in their management, ownership or control. Is the "red card" *per se* an open sesame to those outside organizations?

The charge has been made in the official organ of the Right Wing, "The Socialist", that the Left Wing is the only organization where the red card is not honored. That is not true. The fact is that The Call Association and the Rand School, claim-

An Outline of the Communist International

Adopted by the Congress of the Communist International in Moscow [March 1-6, 1919]

III.

THE breakdown of the capitalistic order and the disruption of capitalistic industrial discipline makes impossible the reorganization of production on a capitalistic basis. Wage wars of the workingmen—even when successful—do not bring the anticipated betterment of conditions of living; the workers can only become emancipated when production is no longer controlled by the bourgeoisie but by the proletariat. In order to raise the standards of productivity, in order to crush the opposition on the part of the bourgeoisie (which only prolongs the death struggle of the old regime and thereby invites danger of total ruin), the Proletarian Dictatorship must carry out the expropriation, only delay the process of disintegration and convert the means of production and distribution into the common property of the proletarian State.

Communism is now being born out of the ruins of Capitalism—there is no other salvation for humanity. The opportunists who are making utopian demands for the reconstruction of the economic system of Capitalism, so as to postpone socialization, only delay the process of disintegration and increase the danger of total demolition. The communist revolution, on the other hand, is the best, the only means by which the most important social power of production—the proletariat—can be saved, and with it society itself.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat does not in any way call for partition of the means of production and exchange; rather, on the contrary, its aim is further to centralize the forces of production and to subject all of production to a systematic plan. As the first steps—socialization of the great banks which now control production; the taking over by the power of the proletariat of all government-controlled economic utilities; the transferring of all communal enterprises; the socializing of the syndicated and trustified units of production, as well as all other branches of production in which the degree of concentration and centralization of capital makes this technically practicable; the socializing of agricultural estates and their conversion into co-operative establishments.

As far as the smaller enterprises are concerned, the proletariat must gradually unite them, according to the degree of their importance. It must be particularly emphasized that small properties will in no way be expropriated and that property owners who are not exploiters of labor will not be forcibly dispossessed. This element will gradually be drawn into the socialistic organization through the force of example, through practical demonstration of the superiority of the new order of things, and the regulation by which the small farmers and

the petty bourgeoisie of the cities will be freed from economic bondage to usurious capital and landlordism, and from tax burdens (especially by annulment of the national debt), etc.

The task of the Proletarian Dictatorship in the economic field can only be fulfilled to the extent that the proletariat is enabled to create centralized organs of management and to institute workers' control. To this end it must make use of its mass organizations which are in closest relation to the process of production. In the field of distribution the Proletarian Dictatorship must re-establish commerce by an accurate distribution of products; to which end the following methods are to be considered; the socialization of wholesale establishments, the taking over of all bourgeois State and municipal apparatus of distribution; control of the great co-operative societies, which organizations will still have an important role in the production-epoch; the gradual centralization of all these organs and their conversion into a systematic unity for the rational distribution of products.

As in the field of production so also in the field of distribution all qualified technicians and specialists are to be made use of, provided their political resistance is broken and they are still capable of adapting themselves, not to the service of capital, but to the new system of production. Far from oppressing them the proletariat will make it possible for the first time for them to develop intensive creative work. The Proletarian Dictatorship, with their co-operation, will retrieve the separation of physical and mental work which Capitalism has developed, and thus will Science and Labor be unified. Besides expropriating the factories, mines, estates, etc., the proletariat must also abolish the exploitation of the people by capitalistic landlords, transfer the large mansions to the local workers' councils, and move the working people into the bourgeois dwellings.

During this great transition period the power of the councils must constantly build up the entire administrative organization into a more centralized structure, but on the other hand constantly draw ever increasing elements of the working people into the immediate control of government.

The revolutionary era compels the proletariat to make use of the means of battle which will concentrate its entire energies, namely, mass action, with its logical resultant, direct conflict with the governmental machinery in open combat. All other methods, such as revolutionary use of bourgeois parliamentarism, will be of only secondary significance.

The indispensable condition for successful struggle is separation not only from the direct servitors of Capitalism and enemies of the communist revo-

lution, in which role the Social Democrats of the Right appear, but also from the Party of the Centre (Kautskians), who desert the proletariat at the critical moment in order to come to terms with its open antagonists. On the other hand, there are essential elements of the proletariat, heretofore not within the Socialist Party, who stand now completely and absolutely on the platform of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the form of Soviet rule; for example, the corresponding elements among the Syndicalists.

The growth of the revolutionary movement in all lands, the danger of suppression of this revolution through the coalition of capitalistic States, the attempts of the Socialist betrayers to unite with one another (the formation of the Yellow "International" at Berne), and to give their services to the Wilsonian League; finally, the absolute necessity for co-ordination of proletarian action,—all these demand the formation of a real revolutionary and real proletarian Communist International. This International, which subordinates the so-called national interests to the interests of the international revolution, will personify the mutual help of the proletariat of the different countries, for without economic and other mutual helpfulness the proletariat will not be able to organize the new society. On the other hand, in contrast with the Yellow International of the social-patriots, the Proletarian Communist International will support the plundered colonial peoples in their fight against Imperialism, in order to hasten the final collapse of the imperialistic world system.

The capitalistic criminals asserted at the beginning of the world war that it was only in defense of the common Fatherland. But soon German Imperialism revealed its real brigand character by its bloody deeds in Russia, in the Ukraine and Finland. Now the Entente states unmask themselves as world despoilers and murderers of the proletariat. Together with the German bourgeoisie and social-patriots, with hypocritical phrases about peace on their lips, they are trying to throttle the revolution of the European proletariat by means of their war machinery and stupid barbaric colonial soldiery. Indescribable is the White Terror of the bourgeois cannibals. Incalculable are the sacrifices of the working class. Their best—Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg—have they lost. Against this the proletariat must defend itself, defend at any price. The Communist International calls the whole world proletariat to this final struggle.

Down with the imperialistic conspiracy of capital!

Long live the International Republic of the Proletarian Councils!

Clearing the Decks

(Continued from page 1)

two gentlemen, and who during a revolutionary period would inevitably act in the same way as has disgraced the name of Socialism in Germany? If not, does he expect the Spartacans to meet with the German Social Democracy in a Congress of international solidarity? Comrade Hillquit answers none of these questions, he dismisses the question of the Third International in a glowing generality!

What, according to Comrade Hillquit, is the function of the American Socialist Party in the immediate future? The United States emerges from the War the strongest capitalist country in the world; our "liberal" administration has become reactionary; the "progressive" element in politics and social reform has collapsed like a house of cards. The "only voice of protest and the only vision of progress have come from the Socialist Party and a negligible group of industrial workers and radical individuals."

The implication is that the Socialist Party is to take the place of this bankrupt "element," to continue, as it has been in the past, a "voice of protest" and a "vision of progress". Protest against what? Why against the failure of the capitalist government to be "democratic"—to protect the working class against itself. Vision of what? Of an infinite accumulation of petit bourgeois social

ing to be Socialist institutions, are two places where the red card is not honored.

In view of the facts enumerated, in view of the deliberate distortions and lies published in the Executive Committee's statement, the members of the Socialist Party should demand the recall of the Executive Committee, the resignation of the Executive Secretary and vote, "No," on the State Committee's referendum for the expulsion of Left Wing locals and branches.

reforms, such as were advocated in the Congressional platform for 1918—which Comrade Hillquit must mean when he speaks of the Party during the War as a "vision of progress."

It appears that the failure of peace, the governmental persecution and repression, the obscurantism of the capitalist press, terrorism, unemployment and intensified exploitation will soon awaken the American workers. Then will come the opportunity of the Socialist Party to convert them to Socialism—whatever that is, for Comrade Hillquit doesn't say. But in order to prepare for this, we must concentrate on propaganda and organization—"propaganda through all methods available, including political campaigns and legislative forums." This is the Left Wing position; this is the Left Wing's idea of political action—for the purpose of propaganda, and for no other reason.

But propaganda for what? Comrade Hillquit has pointed out that there are two theories struggling for control in the Socialist movement—that of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that of "sharing governmental power and responsibilities with the capitalist class . . . during the period of transition". It is all very well to plead for a "harmonious plan of action"—but what shall it be? Comrade Hillquit does not tell us; but he hints that we shall embrace the second of these two plans of action, and he proposes to read out of the Socialist Party all those who disagree with him.

In its particular application to the present situation within the Party the document is a blanket endorsement of the tactics of the Right Wing in Local New York. Hitherto the cry of all "leaders" has been unity, now Comrade Hillquit wants a split. Why? After months of agitation the Left Wing has broken down the opposition and succeeded in having a referendum taken on the necessity for a Na-

tional Emergency Convention. The present attitude of the rank and file forecasts that such a convention will be another St. Louis, and Comrade Hillquit and the other "leaders" doubt whether they can weather another storm. The only thing left is to split the Party before the convention.

This is exactly what Local New York is doing. This is why the "reorganization" of branches goes on apace. Disfranchise the revolutionary section of the membership, expel its spokesmen and the Party is safe for the official junta! The Party of officialdom has found that it is unable to accomplish this purpose in time to save the National Executive Committee, hence the "leaders" call for a split.

But we refuse to split the Party, that is not our purpose. We will capture the Party and if the Right Wing wants to split, it must do the splitting, it must break away from the Party. The rank and file is behind our position, *we are the Party*, and when the time comes for clearing the decks we will handle the mop.

LEFT WING MEMBER-SHIP MEETING

— ON —

SUNDAY, MAY 25th, at 1 P. M.

— AT —

MANHATTAN LYCEUM

66 EAST 4th STREET

NEW YORK CITY

TO ELECT AND INSTRUCT
DELEGATES TO NATIONAL
LEFT WING CONFERENCE

The Pink Terror

V. The Abortive Massacre of the 3d-5th and 10th A. D.

THERE had been rumors that the Pink Dictator of Local New York was marshalling his Cohorts for a descent upon the 3d, 5th and 10th A. D. The assault was delayed, however, until there was a reasonable certainty of the absence of Jim Larkin and the Irish contingent, who, not being very well versed in parliamentary law, might wholly misunderstand the proceedings; and imagining that something illegal was going on, might impulsively vote against it in their nationalistic way.

The opportunity arrived. It was learned by Gerber's spies that on Monday, May 12th, there would be a memorial meeting to James Connolly at Bryant Hall, which the Irish Comrades would attend.

On May 10th, therefore, a chosen few members of the 3d, 5th and 10th received the customary billet-doux from Gerber, so familiar to all the faithful.

At the appointed time on Monday evening, May 12th, a little group of Comrades, with pale but determined faces, left the headquarters of the Branch and proceeded down Broadway. Past the great Victory Arch at Fifth Avenue and 26th Street, with "Murmansk" sculptured on its side, went the brave little band, thrilling with inverted pride to think that this great monument to the invasion of Russia had been erected with money voted by Socialist aldermen.

No. 7 West 21st Street was a low, evil-looking building; upon the steps lounged half a dozen plug-uglies, who glowered upon our Comrades as they passed. The building was the headquarters of Cloak and Suit Cutters' Union No. 10. As far as could be determined, most of the Union members seemed to be hanging around the corridors.

Upstairs in a low, evil-looking room sat Charley Grossman at a table. He looked up in surprise as the comrades entered; evidently they had arrived earlier than was expected; for having looked over the aggregation, Grossman went to the door and shouted down-stairs, "What's the matter with you

fellows? Didn't I say not to let anybody in without a letter?"

A semi-comrade by the name of Fuchs then placed himself at the door. When asked if he were a member of the 3d, 5th and 10th, as specified in the letter, he said defiantly that he was not, but would come in if he pleased.

Grossman asked the Comrades to walk up to his table and answer a few questions.

"Do you believe in an organization within an organization?" he asked.

One innocent Comrade responded firmly, "No. I think *The Call* should be controlled by the Party!"

Grossman immediately noted on his list "Member of the Left Wing." Upon his demand to the Comrades to give up their cards, only one Comrade complied and she demanded it back shortly afterward. At the end of the evening Grossman's list contained about thirty names, with the monotonous comment after all but two, "Refuses to give up card. Refuses to answer questions. L. W."

Comrade Brahdy kept advising the Comrades in a loud voice to pay no attention to Grossman. This finally irritated Grossman to such a degree that after ordering Brahdy to leave the room, he finally summoned Fuchs, and said loudly, "Run down-stairs to the Cloak Cutters and bring somebody up here to clear this room of people we don't want here!"

In a few moments a procession of sinister-looking individuals with cauliflower ears filed in. Questioned as to whether they were members of the 3d, 5th and 10th, they evasively said that they belonged to the Party. Shortly afterward Beckerman and Potter appeared, followed by the strong-arm squad from the 6th A. D. Branch. Asked when the meeting would begin, Beckerman stated that it would begin when the Executive Committee delegates decided to begin it.

The meeting having been called for 8.15 P. M., and there being evidently no intention on the part of the Oligarchy to open the proceedings, at 8.30 Comrade Brophy, organizer of the Branch, rapped

for order and proposed that, since the Executive Committee refused to call the meeting, the Branch declare itself in session.

Comrade Brahdy was elected chairman, and Comrade Coles secretary. Comrade Reed then proposed as the order of business that the delegates of the Executive Committee present be asked to state their reasons for summoning this meeting.

Beckerman replied that until the registration was completed, the delegates of the Executive Committee refused to make any statement. Comrade Reed then proposed that, provided the registration take place in the room, the meeting be suspended until it was completed. Whereupon Beckerman announced that he had changed his mind, and that the registration would be carried on in another room, and the meeting would be called when he felt like it.

Comrade Brahdy was elected chairman, and Comrade Reed formally demand from the Executive Committee delegates their purpose in calling the meeting, and if they refused to state it, that the meeting adjourn until the regular Branch meeting on Wednesday, May 14th. This motion was voted on by roll-call, twenty-seven being in favor and three against.

In the name of the Branch, therefore, Comrade Brahdy formally demanded from Beckerman that he state the purpose of the Executive Committee in calling the meeting. Beckerman flatly refused. The Chair then announced that since there was no business before the meeting, it should stand adjourned. Whereupon the Comrades left the hall.

The mercenaries of the Executive Committee, having failed in their "reorganization" scheme, determined that a more careful choice of Comrades must be made for the next meeting. Accordingly letters were again sent out, and this time two and a half Comrades gathered in the safe precincts of the Rand School on Friday evening, May 16th.

To date the proceedings have not been divulged. But we understand that the 3d, 5th and 10th A. D. Branch has been bloodlessly "reorganized."

Moral: The only peaceful way to "reorganize" a Branch is not to tell the members.

The Party Congressional Platform

(Continued from page 3)

ples," and want an "adequate" (?) representation of labor. We are afraid that it will not have enough power to move against Russia, and hence we "demand legislative and administrative, as well as judicial functions." We demand an international regulation of the hours of labor, thus giving the League an added pretext for interfering in labor disputes. We believe that under Capitalism peace and disarmament are possible, Marx and Engels to the contrary notwithstanding. We worry about a uniform monetary system (and, to phrase it inelegantly, we feel sure that that will "put the proletariat ten ahead"). We even discuss colonization and foreign investment, telling the League how to manage these two pesky matters, and then exhort the working classes of all nations to perceive "the necessity of seeking continually and *aggressively* (as in the present platform) to secure control of their respective governments to the end." To what end? Why to the end that "these policies (the League, disarmament, the universal monetary system, etc.) be officially adopted by all the nations concerned." Heaven forbid that they should "secure control of their respective governments" for any other purposes!

The Platform speaks of the "historic mission" of the Socialist Party of the United States to "prepare the workers of America to take part in the new fraternity of labor." And I trust I will be pardoned for once more dragging in the antiquated Marx, who once said:

"And to what does the party reduce its internationalism? To the consciousness that the result of its efforts will be the 'international fraternization of peoples'—a phrase borrowed from the bourgeois league of peace and freedom which is supposed to pass for the equivalent of the international fraternization of the working classes in their common struggle against the ruling classes and their governments."

"CONCLUSION."

And now for the two paragraphs headed "Conclusion." Here we find the "theoretical" part of the program. It begins favorably. "We warn the masses (the first time we have noticed them) that the above program (twenty three pages of it) has reference to a dying social order." We cheerfully announce that our "reconstruction" program is "designed to assist in the passing of this bankrupt system of capitalism. . . . A complete transformation is necessary." Anything short of this complete transformation will lead to another world tragedy

(and of course that's all we are aiming to avoid). But what complete transformation? Ah, here it is—next to the last sentence. "The main struggle of the masses is to secure *control* of these basic institutions (which?) and this *requires an education of the people to the necessity of such control.*"

But class consciousness? Why that's all concentrated in the last sentence, which rhetoricians assure us is the most effective and emphatic place in a whole platform or essay. Here it is—note the class lines—

"In this work of education we invite the cooperation of *all* who recognize the opportunities for re-building the world on a basis of equity, democracy and fraternity for all." Whatever that may mean.

Using the I. W. W. Against The Left Wing

THE SOCIALIST for May 13th reprints an article from the I. W. W. paper, *One Big Union*, attacking an article in *The Revolutionary Age* in particular, and the principles of the Left Wing in general.

This is precisely the same tactic employed by the *New York World* to discredit the Russian Soviet Government by means of the dispatches of Bob Minor, the anarchist.

The Right Wing has no more sympathy with the I. W. W. than *The World* has with Anarchism, or with Bob Minor in particular, who was forced to leave *The World* because of his radical opinions.

We shall not at this time take the opportunity to answer the article itself, but from a careful reading of it we are driven to wonder whether, after all, there may not be a difference between I. W. Wism and Socialism more profound than we dreamed of—for after all, we did not imagine that in fundamentals we of the Left Wing were so very far away from the revolutionary I. W. W.

Says the article in one place (italics ours):

"Besides, why should we be in such a hurry to imitate the Bolsheviks? What have they done that should make us jump off our track and follow their lead? *They have overthrown autocracy and established political democracy for the proletariat. Political democracy has existed in this country for a long time. . . . We do not have to make a revolution to get it. If we want the political power, control of the parliamentary state, all we have to do is to vote ourselves into power.*"

Is this really the I. W. W. conception of the Russian Soviet Government, of the Proletarian Dictatorship? Is this really the I. W. W. conception of political action?

Workers' Council

The recent conference of the Workers' Council of the Waist and Dress Industry indicates a healthy move on the part of a section of New York's workers, toward industrial democracy.

What was only a few weeks ago estimated at a mere handful of persecuted workers, libelled and misrepresented by the yellow and so-called radical sheets alike, miraculously flourished at this conference to the proportions of over fourteen thousand (half the recognized industry) represented by 320 delegates democratically elected in the various workshops.

At the conclusion of a two-day sitting, the following manifesto was unanimously adopted:

MANIFESTO.

"We, 320 Shop delegates of the Waist and Dress Industry at a Conference held at the People's House, 7 E. 15th Street, New York City, May 3rd and 4th, 1919, realize that Trade Unions, instead of bringing about class-consciousness and solidarity among the workers and uniting them against their exploiters, break them into craft groups and thereby weaken them and serve the interests of the employing class. We also realize that our emancipation from life-long drudgery depends entirely upon our solidarity and class-consciousness.

"We, therefore, *proclaim* to all the workers of the Waist and Dress Industry the inauguration of a Workers' Council.

"The Workers' Council sets out to educate and organize the workers along class-conscious and industrial lines; to break the corrupt and demoralizing influence of craft-union officialdom; to have the workers ready to go on with production when the time comes for them to take over the industries.

"We urge the workers in each shop to elect shop committees which shall adjust all grievances between the workers and their employers.

"These shop committees shall meet in general conferences to adjust problems concerning the entire industry. The time has come when the workers must prepare to take charge of the industries.

"We, therefore, call on the workers in every industry to take matters into their own hands, form Workers' Councils, and manifest their allegiance to the rising solidarity of the Workers the World over."

The shop-committees are self-autonomous, but are joined in an Industrial Federation for matters pertaining to the Industry at large.