Combined with "The New York Communist"

The Revolutionary Age

Devoted to the International Communist Struggle

Vol. 2, No. 1. **Saturday, July 5, 1919** **Price 5c.**

In This Issue:
Left Wing Convention,
Manifesto and Program

"Nothing Doing!"

The Left Wing Manifesto

Issued on Authority of the Conference by the National Council of the Left Wing

THE world is in crisis. Capitalism, the prevailing system of society, is in process of disintegration and collapse. Out of its vitals is developing a new social order, the system of Communist Socialism; and the struggle between this new social order and the old is now the fundamental problem of international politics.

The predatory "war for democracy" dominated the world. But now it is the revolutionary proletariat in action that dominates, conquering power in some nations, mobilizing to conquer power in others, and calling upon the proletariat of all nations to prepare for the final struggle against Capitalism.

But Socialism itself is in crisis. Events are revolutionizing Capitalism *and Socialism*—an indication that this is the historic epoch of the proletarian revolution. Imperialism is the final stage of Capitalism; and Imperialism means sterner reaction and new wars of conquest—unless the revolutionary proletariat acts for Socialism. Capitalism cannot reform itself; it cannot be reformed. Humanity can be saved from its last excesses only by the Communist Revolution. There can now be only the Socialism which is one in temper and purpose with the proletarian revolutionary struggle. There can be only the Socialism which unites the proletariat of the whole world in the general struggle against the desperately destructive Imperialisms — the Imperialisms which array themselves as a single force against the onsweeping proletarian revolution.

THE WAR AND IMPERIALISM.

The prevailing conditions, in the world of Capitalism and of Socialism, are a direct product of the war; and the war was itself a direct product of Imperialism.

Industrial development under the profit system of Capitalism is based upon the accumulation of capital, which depends upon the expropriation of values produced by the workers. This accumulation of capital promotes, and is itself promoted by, the concentration of industry. The competitive struggle compels each capitalist to secure the most efficient means of production, or a group of capitalists to combine their capital in order to produce more efficiently. This process of concentration of industry and the accumulation of capital, while a product of competition, ultimately denies and ends competition. The concentration of industry and of capital develops monopoly.

Monopoly expresses itself through dictatorial control exercised by finance-capital over industry; and finance-capital unifies Capitalism for world-exploitation. Under Imperialism, the banks, whose control is centralized in a clique of financial magnates, dominate the whole of industry directly, purely upon the basis of investment exploitation, and not for purposes of social production. The concentration of industry implies that, to a large extent, industry within the nation has reached its maturity, is unable to absorb all the surplus-capital that comes from the profits of industry. Capitalism, accordingly, must find means outside the nation for the absorption of this surplus. The older export trade was dominated by the export of consumable goods. American exports, particularly, except for the war period, have been largely of cotton, foodstuffs, and raw materials. Under the conditions of Imperialism it is *capital* which is exported, as by the use of concessions in backward territory to build railroads, or to start native factories, as in India, or to develop oil fields, as in Mexico. This means an export of locomotives, heavy machinery, in short, predominantly a trade in iron goods. This export of capital, together with the struggle to monopolize the world's sources of raw materials and to control undeveloped territory, produces Imperialism.

A fully developed capitalist nation is compelled to accept Imperialism. Each nation seeks markets for the absorption of its surplus capital. Undeveloped territory, possessing sources of raw material, the industrial development of which will require the investment of capital and the purchase of machinery, becomes the objective of capitalistic competition between the imperialistic nations.

Capitalism, in the epoch of Imperialism, comes to rely for its "prosperity" and supremacy upon the exploitation and enslavement of colonial peoples, either in colonies, "spheres of influence," "protectorates," or "mandatories,"—savagely oppressing hundreds of millions of subject peoples in order to assure high profit and interest rates for a few million people in the favored nations.

This struggle for undeveloped territory, raw materials, and investment markets, is carried on "peacefully" between groups of international finance-capital by means of "agreements," and between the nations by means of diplomacy; but a crisis comes, the competition becomes irreconcilable, antagonisms cannot be solved peacefully, and the nations resort to war.

The antagonisms between the European nations were antagonisms as to who should control undeveloped territory, sources of raw materials, and the investment markets of the world. The inevitable consequence was war. The issue being world power, other nations, including the United States, were dragged in. The United States, while having no direct territorial interests in the war, was vitally concerned since the issue was world power; and its Capitalism, having attained a position of financial world power, had a direct imperialistic interest at stake.

The imperialistic character of the war is climaxed by an imperialistic peace—a peace that strikes directly at the peace and liberty of the world, which organizes the great imperialistic powers into a sort of "trust of nations," among whom the world is divided financially and territorially. The League of Nations is simply the screen for this division of the world, an instrument for joint domination of the world by a particular group of Imperialism.

While this division of the world solves, for the moment, the problems of power that produced the war, the solution is temporary, since the Imperialism of one nation can prosper only by limiting the economic opportunity of another nation. New problems of power must necessarily arise, producing new antagonisms, new wars of agression and conquest—unless the revolutionary proletariat conquers in the struggle for Socialism.

The concentration of industry produces monopoly, and monopoly produces Imperialism. In Imperialism there is implied the *socialization of industry, the material basis of Socialism.* Production moreover, becomes international; and the limits of the nation, of national production, become a fetter upon the forces of production. The development of Capitalism produces world economic problems that break down the old order. The forces of production revolt against the fetters Capitalism imposes upon production. The answer of Capitalism is war; the answer of the proletariat is the Social Revolution and Socialism.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL.

In 1912, at the time of the first Balkan war, Europe was on the verge of a general imperialistic war. A Socialist International Congress was convened at Basle to act on the impending crisis. The resolution adopted *stigmatized the coming war as imperialistic and as unjustifiable on any pretext of national interest.* The Basle resolution declared:

1. That the war would create an economic and political crisis; 2. That the workers would look upon participation in the war as a crime, which would arouse "indignation and revulsion" among the masses; 3. That the crisis and the psychological condition of the workers would create a situation that Socialists should use "to rouse the masses and hasten the downfall of Capitalism"; 4. That the governments "fear a proletarian revolution" and should remember the Paris Commune and the revolution in Russia in 1905, that is, a civil war.

The Basle resolution indicted the coming war as imperialistic, a war necessarily to be opposed by Socialism, which should use the opportunity of war to wage the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism. The policy of Socialism was comprised in the struggle to transform the imperialistic war into a civil war of the oppressed against the oppressors, and for Socialism.

The war that came in 1914 was the same imperialistic war that might have come in 1912, or at the time of the Agadir crisis. But, upon the declaration of war, *the dominant Socialism, contrary to the Basle resolution, accepted and justfiied the war.*

Great demonstrations were held. The governments and war were denounced. But, immediately upon the declaration of war, there was a change of front. The war credits were voted by Socialists in the parliaments. The dominant Socialism favored the war; a small minority adopted a policy of petty bourgeois pacifism; and only the Left Wing groups adhered to the policy of revolutionary Socialism.

It was not alone a problem of preventing the war. The fact that Socialism could not prevent the war, was not a justification for accepting and idealizing the war. Nor was it a problem of immediate revolution. The Basle Manifesto simply required opposition to the war and the fight to develop out of its circumstances the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat against the war and Capitalism.

The dominant Socialism, in accepting and justifying the war, abandoned the class struggle and betrayed Socialism. The class struggle is the heart of Socialism. Without strict conformity to the class struggle, in its revolutionary implications, Socialism becomes either sheer Utopianism, or a method of reaction. But the dominant Socialism accepted "civil peace," the "unity of all the classes and parties" in order to wage successfully the imperialistic war. The dominant Socialism united with the governments against Socialism and the proletariat.

The class struggle comes to a climax during war. National struggles are a form of expression of the class struggle, whether they are revolutionary wars for liberation or imperialistic wars for spoilation. It is precisely during a war that material conditions provide the opportunity for waging the class struggle to a conclusion for the conquest of power. The war was a war for world-power—a war of

the capitalist class against the working class, since world-power means power *over* the proletariat.

But the dominant Socialism accepted the war as a war for democracy—as if democracy under the conditions of Imperialism is not directly counter-revolutionary! It justified the war as a war for national independence—as if Imperialism is not necessarily determined upon annihilating the independence of nations!

Nationalism, social-patriotism, and social-Imperialism determined the policy of the dominant Socialism, and not the proletarian class struggle and Socialism. The coming of Socialism was made dependent upon the predatory war and Imperialism, upon the international proletariat cutting each other's throats in the struggles of the ruling class!

The Second International on the whole merged in the opposed imperialistic ranks. This collapse of the International was not an accident, nor simply an expression of the betrayal by individuals. It was the inevitable consequence of the whole tendency and policy of the dominant Socialism as an organized movement.

Moderate Socialism.

The Socialism which developed as an organized movement after the collapse of the revolutionary First International was moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism. It was a Socialism adapting itself to the conditions of national development, abandoning in practice the militant idea of revolutionizing the old world.

This moderate Socialism initiated the era of "constructive" social reforms. It accepted the bourgeois state as the basis of its activity and *strengthened* that state. Its goal became "constructive reforms" and cabinet portfolios—the "co-operation of classes," the policy of openly or tacitly declaring that the coming of Socialism was the concern "of all the classes," instead of emphasizing the Marxian policy that the construction of the Socialist system is the task of the revolutionary proletariat alone. In accepting social-reformism, the "co-operation of classes," and the bourgeois parliamentary state as the basis of its action, moderate Socialism was prepared to share responsibility with the bourgeoisie in the control of the capitalist state, even to the extent of defending the bourgeoisie against the working class and its revolutionary mass movements. The counter-revolutionary tendency of the dominant Socialism finally reveals itself in open war against Socialism during the proletarian revolution, as in Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary.

The dominant moderate Socialism was initiated by the formation of the Social-Democratic Party in Germany. This party united on the basis of the Gotha Program, in which fundamental revolutionary Socialism was abandoned. It evaded completely the task of the conquest of power, which Marx, in his *Criticism of the Gotha Program,* characterized as follows: "Between the capitalistic society and the communistic, lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds to a political transition period, in which the state cannot be anything else than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

Evading the actual problems of the revolutionary struggle, the dominant Socialism of the Second International developed into a peaceful movement of organization, of trades union struggles, of co-operation with the middle class, of legislation and bourgeois State Capitalism as means of introducing Socialism.

There was a joint movement that affected the thought and practice of Socialism; on the one hand, the organization of the skilled workers into trade unions, which secured certain concessions and became a semi-privileged caste; and, on the other, the decay of the class of small producers, crushed under the iron tread of the concentration of industry and the accumulation of capital. As one moved upward, and the other downward, they met, formed a juncture, and united *to use the state to improve their conditions.* The dominant Socialism expressed this unity, developing a policy of legislative reforms and State Capitalism, making the revolutionary class struggle a parliamentary process.

This development meant, obviously, the abandonment of fundamental Socialism. It meant working on the basis of the bourgeois parliamentary state, instead of the struggle to destroy that state; it meant the "co-operation of classes" for State Capitalism, instead of the uncompromising proletarian struggle for Socialism. Government ownership, the objective of the middle class, was the policy of moderate Socialism. Instead of the revolutionary theory of the necessity of conquering Capitalism, the official theory and practice was now that of *modifying* Capitalism, of a gradual peaceful "growing into" Socialism by means of legislative reforms. In the words of Jean Jaures: "we shall carry on our reform work to a complete transformation of the existing order."

But Imperialism exposed the final futility of this policy. Imperialism unites the non-proletarian classes, by means of State Capitalism, for international conquest and spoilation. The small capitalists, middle class and the aristocracy of labor, which previously acted against concentrated industry, now compromise and unite with concentrated industry and finance-capital in Imperialism. The small capitalists accept the domination of finance-capital, being allowed to participate in the adventures and the fabulous profits of Imperialism, upon which now depends the whole of trade and industry; the middle class invests in monopolistic enterprises, an income class whose income depends upon finance-capital, its members securing "positions of superintendence," its technicians and intellectuals being exported to undeveloped lands in process of development; while the workers of the privileged unions are assured steady employment and comparatively high wages through the profits that come from the savage exploitation of colonial peoples. All these non-proletarian social groups accept Imperialism, their "liberal and progressive" ideas becoming factors in the promotion of Imperialism, manufacturing the democratic ideology of Imperialism with which to seduce the masses. Imperialism requires the centralized state, capable of uniting all the forces of capital, of unifying the industrial process through state control and regulation, of maintaining "class peace," of mobilizing the whole national power in the struggles of Imperialism. *State Capitalism is the form of expression of Imperialism,*—precisely that State Capitalism promoted by moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism. What the parliamentary policy of the dominant moderate Socialism accomplished was to buttress the capitalist state, to promote State Capitalism,—to strengthen Imperialism!

The dominant Socialism was part and parcel of the national liberal movement,—but this movement, under the compulsion of events, merged in Imperialism. The dominant Socialism accepted capitalistic democracy as the basis for the realization of Socialism,—but this democracy merges in Imperialism. The world war was waged by means of this democracy. The dominant Socialism based itself upon the middle class and the aristocracy of labor,—but these have compromised with Imperialism, being bribed by a "share" in the spoils of Imperialism. Upon the declaration of war, accordingly, the dominant moderate Socialism accepted the war and united with the imperialistic state.

Upon the advent of Imperialism, Capitalism emerged into a new epoch,—an epoch requiring new and more aggressive proletarian tatics. Tactical differences in the Socialist movement almost immediately came to a head. The concentration of industry, together with the subserviency of parliaments to the imperialistic mandates and the transfer of thetr vital functions to the executive organ of government, developed the concept of industrial unionism in the United States and the concept of mass action in Europe. The struggle against the dominant moderate Socialism became a struggle against its perversion of parliamentarism, against its conception of the state, against its alliance with non-proletarian social groups, and against its acceptance of State Capitalism. Imperialism made mandatory a reconstruction of the Socialist movement, the formulation of a practice in accord with its revolutionary fundamentals. But the representatives of moderate Socialism refused to broaden their tactics, to adapt themselves to the new conditions. The consequence was a miserable collapse under the test of the war and the proletarian revolution,—the betrayal of Socialism and the proletariat.

The Proletarian Revolution.

The dominant Socialism justified its acceptance of the war on the plea that a revolution did not materialize, that the masses abandoned Socialism.

This was conscious subterfuge. When the economic and political crisis *did* develop potential revolutionary action in the proletariat, the dominant Socialism immediately assumed an attitude *against* the Revolution. The proletariat was urged *not* to make a revolution. The dominant Socialism united with the capitalist governments to prevent a revolution.

The Russian Revolution was the first act of the proletariat against the war and Imperialism. But while the masses made the Revolution in Russia, the bourgeoisie usurped power and organized the regulation bourgeois-parliamentary republic. This was the first stage of the Revolution. Against this bourgeois republic organized the forces of the proletarian Revolution. Moderate Socialism in Russia, represented by the Mensheviki and the Social-Revolutionists, acted against the proletarian revolution. It united with the Cadets, the party of bourgeois Imperialism, in a coalition government of bourgeois democracy. It placed its faith in the war "against German militarism," in national ideals, in parliamenetary democracy and the "co-operation of classes."

But the proletariat, urging on the poorer peasantry, conquered power. It accomplished a proletarian revolution by means of the Bolshevik policy of "all power to the Soviets,"—organizing the new transitional state of proletarian dictatorship. Moderate Socialism, even after its theory that a proletarian revolution was impossible had been shattered by life itself, acted against the proletarian revolution and mobilized the counter-revolutionary forces against the Soviet Republic,—assisted by the moderate Socialism of Germany and the Allies.

Apologists maintained that the attitude of moderate Socialism in Russia was determined not by a fundamental policy, but by its conception that, Russia not being a fully developed capitalist country, it was premature to make a proletarian revolution and historically impossible to realize Socialism.

This was a typical nationalistic attitude, since the proletarian revolution in Russia could not persist as a national revolution, but was compelled by its very conditions to struggle for the

(*Continued on Page 8*)

(*Continued from Page 7*)

international revolution of the proletariat, the war having initiated the epoch of the proletarian revolution.

The revolution in Germany decided the controversy. The first revolution was made by the masses, against the protests of the dominant moderate Socialism, represented by the Social-Democratic Party. As in Russia, the first stage of the Revolution realized a bourgois parliamentary republic, with power in the hands of the Social-Democratic Party. Against this bourgeois republic organized a new revolution, the proletarian revolution directed by the Spartacan-Communists. And, precisely as in Russia, *the dominant moderate Socialism opposed the proletarian revolution,* opposed all power to the Soviets, accepted parliamentary democracy and repudiated proletarian dictatorship.

The issue in Germany could not be obscured. Germany was a fully developed industrial nation, its economic conditions mature for the introduction of Socialism. In spite of dissimilar economic conditions in Germany and Russia, the dominant moderate Socialism pursued a similar counter-revolutionary policy, and revolutionary Socialism a common policy, indicating the international character of revolutionary proletarian tactics.

There is, accordingly, a common policy that characterizes moderate Socialism, and that is *its conception of the state.* Moderate Socialism affirms that the bourgeois, democratic parliamentary state is the necessary basis for the introduction of Socialism; accordingly, it conceived the task of the revolution, in Germany and Russia, to be the construction of the democratic parliamentary state, after which the process of introducing Socialism by legislative reform measures could be initiated. Out of this conception of the state developed the counter-revolutionary policy of moderate Socialism.

Revolutionary Socialism, on the contrary, insists that the democratic parliamentary state can never be the basis for the introduction of Socialism; that it is necessary to destroy the parliamentary state, and construct a new state of the organized producers, which will deprive the bourgeoisie of political power, and function as a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

The proletarian revolution in action has conclusively proven that moderate Socialism is incapable of realizing the objectives of Socialism. Revolutionary Socialism alone is capable of mobilizing the proletariat for Socialism, for the conquest of the power of the state, by means of revolutionary mass action and proletarian dictatorship.

AMERICAN SOCIALISM.

The upsurge of revolutionary Socialism in the American Socialist Party, expressed in the Left Wing, is not a product simply of European conditions. It is, in a fundamental sense, the product of the experience of the American movement—the Left Wing tendency in the Party having been invigorated by the experience of the proletarian revolutions in Europe.

The dominant moderate Socialism of the International was equally the Socialism of the American Socialist Party.

The policy of moderate Socialism in the Socialist Party comprised its policy in an attack upon the larger capitalists, the trusts, maintaining that all other divisions in society —including the lesser capitalists and the middle class, the *petite bourgeoisie*—are material for the Socialist struggle against Capitalism. The moderate Socialism dominant in the Socialist Party asserted, in substance: Socialism is a struggle *of all the people* against the trusts and big capital, making the realization of Socialism depend upon the unity of "the people," of the workers, the small capitalists, the small investors, the professions,—in short, the official Socialist Party actually depended upon the *petite bourgeoisie* for the realization of Socialism.

The concentration of industry in the United States gradually eliminated the small producers, which initiated the movement for government ownership of industry—and for other reforms proposed to check the power of the plutocracy; and this bourgeois policy was the animating impulse of the practise of the Socialist Party.

This party, moreover, developed into an expression of the unions of the aristocracy of labor,—of the A. F. of L. The party refused to engage in the struggle against the reactionary unions, to organize a new labor movement of the militant proletariat.

While the concentration of industry and social developments generally conservatized the skilled workers, it developed the typical proletariat of unskilled labor, massed in the basic industries. This proletariat, expropriated of all property, denied access to the A. F. of L. unions, required a labor movement of its own. This impulse produced the concept of industrial unionism, and the I. W. W. But the dominant moderate Socialism rejected industrial unionism and openly or covertly acted against the I. W. W.

Revolutionary industrial unionism, moreover, was a recognition of the fact that extra-parliamentary action was necessary to accomplish the revolution, that the political state should be destroyed and a new proletarian state of the organized producers constructed in order to realize Socialism. But the Socialist Party not only repudiated the form of industrial unionism, it still more emphatically repudiated its revolutionary political implications, clinging to petty bourgeois parliamentarism and reformism.

United with the aristocracy of labor and the middle class, the dominant Socialism in the Socialist Party necessarily developed all the evils of the dominant Socialism of Europe,—and, particularly, abandoning the immediate revolutionary task of reconstructing unionism, on the basis of which alone a militant mass Socialism could emerge.

It stultified working class political action, by limiting political action to elections and participation in legislative reform activity. In every single case where the Socialist Party has elected public officials they have pursued a consistent petty bourgeois policy, abandoning Socialism.

This was the official policy of the Party. Its representatives were petty bourgeois, moderate, hesitant, oblivious of the class struggle in its fundamental political and industrial implications. But the compulsion of life itself drew more and more proletarian masses in the party, who required simply the opportunity to initiate a revolutionary proletarian policy.

The war and the proletarian revolution in Russia provided the opportunity. The Socialist Party, under the impulse of its membership, adopted a militant declaration against the war. But the officials of the party sabotaged this declaration. The *official* policy of the party on the war was a policy of petty bourgeois pacifism. The bureaucracy of the party was united with the bourgeois People's Council, which accepted a Wilson Peace and betrayed those who rallied to the Council in opposition to the war.

This policy necessarily developed into a repudiation of the revolutionary Socialist position. When events developed the test of accepting or rejecting the revolutionary implications of the declaration against the war, the party bureaucracy immediately exposed its reactionary policy, by repudiating the policy of the Russian and German Communists, and refusing affiliation with the Communist International of revolutionary Socialism.

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM

Imperialism is dominant in the United States, which is now a world power. It is developing a centralized, autocratic federal government, acquiring the financial and military reserves for aggression and wars of conquest. The war has aggrandized American Capitalism, instead of weakening it as in Europe. But world events will play upon and influence conditions in this country—dynamically, the sweep of revolutionary proletarian ideas; materially, the coming constriction of world markets upon the resumption of competition. Now all-mighty and supreme, Capitalism in the United States must meet crises in the days to come. These conditions modify our immediate task, but do not alter its general character; this is not the moment of revolution, but it is the moment of revolutionary struggle. American Capitalism is developing a brutal campaign of terrorism against the militant proletariat. American Capitalism is utterly incompetent on the problems of reconstruction that press down upon society. Its "reconstruction" program is simply to develop its power for aggression, to aggrandize itself in the markets of the world.

These conditions of Imperialism and of multiplied aggression will necessarily produce proletarian action against Capitalism. Strikes are developing which verge on revolutionary action, and in which the suggestion of proletarian dictatorship is apparent, the striker-workers trying to usurp functions of municipal government, as in Seattle and Winnipeg. The mass struggle of the proletariat is coming into being.

A minor phase of the awakening of labor is the trades unions organizing a Labor Party, in an effort to conserve what they have secured as a privileged caste. A Labor Party is not the instrument for the emancipation of the working class; its policy would in general be what is now the official policy of the Socialist Party—reforming Capitalism on the basis of the bourgeois parliamentary state. Laborism is as much a danger to the revolutionary proletariat as moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism, —the two being expressions of an identical tendency and policy. There can be no compromise either with Laborism or the dominant moderate Socialism.

But there is a more vital tendency,—the tendency of the workers to initiate mass strikes,—strikes which are equally a revolt against the bureaucracy in the unions and against the employers. These strikes will constitute the determining feature of proletarian action in the days to come. Revolutionary Socialism must use these mass industrial revolts to broaden the strike, to make it general and militant; use the strike for political objectives, and, finally, develop the mass political strike against Capitalism and the state.

Revolutionary Socialism must base itself on the mass struggles of the proletariat, engage directly in these struggles while emphasizing the revolutionary purposes of Socialism and the proletarian movement. The mass strikes of the American proletariat provide the material basis out of which to develop the concepts and action of revolutionary Socialism.

Our task is to encourage the militant mass movements in the A. F. of L. to split the old unions, to break the power of unions which are corrupted by Imperialism and betray the militant proletariat. The A. F. of L., in its dominant expression, is united with Imperialism. A bulwark of reaction,—it must be exposed and its power for evil broken.

Our task, moreover, is to articulate and organize the mass of the unorganized industrial proletariat, which constitutes the basis for a militant Socialism. The struggle for the revo-

(*Continued on page 14.*)

The Left Wing Manifesto

lutionary industrial unionism of the proletariat becomes an indispensable phase of revolutionary Socialism, on the basis of which to broaden and deepen the action of the militant proletariat, developing reserves for the ultimate conquest of power.

Imperialism is dominant in the United States. It controls all the factors of social action. Imperialism is uniting all non-proletarian social groups in a brutal State Capitalism, for reaction and spoliation. Against this, revolutionary Socialism must mobilize the mass struggle of the industrial proletariat.

Moderate Socialism is compromising, vacillating, treacherous, because the social elements it depends upon—the *petite bourgeoisie* and the aristocracy of labor—are not a fundamental factor in society; they vacillate between the bourgeois and the proletariat, their social instability produces political instability; and, moreover, they have been seduced by Imperialism and are now united with Imperialism.

Revolutionary Socialism is resolute, uncompromising, revolutionary, because it builds upon a fundamental social factor, the industrial proletariat, which is an actual producing class, expropriated of all property, in whose consciousness the machine process has developed the concepts of industrial unionism and mass action. Revolutionary Socialism adheres to the class struggle because through the class struggle alone—the mass struggle—can the industrial proletariat secure immediate concessions and finally conquer power by organizing the industrial government of the working class.

Political Action

The class struggle is a political struggle. It is a political struggle in the sense that its objective is political—the overthrow of the political organization upon which capitalistic exploitation depends, and the introduction of a new social system. The direct objective is the conquest by the proletariat of the power of the state.

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

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

Parliamentary action is necessary. In the parliament, the revolutionary representatives of the proletariat meet Capitalism on all general issues of the class struggle. The proletariat must fight the capitalist class on all fronts, in the process of developing the final action that will conquer the power of the state and overthrow Capitalism. Parliamentary action which emphasizes the implacable character of the class struggle is an indispensable means of agitation. Its task is to expose through political campaigns and the forum of parliament, the class character of the state and the reactionary purposes of Capitalism, to meet Capitalism on all issues, to rally the proletariat for the struggle against Capitalism.

(*Continued from Page 8*)

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

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

Moderate Socialism refuses to recognize and accept this supreme form of proletarian political action, limits and stultifies political action into legislative routine and non-Socialist parliamentarism. This is a denial of the mass character of the proletarian struggle, an evasion of the tasks of the Revolution.

The power of the proletariat lies fundamentally in its control of the industrial process. The mobilization of this control in action against the bourgeois state and Capitalism means the end of Capitalism, the initial form of the revolutionary mass action that will conquer the power of the state.

Unionism and Mass Action.

Revolutionary Socialism and the actual facts of the class struggle make the realization of Socialism depend upon the industrial proletariat. The class struggle of revolutionary Socialism mobilizes the industrial proletariat against Capitalism,—that proletariat which is united and disciplined by the machine process, and which actually controls the basic industry of the nation.

The coming to consciousness of this proletariat produces a revolt against the older unionism, developing the concepts of industrial unionism and mass action.

The older unionism was implicit in the skill of the individual craftsmen, who united in craft unions. These unions organized primarily to protect the skill of the skilled workers, which is in itself a form of property. The trades unions developed into "job trusts," and not into militant organs of the proletarian struggle; until to-day the dominant unions are actual bulwarks of Capitalism, merging in Imperialism and accepting State Capitalism. The trades unions, being organized on craft divisions, did not and could not unite the workers as a class, nor are they actual class organizations.

The concentration of industry, developing the machine process, expropriated large elements of the skilled workers of their skill, but the unions still maintained the older ideology of property contract and caste. Deprived of actual power, the dominant unionism resorts to dickers with the bourgeois state and an acceptance of imperialistic State Capitalism to maintain its privileges, *as against* the industrial proletariat.

The concentration of industry produced the industrial proletariat of unskilled workers, of the machine proletariat. This proletariat, massed in the basic industry, constitutes the militant basis of the class struggle against Capitalism; and, deprived of skill and craft divisions, it turns naturally to mass unionism, to an industrial unionism in accord with the integrated industry of imperialistic Capitalism.

Under the impact of industrial concentration, the proletariat developed its own dynamic tactics—mass action.

Mass action is the proletarian response to the facts of modern industry, and the forms it imposes upon the proletarian class struggle. Mass action starts as the spontaneous activity of unorganized workers massed in the basic industry; its initial form is the mass strike of the unorganized proletariat. The mass movements of the proletariat developing out of this mass response to the tyranny of concentrated industry antagonized the dominant moderate Socialism, which tried to compress and stultify these militant impulses within the limits of parliamentarism.

In this instinctive mass action there was not simply a response to the facts of industry, but the implicit means for action against the dominant parliamentarism. Mass action is industrial in its origin: but its development imposes upon it a political character, since the more general and conscious mass action becomes the more it antagonizes the bourgeois state, becomes *political* mass action.

Another development of this tendency was Syndicalism. In its mass impulse Syndicalism was a direct protest against the futility of the dominant Socialist parliamentarism. But Syndicalism was either unconscous of the theoretical basis of the new movement; or where there was an articulate theory, it was a derivative of Anarchism, making the proletarian revolution an immediate and direct seizure of industry, instead of the conquest of the power of the state. Anarcho-Syndicalism is a departure from Marxism. The theory of mass action and of industrial unionism, however, are in absolute accord with Marxism—*revolutionary Socialism in action.*

Industrial unionism recognizes that the proletariat cannot conquer power by means of the bourgeois parliamentary state; it recognizes, moreover, that the proletariat cannot use this state to introduce Socialism, but that it must organize a new "state."—the "state" of the organized producers. Industrial unionism, accordingly, proposes to construct the forms of the government of Communist Socialism—the government of the producers. The revolutionary proletariat cannot adapt the bourgeois organs of government to its own use: it must develop its own organs. The larger, more definite and general the conscious industrial unions, the easier becomes the transition to Socialism, since the revolutionary state of the proletariat must reorganize society on the basis of union control and management of industry. Industrial unionism, accordingly, is a necessary phase of revolutionary Socialist agitation and action.

But industrial unionism alone cannot conquer the power of the state. Potentially, industrial unionism may construct the forms of the new society; but only potentially. Actually the forms of the new society are constructed under the protection of a revolutionary proletarian government; the industrial unions become simply the starting point of the Socialist reconstruction of society. Under the conditions of Capitalism, it is impossible to

organize the whole working class into industrial unions; the concept of organizing the working class industrially *before* the conquest of power is as utopian as the moderate Socialist conception of the gradual conquest of the parliamentary state.

The proletarian revolution comes at the moment of crisis in Capitalism, of a collapse of the old order. Under the impulse of the crisis, the proletariat acts for the conquest of power, by means of mass action. Mass action concentrates and mobilizes the forces of the proletariat, organized and unorganized; it acts equally against the bourgeois state and the conservative organizations of the working class. The revolution starts with strikes of protest, developing into mass political strikes and then into revolutionary mass action for the conquest of the power of the state. Mass action becomes political in purpose while extra-parliamentary in form; it is equally a process of revolution and the revolution itself in operation.

The final objective of mass action is the conquest of the power of the state, the annihilation of the bourgeois parliamentary state and the introduction of the transition proletarian state, functioning as a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

The attitude toward the state divides the Anarchist (and Anarcho-Syndicalist), the moderate Socialist and the revolutionary Socialist. Eager to abolish the state (which is the ultimate purpose of revolutionary Socialism), the Anarchist (and Anarcho-Syndicalist) fails to realize that the state is necessary in the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism. The moderate Socialist proposes to use the bourgeois state, with its fraudulent democracy, its illusory theory of the "unity of all the classes," its standing army, police and bureaucracy oppressing and baffling the masses. The revolutionary Socialist maintains that the bourgeois parliamentary state must be completely destroyed, and proposes the organization of a new state, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The state is an organ of coercion. The bourgeois parliamentary state is the organ of the bourgeoisie for the coercion of the proletariat. The revolutionary proletariat must, accordingly, destroy this state. But the conquest of political power by the proletariat does not immediately end Capitalism, or the power of the capitalists, or immediately socialize industry. It is therefore necessary that the proletariat organize its own state *for the coercion and suppression of the bourgeoisie.*

Capitalism is bourgeois dictatorship. Parliamentary government is the expression of bourgeois supremacy, the form of authority of the capitalist over the worker. The bourgeois state is organized to coerce the proletariat, to baffle the will of the masses. In form a democracy, the bourgeois parliamentary state is in fact an autocracy, the dictatorship of capital over the proletariat.

Bourgeois democracy promotes this dictatorship of capital, assisted by the pulpit, the army and the police. Bourgeois democracy seeks to reconcile all the classes; realizing, however, simply the reconciliation of the proletariat to the supremacy of Capitalism. Bourgeois democracy is political in character, historically necessary, on the one hand, to break the power of feudalism, and, on the other, to maintain the proletariat in subjection. It is precisely this democracy that is now the instrument of Imperialism, since the middle class, the traditional carrier of democracy, accepts and promotes Imperialism.

The proletarian revolution disrupts bourgeois democracy. It disrupts this democracy in order to end class divisions and class rule, to realize that industrial self-government of the workers which alone can assure peace and liberty to the peoples.

Proletarian dictatorship is a recognition of the necessity for a revolutionary state to coerce and suppress the bourgeoisie; it is equally a recognition of the fact that, in the Communist reconstruction of society, the proletariat as a class alone counts. The new society organizes as a communistic federation of producers. The proletariat alone counts in the revolution, and *in the reconstruction of society on a Communist basis.*

The old machinery of the state cannot be used by the revolutionary proletariat. It must be destroyed. The proletariat creates a new state, based directly upon the industrially organized producers, upon the industrial unions or Soviets, or a combination of both. It is this state alone, functioning as a dictatorship of the proletariat, that can realize Socialism.

The tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat are:

a) to completely expropriate the bourgeoisie poitically, and crush its powers of resistance.

b) to expropriate the bourgeoisie economically, and introduce the forms of Communist Socialism.

Breaking the political power of the capitalists is the most important task of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, since upon this depends the economic and social reconstruction of society.

But this political expropriation proceeds simultaneously with an immediate, if partial, expropriation of the bourgeoisie economically, the scope of these measures being determined by industrial development and the maturity of the proletariat. These measures, at first, include:

a) Workmen's control of industry, to be exercised by the industrial organizations of the workers, operating by means of the industrial vote.

b) Expropriation and nationalization of the banks, as a necessary preliminary measure for the complete expropriation of capital.

c) Expropriation and nationalization of the large (trust) organizations of capital. Expropriation proceeds without compensation, as "buying out" the capitalists is a repudiation of the tasks of the revolution.

d) Repudiation of all national debts and the financial obligations of the old system.

e) The nationalization of foreign trade.

f) Measures for the socialization of agriculture.

These measures centralize the basic means of production in the proletarian state, nationalizing industry; and their partial character ceases as reconstruction proceeds. Socialization of industry becomes actual and complete only after the dictatorship of the proletariat has accomplished its task of suppressing the bourgeoisie.

The state of proletarian dictatorship is political in character, since it represents a ruling class, *the proletariat,* which is now supreme; and it uses coercion against the old bourgeois class. But the task of this dictotorship is to render itself unnecessary; and it becomes unnecessary the moment the full conditions of Communist Socialism materialize. While the dictatorship of the proletariat perform its negative task of crushing the old order, it performs the positive task of constructing the new. Together with the government of the proletarian dictatorship, there is developed a new "government," which is no longer government in the old sense, since it concerns itself with the management of production and not with the government of persons. Out of workers' control of industry, introduced by the proletarian dictatorship, there develops the complete structure of Communist Socialism,—industrial self-government of the communistically organized producers. When this structure is completed, which implies the complete expropriation of the bourgeoisie economically and politically, the dictatorship of the proletariat ends, in its place coming the full and free social and individual automony of the Communist order.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

The Communist International, issuing directly out of the proletarian revolution in action and in process of development, is the organ of the international revolutionary proletariat: just as the League of Nations is the organ of the joint aggression and resistance of the dominant Imperialism.

The attempt to resurrect the Second International, at Berne, was a ghastly failure. It rallied the counter-revolutionary forces of Europe, which were actually struggling against the proletarian revolution. In this "International" are united all the elements treasonable to Socialism, and the wavering "centre" elements whose policy of miserable compromise is more dangerous than open treason. It represents the old dominant moderate Socialism; it based affiliation on acceptance of "labor" parliamentary action, admitting trades unions accepting "political action." The old International abandoned the earlier conception of Socialism as the politics of the Social Revolution—the politics of the class struggle in its revolutionary implications—admitting directly reactionary organizations of Laborism, such as the British Labor Party.

The Communist International, on the contrary, represents a Socialism in complete accord with the revolutionary character of the class struggle. It unites all the consciously revolutionary forces. It wages war equally against the dominant moderate Socialism and Imperialism,—each of which has demonstrated its complete incompetence on the problems that now press down upon the world. The Communist International issues its challenge to the conscious, virile elements of the proletariat, calling them to the final struggle against Capitalism on the basis of the revolutionary epoch of Imperialism. The acceptance of the Communist International means accepting the fundamentals of revolutionary Socialism as decisive in our activity.

The Communist International, moreover, issues its call to the subject peoples of the world, crushed under the murderous mastery of Imperialism. The revolt of these colonial and subject peoples is a necessary phase of the world struggle against capitalist Imperialism; their revolt must unite itself with the struggle of the conscious proletariat in the imperialistic nations. The communist International, accordingly, offers an organization and a policy that may unify all the revolutionary forces of the world for the conquest of power, and for Socialism.

It is not a problem of immediate revolution. It is a problem of the immediate revolutionary struggle. The revolutionary epoch of the final struggle against Capitalism may last for years and tens of years; but the Communist International offers a policy and program immediate and ultimate in scope, that provides for the immediate class struggle against Capitalism, in its revolutionary implications, and for the final act of the conquest of power.

The old order is in decay. Civilization is in collapse. The proletarian revolution and the Communist reconstruction of society—*the struggle for these*—is now indispensable. This is the message of the Communist International to the workers of the world.

The Communist International calls the proletariat of the world to the final struggle!