

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A JOURNAL OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST RECONSTRUCTION

VOL. I, No. 12

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1918

PRICE, 10 CENTS

Meyer London—A Socialist Disgrace

THE circle of Socialist reaction, of the betrayal of fundamental principles by representatives of Socialism, is completed. Germany produced its Scheidemann, Parvus, Sudekum and Wolfgang Heine; France its Albert Thomas and Marcel Cachin; Austria its Dr. Renner and Victor Adler; England its Hyndman and Henderson; and the United States its Russell, Spargo, Walling and Meyer London.

There are members of the Socialist Party who are fond of the sport of denouncing Spargo, Walling & Co. It is a comfortable and safe procedure to kick the dead. But these very same comrades are utterly silent about the infamous attitude of Meyer London, his flouting of the declarations and instructions of the party, his betrayal of fundamental Socialism. Even prior to America's entry into the war, London acted against international Socialism; and since, his conduct has been completely reactionary and demoralizing. Socialism should have its own independent class policy on war and peace; but Meyer London has accepted the policy of the government; American Socialism is compelled, by the declaration it adopted a year ago, to co-operate with the minority Socialists of Europe and support the Bolsheviks; yet Meyer London accepts the policy of the majority Socialists and denounces the Bolsheviks.

Eugene V. Debs publicly declares his adherence to fundamental facts and principles, and is indicted. His courageous action was an inspiration to the party, a rebuke to the wavering. And then Local New York nullifies Debs' action by renominating Meyer London for Congress.

The recent state convention of the Socialist Party of New York adopted a resolution calling upon Meyer London to introduce a bill in Congress for the recognition of the Russian Soviet Republic. This "Socialist" representative in Congress did nothing of the sort; and shortly after appeared in print criticizing the Bolsheviks and coquetting with the counter-revolutionary forces.

As if the nomination of Meyer London were not sufficiently demoralizing, Local New York nominates Edward F. Cassidy and Algernon Lee, both of whom repudiate the accepted attitude of the party on the war.

There is danger ahead, comrades! There is an active movement in the party to castrate its international Socialist attitude. The openly pro-war group, which is small, is exploiting the fears, prejudices and opportunism of the moderates to put over reactionary candidates and policy. Not all who voted to re-nominate Meyer London want his policy; many, if not the majority, voted affirmatively on the plea that to repudiate London would mean losing the district—the plea made by Alder-

man Beckerman. But what kind of a victory is it to elect a man to Congress who betrays Socialism and brazenly flouts the party? Rather no representatives in Congress than a man who repudiates the attitude of the party.

When Meyer London speaks in Congress, he speaks not as the representative of the Twelfth Congressional Dis-

trict, but as the representative of the Socialist Party. To have Meyer London represent the Socialist Party is to link the party with the European social-patriots and betrayers of Socialism, when it should be linked with the intrepid Italian Socialist Party, the French minority Socialists, the Independent Socialist Party of Germany, and the Bolsheviks.

Socialist Reconstruction in Europe

Revolutionary Socialism in Europe is making rapid progress under the impact of the war and the proletarian revolution in Russia. At the Congress of the Socialist Party of Norway, held in March, the left wing secured practical control of the party and revolutionary resolutions were adopted. The moderates introduced resolutions against the dictatorship of the proletariat, against general strikes and revolutionary mass action, against military strikes. All these resolutions were defeated. The resolutions of the left were adopted, as follows:

I.
Socialism cannot recognize the right of the ruling class to exploit the working class even when this exploitation is supported by the consent of the majority in the national parliament. The Norwegian labor party must, therefore, insist upon its right to use mass action or revolutionary measures in its struggle for the industrial liberation of the working class. As a party whose most vital issue is the class struggle, it cannot be indifferent to this struggle when it is being conducted by other class organizations. The Congress, therefore, greets with joy the creation of Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils in Norway and sees in them an expression of the self-reliance and self-activity of the working class population.

II.
The Congress hereby calls upon the workers of Norway to prepare and organize a strike on a national basis, with the support of labor union action, against military and defense service. We demand, furthermore, that a general strike be prepared to prevent war, and the declaration of war.

III.
Whereas, the National Labor Union Congress has refused to support a military strike; and,
Whereas, separate organizations have been formed for those who are liable to military service; be it,
Resolved, That there is no possibility of united action between the two main organizations in this matter; and be it further,
Resolved, That military strikes are fully compatible with Socialist principles—that the working class, therefore, cannot relinquish the right to use this weapon in the struggle for its own emancipation.

London's nomination was confirmed by a vote of 42 to 38.

The movement in Local New York to demoralize the party's attitude on the war started with the Socialist Aldermen voting for the Liberty Loan. At a general party meeting to discuss this action, Algernon Lee frankly justified the vote on pro-war grounds. The action was repudiated, but the work went on, and has culminated in the re-nomination of Meyer London for Congress.

The nomination of London met with a storm of protest. At a general party meeting to conclude nominations, the radicals were in the majority, and tried to force a reconsideration. The attempt was balked by the stupidity, or duplicity of the chairman, and by the mean parliamentary tricks of the moderates, who prevented a vote by wasting time and

blocking a motion to extend the time. The matter came up at a meeting of the Central Committee, and by a vote of 31 to 28, the Executive Committee was instructed to nominate a candidate other than Meyer London in the Twelfth Congressional District. The Executive Committee refused to act, and at a special Central Committee meeting, Meyer

worthy of revolutionary Socialism. A Socialist party that does not at all times adhere to fundamental principles is a party that builds upon sand; it is, moreover, a party that, when the test comes, will act precisely as did the opportunistic, petty bourgeois Social Democratic Party of Germany.

The Socialist Party of the United States is now being put to the test, and the test must be met in spite of the policy of evasion adopted by the opportunists. It is the test of principles and the test of the class struggle. We have hopes that the party will on the whole meet this test adequately, in spite of all and everything.

Shall our party be a party of Leibknecht, Lazzari, Lenin and Trotzky, or shall it be a party of Scheidemann, Thomas, Hyndman and Meyer London? This is the great issue in our party, in every party affiliated with the Socialist International. Comrades, upon you rests the responsibility. Repudiate Meyer London! Repudiate the policy of confusion and compromise!

Blood that Doesn't Count

THE New York *Call* is doing an excellent piece of work by re-printing what Roosevelt, Taft, Nicholas Murray Butler, the intellectual and newspaper hirelings of reaction generally, said about the Kaiser in the years preceding the great war. The praise and adulation they lavished upon the imperial murderer makes interesting and significant reading today. The *Call* quotes an editorial in the New York *Times* of June 8, 1913, celebrating the Kaiser's twenty-fifth anniversary of his reign, which burns verbal incense at the shrine of the Chief of the Huns. One sentence in this editorial is particularly instructive: "Since he (Kaiser Wilhelm) has ruled Germany he has not shed a drop of blood." Indeed? The Kaiser shed the blood of workers in strikes and demonstrations; his military hireling murdered scientifically and ruthlessly, 90,000 out of 100,000 of the Herreros in German Africa; more persons were murdered in minor colonial wars. Is this blood which doesn't count? But that is the psychology of capitalism. France was "at peace" for forty years, and yet France shed the blood of thousands of persons in colonial wars; the same is true of England and the United States. Mexico, the Philippines and Central America—the blood shed there also doesn't count. And that "is the hell of it." A nation may be shedding blood copiously, but if it is the blood of strikers, if it is the blood of natives shed in colonial wars—the "nation is at peace." It is dirty and disgusting; and the tragic part of it all is that this attitude prevails among conservative labor organizations. But history is relentless; and out of the colonial wars developed this great war.

The Situation in Russia

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

THE information that comes from Russia is usually confused and contradictory, and the most important is suppressed. On July 3 an All-Russian Congress of Soviets convened, was in session more than a week, but scarcely any news was allowed to come here of the sessions, except one or two unimportant items. This suppression of Russian news by the newspaper hirelings of imperialism is eloquent in itself. It proves conclusively that the Soviets are in undisputed control of Russia; that they are proceeding satisfactorily with the reconstruction of the country, otherwise the papers would teem with news to the contrary; and the suppression of news concerning the recent All-Russian Congress is very satisfactory as showing that the Bolsheviks are still directing the destiny of revolutionary Russia, otherwise the press would have screamed in big, black-face type, "Pro-German Bolsheviks Overthrown."

This is, indeed, the salient feature in the Russian situation: the undisputed supremacy of the Soviets. Counter-revolutionary plots, some of them engineered by the infamous traitors among the moderate Socialists, have been swiftly crushed and caused scarcely a ripple upon the surface of things. The eighth or tenth "Provisional Siberian Government" has been organized, and yet the Russian masses do not rally to its support. Nine months of the "dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" has proven the will of the Russian masses, the supremacy of the Soviets. The Soviets will not be overthrown except at the point of foreign bayonets, by the combined invasion of Austro-German and Japanese-Entente troops. For it is certain that an invasion of Siberia by Japanese troops, miserably camouflaged as "assisting Russia," would be the signal for a new German invasion of European Russia; and each imperialistic government would "justify" itself by the action of the other.

It would be a waste of time to characterize the infamous charges concerning the "pro-Germanism" of the Bolsheviks. The acceptance of the brutal peace terms of Germany was an expression of realistic policy, a necessity imposed upon the Soviets by the disorganization of the economic life of the country and of the army—a disorganization started under Czarism and completed by the various coalition governments. Revolutionary Russia accepted this peace temporarily, to prepare its material and psychological forces to renew the struggle against German Imperialism—against all Imperialism. Today, one of the tasks of the Council of People's Commissaries is the organization of a new revolutionary army; as Trotsky phrased it in urging conscription, only an adequate army can save revolutionary Russia considering the prevailing international situation. Conscription was adopted by the Soviets; and soon revolutionary Russia will have its own army as an instrument of revolutionary proletarian policy. Should the Soviets retain power and not be overthrown by foreign intervention, and should peace, as is likely, not be concluded within a year or two, revolutionary Russia will re-enter the war against Germany in order to enforce real self-determination in the provinces brutally annexed by Germany and Austria. Provided with the means, revolutionary Russia will fight; but it will be its own separate war, a revolutionary war waged for revolutionary purposes. This war might conceivably contribute to the development of revolution in

Germany, in which event Russia's war against Germany would immediately cease, and the revolutionary proletariat of both nations unite to fight all Imperialism and for the international

by prolonging the war. This circumstance has developed pro-war sentiments among some American Socialists. But the problem is a much more fundamental one. Objectively, the war as-

stroying the political power of the capitalist class and taking resolute steps toward the gradual introduction of Socialism. Socialism is not as yet established, Russia now being in the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism, a period characterized by the dictatorship of the proletariat—as projected by the genius of Marx.

The old state, equally the bourgeois parliamentary state and the Czarist state, has been completely overthrown, with all its machinery of repression, its bureaucracy, and its anti-proletarian character. The new state recognizes only the workers and the peasants as its constituents; as the old state was an instrument for the coercion of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, so the new state is an instrument for the coercion of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat—with this difference: that where the old state considered itself as sacrosanct and eternal, the new state considers itself a temporary necessity in the measure that the process of reconstruction emerges definitely into the Socialist communist society of the organized producers.

As an historical category, the Soviets are not a peculiar Russian product, but class organizations characteristic of the proletarian revolution. They constitute a dictatorship in relation to the bourgeoisie, but a democracy in relation to the workers and peasants—the real democracy of Socialism.

The representatives to the Soviets are elected directly by the workers and peasants, on the basis of male and female suffrage. The Soviet is the local organ of authority, supervising the industrial and social activity of the people. The division of functions into legislative and executive, characteristic of the parliamentary system and a means of thwarting the will of the people, is abolished; legislative and executive functions are combined into one body, the people itself acts—as in the Paris Commune. The local Soviets elect delegates to an All-Russian Congress of Soviets, which meets every three months in Moscow, and constitutes the supreme authority in Russia. This Congress elects the members of the Council of People's Commissaries and a Central Executive Committee which sits permanently during the period intervening between sessions of the All-Russian Soviet Congress and renders full reports, and if satisfactory they are continued in power; if not, they are dismissed. Election of delegates to the All-Russian Congress and to the Central Executive Committee are on the basis of *proportional representation*: and this fact is eloquent of the infamy of the moderate Socialists who intrigue and plot against the Soviet government, since they have equal rights with the Bolsheviks to acquire control; and if they are in a pitiful minority, it is because the revolutionary masses reject their policy.

The peasantry has, at least for the present, accepted the tutelage of the revolutionary proletariat, the Social-Revolutionary party having split into two factions, the great majority, the Social-Revolutionists of the left, accepting the program of the Bolsheviks. Private ownership of land has been abolished, the land being nationalized and distributed to the peasants with provision for periodical re-distribution. Local land committees take charge of production and distribution, inventory the land in a particular district, allot land to the villages, regulate agricultural labor, control forests, etc., and receive the rental for the use of the land, which is turned over to the national govern-

Workers' Control of Industry in Russia

[On November 27, 1917, the Soviet government issued a decree establishing organs for the workers' control of factories. The decree published below was supplemented, on December 18, 1917, by a decree establishing a Council of National Economy, constituted of representatives from the All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control, from each commissariat, from trades unions, etc. The Council of National Economy unifies and directs the regulation of economic activity and state finances, and has the authority to confiscate, requisition, sequester and syndicate any industrial establishment. The Council of National Economy is divided into several sections, each of which deals with a separate phase of economy. All bills proposed by this council are submitted to the Council of People's Commissaries.]

(1) In order to put the economic life of the country on an orderly basis, control by the workers is instituted over all industrial, commercial, and agricultural undertakings and societies; and those connected with banking and transport, as well as over productive co-operative societies which employ labor or put out work to be done at home or in connection with the production, purchase, and sale of commodities and of raw materials, and with conservation of such commodities as well as regards the financial aspect of such undertakings.

(2) Control is exercised by all the workers of a given enterprise through the medium of their elected organs, such as factories and works committees, councils of workmen's delegates, etc., such organs equally comprising representatives of the employes and of the technical staff.

(3) In each important industrial town, province, or district, is set up a local workmen's council of control, which, being the organ of the soldiers', workmen's and peasants' council, will comprise the representatives of the labor unions, workmen's committees, and of any other factories, as well as of workmen's co-operative societies.

(4) Until such time as workmen's councils of control hold a congress, the All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control is to be set up in Petrograd, on which will sit representatives of the following organizations. Five delegates of the E. C. [executive committee] of the Council (Soviet) of Workmen's and Soldiers' delegates of Russia; five delegates of the E. C. of the Peasants' Council of Russia; five delegates of the Labor Unions of Russia; two delegates of the Central Committee of the Workingmen's Co-operative Societies of Russia; five delegates of the Factory and Works Committee of Russia; five delegates of the Engineers' and Technical Agents' Union of Russia; two delegates of the Agrarian Union of Russia; one delegate from each Workmen's Union in Russia having not less than 100,000 members, two delegates from any union having a membership of over 100,000, two delegates from the E. C. of the Labor Unions.

(5) Side by side with the Workmen's Supreme Council of Control are set up committees of inspection comprising technical specialists, accountants, etc. These committees, both on their own initiative or at the request of local workmen's organs of control, proceed to a given locality to study the financial and technical side of any enterprise.

(6) The Workmen's Organs of Control have the right to supervise production, to fix a minimum wage in any undertaking, and to take steps to fix the prices at which manufactured articles are to be sold.

(7) The Workmen's Organs of Control have the right to control all correspondence passing in connection with the business of an undertaking being held responsible before a court of justice for diverting their correspondence. Commercial secrets are abolished. The owners are called upon to produce to the Workmen's Organs of Control all books and moneys in hand, both relating to the current year and to any previous transactions.

(8) The decisions of the Workmen's Organs of Control are binding upon the owners of undertakings, and can not be nullified save by the decision of a Workmen's Superior Organ of Control.

(9) Three days are given to the owners, or the administrators of a business, to appeal to a Workmen's Superior Court of Control against the decisions filed by any of the lower organs of Workmen's Control.

(10) In all undertakings, the owners and the representatives of workmen and employes delegated to exercise control on behalf of the workmen, are responsible to the Government for the maintenance of strict order and discipline, and for the conservation of property (goods). Those guilty of misappropriating materials and products, of not keeping books properly, and of similar offences, are liable to prosecution.

(11) Workmen's District Councils of Control settle all disputes and conflicts between the lower Organs of Control, as well as all complaints made by the owners of undertakings, taking into consideration any peculiar conditions under which production is carried on, and local conditions. They will issue instructions within the limits prescribed by the All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control and supervise the activities of the lower organs of control.

(12) The All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control shall work out a general plan for control to be exercised by the workmen, and to issue instructions and regulations, and to systematize the reports of the various Workmen's Councils of Control; and constitute the supreme authority for dealing with all matters connected with the control exercised by workmen.

(13) The All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control co-ordinates the activities of the Workmen's Organs of Control and of those institutions which direct the organization of the economic life of the country.

A regulation concerning the relations between the All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control and the other institutions which organize and put in order the economic life of the country will be issued later.

(14) All laws and circulars which impede the proper working of the factory, works, and other committees, and that of workmen's and employes' councils, are abrogated.

Social Revolution. Revolutionary Socialism recognizes one struggle alone—the class struggle; and revolutionary Socialism wages the class struggle under any and all conditions, even should it become a test of military power in the form of a revolutionary war.

The longer the war lasts, the more intense becomes the struggle, the better the prospects of the Russian Revolution, since neither group of imperialistic belligerents can do all that they otherwise would do to crush the Revolution. It is in the interest of international Imperialism to crush the proletarian Revolution in Russia, and it is in spite of itself that Imperialism assists the Revolution

by giving it a respite; but this respite is naturally only temporary, since once the war ends international Imperialism will unite to crush the proletarian revolution; subjectively, the only force that can assist the proletarian revolution in Russia is the class-consciousness and action of the proletariat in all belligerent nations. It is the supreme task of the Socialist to develop this class consciousness and action. The prevailing international situation emphasizes the necessity of adhering to our fundamental principles of revolutionary Socialism—the uncompromising policy of the class struggle.

In Russia itself, the Soviets are de-

ment. The land committees of the rural districts are unified into the county committee, which in turn elects delegates to a provincial committee, the provincial land committees being centralized into the Main Land Committee acting for all Russia. On this central body are represented the All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Peasants and Workers, the Commissaire of Agriculture, etc. The abolition of private ownership in land includes city real estate and buildings, land and buildings being declared public property.

It will be observed that this elaborate machinery for the management of agriculture starts at the bottom, and not at the top. It is the same with the workers' control of industry. The state expresses the activity of the organized producers, and not the producers the will of the state. As a reading of the decree establishing workers' control of industry will show, industry has not been completely socialized; the employer, or the owner, is still retained as a director, but his rights as owner are obrogated. This control of industry starts with the local workers, and gradually it should transform itself into

the unification of all the separate parts of a particular industry into one industrial department, as provided in the theory of industrial unionism, and the unification of these separate industrial departments into one industrial centralized administration.

A particularly important measure was the nationalization of the banks, which destroys the potential power of finance to control industry. By means of nationalization, the banks become exclusively a means for the development of industry, and not dominantly a means of exploitation as under the bourgeois regime. One of the first measures of the proletarian revolution must necessarily be the destruction of the power of monopolistic finance by means of the nationalization of the banks.

Systematic and intensive measures of labor legislation are introduced, measures directed to the improvement of the workers' status at the expense of the "owners" of industry.

This is a rough sketch of the measures of reconstruction introduced by the Soviets. The great problem is the reorganization of industry, the rapid and intensive increase of production. This

great problem is made exceptionally difficult by the sabotage of the bourgeoisie and the moderate Socialists, who do all in their power to disrupt the work of the Soviets. Obviously, the working of this process of reconstruction is not a smooth one, considering the disorganization inherited by the Bolshevik regime and the intense opposition of various elements of the population.

The *petite bourgeois* pedants of Socialism, the characteristic pseudo-Marxists reviled by Marx, piled theory upon history and history upon theory to prove the impossibility of a proletarian revolution in Russia; but life itself and the proletariat achieved the apparently impossible. Russia for nine months has been a proletarian community, a magnificent expression of the Social Revolution. The ultimate fate of this proletarian revolution only the future can reveal. It is a challenge to the proletariat of the world; it is particularly a challenge to the Socialist, since if the proletarian revolution is crushed the bulk of the responsibility will belong to moderate Socialism and in and out of Russia. In the great crisis, a crisis produced by the convulsions of the old

society pregnant with the new, moderate Socialism is a conservative and conserving factor in the bourgeois system of things, directly and indirectly an ally of Imperialism and a traitor to the revolution.

The fate of the proletarian revolution in Russia only the future can reveal, truly. But one thing is clear: the proletarian revolution in Russia is the call to the new day; it marks the entry of the international proletariat into the epoch of the final struggle against capitalism—the epoch of the Social Revolution. Marx is the source of Socialist theory; the proletarian revolution in Russia is the source of Socialist practice.

The world is in the agonizing travail of a new birth. Capitalism, the Capitalism of this imperialistic epoch, is in a new stage of its development—the final stage. It is the task of the revolutionary Socialist to work devotedly and unflinchingly for the reconstruction of Socialism as determined by the requirements of the new epoch. By dedicating ourselves to this task, we shall worthily answer the challenge of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

The Collapse of the International

By N. LENIN

[Lenin wrote this article in May, 1915, and expresses the general revolutionary Socialist attitude toward the collapse of the Second International. Karl Kautsky, attacked herein by Lenin, has since joined the opposition in the Independent Socialist Party, but his tendency is still that of the Kautsky indicted by Lenin.]

THE collapse of the International is sometimes looked upon purely from its formal side, as a rupture of the international tie between the Socialist parties of the belligerent countries—the impossibility to convene either an International Socialist Conference or the International Socialist Bureau, etc. This point of view has been adopted by the Socialists of the small neutral countries, perhaps even by the majority of their official parties, also by opportunists and their defenders.

For class-conscious workingmen Socialism is an earnest conviction and not a convenient cover for bourgeois-conciliatory and nationally-conflicting aims. By the collapse of the International they understand the flagrant treason of the majority of the official Social-Democratic parties to their convictions, to their most solemn declarations expressed in the speeches at the Stuttgart and Basel International Congresses, and in the resolutions at said Congresses, etc. Only those will not see such treason as do not want to see it, those to whom it will be disadvantageous to see it. To formulate the matter in a scientific way, i. e., from the standpoint of the relations of classes in modern society, we must state that the majority of the Socialist parties, at the head of which was the largest and most influential party of the Second International—the German party—placed themselves at the side of their general staffs, their governments, and their bourgeoisie, against the proletariat. This was an event of world-historical significance and it is impossible to pass it without a more exhaustive analysis. It has long ago been recognized that wars with all the horrors and misery they bring, are of more or less benefit in mercilessly exposing and destroying a great deal of the rotten, defunct and the cadaverous in human institutions. The European war of 1914-15 is beginning to bring undoubted benefit, in revealing to the most advanced class of civilized countries,

that in its parties has ripened a sort of disgusting, purulent abscess, and from somewhere there is being emitted an unbearable, cadaverous odor.

I.

Is the treason to all their convictions and problems of the chief Socialist parties of Europe evident? It is to be understood that neither the traitors nor those who well know or vaguely guess that they will be obliged to make peace and friends with them—like to speak of this. But no matter how unpleasant it may be to various "authorities" of the Second International or their party friends among the Russian Social-Democrats, we must look things straight in the face, give them their own names, in short tell the truth to the workers.

Are there any real data as to the position taken prior to this war and in expectation of it, by the Socialist parties? Undisputably there are. They are the resolutions of the Basel International Congress of 1912, together with the resolution of the Chemnitz German Social Democratic Convention, of the same year, which live as a remembrance of "the forgotten words" of Socialism.

Summing up the propagandist and agitational literature of all countries against war the Basel resolution represents the most correct and full, the most solemn and formal exposition of Socialist views on war and of the tactics in relation to war. We can not call by any other name than treason the fact that no one of the authorities of the International of yesterday and of the social-patriotism of today—neither Hyndman, nor Guesde, nor Kautsky, nor Plechanoff, dare to remind their readers of this resolution, and are either altogether silent about it or they cite (as does Kautsky) the unimportant, while they pass over the important parts of it. The most "extreme," arch-revolutionary resolutions and the most shameless neglect or repudiation of them—such is one of the striking manifestations of the collapse of the International—and at the same time one of the striking proofs that to believe in "the reformation" of Socialism and in the "straightening of its line" by means of resolutions alone is a belief only of people in whom an unexampled naivete is combined with a cunning desire to perpetuate the former hypocrisy.

The views of Guesde have lately been expressed by the Guesdist, Charles Dai-

nas, who cites the former Socialist declarations of patriotic context (as does the German Social-Chauvinist David in his last pamphlet, on the defence of the fatherland), but who does not cite the Basel manifesto. About this manifesto Plechanoff is completely silent while offering up with an especially smug air, his chauvinistic commonplaces. Kautsky is like Plechanoff; in citing the Basel manifesto he skips all the revolutionary places (that is all which is substantial) very likely under the pretext of prohibition by the censor. The police and the military heads with their censorial prohibition against mentioning the revolution and the class struggle, have been very "handy" in helping the traitors of the Revolution. But perhaps the Basel manifesto presents some sort of an empty appeal, which has no definite content, neither historical or factional—which may directly refer to this present war?

On the contrary the Basel resolution contains less than others of declamation, and more concrete substance. The Basel resolution deals specifically with the very same war which did come and especially of those same imperialistic conflicts which broke out in 1914-1915. The conflict of Austria and Serbia because of the Balkans, of Austria and Italy because of Albania, etc., of England and Germany because of markets and colonies in general, of Russia with Turkey, etc., because of Armenia and Constantinople—that is what the resolution of Basel, foreseeing the present war, deals with specifically. Precisely of the present war between "the great Powers of Europe" the Basel resolution states that such war "can not be justified under any pretext whatsoever of national interest"!

And if now Plechanoff and Kautsky—to take only two of the typical Socialists of authority—are searching for all sorts of "national justifications" for the war, if they, with learned air and with a stock of false citations from Marx, refer for "examples" to the wars of 1813 and 1870 (Plechanoff) or 1854, 1871, 1876-77, and 1897 (Kautsky)—then, in truth, only people without a shadow of Socialistic convictions, without the least bit of Socialistic conscience, can take such proof seriously, and not style them as unmitigated Jesuitism, hypocrisy and prostitution of Socialism. Let the German "Vorstand" of the party deliver

unto damnation the new magazine of Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg (*Internationale*) for its correct estimation of Kautsky. Let Vandervelde, Plechanoff, Hyndman & Co., with the help of the police of the "Triple Entente" treat their opponents in the same way we will reply simply by reprinting the Basel manifesto, which convicts these leaders of their change and for which there is no other word but treason.

The Basel resolution treats not of a national, not of a people's war, examples of which have occurred in Europe, which even were typical of the period between 1789 and 1871, and not of a revolutionary war which Socialists have never renounced, but of the present war on the basis of "capitalistic Imperialism" and "dynastic interests" on the basis of "a policy of conquest" of both the belligerent groups, Austro-German as well as Anglo-French-Russian. Plechanoff, Kautsky & Co. are plainly deceiving the workers in repeating the selfish falsehoods of the bourgeoisie of all lands who strive with all their power to represent this imperialistic colonial, predatory war—as a national and self-defensive war (no matter for whom), and in searching justifications for it from the sphere of historical examples of non-imperialistic wars.

The question as to the imperialistic, predatory, anti-proletarian character of this war has long ago passed from the purely theoretical stage. Not only has Imperialism been theoretically appraised in all its main characteristics as the struggle of a perishing, rotting, decrepit bourgeoisie for the partition of the world and the enslavement of "small" nations; not only have these conclusions been repeated in all the vast literature of the Socialists of all countries; not only has, for example, the Frenchman, Deleze, a representative of one of our "Allied" countries, in the pamphlet "The Inevitable War," (in the year 1911!), popularly exposed the predatory character of the present war even from the standpoint of the French bourgeoisie. That isn't enough. The representatives of the proletarian parties of all countries unanimously and formally declared at Basel their firm conviction that a war was imminent precisely of an Imperialistic character and drew tactical conclusion because of that. Therefore, in passing, all allusions as to failure to define the difference be-

tween international and national tactics must be repudiated as sophistry (cf. the last interview of Axelrod in No. 87 and 90 of *Nasche Slovo*). It is sophistry because a many-sided, scientific, analysis of Imperialism is one thing—an analysis which eventually is as endless as science itself, and another thing—the principles of Socialist tactics against capitalistic Imperialism explained in millions of copies of Socialist-Democratic papers and in decisions of the International.

Socialist parties are not debating clubs but organizations of a fighting proletariat and when a number of battalions have gone over to the enemy they must be named and discredited as traitors, without any one being deceived by hypocritical phrases to the effect that not everybody comprehends Imperialism "in the same manner," that Chauvinist Cunow, and Chauvinist Kautsky are capable of writing volumes about it, that that the question has not been efficiently discussed, etc., etc. Capitalism in all manifestations of its rapine; in all the smallest ramifications of its historical development and its national peculiarities, will never be learnt through and through. About details savants (and pedants especially) will never cease to dispute. "On this basis" to renounce the Socialist struggle against imperialism and also the opposition to those who have been treasonable to this conflict would have been ridiculous. Yet what else do Kautsky, Cunow, Axelrod, etc., propose? No one has as yet attempted to dissect now, after the war, the Basel resolution, and prove its incorrectness!

II.

But perhaps sincere Socialists favored the Basel resolution in the expectation that the war would create a revolutionary situation, but the events refuted their reasoning and the revolution became impossible.

Precisely with this sort of sophistry Cunow (in his pamphlet, "The Collapse of the Party," and in many articles) attempts to justify his entry into the bourgeois camp, and we meet hints of similar "conclusions" almost in all the Socialist Chauvinists, with Kautsky at the head. Hopes of a revolution turned out to be illusions and to defend illusions is not a function of a Marxist, reasons Cunow. At the same time he does not say a word about the "illusions" of everybody who signed the Basel manifesto, but as a highly honorable man he tries to shift the responsibility on those of the extreme left, such as Pannekoek and Radek.

Let us examine the substance of the argument that the authors of the Basel resolution sincerely expected the advent of the revolution but that events refuted them. The Basel manifesto declares: (1) That the war will create an economic and political crisis; (2) that the workers will look upon their participation in it as a crime—as an iniquitous shooting at each other for the sake of Capitalist profits, the vanity of dynasties, the fulfillment of secret diplomatic agreements, that the war calls forth "indignation and revulsion" among the workers; (3) that the said crisis and the said psychological condition of the workers, Socialists should take advantage of "to rouse the people, and hasten the downfall of Capitalism"; (4) that all "governments," without exception, can not begin the war "without danger to themselves"; (5) that the governments "fear a proletarian revolution"; (6) that the governments should remember the Paris Commune (i. e., a civil war), the revolution of 1905 in Russia, etc., etc. All these are very clear ideas. There is no *guarantee* in them that the revolution will take place. In them is emphasized the precise consideration of *facts* and *tendencies*. Any one who on the basis of these ideas and arguments states that the expected advent of the

revolution turned out to be an illusion, exhibits not a Marxist but a Struivist and a renegade police relation to the revolution.

For a Marxist there is no doubt that a revolution is impossible without a revolutionary situation, and moreover that not every revolutionary situation leads to a revolution. What are the signs of a revolutionary situation? We will probably not err, if we cite the following three leading signs:

(1) The impossibility of the ruling classes to preserve their domination without change of form; one or another crisis "at the top," a political crisis of the ruling class, creating a breach through which the indignation and dissatisfaction of the masses bursts through. For the approach of the revolution it is insufficient that only "those on the bottom" did not want to, but also that those "on the top" no longer can live as before.

(2) The more than usual increase of the needs and misery of the exploited classes.

(3) The marked growth, because of mentioned causes, of the activity of the masses who in "peaceful periods" permit themselves to be robbed in quiet—and in stormy ones are drawn to independent, historical action, under the influence of those "at the top" as well as the entire atmosphere of crises. With-

The I. W. W. Trial

THE facts in the I. W. W. persecution are clear: there is a definite, concerted, thoroughly organized campaign to destroy the I. W. W., the militant organization of the industrial proletariat. The employers in centres where the I. W. W. is strong are using all means to break the organization, including means that are a violation of the law, a repudiation of the government's labor policy, and a direct threat to the army in France—since the employers apparently act on the assumption that it is more important to crush the workers than carry on production. The government discourages mob violence against the I. W. W.'s and prefers to use the more successful method of legal terrorism. The bureaucracy of the A. F. of L. overtly and covertly engages in the conspiracy to smash its militant union rival.

While the government wages a war to make the world safe for democracy, Capitalism uses the opportunity to wage a civil war of its own against the I. W. W. to make America safe for plutocracy and the plutocratic unionism of the A. F. of L.

While all eyes are centered on the great trial in Chicago, an epochal trial in which capital and labor appear in their definite class character and proportions, the I. W. W. in other sections of the country is being persecuted and arrests and imprisonments proceed merrily on their way.

In Idaho, large numbers of I. W. W.'s have been arrested and imprisoned pending trial—and the timber barons are happy. Montana has a similar record. Jim Weaver and Edward Horn have been convicted of "criminal Syndicalism." Fellow Worker Brooks expressed the spirit of all when he said: "Come what will to the individual, our cause is right and we cannot fail."

The record of the I. W. W. trial, should it ever be edited and published, would make one of the finest propaganda works in American Socialist literature. The testimony, the defense, goes to the roots of the social evils and the social problems of capitalist society. The terrorism of the employers, their shameless lust for profits, their disregard of all the laws of heaven and earth in their attitude toward the workers, the shameless collusion that often prevails between the employers and the

out these objective changes, independent of the will not only of separate groups and parties, but of separate classes as well, revolution, according to general conceptions, is impossible. The conjunction of all these objective changes is what is called a revolutionary situation. There was such a situation in Russia in 1905 and during all revolutionary periods in the West. But there was the same revolutionary situation in the sixties of the last century in Germany and in 1859-1861 and 1879-1880 in Russia although no revolutions occurred at the time. Why? Because not from every revolutionary situation there arises a revolution—but only from such in which there is joined with the objective changes a subjective change as well, viz., the capacity of the revolutionary class to effect revolutionary mass actions, sufficiently powerful to break down or undermine the old government which will never "fall," not even in periods of crises, if it is not "overthrown."

Such is the Marxist attitude toward revolution, which were very often expressed and acknowledged and confirmed for us Russians by the experiences of the year 1905. The question is what was expected in this connection by the Basel manifesto in 1912 and what did take place in 1914-15.

A revolutionary situation was expected, briefly described by the phrase "an economic and a political crisis." Did

officers of the laws—all this, and more, is brought out vividly by the evidence. The exploitation of the workers, their terrible conditions of life, misery and sorrow is transfigured by the awakening determination to end once and for all a social system that preys upon those who sustain it.

The trial cannot be judged adequately unless considered in relation to its background, the history of Capitalism and labor in this country within the past fifteen years. And this history shows the onward, brutal march of Capitalism, strengthening itself, increasing the workers' yield of surplus value, emphasizing its control of the nation, entering into a new epoch of its existence, more malevolent and powerful than ever. But this tendency of Capitalism produces a new tendency—the awakening to consciousness and action of the great industrial proletariat of unskilled labor, expressing itself through the I. W. W. The history of the I. W. W. is the history of the development of unskilled labor, that great industrial and social force which is destined to overthrow Capitalism and erect the new social structure of industrial communism. The history of the I. W. W., and particularly its attitude today and during the trial, demonstrates the great moral and physical power latent in the industrial proletariat, which requires only the impact of a favorable situation to act in the performance of the historic mission of the working class.

The reaction considered that by arresting the "leaders" the I. W. W. would collapse like a house of cards. But you cannot destroy a mass movement in that simple way. The I. W. W. has not collapsed, will not collapse until the conditions of its existence pass away—and that won't be until Socialism is established. The *Labor Defender* wittily says: "If there is one thing the great trial is proving it is that Fellow Worker A. Wobbly is the greatest of all I. W. W. leaders." Exactly; a militant organization of labor depends upon its own initiative and action, upon its own moral and physical reserves. The I. W. W. is the militant proletariat in action.

Urgent: Money is needed, and needed immediately, for the I. W. W. Defense Fund. Contribute yourself, and get others to contribute. "Give until it hurts" Capitalism.

it take place? Undoubtedly, yes. The Socialist-Chauvinist, Lensch (who was much more honest in expressing his views, than the hypocrites Cunow, Kautsky, Plechanoff & Co.), even said that we are living through a peculiar *revolution* (vide page 6 of his pamphlet, "German Social-Democracy and the War," Berlin, 1915). The political crisis was self-evident. Not one of the governments was sure of the next day, not one was free from the danger of a financial collapse, loss of territory or expulsion from its own country (as, for instance, the Belgian government was expelled). All the governments are living at the edge of a volcano; all are making appeals to the heroism of the masses.

The political regime of Europe is completely shaken and no one will deny that we have entered (and entering further still—I am writing this on the day when Italy has entered the war.) into an epoch of great political disturbances. If Kautsky two months after the declaration of war wrote (Oct. 2, 1914, *The Neue Zeit*) that never is the government so strong and the parties so weak as at the commencement of a war, it is but one of the samples of the counterfeit historical science of Kautsky for the benefit of Sudekum and other opportunists. Never does a government require the agreement of all the parties of the ruling classes and the "peaceful subservience" to their "rule" of the exploited classes, as in times of war. "At the commencement of war," especially in a country expecting a quick victory, the government "appears" all-powerful, yet nobody, at no time, and nowhere in the world, connected the expectation of a revolutionary situation exclusively with the moment of commencement of the war, and therefore never identified "the appearance" with the actuality.

That the European war will be burdensome, beyond comparison with others, everybody knew and acknowledged. The experiences of the war confirm this more and more and more. The misery of the masses is terrible, and the efforts of the governments, bourgeoisie and opportunists to conceal the misery meet with frequent disaster. The profits of certain groups of Capitalists are scandalously high.

The intensification of contradictions is enormous. Suppressed indignation of the masses, vague longing of stupefied and lowest strata of society for kindly ("democratic") peace, the beginning of revolt "below"—all these are evident. And the more war is prolonged and intensified the more governments develop and are obliged to develop the activity of the masses, call them to exceptional, extraordinary efforts and sacrifices. The experiences of war like the experiences of every crisis in history, of every misery and catastrophe in the life of man, stupefies and breaks down some but at the same time *hardens and enlightens others*. In general besides, in the world's history, the numbers and strength of the latter exceeds the former, with the exception of certain instances of breakdown and destruction of this or that government. The conclusion of peace not only is unable "at once" to put an end to these miseries and to all this intensification of contradictions, but on the contrary in many respects makes the misery even more burdensome, and especially more evident for the most backward masses of the people. In a word, a revolutionary condition in the majority of the leading countries and great powers of Europe is at hand. In this respect the expectations of the Basel manifesto have been fully realized. To deny this truth directly or indirectly or to be silent about it as do Cunow, Plechanoff, Kautsky & Co. means to be telling the greatest untruth, to deceive the working class and to serve the bourgeoisie.

(To be continued)

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat

By S. J. RUTGERS

POLITICAL power properly so-called, is merely the organized power of one class oppressing another," says the Communist Manifesto. At present the political power of the capitalist class, organized in the capitalist State and capitalist government, serves the purpose of protecting and enforcing the exploitation of the proletariat class. Class division excludes democracy because the interests of one class, the ruling class, must prevail. The ruling class always has been a minority class, as it would not be necessary for a majority class to "rule." Democracy being incompatible with a society based on class antagonism, no form of bourgeois "democracy" can ever be real democracy.

Real democracy must secure conditions and decisions in accordance with the interests of society as a whole, and if we find that a "democratic" government is used to secure the interests of a minority class, there is something wrong with that kind of democracy. Without going into details how the specific "democratic" system accomplishes its special aims, we know as a fact that there is some scheme to prevent democracy working out democratically. In fact the prevailing institutions, customs, laws, morals, etc., of a class society largely have no other purpose than to create sentiments and conditions which operate to make people support their own oppressors. The working class and those groups whose interests are one with the interests of the working class, largely through intellectual and moral influences, are brought to betray their ultimate class interests. Such is the power of control over the economic conditions and over the instruments of civilization—schools, churches, public opinion, newspapers, science, art, etc.

Only to a very limited extent, only to the extent to which the ruling class needs a certain amount of freedom in its own interest, can the oppressed class counteract this control by propaganda and education. If the capitalists could put each worker in a separate cell to sweat out profits without contact with his fellow-workers, the system might be permanized altogether and no amount of general suffrage and vote casting would be of any effect.

The present situation under capitalism, is not quite so "perfect," but still conditions are maintained in such shape as to enable a minority to rule. Even though we may not always be able to find out how it works, we know by its results that the scheme works all right, because otherwise the majority would not accept the minority rule.

Under present circumstances, "democracy" is one of the means to deceive the workers, is part of the anti-democratic reality, and the strength of this and other means to the same end is the more remarkable since the material means of power largely have to be put in the hands of the underlying class. Even the ultimate power of militarism is in the actual control of the workers if they only could overcome the mental and moral obstacles raised by their masters.

Without going into details of the schemes of bourgeois democratic government and the multitude of ways to accomplish its anti-democratic aims, it may be worth while to call attention to the fact that parliamentarism adapts itself to the most brutal forms of autocracy. Even Germany has a parliament elected by general suffrage, a general suffrage more "democratic" than that of the United States. But while the Reichstag is allowed to talk to a certain ex-

tent, the bureaucracy acts, and is, moreover, ready to stop this talking machine any moment it threatens to become a nuisance. Another and most instructive example of a bourgeois democratic system serving Capitalism is right at hand and it is unnecessary to analyze its methods in detail. Direct corruption and speculation on personal material interests no doubt often play a role, but by far more important are the mental methods to fool and enslave the worker. Therefore "class consciousness" has to develop so that the material means of power already in the hands of the workers can be used to overcome the class-rule of the exploiters.

This Social revolution, however, is not a matter of majority or democracy; it is a matter of material and mental power. While it is perfectly clear that only a large number of the exploited masses with definite and well defined purposes can bring the change, there is no necessity that this should be a majority of the population or even a majority of the suppressed class. In fact a social revolution may turn out and has so far always turned out to be a new class rule of another minority. The hope for democracy under Socialism lies not in the Social Revolution as such

but in the fact that the victory of the workers will do away with every form of class rule. During the period of the Social Revolution the two classes continue to struggle and democracy can only be a weapon in this struggle, can only serve the interests of one class against the other. Bourgeois democracy will continue to enlist groups whose ultimate interests are with the proletarian revolution and the democracy of the victorious workers will be based upon the will and action of those groups among the workers that carry the revolution to success although they may form a minority even within the class of wage earners. Revolutions do not depend upon a majority but upon sufficient power to overcome the ruling class. This requires a mass of self-conscious and resolute proletarians acting in accordance with the demands of historic development, but there is no necessity nor even a possibility that this should be a majority from the very start. The proletarian revolution develops out of a condition in which the great mass of the exploited class is held in mental slavery and it is only natural that this mentality will first be broken in those workers whose position in the process of production makes them spe-

cially fit to see the light. The atmosphere of the social revolution itself is liable to open many eyes but at any given moment there is no logical reason whatever why the revolutionary forces should represent an absolute majority. And even when embracing a majority of the working class or even of the population the acts and decisions will not be based on democracy but on the proletarian class position as against the reactionary forces. This period has been called by Marx "the dictatorship of the proletariat," and he states: "If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled by circumstances to organize as a class, if by means of the revolution it makes itself the ruling class, as such sweeps away by force the old conditions of existence of class antagonism and of classes generally it will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class." Not before then can democracy prevail.

The power in the hands of the Soviets without recognizing the bourgeois interests was the first demand of the Russian proletarian revolution. And the Soviets were by no means organized with the purpose of expressing the most ideal form of democracy but to give the most efficient expression of the Social Revolution. In the Soviets the factory workers are represented through their direct delegates, the soldiers who, under the special conditions of this world war, proved to be an active revolutionary force, have a strong influence, as well as the peasants who want the land and know that the bourgeoisie is not willing to give it to them.

And this Soviet has quite a different character from the old bourgeois parliaments. It is highly important to mark this difference, as a clear illustration of the fact, pointed out by Marx: "that the victorious proletariat cannot seize the ready-made machinery of the state and use it for its own purposes." It has to build new organizations based, not on the government of persons, but upon administration of things. The Russian Soviet through its many subdivisions and committees controls the actual economic structure of society. Committees in charge of factories send their delegates to the local Soviets and so do the army corps, and the peasantry. Food distribution and the regulation of housing problems, requisitions, etc., are managed through local committees representing a block, a quarter, etc., and finally co-operating with the local Soviets.

All this is an organic structure in course of development under most difficult circumstances and far from complete or perfect, but nevertheless it functions, it has maintained itself already during ten months against the solid opposition of the old bureaucracy and it becomes stronger every day. It is a unity of representative and executive functions, a combination also of industrial and territorial government. This is the great lesson and the great hope in the social revolution all the revolutionary forces grow into one force, all the tendencies in the class struggle come into unity. There is no longer antagonism between economic and political action, all the revolutionary groups and fractions in the class struggle unite against the counter-revolution and for the building of a new society. Development of actual facts and conditions solve problems quicker than debates ever could. What remains however, is the fundamental division in the class struggle: whosoever is not for the social revolution supports the counter-revolution and has to be dealt with as such.

The Case of Debs

THE arrest and indictment of Eugene V. Debs has aroused the comrades throughout the country, who are rallying heartily to his support. Debs is out on \$10,000 bail.

Debs was arrested for alleged violation of the Espionage act, and the indictment consists of ten counts:

Making false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States;

Attempting to promote the success of the enemies of the United States;

Attempting to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, and refusal of duty in the military or naval forces;

Attempting to obstruct the recruiting or enlistment in the service of the United States;

Uttering disloyal language about the form of government of the United States;

Uttering language intended to bring the form of government of the United States, its military or naval forces, its flag or the uniform of the army or navy into contempt, scorn, contumely, or disrepute;

Uttering language intended to incite, provoke, or encourage resistance to the United States and to promote the cause of its enemies;

Uttering language to advocate curtailment of production of products essential to the prosecution of the war;

Opposing the cause of the United States by words.

The speech upon which Debs is indicted was delivered at the state convention of the Socialist Party of Ohio. In this speech, according to the New York Tribune of July 1, Debs is alleged to have said, among other things:

"Do not imagine for one moment that all the plutocrats and junkers are in Germany. We have them here in our own country, and these want our eyes focused on the junkers in Germany so that we won't see those within our own borders. I have no earthly use for the junkers of Germany and not one particle more use for the junkers in the United States.

"They tell us that we live in a great republic. Our institutions are democratic. We are a free people. This is

too much even as a joke. It is not a subject for levity; it is an exceedingly serious matter.

"They would have you believe that the Socialist Party consists in the main of disloyalists and traitors. It is true in a certain sense. We are disloyalists and traitors to the real traitors of this nation and the gang on the Pacific Coast is trying to hang Tom Mooney despite the civilized world.

"Who appoints the Federal Courts? The people? Every solitary one of them holds his position through the power of corporation capital and when they go to the bench they are not to serve the people, but they serve the interests who sent them. The other day, by a vote of five to four, they declared the child labor law unconstitutional—a law secured after years of education and agitation by all kinds of people, and yet by a majority of one of the Supreme Court, a body of corporation lawyers with just one solitary exception, wiped it from the statute books, so that we may still continue to grind the blood of little children into profit for the junkers of Wall Street, and this in a country that is fighting to make democracy safe for the world.

"Here I hear your hearts responsive to the Bolsheviks of Russia—those heroic men and women who have by their sacrifices, added further lustre to the international movement; those Russian comrades who have made greater sacrifices, who have suffered more, who have shed more heroic blood than any other like band of men and women. They have held the first real convention of any democracy that ever drew breath. The first act of that memorable revolution was to proclaim a state of peace, with an appeal not to the kings, not to the rulers, but an appeal to the people of all nations.

"Wars have been waged for plunder, for conquest and, since the feudal ages along the Rhine, the feudal lords made war upon each other. But they did not go to war any more than the Wall Street junkers go to war. Their predecessors declared the war, but their miserable serfs fought the wars. Their serfs believed it was their patriotic duty to wage war upon one another."

The New International

Published by
THE SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA
LEAGUE

LOUIS C. FRAINA . . . Editor

Address Communications to
ALFRED BURNS,
195 Lenox Avenue, New York City

Socialism and Industrial Unionism

THE recent state convention of the Socialist Party of New York was an exceptionally uninteresting and routine affair. It dodged all large problems of policy, and in general straddled on problems upon which it did act. In a perfunctory sort of way it passed the following resolution on industrial unionism:

"Resolved, That the Socialist Party of the State of New York, in state convention assembled, recognizes the advisability of industrial unionism as the logical and efficient form of organization of the working class, because of the modern development of industry, and urges its members to bring the advantages of this form of economic organization to the attention of the working class of this country."

Bitter experience teaches us that the adoption of resolutions usually means nothing: they are conveniently forgotten. The militant Socialists in the party should make it their business that this particular resolution does not meet the fate of others. Action should be taken to have the national organization adopt a similar resolution. And it is our task to make the party's propaganda include a propaganda for industrial unionism. Unless industrial unionism becomes an active phase of the party propaganda, the resolution will have been in vain. Moreover, it is necessary that the revolutionary implications of industrial unionism—the overthrow of the bourgeois state and the erection of an industrial state of the organized producers—should be emphasized as dynamic factors in Socialist theory and practice.

The Lehane Case

THE arrest and indictment of Cornelius Lehane, recently, upon serious charges is another expression of the general reaction. But the interesting feature of the case is the attitude of certain moderate Socialists toward Lehane. The Central Committee and the Executive Committee of Local New York are frittering away precious time in meetings and discussions, instead of actively assisting to raise the bail money. But, most damning of all, the Executive Committee sends Edward F. Cassidy to Ansonia to get the facts of the indictment. Cassidy brings back, instead, an unfavorable report, declaring that the Connecticut Socialists, including the state secretary, are against Lehane; that Lehane is a disrupter and an enemy of the party. Now, Cassidy is pro-war and prior to accepting the mission had spoken against Lehane. In other words, the Executive Committee sends a biased and prejudiced individual to investigate! And, naturally, his report is biased and prejudiced. As a member of the Central Committee appropriately declared, even in a capitalist court the theory is that the jury should not be prejudiced against the defendant. And when Cassidy was bitterly criticized for his dishonesty, he sought refuge in the wail, "I have been a member of the party for twenty years." So has Philip

Judas Scheidemann. The Scheidemanns in Germany, the Cassidys and Meyer Londons in this country, are an abomination. They must be cleaned out. Class conscious Socialists should rally to the defense of Lehane, who, in spite of all his faults, is a victim of the reaction and as such has a claim upon the militant Socialist. *Is a Socialist who criticizes the party to be penalized by the party's indifference when the claws of the reaction are at his throat?*

Intervention in Russia

SINISTER forces of reaction are preparing an onslaught upon revolutionary Russia.

They are eager to complete the work of counter-revolution unfinished by German Imperialism—and all in the name of preserving Russia against Germany's aggression.

These sinister forces, actively on the job in Great Britain and France and in this country, aided and abetted by reactionary Russian emigres, do not disguise the fact that their plans of military intervention in Russia mean inevitably an attempt to overthrow the revolutionary Soviet government.

Intervention means a struggle against the Revolution, and this means a military dictatorship and ultimately the restoration of autocracy in one form or another.

The revolutionary masses of Russia are determined to resist intervention to the death; and the hypocrites who are moaning about the sufferings of the Russian people are going to increase these sufferings in order to carry through their infamous imperialistic schemes.

We are familiar with the hypocritical procedure that is part of a campaign to force intervention in the affairs of another country. Our experiences with the business forces that tried to force intervention in Mexico are still fresh in our memory. The newspapers then were full of wails about starvation in Mexico; and these newspapers are today teeming with wails about starvation in Russia.

Won't intervention and the attempt to force Russia into the war multiply the agony of starvation by destroying the work of reorganization which is the one hope of Russia?

They speak of the hunger in Russia. But they don't speak of the hunger in France. They don't speak of the hunger in Great Britain and Italy.

Russia is hungry, more than the others, perhaps; but Russia is at least free! And Russia is determined to remain free, determined to work out her revolutionary destiny in her own way.

Why don't the Allies ship food to Russia, if their hearts are wrung by starvation in Russia? Why don't they co-operate in the work of internal reconstruction? No—the sinister forces of reaction want military intervention, the restoration of the bourgeoisie, of the rule of capital, if not of the monarchy. The initiative for intervention came from France, and the French plutocracy is not interested in the starving Russian people, but in the billions of French capital invested in Russia, upon which no interest is being paid.

In the *New York Times Magazine*, recently, Lieutenant Boris Brasol, formerly of the army of the Czar, says:

"For the sake of self-preservation the Allied Powers should pass from words to deeds; to the 'iron hand' from the 'velvet glove.' . . . These Russians [counter-revolutionary forces] are not able to unite themselves into one force strong enough to cast off the domination of the Lenines and Trozkys. The Allied Powers, therefore, must keep in view the fact that the fight against Bolshevism in all its manifestations is part of the fight against Germanism. . . . At present there is only one way to help Russia: The or-

ganization of an Inter-allied and Pan-Slavic expedition into Russia for the overthrow of the Bolshevik government."

There is the whole plot. There is the crime against civilization that is being prepared by the sinister forces of reaction.

—Against this campaign of calumnia-tion and conspiracy, the forces of Socialism and of labor must immediately organize a counter-campaign of truth and action against the proposed intervention.

In striking at Soviet Russia, international Imperialism strikes a blow at the workers and the cause of Socialism throughout the world.

Soviet Russia is not pro-German: it is proletarian, pro-revolution, pro-Socialism. Its attitude is determined by the requirements of the class struggle and of Socialism. Its enemy is not simply German Imperialism, but all Imperialism; and it matters not whether this Imperialism acts through a monarchy or a bourgeois republic.

Russia accepted a humiliating peace with Germany because of the temporary requirements of the Revolution. In an article in *Pravda*, Lenin analyzed the situation thus:

"The Russian Revolution, reaching a culminating point in November, when the proletariat secured the reins of government, was bound to pass through a period of civil war and internal disorder, because the propertied classes could not be expected to give up their privileges without a struggle.

"This means the necessity of the Soviet government to concentrate all its forces on the internal struggle.

"The policy of the Russian Revolution must be based on the general international situation—namely, the probability or improbability of the outbreak of Social Revolution in the rest of Europe, but the chances of this in the immediate future are slight.

"Therefore it is a mistake for the Russian Revolution to base its policy on uncertain eventualities.

"To sign a peace with German Imperialists is not, objectively speaking, treason to international Socialism.

"When workmen are beaten in a strike, and have to accept bad terms from employers, they do not betray their class because they cannot get all their demands satisfied at once. They only accept bad conditions in order to better prepare for another struggle later.

"If the Russian Revolution continued the war in alliance with Anglo-French Imperialism against Austro-German Imperialism on the basis of the old secret treaties recently published and not openly repudiated by the Allies, then it would be prostituting itself to foreign Imperialists.

"As long as there is no Social Revolution in England and Germany, the Russian Revolution must seek the most profitable conditions in existence, relying as little as possible on the English or German governments negotiating one against the other.

"By concluding a separate peace Russia can utilize the fact that the Anglo-German Imperialists are too much engaged in a bloody struggle to attend seriously to her. She can therefore concentrate on the internal development of the Revolution.

"If Russia, under present conditions, attempts both enterprises—internally to reap the full fruits of the Revolution, and externally to carry on the conflict against foreign Imperialism—she will lose both her objects; but if she concentrates on internal development now, she will secure her second victory later."

Soviet Russia is not willingly allowing German encroachments; but she is sacrificing a little now in order to reap much more later.

Soviet Russia may renew the war against German Imperialism; but it will be upon her own initiative, of her own choice, and not of choice of the Allies. And if Russia renews the war, it will be a revolutionary war against German Imperialism as the preliminary to a revolutionary war against all Imperialism.

Russia must reconstruct the affairs of the country. Russia must have peace until such time as she may have the revolutionary war. This is the great task of the workers and peasants of Russia.

And it is the task of the workers of the world to see to it that governments don't interfere. Through the class struggle against all Imperialism the proletariat will co-operate with Soviet Russia. Proletarian pressure must be brought to bear upon the governments to prevent intervention.

Socialism and the State

THE article in this issue by Robert Dell on "Vandervelde's Socialism" poses an interesting and fundamental problem in Socialist tactics. Unfortunately, Vandervelde's book has not yet reached this country, and we must be satisfied with Mr. Dell's excellent if short review. As summarized in the review, Vandervelde's thesis is as follows:

"The notion that Socialism can be brought about by the gradual absorption of production by the state or the municipalities—that, for instance, the municipalization of the gas or water is a step toward Socialism—is a delusion. . . . To the conception . . . of the organization of labor by the state, Socialism, properly so-called, opposes that of the organization of labor by the workers themselves, grouped in vast associations independent of the government. . . . M. Vandervelde shows that the conquest of political power [by the proletariat] alone will not suffice. One of the most interesting chapters of his book is that in which he exposes the failure of political democracy and the parliamentary system."

This is in accord with a lecture delivered by Vandervelde in 1914, just prior to the war, on "Socialism versus the State" (of which the book is probably an elaboration), in which he said:

"We see, with Guesde, as with Marx and Engels, that there is no confusion possible between Socialism and state ownership. They will have nothing to do with the Capitalist state, except to fight it. [Shortly after this was said, Guesde and Vandervelde accepted ministerial responsibility in capitalist states.] If they wish to master it, it is only that they may abolish it. At most, they would use the state during a transitory period of working class dictatorship."

Vandervelde is a typical opportunist and reformist, as his activity prior to and during the war amply proves. His whole policy, in spite of his theoretical realization of its futility, has been a policy of "stateism," a policy making for State Capitalism, which is not and never can become Socialism. Precisely because of Vandervelde's policy, his formulation of the fundamental difference between Socialism and State Capitalism is exceptionally important testimony.

This theoretical formulation of Vandervelde against "stateism" is nothing new, having been made again and again by "the masters of Socialist theory." But it remained a theoretical formulation, being used purely as an abstract argument when necessary. These "masters" (the pseudo-Marxists, of whom Marx himself said, "I sowed dragons' teeth, and I reaped fleas") did not draw practical tactical conclusions implicit in their information, and acquiesced in a policy for the Socialist movement that

simply promoted State Capitalism and castrated the revolutionary action of the proletariat.

State ownership or control of industry is not and never can become Socialism—the revolutionary Socialist must repeatedly emphasize this in his propaganda. State Capitalism is, in fact, Capitalism at the climax of its development, an instrument for the progressive promotion of capitalist expansion and supremacy. State Capitalism is introduced under the aegis of Imperialism, which has absorbed within itself the remnants of the old industrial middle class, the new "income" middle class, and the upper layers of the working class, united in and expressing their interests through State Capitalism. State Capitalism is the last desperate attempt of the ruling class to maintain the supremacy of Capitalism and the bourgeois state; it is compelled, however, to increase its control and exploitation of the industrial proletariat, the mass of the machine workers, and in this way prepares the proletariat for that mass action which will sweep aside imperialism and state capitalism as unified in the malevolent autocracy of the contemporary bourgeois state.

Socialism, accordingly, should not adopt a policy of promoting State Capitalism, but should fight State Capitalism. The theory of State Capitalism is "the co-operation of classes"—with the industrial proletariat in subjection; and it is not at all strange that the policy of moderate Socialism, which makes for State Capitalism, is one of "the co-operation of classes"—which results in the betrayal of fundamental Socialist and proletarian interests, as proven by the attitude of moderate Socialism toward the war and toward the proletarian revolution in Russia. Under the prevailing conditions, State Capitalism and moderate Socialism are each imperialistic and promote Imperialism.

The answer of Socialism to the menace of imperialistic State Capitalism is to awaken the consciousness and action of the industrial proletariat of unskilled labor, to promote the concept and the organization of industrial unionism, to prepare to awaken and direct the mass action of the proletariat, and to realize, and emphasize in its activity, that the bourgeois state must be abolished before the process of introducing Socialism can begin.

Vandervelde is not in accord with revolutionary Socialist theory in his statement that Socialism "would use the state during a transitory period of working class dictatorship"—since Vandervelde means the state of the bourgeois parliamentary regime. The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat will have nothing in common with the bourgeois parliamentary state: it will be the state of the organized workers—as in the Soviets of proletarian Russia. This state will, during the transition period, combine industrial and political function; but the purely political functions will gradually be discarded, and the dictatorship of the proletariat develop into the industrial, communistic "state" of the organized producers—Engels' "administration of things."

The revolutionary Socialist attitude toward the state has been clearly stated by Lenin:

"From the praxis of the Paris Commune, Marx shows that the working class cannot lay hold of the ready-made machinery of the state, and wield it for its own purposes." The proletariat must break down this machinery. And this has been either concealed or denied by the opportunists. But it is the most valuable lesson of the Paris Commune of 1871 and of the Revolution in Russia of 1905 and 1917.

"The difference between us and the Anarchists is, that we admit the state

is a necessity in the development of our Revolution. The difference with the opportunists and disciples of Kautsky is, that we claim we do not need the bourgeois state machinery as completed

in the 'democratic' bourgeois republics, but the direct power of armed and organized workers. Such is the state we need."

The problems implicit in Socialism

and the state are fundamental problems of theory and tactics, and the attitude toward these problems will be a vital one in the coming days of Socialist reconstruction.

Socialism in Japan

Introduction, by Louis C. Fraipa, to Sen Katayama's forthcoming book on "The Labor Movement in Japan," to be published by Chas. H. Kerr & Co.

AT the moment when reaction is ascendant in Japan, when its Imperialism is aggressively triumphant and its proletariat apparently crushed and silent—at this moment, more than any other, is a book on the Japanese Labor movement of great value. It is of value in showing a militant proletariat in action and by emphasizing our international spirit without which Socialism cannot conquer.

This book, appearing at this particular time, is, moreover, a symbol to the world of Socialism and revolution. It is a symbol of the great role that the Japanese proletariat is destined to play in the days to come; it is even more a symbol of the momentous fact washed upon the shores of Time by the Great War—that Labor, and Labor alone, in spite of momentary collapse and a swerving from its historic mission, is the force that can preserve civilization from total ruin by creating the new civilization of Socialism.

Japan is today dominantly reactionary. It is preparing itself to extend the power and influence of its ruling class. As a capitalist nation, Japan is part and parcel of the general imperialistic interests and ambitions that plunged the world into disaster. And in Japan, as in other imperialistic nations, all classes are reactionary, all classes are eager for the spoils of exploitation, all classes are willing to sell humanity and civilization for the mess of pottage of imperialistic aggrandizement. All classes, that is to say, except the proletariat, which is silent under the oppression of a malevolent tyranny, but which has within itself the latent power and inspiration for great deeds, as is amply proven by Comrade Katayama's sketch of the rise of the Labor and Socialist movement under the most discouraging conditions.

The Japanese government is increasing its repressive measures against the proletariat. Recently, Comrade T. Sakai was imprisoned for propaganda in favor "of an extension of the suffrage." And in its reactionary sweep, the Japanese government is destroying a peculiar instrument it forged for the deception of the workers—the Yu-Si-Kai. The Yu-Si-Kai was a "union" organized under government auspices, including in its membership capitalists, professors and officials of the government, its chief activity being the publication of a paper to deceive the workers. Employers often brutally coerced their workers to join this "union," and it became a means of destroying the legitimate organizations of the proletariat. But now the Imperial government itself is persecuting the Yu-Si-Kai, against the protests of Baron Shibusawa and other magnates of capital, while the workers are rapidly deserting it entirely. This is significant equally of the stupidity of the government and the awakening of the workers.

I have said that Japan is part and parcel of the general imperialistic forces and ambitions that plunged the world into disaster; and this Imperialism is determinant in the recent history and development of Japan.

The Japanese people emerged definitely into the world of modern production and exchange at a time when Cap-

italism had developed into a new stage of its existence—the stage of Imperialism. Normally, the development of Capitalism would have produced a bourgeois, democratic revolution in Japan; but the existence of Imperialism altered the course of events. Imperialism is the negation of democracy; it means, historically, the end of bourgeois democracy and the re-introduction of autocracy under a variety of political forms. In nations which completed their bourgeois democratic revolution, as England and France, Imperialism develops a reaction against democracy and establishes the autocracy of imperialistic State Capitalism; in nations which had not completed their bourgeois revolution, as Germany, or which never had the beginnings of one, as Japan, Imperialism prevents the appearance of the institutions of bourgeois democracy. The feudal class is not destroyed; it becomes capitalistic and is put into the service of Imperialism; autocracy is not abolished, but bent to the uses of Imperialism. This was precisely the development in Japan, as in Germany. Imperialistic Capitalism was developed on the basis of still prevailing feudal conditions and ideology, a situation excellent for the profit-mad ruling class, but simply murderous to the workers and peasants, and disastrous to the rise of democratic ideas and institutions. Instead of comprehensively developing the internal market and its corresponding normal conditions of production, the Japanese ruling class embarked upon a policy of export trade and Imperialism, because it was more profitable, and because the development of the internal market would have meant the end of low wages and the appearance of a homogenous, aggressive proletariat.

The role to which Japan aspires, and conspires for, is that of arbiter of the Far East. Its imperialistic interests dictate the establishment of Japanese hegemony on the Asiatic continent, and particularly in succulently-rich and helpless China. Japan has already promulgated a sort of "Monroe Doctrine," which insists upon priority of interest and consideration for Japan in the Far East, just as the American Monroe Doctrine has been perverted into a similar claim for the United States in Central and South America.

The war has definitely converted Japan into a dominant imperialistic nation. From a debtor nation, Japan has become a creditor nation, with large masses of capital that must be exported for investment. In January, 1918, Finance Minister Shoda in his budget speech said that imports since the beginning of the war had aggregated 2,623,000,000 yen (a yen is equivalent to almost half a dollar), and exports, 3,799,000,000 yen, the resulting favorable balance of 1,175,000,000 yen being increased by 700,000,000 yen "from other sources." The accumulation of capital from this favorable balance of trade is increasing rapidly as the months go by. Moreover, industry has expanded to gigantic proportions, including the shipping industry. Industry and trade are increasing, not in arithmetical, but in geometrical progression. Japanese capitalism is entrenched itself firmly in all sections of Asia, and particularly China, where economic and political "penetration" proceed simultaneously. Japan's great need until recently was the import of

raw materials, including iron and coal; the enormous expansion of industry has made this need still more imperative, and it has been supplemented by the urgent need for investment markets to which Japanese Capitalism can export its surplus capital. All this means a feverish impetus to Imperialism; and the field for Japanese Imperialism is Asia.

It is just at this point that antagonism develops between Japan and the other imperialistic powers in general, between Japan and the United States in particular, an antagonism latent with the threat of war, a war that would ultimately involve all the other great powers to protect their own Imperialism. Economically and financially, the United States is being affected by the war in precisely the same way as Japan, only more so. The Far East, and particularly China, is a great, capitalistically-untapped reservoir; it can do two things indispensable to an imperialistic nation—provide practically unlimited sources of raw materials and absorb vast amounts of investment capital. This import of raw material and the export of capital are the nerve-centers of Capitalism today, and the source of the great antagonisms which may again produce a catastrophe—unless the proletariat acts decisively in the performance of its historic mission.

In this situation latent with catastrophe, the workers of the two nations must understand each other, must assist each other, must unite to avert the impending menace.

For the workers of the two nations alone and decisively, in co-operation with the workers of the world, can prevent a conflict. No dependence can be placed upon the words of the representatives of the ruling classes, understandings and agreements are converted into scraps of paper when they clash with dominant imperialistic interests. The proletariat alone can act; and it is the function of the New International now in process of becoming to prepare the revolutionary proletariat to act when the crisis comes, aye, to prevent the coming of the crisis.

The fomenting of race prejudice and hatred is exactly what the ruling classes desire. Hatreds of race against race constitute the ideologic dynamo of Imperialism. It is the task of the Socialist to break down these hatreds. And when the American Federation of Labor foments racial hatred against the Japanese, it is betraying the interests of the workers. The Japanese workers in this country are part and parcel of our proletariat; they have proven that they are organizable, that they can fight the industrial oppressors, that they are excellent material for the militant proletarian movement. It is sheer suicide for the American proletariat to indulge in race hatred against the Japanese, or against any other racial element of our people.

The American proletariat, moreover, must understand precisely what are the real forces of labor and progress in Japan. It must not play into the hands of the Imperial government. Some years ago, the Yu-Si-Kai sent a fraternal delegate to a convention of the American Federation of Labor, a Mr. Susuki, secretary of Baron Shibusawa. Mr. Susuki was accepted as a bona-fide representative of the Japanese workers, Messrs. Gompers and Scharrenberg solemnly accepting the invitation to go

to Japan to "teach" the workers there how to organize. Opera-bouffe! Many Socialists also made this gross error, in spite of Comrade Katayama's expose in the New York *Call* of the real character of Susuki and his "labor" organization.

In the coming great work of reconstruction, the Socialist Party should recognize and emphasize the vital importance of the Japanese-American issue, and make it a central feature of its agitational and educational propaganda. Indeed, this is all the more necessary considering the temporary weakness of the Japanese movement, a weakness due to definite historical circumstances. Why could not the Party make an appropriation to assist our comrades in Japan? Why not more intimate contact between the two movements? And, surely, the Party could make use of an appropriation for special propaganda among the Japanese in this country, could avail itself of the services of a Sen Katayama.

* * *

Comrade Sen Katayama is an interesting personality. At sixty years of age, he retains the enthusiasm and idealism of youth; forced to make a living for himself and his daughter, as an ordinary worker, he devotes all his spare time to the cause to which he has dedicated his life. Katayama is unpretentious and democratic; the fan-fare of heroics makes no appeal to him. He is a worker in the workers' movement, accepting the worker's lot—that is all; but that is *all* a man can do.

It was at the Amsterdam Socialist Congress in 1904 that Katayama participated in a symbolic act. Japan and Russia, the Russian and Japanese autocracy, were at war. The chairman of the Congress was speaking, when Katayama and Plekhanov arose, and in full view of the audience, shook hands—symbol of that international proletarian solidarity which will yet prove mightier than cannon and chauvinism.

Sen Katayama was born December 7, 1858, of peasant parentage, and the story of his life is the story of the Japanese labor and Socialist movement. He worked on a farm, studying at home, with only short intervals of school education. In 1882 Katayama went to Tokyo, working in a printing plant ten hours a day at 7½ cents a day; by working overtime he could earn \$2.50 a month. The ordeal of these days made Katayama a permanent proletarian with the aspirations of the militant proletarian.

For a time, Katayama worked as a janitor in a Chinese University, and studied the Chinese classics in his spare time; then he came to the United States to study—not subsidized by the Imperial government, as so many Japanese students are, but entirely upon his own resources, which consisted of exactly one dollar upon his arrival in California in 1884. Katayama studied English in a Chinese Mission in Alameda, entered John Hopkins Academy at Oakland, from there went to Marysville College, Tennessee, and in 1889 entered Grinnel College, graduating in 1892. Two years at Andover and one year at Yale were spent in the study of social problems. And during all these years Katayama had to work for his living and his tuition, the ordeal of it all preparing him for the activity of a militant rebel.

About this time, Katayama began to study Socialism, starting with Ferdinand Lassalle, who inspired him with a love for the practical work of organization. After a short stay in England studying social problems, Katayama returned to the United States on his way to Japan, where he immediately became active in the developing labor movement, and soon became its central fig-

ure. In 1904 he went as a delegate to the Amsterdam Congress, and after a tour of the United States returned to the Amsterdam Congress, and after a tour of the United States returned to Japan, to find the movement dominated by *petit bourgeois* intellectuals and persecuted bitterly by the authorities. His activity in a big strike in Tokyo caused his arrest and nine months' imprisonment, which greatly impaired his health; and upon his release, his every move was interfered with, detectives were always with him wherever he went, and he was compelled to leave Japan, again coming to the United States. This persecution was largely due to the intrepid attitude against war with Russia adopted by the Japanese Socialists.

But in America the Japanese Consuls and detectives, upon instructions from the Imperial Government kept watch of

Katayama, making his life unpleasant and his organizing work impossible. His friends were intimidated by the consuls, who possess great power. The Japanese Day Laborers Union, of which Katayama was an officer, was compelled to denounce him; one of his friends was actually kidnapped, sent to Japan, and imprisoned for eighteen months. Katayama was compelled to leave California and come to New York, where he has since been publishing a paper in Japanese and English, *The Heimin*.

The central characteristics of Katayama's activity and personality are an uncompromising class consciousness and internationalism. He greeted with joy the proletarian revolution in Russia, as did his comrades in Japan; and he is firmly convinced that the revolutionary Socialism of the Bolsheviki

must become the basis of the New International. At sixty years of age, Sen Katayama looks to the future, and not to the past—to the immediate future of the Third International, the International of revolutionary Socialism, of the final, unconquerable struggle against Capitalism, initiated by the proletarian revolution in Russia.

History, says Trotzky, is a mighty mechanism serving our ideals. And contemporary history is preparing the way feverishly and swiftly for our final struggle. In this struggle the international solidarity of the proletariat is an indispensable requirement. May Sen Katayama's book on the Japanese Labor movement prove a factor in promoting this solidarity! May Sen Katayama's revolutionary conception of Socialism prove a factor in the revolutionary reconstruction of Socialism!

Vandervelde's Socialism

By ROBERT DELL.

THE ordeal through which we are passing here makes it almost impossible to give one's mind to anything but the war. But the other night, having been awakened by the alarm of an air raid at three in the morning, I began to read a book that had just come from the publisher, "Le Socialisme contre l'Etat" (Berger-Levrault, Paris), by M. Emile Vandervelde, the distinguished Belgian Socialist and president of the International Socialist Bureau.

The title will astonish many people, for it is a common fallacy that Socialism is identical with "Etatisme"—why is there no English equivalent for that useful word? M. Vandervelde's purpose is to combat that fallacy, which, as he admits, is shared by many Socialists or persons claiming that title.

He has no difficulty in showing that the Socialism of Marx and Engels, for instance, far from being "etatiste," was exactly the contrary, for it aimed at the abolition of the state as we know it. If they admitted the conversion of certain services or industries, such as the railways, into state monopolies, it was only as a measure of transition, not as a final aim.

And they never supposed that a state monopoly was Socialism. Many of their followers have even opposed all state monopolies as dangerous to the proletariat, on the ground that they paralyze the action of the working class and strengthen the bourgeoisie. M. Vandervelde admits the danger if, for instance, the employes of the state are prevented from organizing themselves and are deprived of the right to strike.

The notion that Socialism can be brought about by the gradual absorption of production by the state or the municipalities—that, for instance, the municipalization of the gas or water is a step toward Socialism—is a delusion. A bureaucratic state Socialism, such as is conceived by some of the leading members of the English Fabian Society, would produce a servile community in which the worker would be the "wage-slave" of a state official instead of a capitalist. To this conception, that of the organization of labor by the state, Socialism, properly so-called, opposes that of the organization of labor by the workers themselves, grouped in vast associations independent of government.

State control of industry has been so enormously extended by the war that this book is very opportune. That extension has been hailed by many Socialists as a triumph for their ideas, and is feared by many opponents of Socialism for the same reason. It was necessary to demonstrate that these hopes and fears are alike mistaken, and M.

Vandervelde's demonstration is convincing. In fact, state control of industry of the workmen and hampered their collective action, and it might easily be used to reduce them to complete subserviency and to make efforts at economic emancipation more difficult than ever.

It is a maxim of social democracy that the workers should aim at the conquest of political power, so as to obtain control of the state in order to get rid of it. For the "government of men" Socialism would substitute the "administration of things." But M. Vandervelde shows that the conquest of political power alone will not be sufficient. One of the most interesting parts of his book is that in which he exposes the failure of political democracy and of the parliamentary system.

It is a wholesome corrective to the notion that, if Germany would only adopt the system of a government responsible to a parliament, all would be well. In fact, as M. Vandervelde shows, the people have very little more effective influence on the government in the countries called democratic than in the others. Perhaps, as Mr. Vandervelde says, no country in the world is so completely dominated by the financial interests as France, which has, in form, the institutions most nearly democratic of all the great nations, not excepting the United States.

It is much to be hoped that this book will be translated into English,

for it is quite the most valuable work of the kind that has appeared for a long time. It would be impossible to give in so small a compass, for the book is quite short, a clearer exposition of what Socialism means and does not mean. M. Vandervelde has an admirable style and makes his subject interesting to the least specialist or readers; the book is essentially a popular one.

Incidentally, it should do much to reconcile with the Socialists those revolutionaries, or "radicals," as I believe you call them in America, who rightly dread the restrictions of individual liberty that would result from a system of state monopoly. The difference between Socialists and Syndicalists in France is chiefly one of method, and there is every sign of a rapprochement between them, due to the disgust of the younger Socialists with parliamentarism and with the "etatiste" tendencies of some of the leaders, who are much nearer to the Italian "Reformists" and the English Fabians than to the International Socialist Party.

A schism between these bourgeois Socialists and the adherents of the revolutionary Socialism, seems, sooner or later, inevitable. In any case, revolutionary Socialism is likely to be stronger than ever after the war, and, whether one agree or not with its principles and aims, it is desirable to know what they are. That knowledge can be obtained without difficulty from M. Vandervelde's book.—*The Dial*.

A Timely and Necessary Book!

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM

A Study in Socialist Reconstruction

This book is a real contribution to Socialist Literature, an analysis of the new tendencies and ideas now at work in International Socialism.

Chapters: I—Introductory; II—Imperialism, A New Stage in Capitalism; III—Class Divisions Under Imperialism; IV—The Death of Democracy; V—Fundamentals of Socialism; VI—Socialism in Action; VII—The Great Collapse; VIII—Socialist Readjustment; IX—Class and Nation; X—Problems of State Capitalism; XI—Unionism and Mass Action; XII—The Proletarian Revolution.

176 pages; 60c a copy.

ALFRED BURNS 195 Lenox Avenue, New York City