

There are just two moves they can make
—war against Russia which will mean
revolution at home; peace with Russia,
which will mean the spread of Soviet
principles throughout the world.—*Liberator*, February, 1920.



"Checkmate, Gentlemen!"

New York (State) Legislature, Joint
Committee investigating seditious activities.

REVOLUTIONARY RADICALISM

ITS HISTORY, PURPOSE AND TACTICS
WITH AN EXPOSITION AND DISCUSSION OF THE STEPS BEING
TAKEN AND REQUIRED TO CURB IT

BEING THE

REPORT OF THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
INVESTIGATING SEDITIOUS ACTIVITIES, FILED
APRIL 24, 1920, IN THE SENATE OF
THE STATE OF NEW YORK

PART I

REVOLUTIONARY AND SUBVERSIVE
MOVEMENTS ABROAD AND AT HOME

VOLUME I



EVERY STRIKE IS A SMALL REVOLUTION AND A DRESS
REHEARSAL FOR THE BIG ONE

—*The Labor Defender*, (J. W. W.) Dec. 15, 1918.

ALBANY
J. B. LYON COMPANY, PRINTERS

1920

CHAPTER IV

The Left Wing Movement in the Socialist Party of America

Evidence of a marked divergence of opinion in the ranks of the Socialist Party began to be manifest after the declaration of war on Germany by the United States. These differences were greatly aggravated by the success of the Russian proletarian revolution of November, 1917, the foreign language federations being the first to show marked impatience with the policies of the party leaders. The consequence of these events was the development of the so-called Left Wing movement in the Socialist Party, which culminated in the spring and summer of 1919 in an attempt by the hot-headed and less calculating elements to gain control of the party machinery. While no material difference of opinion existed between the so-called Left Wing elements and the party management as to the ultimate object of the Socialist movement and as to the probable necessity of employing other than parliamentary means to set up the co-operative commonwealth in this country, a very distinct difference of opinion arose over the question of immediate tactics. Whereas, the old party managers believed that America was not ripe for the social revolution and that industrial organization had not proceeded sufficiently to give promise of a successful revolution through industrial action, those who headed the so-called Left Wing movement, inspired by the success of the Russian proletariat, believed the time had come when a successful attempt might be made to overthrow our government by the use of the general strike or, if necessary, by force and violence. This extremely radical tendency seems to have been manifested first in the Russian Socialist Federation, which under the leadership of Alexander Stoklitsky, Oscar Tywerowsky, Michael Misligh, and others, kept in intimate touch with Russian affairs. This was the natural consequence of the part some of its members had played in the Bolshevik revolution in Russia.

The official organ of this federation, the "Novy Mir," had since its inception advanced the principles represented by Lenin and Trotsky; its former editor, N. Bucharin, having returned to Russia, assumed a prominent position in the Moscow government. Leon Trotsky, the Bolshevik Minister of War, was on its staff during his stay in this country in 1917, and Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, now unofficially representing in the United States the

Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, was connected with the paper after his arrival here in 1916. Many members of this federation had returned to Russia and taken part in the November revolution, or had gone to Russia after its success to participate in Soviet affairs.

When Santeri Nuorteva accepted the appointment to represent the Finnish Socialist Republic in this country in 1918 and later undertook to represent the interests of the Russian Soviet regime before the appointment of Mr. Martens, it was to the Russian Socialist Federation that he turned for assistance, and was aided by Mr. Gregory Weinstein, at that time editor of the "Novy Mir."

The result of this intimate relationship between this federation of the Socialist Party and the leaders of the Russian proletariat, was to commit the federation to the policies of the Russian Communist Party.

Evidence that some of the leaders in other branches of the party were beginning to call for a more militant program appeared from several of the party publications and various independent Socialist organs of this period, notably the "Revolutionary Age," which was the official organ of Local Boston, Socialist Party; "Der Kampf," the official organ of the Jewish Socialist Federation; and the publications of the Socialist Publication Society, which included the monthly magazine known as the "Class Struggle," as well as many pamphlets and leaflets designed to impress upon their readers that the Bolsheviks were the true representatives of the working-class of the world. The so-called Left Wing movement, as such, however, was crystallized on February 15, 1919, when certain delegates from Local Kings and Queens, New York City, to the Central Committee of Greater New York bolted the meeting and procured a hall in the Rand School of Social Science, 7 East 15th Street. There they elected a Committee of Fourteen to prepare resolutions and manifestos. This committee was authorized to call meetings in the various boroughs to discuss the formation of a Left Wing organization within the Socialist Party.

The committee proceeded to do this, a draft of the manifesto and program appeared, and a convention was called. The following officers were elected:

Executive secretary, Maximilian Cohen; recording secretary, L. L. Wolfe, later succeeded by Fanny Horowitz; treasurer, Rose Pastor Stokes; financial secretary, Rose Spaniar, later succeeded by Milton Goodman.

A City Committee of Fifteen was elected to carry on the work of the organization, as follows:

Benjamin Gitlow, Nicholas I. Hourwich, Fanny Horowitz, Jay Lovestone, James Larkin, Harry Hiltzik, Edward I. Lindgren, Milton Goodman, John Reed, Joseph Brodsky, Dr. Julius Hammer, Jeanette D. Pearl, Karl Brodsky, Mrs. L. Ravitch and Bertram D. Wolfe.

An Executive Committee was selected to carry on actively the work of organizing the Left Wing Section, which consisted of:

Benjamin Gitlow, Nicholas I. Hourwich, George Lehman, James Larkin, L. Himmelfarb, George C. Vaughn, Benjamin Corsor, Edward I. Lindgren and Maximilian Cohen.

At the convention a manifesto and program were adopted.

To illustrate the nature of this document, we need quote only the following provisions:

"It is the task of a revolutionary Socialist Party to direct the struggles of the proletariat and provide a program for the culminating crisis. Its propaganda must be so directed that when this crisis comes, the workers will be prepared to accept a program of the following character:

"(a) THE ORGANIZATION OF WORKMEN'S COUNCILS; recognition of, and propaganda for, these mass organizations of the working-class as instruments in the immediate struggle, as the form of expression of the class struggle, and as the instruments for the seizure of the power of the state and the basis of the new proletarian state of the organized producers and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"(b) WORKMEN'S CONTROL OF INDUSTRY, to be exercised by the industrial organizations (industrial unions or Soviets) of the workers and the industrial vote, as against government ownership or state control of industry.

"(c) REPUDIATION OF ALL NATIONAL DEBTS — with provisions to safeguard small investors.

"(d) EXPROPRIATION OF THE BANKS—a preliminary measure for the complete expropriation of capital.

"(e) EXPROPRIATION OF THE RAILWAYS, AND THE LARGE (TRUST) ORGANIZATIONS OF CAPITAL — no compensation to be paid, as 'buying-out' the capitalists would insure a continuance of the exploitation of the

workers; provision, however, to be made during the transition period for the protection of small owners of stock.

"(f) THE SOCIALIZATION OF FOREIGN TRADE.

"These are not the 'immediate demands' comprised in the social reform planks now in the platform of our party; they are not a compromise with the capitalist state, but imply a revolutionary struggle against that state and against capitalism, the conquest of power by the proletariat through revolutionary mass action. They imply the new Soviet state of the organized producers, the dictatorship of the proletariat; they are preliminary revolutionary measures for the expropriation of capital and the introduction of Communist Socialism." (Page 13 of pamphlet entitled "Manifesto and Program of Left Wing Section Socialist Party Local Greater New York.")

The position taken in this manifesto by the supporters of the Left Wing Section, is one completely in accord with that of the Russian Communist Party. It involves a program which, if an attempt were made to put it into effect, would necessarily result in violence and bloodshed. It was the evident hope of the leaders of this movement that they would be able to capture the machinery of the Socialist Party, and this is made clear by the program which was adopted at the convention:

"1. We stand for a uniform declaration of principles in all party platforms both local and national and the abolition of all social reform planks now contained in them.

"2. The party must teach, propagate and agitate exclusively for the overthrow of capitalism, and the establishment of Socialism through a Proletarian Dictatorship.

"3. The Socialist candidates elected to office shall adhere strictly to the above provisions.

"4. Realizing that a political party can not reorganize and reconstruct the industrial organizations of the working class, and that that is the task of the economic organizations themselves, we demand that the party assist this process of reorganization by a propaganda for revolutionary industrial unionism as part of its general activities. We believe it is the mission of the Socialist movement to encourage and assist the proletariat to adopt newer and more effective forms of organ-

ization and to stir it into newer and more revolutionary modes of action.

"5. We demand that the official party press be party owned and controlled.

"6. We demand that officially recognized educational institutions be party owned and controlled.

"7. We demand that the party discard its obsolete literature and publish new literature in keeping with the policies and tactics above mentioned.

"8. We demand that the National Executive Committee call an immediate emergency national convention for the purpose of formulating party policies and tactics to meet the present crisis.

"9. We demand that the Socialist Party repudiate the Berne Congress or any other conference engineered by 'moderate Socialists' and social patriots.

"10. We demand that the Socialist Party shall elect delegates to the International Congress proposed by the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviki); that our party shall participate only in a new International with which are affiliated the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviki), the Communist Labor Party of Germany (Spartacaus), and all other Left Wing parties and groups." (Page 14 of pamphlet entitled "Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing Section Socialist Party Local Greater New York.")

This manifesto and program is appended in full at the close of this chapter.

This document was thereupon published in pamphlet form and distributed widely in the branches of the Socialist Party, sold by the Rand School of Social Science and other radical book stores, and was reprinted in an issue of the "Revolutionary Age" on March 22, 1919. (See letter from Secretary of Local Boston Socialist Party, dated April 1, 1919, to the Left Wing Section Headquarters, signed by Amy Collyer, Assistant Secretary *pro tem*, Exhibit No. 215, page 454 stenographer's minutes, Committee Hearings.) Also in the "Soviet World" of Philadelphia and in "Truth" of Duluth, Minnesota. (Report of Maximilian Cohen, Executive Secretary to Left Wing Section, dated April 19, 1919.)

Headquarters were immediately opened at 43 West 29th Street, New York City, and a vigorous campaign was carried on to enroll members of the Socialist Party in the Left Wing section.



JAMES LARKIN

Member of the Executive Committee of Left Wing Section Socialist Party. Arrested on charge of Criminal Anarchy by the direction of the Committee, November 8, 1919, tried, convicted and sentenced to State Prison for not less than five years nor more than ten years.



BENJAMIN GITLOW
 Business Manager of "The Revolutionary Age," official organ — Left Wing Section of Socialist Party.
 Arrested on charge of Criminal Anarchy by direction of the Committee, December 1, 1919, tried, convicted and sentenced to State Prison for not less than five years nor more than ten years.

The radical revolutionary movement thus started appears to have had the full sympathy and support of Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, the Bolshevik representative in this country, as appears from the minute book taken from the headquarters of the Left Wing Section in New York City, which contained the following entry as a part of the minutes of the meeting held on April 20, 1919, at Manhattan Lyceum, 64 East Fourth Street:

"A message sent to the gathering by Mr. Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, who was unable to attend in person, extending his allegiance and support to the Left Wing movement, was delivered by Dr. Hammer." (Committee's Exhibit 231, Public Hearings.)

In order to insure that the members of the new movement should be in full accord and sympathy with the principles enunciated in its manifesto and program a membership application blank was prepared in the following form:

APPLICATION BLANK

LEFT WING SECTION SOCIALIST PARTY

The undersigned members of the Socialist Party hereby subscribe to the Manifesto, Program and Rules of Organization of the Left Wing Section of the Socialist Party.

Name
 Street and No. County
 Local Branch
 Age Occupation Labor Union.....
 How long in the party
 Other Socialist organizations
 Where What period

The activity of the leaders of this movement led to the enrollment of a large number of members of the Socialist Party in this organization.

Dr. Maximilian Cohen, executive secretary of the so-called Left Wing Section, reported to the Executive Committee, on April 19, 1919 (referring to the adoption of the Left Wing manifesto and program), as follows:

"It has been adopted by Local Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Rochester, Buffalo, Essex County, New Jersey, the States of Michigan, Minnesota and Massachusetts, and

many smaller Locals throughout the country, as their platform. In Greater New York we have won some notable victories. Local Queens on April 3d adopted the manifesto and program and joined the Left Wing organization.

"At the next Central Committee meeting they elected Comrades William Ahrens and Fred Scheff as their delegates. Local Bronx after holding three membership meetings finally passed the same resolution as Local Queens and also joined the Left Wing organization."

His report further states that all the Russian, Ukrainian, Lettish, Lithuanian, Esthonian and Hungarian branches as well as the Deutsche Ungarische branch, the Finnish branch, Bronx, Murray Hill German branch, and many Jewish branches, and the Third, Fifth, Eighth and Tenth Assembly districts had endorsed the manifesto and program.

At the time of making this report, the executive secretary states:

"Membership to date is approximately about 4,000, and when all the cards are in from Queens and Bronx and Kings (which is holding a membership meeting in about three weeks when it will go as Bronx and Queens) the total will rise to about 6,000."

On June 21, 1919, the headquarters of the Left Wing Section at 43 West 29th Street was searched pursuant to a search warrant issued by the Chief City Magistrate, William McAdoo, on application of this Committee. At that time, approximately 2,000 signed membership cards were taken.

The propaganda of the Left Wing Section was carried on through the medium of the "Revolutionary Age" in Boston, "Novy Mir" and "Der Kampf," in New York City. Several attempts were made to induce Local Boston to transfer the "Revolutionary Age" to New York City, but on April 1, 1919, the letter of Amy Collier, above referred to, states:

"Local Boston intends to keep the 'Revolutionary Age' in Boston until a National Convention of the Left Wing organization shall be held. Organizations taking part in said convention should agree with the tactics of Bolshevik Russia and the Left Wing manifesto as published in the March 22d issue of the 'Revolutionary Age.'" (See p. 454 of the Stenographer's minutes, Committee Hearings).

In the meantime, an official organ of the Left Wing Section was started in New York under the title "New York Communist," of which John Reed was the editor, Eadmonn MacAlpine, associate editor, and Dr. Maximilian Cohen, business manager. The first issue appeared on April 19, 1919. It states the position taken by the leaders of the Left Wing movement in an editorial on page 2 of that issue, which closes with the following:

"We take our stand with the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviki), with the Spartacides of Germany, and the Communists of Hungary and Bavaria, believing that only through the dictatorship of the proletariat can the Socialist order be brought about.

"And in token of our position, we have named our official organ the 'New York Communist.'"

The second issue of this periodical shows the addition of an editorial board, consisting of Nicholas I. Hourwich, Bertram D. Wolfe, Morris Zucker and J. Wilenkin. The last issue of this paper came out on the day of the execution of the search warrant above referred to.

Although the organization of the Left Wing Section began in New York City, it apparently had a wide response from other parts of the country. Local Boston initiated a call for a National Left Wing Conference, which was endorsed by the Committee of Massachusetts, Locals Cleveland, Philadelphia, Essex County, New Jersey, and the City Committee of the Left Wing Section, Local Greater New York. (Report of Dr. Maximilian Cohen of April 19, 1919.)

The National Conference of the Left Wing met pursuant to call in New York City on June 21, 1919. The purpose of this conference was to unify and organize the so-called Left Wing elements in the Socialist Party throughout the country. The first subject under discussion was whether this element should organize immediately as a Communist Party, or whether it should continue the fight to control the National Emergency Convention of the Socialist Party, which had been called for the latter part of August in that year.

The conference, however, decided that the fight for party domination should continue until September, "in order to rally all revolutionary elements for a Communist Party, meanwhile organizing temporarily as the Left Wing Section of the Socialist

Party." (National Left Wing Conference, "Revolutionary Age," issue July 5, 1919, page 4.)

The conference was composed of over ninety delegates from twenty different cities, principally from the large industrial centers, such as New York, Boston, Buffalo, Rochester, Philadelphia, Providence, Pittsburgh, Hartford, Minneapolis, Duluth, St. Paul, Detroit, Kansas City, Mo., Denver, Cleveland and Oakland, Cal.

It was reported to the conference that the Left Wing had taken firm hold in New England and on the Pacific Coast, Northwest and Middle Western States, and in New Mexico.

The temporary chairman of the conference was Louis C. Fraina, editor of the "Revolutionary Age," who, in his opening address, stated as the cause for the Left Wing movement:

"The Proletarian Revolution in action has modified the old tactical concepts of Socialism; and the inspiration of the Bolshevik conquests, joining with the original minority Socialism in the Socialist Party, has produced the Left Wing."

William Bross Lloyd, of Chicago, was selected as permanent chairman, A. Renner, of Detroit, as vice chairman, and Fanny Horowitz, of New York, as permanent secretary.

The following committees were also chosen:

Manifesto and Program Committee.—Louis C. Fraina, of Boston; Dennis E. Batt, of Detroit; Alexander Stoklitsky, of Chicago; C. E. Ruthenberg, of Cleveland; I. E. Ferguson, of Chicago.

Organization, Finance and Press.—Maximilian Cohen, New York; A. Wagenknecht, Chicago; Nicholas I. Hourwich, New York; Edward I. Lindgren, Brooklyn; Eadmonn MacAlpine, New York.

Labor Committee.—John Reed, New York; Benjamin Gitlow, Bronx, N. Y.; A. Anderson, Boston; Jack Carney, Duluth; Jurgis, Boston.

A National Council of nine members was selected consisting of Louis C. Fraina, of Boston; C. E. Ruthenberg, Cleveland; I. E. Ferguson, Chicago; John Ballam, Boston; James Larkin, New York; Eadmonn MacAlpine, New York; Benjamin Gitlow, New York; Maximilian Cohen, New York, and Bertram D. Wolfe, New York.

At a meeting of the National Council held in New York County on June the 26th, 1919, a new Left Wing manifesto was prepared and adopted, which is printed in full on page 6 of the July 5, 1919, issue of the "Revolutionary Age," and is reproduced at the close of this chapter.

It is an analytical statement of the necessity for the Left Wing or revolutionary movement of the Socialist Party, a criticism of the dominant or moderate Socialism, and a statement of the objects, purposes, methods and tactics to be employed to bring about the destruction of the form of government now existing in the United States and other civilized countries.

In analyzing this manifesto, it will be convenient to state briefly the reasons given for the necessity of the Left Wing movement. These will be found in the first part of the manifesto, from which is quoted the following:

"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. . . . Imperialism is the final stage of capitalism; and imperialism means sterner reaction, and new wars of conquest—unless the revolutionary proletariat acts for Socialism. . . . Humanity can be saved from its last excesses only by the Communist revolution. There can now be only the Socialism which unites the proletariat of the whole world in 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 on-sweeping proletarian revolution."

Reference is here unquestionably made to the governments as they now exist in their attitude toward Soviet Russia.

The manifesto then takes up the collapse of the Second International. This Second International, as has been previously pointed out, was an international body organized in 1889, consisting of delegates representing the various elements of the Socialist movement in all countries. It created the International Socialist Bureau at Brussels for the purpose of carrying on the

propaganda of the International Socialist revolution. This organization was disrupted by the World War in August, 1914, because the controlling elements of the International supported their respective governments in the war. The manifesto criticizes the action of the so-called dominant Socialists which were the controlling elements of the Second International, in the following terms:

"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. . . . The dominant Socialism united with the governments against Socialism and the proletariat, . . . nationalism, social patriotism, and social imperialism determined the policy of the dominant Socialism, and not the proletarian class struggle and Socialism."

Moderate Socialism is further criticized for its recognition of what is called the "bourgeois state," a term which is applied to the Government of the United States as well as to the governments of such countries as Great Britain, France, Italy, and the other civilized nations of the world in the following words:

"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 Socialism was a concern 'of all the classes,' instead of emphasizing the Marxian policy that the construction of the Socialist system is the task of the revolutionary proletariat alone. In accepting Social reformism, 'the co-operation of the 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. . . . What the parliamentary policy of the dominant moderate Socialism accomplished was to buttress the capitalist state, to promote state capitalism—to strengthen imperialism! . . . 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 dominant Socialism united with capitalist governments to prevent a revolution."

Then follows a discussion of the Russian proletarian revolution, and a discussion of the German revolution. The patriotic attitude of the dominant Socialists of Europe is severely criticized thus:

"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."

Contrasted with the attitude of the moderate Socialist, is the policy of revolutionary Socialism as expressed in the Left Wing movement. The manifesto says:

"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."

In speaking of the conditions in the United States, the manifesto says:

"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 spoilation. Against this, revolutionary Socialism must mobilize the mass struggle of the industrial proletariat. . . . 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.”

The political character of the class struggle referred to is shown by the following statement:

“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.”

The purpose of the authors of this manifesto to bring about the destruction of our government by other than parliamentary means, is indicated by the following quotation:

“*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 proletariat 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.”

In reading the foregoing, it must be noted that revolutionary Socialism, represented in this instance by the so-called Left Wing movement of the Socialist Party, repudiates the policy of introducing Socialism by means of legislative measures. It

aims not to capture the bourgeois parliamentary state, by which is meant the governments of the United States and of the State of New York, but to conquer and destroy both. This is still further emphasized by the following paragraphs:

“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*. . . . 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.”

The provisions of this manifesto show clearly that the purpose of the adherents to the Left Wing movement was the destruction of the American form of government, the tearing up of the Constitution of the United States, the expropriation of private property. That this destruction of our government and this expropriation of private property cannot be accomplished by means of the ballot and the exercise of legislative powers, but must be accomplished by means of the mass or general strike of the workers in industry. They also aimed to set up a dictatorship of the proletariat only, to the exclusion of all other classes of our society, and believed that this was to be accomplished by revolutionary mass action, which is stated in the manifesto to be an outgrowth of the general political strike.

In defining mass action, the manifesto says:

“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. . . . 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. . . . 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.*"

Here is presented a graphic picture of the method sought to be employed by the adherents to the principles of this manifesto, in seeking the overturn of the government of the United States and this State. As if in fear that the manifesto might be misunderstood, its authors have continued to reiterate the purpose and object of the revolution which they advocate, and the methods which they advise for its achievement. This is illustrated by the following quotation:

"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."

The purpose of the dictatorship of the proletariat is thus expressed:

"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."

The Government of the United States, as well as all other democratic governments, is viewed by the authors of this manifesto as an autocracy.

"In form a democracy, the bourgeois parliamentary state is in fact an autocracy, the dictatorship of capital over the proletariat. . . . 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 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 this dictatorship are then enumerated.

Among the preliminary measures advanced as necessary are:

"(a) Workers' 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."

This is advocating the repudiation of Liberty Bonds and all other government obligations and is a part of the plan for the expropriation of the so-called bourgeoisie which has been previously referred to.

The closing section of the manifesto has to do with the Communist International, which phrase refers to the International

body set up at Moscow in March, 1919, under the leadership of Lenin and Trotzky, and known as the Third International. This organization is contrasted with the attempt to resurrect the Second International at Berne, Switzerland:

"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, moreover, issues its call to the subject peoples of the world, crushed under the murderous mastery of imperialism. . . .

"The Communist International, accordingly, offers an organization and a policy that may unify all revolutionary forces of the world for the conquest of power, and for Socialism."

The manifesto closes with this revolutionary appeal:

"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" which "calls the proletariat of the world to the final struggle!"

A careful consideration of the foregoing shows that the authors of this authoritative statement of the objective methods and tactics of the Left Wing movement not only teach and advise the propriety of overthrowing organized government, including the government of the United States and the State of New York by force, violence and unlawful means, but urge immediate action on the part of the working-classes of this country in co-operation with the proletariat of other countries to bring about the world revolution. The means advocated to accomplish the revolution and the setting up of a proletarian dictatorship in this country, is the mass strike. Legislative reforms and the alteration of our Constitution by legal means, are specifically repudiated.

It is apparent that an attempt to put into operation such a program, including the seizure and confiscation of private property without compensation to its owners, would, of necessity,

lead to violence, and that such program could not be put into operation without the employment of armed force. The program contemplates the exclusion from participation in the revolutionary government, sought to be set up of all elements of society except the proletariat. No reasonable man will believe that so large an element of American society can be coerced, robbed and crushed without force and violence, and without civil war. Although this manifesto is a labyrinth of phrases, a perfect maze of words, throughout can be clearly discerned the avowed purpose of its authors to advocate the destruction of our government. To change that government not by lawful means, not by the ballot, not by legislative reform, but by a brutal autocratic dictatorship of a comparatively small element of the community, designated the proletariat—in other words, the propertyless class—with the avowed purpose of setting up in this country a duplicate of the government which Lenin and Trotzky, the followers and disciples of Marx, have temporarily reared in Russia. All that has been said with respect to the methods of bringing about Socialism by means of forceful revolution as advocated by the leaders of the Left Wing movement, is further emphasized by an article that appears on page 10 of the "Revolutionary Age" in the issue of July 19, 1919, entitled "The Communist Party," by N. Bucharin. The author of this article, as heretofore stated, was a member of the Russian Socialist Federation in this country, and editor of the "Novy Mir," which later became one of the official organs of the Left Wing movement. This article deals with the dictatorship of the proletariat as understood and applied by the Communist Party of Russia, the sponsors for the Third International above referred to, and with whom the Left Wing elements are allied.

The article opens with this question:

"By what means is the Communist world order to be established? How are we to attain it? The answer of the Communist Party to these questions is 'through the dictatorship of the proletariat.'

"'Dictatorship' means a power as strong as iron, a power which gives no quarter to its enemies. The 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' means the government of the working class which abolishes the land owners and capitalists.

"A workers' government can only be produced by a social revolution of the working-class; a revolution which will

destroy the capitalist state and erect on its ruins a new power; the power of the working-class, and the poor peasants who support the workers' government.

"We Communists, therefore, stand for a workers' government until the workers have gained complete control over their adversaries; until they have crushed the entire employing class and knocked out its pride, and until the employing class itself has given up all hopes of ever again coming into power. Of course, it will be said: 'Then you Communists are believers in force?'

"We shall answer: 'Most certainly; but our belief is in revolutionary force. We are convinced that by soft words the working-class will gain nothing from the capitalists. No good will come from reconciliation. Nothing short of a revolution, which will overthrow capitalism and destroy the bourgeoisie can liberate the working-class.'

"Every revolution means using force against the form of government. Force was used against the tyrannical landlords and Czar in the Russian revolution of March, 1917, and in the revolution of November, 1917, force was used against the capitalists by the workers, peasants, and soldiery. Such force — the use of force against those who are oppressing millions of workers — is not merely free from evil; it is sacred."

No more clear statement could be made indicating that those participating in the Left Wing movement, advocate, advise and teach the doctrine that organized government should be overthrown by force, violence and unlawful means. All doubt as to the precise meaning of the word "force" as employed in this article is removed by reference to the methods employed in Russia both in bringing about the revolution of March, 1917, and the revolution of November, when the Bolsheviki usurped the power of the state at the point of the bayonet.

It may be urged that many of the phrases used and principles enunciated in the manifesto and program of the Left Wing Section and the article above referred to may be found in the works of Marx, Engels, and other well-known writers on Socialism. Many of these principles have undoubtedly been stated by these authors, but if any of this number were to advocate such principles in the State of New York at the present time, they would unquestionably be subject to the penalties imposed by our statutes.

Evidence of the publication of this manifesto in the "Revolutionary Age" and of the connection therewith of the editors and the members of the National Executive Committee was presented to a Special Grand Jury sitting in and for the County of New York in November, 1919. Indictments were found against all concerned, and at the time of the preparation of this report, one of the defenders, namely, Benjamin Gitlow, had been tried and convicted of the crime of Criminal Anarchy.

The National Left Wing Conference in addition to the adoption of this manifesto, decided that the "Revolutionary Age" of Boston and the "New York Communist" should be combined and published in New York City as the national organ of the Left Wing of the Socialist Party. This was done and the new publication made its appearance on Saturday, July 5, 1919, with Louis C. Fraina and Eadmonn MacAlpine, editors, and Benjamin Gitlow, business manager.

On the third day of the conference, thirty-one delegates, consisting mostly of those from the foreign language federations, decided after a caucus, that they would withhold further activity in the conference because of its refusal to act upon the question of the immediate organization of a Communist Party. These delegates resigned from all the committees, having previously declined nominations to the National Council, and thereupon left the Conference.

The report of the Committee on Labor was duly accepted. It clearly demonstrated the methods advocated by the Left Wing to carry out the program enunciated in its manifesto. The report says in part:

"The purpose of the Left Wing organization is to create a revolutionary working class movement in America, which, through the action of the working masses themselves, will lead to workers' control of industry and the state, as the only means of expropriating capitalist property and abolishing classes in society. The capitalist state, as has been clearly proven, expresses the existing dictatorship of the capitalist class, a weapon to defend capitalist interests and to extend them at the expense of the workers. Capitalist control of the machinery of politics and publicity makes it impossible for the workers to conquer this state power by use of the ballot; but even if it were possible, the State could not be used by the workers for their own purpose so long

as the factories, mills, mines, land, transportation systems and financial institutions remained in the hands of private capitalist owners.

"With the legislatures, courts, police and armies under control of the capitalists, the workers can only win the state power by extra-parliamentary action which must have its basis in the industrial mass action of the workers.

"The first act of the workers' dictatorship must be the destruction of the capitalist state and the creation of a new form of Government based on the workers' organizations, whose purpose shall be the permanent destruction of capitalist power by the expropriation of capitalist property. . . . It is the intention of the Left Wing to help prepare the American workers for their historic role, so that when the hour strikes they may take their places in the front ranks of the Social revolution.

"(1) Revolutionary Industrial Unionism. By the term 'revolutionary industrial unionism' is meant the organization of the workers into unions by industries with a revolutionary aim and purpose; that is to say, those whose purpose is, not merely to defend and strengthen the status of the workers as wage-earners, but to gain control of industry.

"In any mention of revolutionary industrial unionism in this country, there must be recognition of the immense effect upon the American labor movement of the propaganda and example of the Industrial Workers of the World, whose long and valiant struggles and heroic sacrifices in the class-war, have earned the respect and affection of all workers everywhere. We greet the revolutionary industrial proletariat of America in the ranks of the I. W. W. and pledge them our whole-hearted support and co-operation in their struggles against the capitalist class. . . ."

"We suggest that some plan of labor organization be inaugurated along the lines of the Shop Stewards' Committees of Scotland and England or the Factory Shop Committees of Russia. These committees can serve as a spur or check upon the unions. Such committees will necessarily reflect the spirit and the wishes of the rank and file, and will enable the National Left Wing to keep in direct touch with the workers. In this way, the workers can be educated on the job and prepare for the taking over of industry."

The report closes with the following recommendations:

"(1) That a Committee of Seven be elected by the Convention to be known as the Labor Committee.

"(2) That the functions of this committee shall be to carry on revolutionary propaganda among the workers on the job.

"(3) Those workers found to be radical shall be organized into Shop Committees.

"(4) These Shop Committees shall distribute literature, supply information to the Labor Committee, and generally keep in touch with the National Left Wing organization.

"(5) At places where a number of these committees are formed, they shall elect delegates to a local Workers' Council.

"(6) An appropriation shall be made for the purpose of carrying on the work of this committee.

"(7) A general propaganda periodical shall be issued by the National Left Wing Council for the special purpose of reaching the workers at their jobs. And this project shall be referred for further elaboration to the Labor Committee."

It will be noted that in this report and by its adoption, it became the settled purpose of the National Left Wing organization to institute a thoroughly organized agitation among the workers with the view to reorganize them along the lines which had been adopted in Russia, and to create a Workmen's Council which it was hoped might ultimately take the form of Soviets. The plan thus promulgated demonstrated a hostility toward and the determination to destroy the conservative organizations of labor affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. This animosity is apparent in all of the propaganda issued by the Left Wing. An example might be cited in an editorial appearing on page 2 of the "Revolutionary Age," of July 19, 1919, entitled "Union Bureaucracy":

"Wherever militant labor gets in action, it meets the antagonism of the bureaucracy of the old unions. The American labor movement is familiar with the contemptible intrigues of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy against I. W. W. strikes, and particularly during the great Lawrence strike of 1912, when the A. F. of L. officials did all in their power to break the workers' struggle. This tendency also characterized the recent general strike in Seattle.

"The union bureaucrats are particularly against industrial unionism, since industrial unionism ends craft divisions and craft disputes, which constitute the power of the union bureaucracy. In Canada, the One Big Union — Industrial Unionism — has captured the imagination of the organized workers. The One Big Union directed the great general strike in Canada; but, says an observer, '*The International Brotherhoods have come out against the strikers, shrewdly foreseeing in the One Big Union the destruction of their organization.*' This is a damning indictment of the old unionism."

In July, 1919, the disruption of the Socialist movement of the United States became complete. As has been pointed out in the chapter of this report dealing with the activities of the Socialist Party of America, the principle Foreign Language Federations have been expelled from the Socialist Party, and those Locals which had joined the Left Wing Section and had refused to repudiate it, were also expelled.

The original hope of the leaders of the Left Wing movement to harmonize all of the elements who were in opposition to the Socialist Party leadership, disappeared at the Left Wing Conference in June, when the delegates from the Russian Federation, together with four delegates from the State of Michigan, withdrew from the conference.

In the early part of July, the Michigan Federation issued a call for the organization of the Communist Party at Chicago on September 1st. The convention was called by a "National Organization Committee," consisting of Dennis E. Batt, D. Elbaum, O. C. Johnson, John Keracher, S. Kopnagel, I. Stilson and Alexander Stoklitsky. The Michigan Federation in their call, attacked the National Left Wing for their policy in endeavoring "to capture the old party machinery and the stagnant elements who have been struggling for conference unity and who are only too ready to abandon the ship when it sinks beneath the wave of reaction."

This criticism of the Left Wing movement was violently denounced in Left Wing organs and made the task of reconciling the Left Wing and the Michigan Party difficult. This, however, was in large measure effected at a later date.

To the fair and impartial observer, the element of personal antagonism to the party leaders rather than any fundamental difference of principles seems the occasion for the splits which

occurred in the Socialist Party ranks. (See article by Louis C. Fraina in the "Revolutionary Age," July 19, 1919, page 7, entitled "The Left Wing," and an unsigned article in the same issue on page 3, entitled "The Party Fight.")

The attempt to control the National Emergency Convention of the Socialist Party, however, was not abandoned. A large number of the State organizations and Locals which were expelled by the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, refused to recognize such expulsion, and prepared to send delegates to the Emergency Convention at Chicago.

Resolutions similar to those adopted by Local Boston were generally adopted. We quote here the statement issued by Local Boston, as given in the "Revolutionary Age" of the issue of July 12, 1919, page 15, as follows:

"(1) We refuse to recognize the expulsion by the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of the State organization of Michigan and Massachusetts, and the suspension of the Hungarian, Lettish, Lithuanian, Polish, South Slavic, Russian and Ukrainian Federations.

"(2) We note that the members of the Executive Committee responsible for this action charged that the Language Federations made plans to vote for a 'slate.' Such procedure has always been recognized within the party as a legitimate method of giving effect to majority opinion in elections. As a matter of fact, James Oneal, one of the objectors, was himself elected on a 'slate,' as State Secretary of Massachusetts, a few years ago.

"(3) Another charge is that five federations issued a statement that they would not assist in the so-called Amnesty Convention called by the National Executive Committee, and even affirmed their opposition to such convention. The purpose of that convention was, in our judgment, to use the Socialist Party as an instrument in securing the release of the bourgeois 'conscientious objectors' and then to abandon the imprisoned victims of the class struggle. Therefore, we declare that the five federations in this matter adhered to the party pledge, while its National Executive Committee violated the third paragraph of that pledge which reads as follows:

'I am opposed to all political organizations that support and perpetuate the present capitalist profit system, and I am opposed to any form of trading or

fusing with any such organizations to prolong that system.'

"(4) The members of the outgoing National Executive Committee who voted to hold up the tabulation of votes upon National membership referendums, rendered themselves liable to expulsion from office under Article XIII, section 4, of the party constitution, which reads:

'Any officer who attempts to interfere with the processes of the membership shall be expelled from office.'

"(5) The state organizations of Michigan and Massachusetts were expelled without even the decency of a hearing. Those members of the National Executive Committee who were responsible for this outrage, are now straining every nerve to prevent an appeal against their action to a referendum vote of the party membership. Even in capitalist courts, the accused is given a hearing and a trial, with right of appeal if convicted. The guilty members of the National Executive Committee are seeking to deprive the accused comrades of rights such as are granted to Socialists by a hostile capitalist civilization. Comrades, the Socialist movement of the world is everywhere swinging to the Left. Sweep out of your path the handful of fossilized officials who are trying to stop the swing in America!

"For Local Boston,

"LOUIS E. HENDERSON,

"WILLIAM GOLDBERG,

"LEON GOLOSOV,

"W. T. COLYER,

"Authorized Committee."

The New National Executive Committee met in Chicago on July 26 and 27, 1919, at Bradley Hall. There were present: Louis C. Fraina, Edward I. Lindgren, Fred Harwood, Marguerite Prevey, C. E. Ruthenberg, William Bross Lloyd, L. E. Katterfeld and H. M. Wicks. Other members of the Committee not present were: Denis E. Batt, Nicholas I. Hourwich, John Keracher, Dan Hogan, Mary R. Millis, Pat Nagle, and Kate Greenhalgh.

A committee to tabulate the votes reported that Louis C. Fraina, John Reed, C. E. Ruthenberg and A. Wagenknecht were elected overwhelmingly as International delegates, and Kate Richards O'Hare as International secretary. The new committee made a demand upon the executive secretary of the Socialist

Party, Adolf Germer, to turn over the National headquarters to the New National Executive Committee, and appear at its sessions. This demand was presented in writing to Germer, who is reported to have refused.

At the afternoon session of this National Executive Committee the following motion was adopted:

"That we declare the office of National Executive Secretary vacant, inasmuch as the present incumbent violates his functions by refusing to tabulate the vote on referendums expressing the will of the membership, and refuses to recognize the regularly elected N. E. C."

Thereupon, A. Wagenknecht was chosen to act as temporary secretary until the National Emergency Convention of August 30th.

A motion was also adopted "That the Massachusetts and Michigan State Organizations be reinstated in the Party, and that the suspension of the Russian, Polish, Lithuanian, South Slavic, Hungarian, Lettish, and Ukrainian Socialist Federations be revoked.

It is reported that this new National Executive Committee decided to assume full control of the Emergency Convention, and resolved:

"That we recognize the National Council of the Left Wing Section, Socialist Party organized at the National Left Wing Conference, June 21-24, and its official organ, the 'Revolutionary Age,' as an organized expression of the revolutionary sentiments of the party, and that we request their co-operation."

It must be borne in mind that the regular organization of the Socialist Party did not recognize the validity of the elections which resulted in the choice of this Executive Committee, and that they retained control of the party machinery, including the party newspapers and party funds and records. However, the so-called New National Executive Committee proceeded to transact business as though it was in full charge of party affairs, and issued a statement in which it appears by unanimous decision in the session of July 26th and 27th, the Committee decided:

"(1) To oust National Executive Secretary Germer, who refuses to recognize your N. E. C. as the organ

of the party. (2) To re-instate the expelled State organizations of Michigan and Massachusetts, and the suspended language Federation, restoring to the party with all rights, more than 35,000 comrades. (3) To reorganize the Socialist Party as a Communist Party in harmony with our affiliation with the Communist International. (4) To call upon the members, regardless of the party wrecking old N. E. C. to rally to the support of the class war prisoners. (5) To consider seriously and comprehensively problems of organization shamefully neglected by the old party administrations. (6) To request the co-operation of the National Council of the Left Wing Section, Socialist Party (and its official organ, 'Revolutionary Age,') as an organized expression of the revolutionary sentiments of the party. (7) To assume full control of the Emergency National Convention on August 30th, the old N. E. C. and its executive secretaries leaving no authority to organize or postpone this convention. We will shortly inform you of the place where the convention will meet, together with the roster of delegates. Our temporary executive secretary will call the convention to order."

On the issues of the Emergency Convention, this so-called National Executive Committee adopted the following declaration:

"The movement which culminated in the calling of the Emergency National Convention of August 30th, did not have its origin in a contest over administrative actions of the party Executive Committee; its origin was a demand by large sections of the party membership, for a reformulation of the party tactics; and a restatement of its principles in harmony with the revolutionary Socialist practice of the Bolsheviks of Russia.

"Local after Local, in resolutions and demonstrations urged the National Executive Committee to call a convention, great masses of the membership declared their adherence to the new revolutionary principles, but the National Executive Committee, the representative of moderate Socialism—the Socialism of Scheidemann and Kerensky—acting as self-appointed guardians of the party, refused to accede to the demand of the membership for a convention.

"It was only after the membership itself had taken the matter out of the hands of the National Executive Com-

mittee and had endorsed the convention by an overwhelming vote, that the convention was finally called.

"In their effort to maintain their rule of the party the moderate Socialists of the National Executive Committee did not hesitate to disrupt the organization. Members have been expelled and suspended wholesale in order to influence the vote of the referendum election, and to give the old National Executive Committee and moderate Socialism control of the convention and the party. These reactionary and treacherous acts have injected into the present party situation a bitter struggle for control of the party organization and the danger exists that this factional struggle over democracy against autocracy within the organization may overshadow the original purpose of the call for a national convention—to reorganize the Socialist Party of the United States on the basis of the Communist Socialism which is sweeping through the ranks of the proletarian movement of the world and everywhere bringing new inspiration and courage to the workers in their struggle for emancipation. The old National Executive Committee consciously inspired this process by attempting to refer to the convention the controversial questions over administrative actions, which is disruptive.

"Recognizing this danger we call upon the membership to elect representatives to the Emergency National Convention, not merely on the basis of settling questions arisen out of the reactionary administrative action of the old National Executive Committee—the issue is not party democracy as against party autocracy, but revolutionary Socialism against moderate Socialism—but on the basis of reorganizing the party for the achievement of Communist Socialism.

"The action of the membership in this question has already been indicated in the overwhelming and all but unanimous endorsement by referendum vote of affiliation with the Communist International, side by side with the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Russia and the Communist Labor Party (Spartacans) of Germany and other Communist parties of Europe. The work of the Emergency National Convention of August 30th, will be to reorganize the Socialist Party on the basis of the Communist Socialist

principles and tactics outlined in the declaration of the Communist International. *Out of the Emergency National Convention came the Communist Party of the United States.*

"To carry out this purpose we adopt the following program:

"I. We reaffirm the call for the Emergency National Convention to be held on August 30th, in Chicago, and call upon all party units to send delegates irrespective of any action which the usurping members of the former National Executive Committee may take.

"II. The convention will be held under the direction of this committee and the executive secretary elected by it will make up the roster of delegates and will call the convention to order.

"III. We call upon all sections of the party expelled or suspended by the reactionary Executive Committee and reinstated by this committee, to send delegates as provided in the rules of party procedure.

"IV. We call upon all party units expelled by state or local organizations to take such actions, in accordance with their local rules, as will insure them representation."

At about the same time an effort was being made to compromise the differences between the Russian Language Federation and the National Council of the Left Wing. These negotiations resulted in the calling of a conference on July 27, 1919, in New York, between the Russian Federation Executive Committee and representatives of the National Council of the Left Wing.

As a result of that Conference, the following resolution was submitted to the National Council:

"Having discussed the written statements issued by the National Left Wing Council and the telegram of the so-called 'New N. E. C.' of the Socialist Party, reported by the Secretary of the National Left Wing Council, we, the Central Executive Committees of the Lettish, Lithuanian, Esthonian, Ukrainian, Polish and Russian Federations, came to the conclusion that these documents justify once again the position taken by the minority of the Left Wing Conference, and call upon all our members to carry on the work of the creation of the Communist Party. We appeal

to the comrades of the majority group to clarify their desire in forming the Communist Party through participation in the Convention which is being called by the minority of the Left Wing Conference on September 1, 1919. In case of reply in the affirmative, we are prepared to instruct our National Organization Committee to combine with the National Left Wing Council in the common work of calling the convention for the purpose of organizing the Communist Party of America on September 1, 1919, in Chicago.

"For the Lettish, Lithuanian, Esthonian, Ukrainian, Polish and Russian Central Executive Committees,

"(Signed) O. TYWEROWSKY,
"Secretary."

This resolution was submitted to the National Council of the Left Wing on July 28, 1919, and the following motions were made and carried:

"(1) The National Left Wing Council stands for a Communist Party on September 1st, and we repeat the call of the Left Wing Conference for a Convention on September 1st to form the Communist Party of America, inviting all revolutionary Socialist groups to join with us.

"(2) We invite the minority group of the Left Wing Conference and the Federations to work with us on the basis of a September 1st Convention to form the Communist Party.

"(3) We associate ourselves with the N. E. C. in relation to the August 30th Emergency Socialist Party Convention only as a preliminary to the September first Communist Party Convention."

At this meeting of the National Council, there appeared a new divergence of opinion, Benjamin Gitlow and James Larkin apparently disagreeing with the majority of the council. This action on the part of the National Council of the Left Wing in reality ended the movement to organize for the control of the Socialist Party of America by the so-called Left Wing elements, and marked the definite beginning of the movement to organize the Communist Party of America, which will be dealt with in the following chapter of this report.

APPENDIX

CHAPTER IV

Official Documents

1. Manifesto of Left Wing Section Socialist Party Local Greater New York.
2. Left Wing Manifesto adopted by National Left Wing Council.

Document No. 1

MANIFESTO

Prior to August, 1914, the nations of the world lived on a volcano. Violent eruptions from time to time gave warning of the cataclysm to come, but the diplomats and statesmen managed to localize the outbreaks, and the masses, slightly aroused, sank back into their accustomed lethargy with doubts and misgivings, and the subterranean fires continued to smoulder.

Many trusted blindly—some in their statesmen, some in the cohesive power of Christianity, their common religion, and some in the growing strength of the international Socialist movement. Had not the German Social-Democracy exchanged dramatic telegrams with the French Socialist Party, each pledging itself not to fight in case their governments declared war on each other! A general strike of workers led by these determined Socialists would quickly bring the governments to their senses!

So the workers reasoned, until the thunder-clap of Sarejevo and Austria's ultimatum to Serbia. Then, suddenly, the storm broke. Mobilization everywhere. Everywhere declarations of war. In three or four days Europe was in arms.

The present structure of society—Capitalism—with its pretensions to democracy on the one hand, and its commercial rivalries, armament rings and standing armies on the other, all based on the exploitation of the working class and the division of the loot, was cast into the furnace of war. Two things only could issue forth: either international capitalist control, through a League of Nations, or Social Revolution and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Both of these forces are to-day contending for world-power.

The Social Democracies of Europe, unable or unwilling to meet the crisis, were themselves hurled into the conflagration, to be tempered or consumed by it.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

Great demonstrations were held in every European country by Socialists protesting against their governments' declarations of war, and mobilizations for war. And we know that these demonstrations were rendered impotent by the complete surrender of the Socialist parliamentary leaders and the official Socialist press, with their "justifications" of "defensive wars" and the safeguarding of "democracy."

Why the sudden change of front? Why did the Socialist leaders in the parliaments of the belligerents vote the war credits? Why did not Moderate Socialism carry out the policy of the Basle Manifesto, namely: the converting of an imperialistic war into a civil war—into a proletarian revolution? Why did it either openly favor the war or adopt a policy of petty-bourgeois pacifism?

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERATE "SOCIALISM"

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Social-Democracies of Europe set out to "legislate Capitalism out of office." The class struggle was to be won in the capitalist legislatures. Step by step concessions were to be wrested from the state; the working class and the Socialist parties were to be strengthened by means of "constructive" reform and social legislation; each concession would act as a rung in the ladder of Social Revolution, upon which the workers could climb step by step, until finally, some bright sunny morning, the peoples would awaken to find the Cooperative Commonwealth functioning without disorder, confusion or hitch on the ruins of the capitalist state.

And what happened? When a few legislative seats had been secured, the thunderous denunciations of the Socialist legislators suddenly ceased. No more were the parliaments used as platforms from which the challenge of revolutionary Socialism was flung to all the corners of Europe. Another era had set in, the era of "constructive" social reform legislation. Dominant Moderate Socialism accepted the bourgeois state as the basis of its action and strengthened that state. All power to shape the policies and tactics of the Socialist parties was entrusted to the parliamentary leaders. And these lost sight of Socialism's original purpose; their goal became "constructive reforms" and cabinet portfolios—the "cooperation of classes," the policy of openly or tacitly

declaring that the coming of Socialism was a concern "of all the classes," instead of emphasizing the Marxian policy that the construction of the Socialist system is the task of the revolutionary proletariat alone. "Moderate Socialism" accepted the bourgeois state as the leaders, was now ready to share responsibility with the bourgeoisie in the control of the capitalist state, even to the extent of defending the bourgeoisie against the working class — as in the first Briand Ministry in France, when the official party press was opened to a defense of the shooting of striking railway-workers at the order of the Socialist-Bourgeois Coalition Cabinet.

"SAUSAGE SOCIALISM"

This situation was brought about by mixing the democratic cant of the eighteenth century with scientific Socialism. The result was what Rosa Luxemburg called "sausage Socialism." The "Moderates" emphasized petty-bourgeois social reformism in order to attract tradesmen, shop-keepers and members of the professions, and, of course, the latter flocked to the Socialist movement in great numbers, seeking relief from the constant grinding between corporate capital and awakening labor.

The Socialist organizations actively competed for votes, on the basis of social reforms, with the bourgeois-liberal political parties. And so they catered to the ignorance and prejudices of the workers, trading promises of immediate reforms for votes.

Dominant "moderate Socialism" forgot the teachings of the founders of scientific Socialism, forgot its function as a proletarian movement — "the most resolute and advanced section of the working class parties"—and permitted the bourgeois and self-seeking trade union elements to shape its policies and tactics. This was the condition in which the Social-Democracies of Europe found themselves at the outbreak of the war in 1914. Demoralized and confused by the cross-currents within their own parties, vacillating and compromising with the bourgeois state, they fell a prey to social-patriotism and nationalism.

SPARTICIDES AND BOLSHEVIKI

But revolutionary Socialism was not destined to lie inert for long. In Germany, Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg and Otto Ruhle organized the Spartacus Group. But their

voices were drowned in the roar of cannon and the shrieks of the dying and the maimed.

Russia, however, was to be the first battle-ground where "moderate" and revolutionary Socialism should come to grips for the mastery of the state. The breakdown of the corrupt, bureaucratic Czarist regime opened the flood-gates of Revolution.

Three main contending parties attempted to ride into power on the revolutionary tide; the Cadets, the "moderate Socialists" (Mensheviki and Social Revolutionists), and the revolutionary Socialists—the Bolsheviki. The Cadets were first to be swept into power; but they tried to stem the still-rising flood with a few abstract political ideals, and were soon carried away. The soldiers, workers, and peasants could no longer be fooled by phrases. The Mensheviki and Social Revolutionaries succeeded the Cadets. And now came the crucial test: would they, in accord with Marxian teachings, make themselves the ruling class and sweep away the old conditions of production, and thus prepare the way for the Cooperative Commonwealth? Or would they tinker with the old machinery and try to foist it on the masses as something just as good?

They did the latter and proved for all time that "moderate Socialism" cannot be trusted.

"Moderate Socialism" was not prepared to seize the power for the workers during a revolution. "Moderate Socialism" had a rigid formula—"constructive social reform legislation within the capitalist state" and to that formula it clung. It believed that bourgeois democracy could be used as a means of constructing the Socialist system; therefore, it must wait until the people, through a Constituent Assembly, should vote Socialism into existence. And in the meantime, it held that there must be established a Government of Coalition with the enemy, the bourgeoisie. As if, with all the means of controlling public opinion in the hands of the bourgeoisie, a Constituent Assembly could or would ever vote the Socialists into power!

Revolutionary Socialists hold, with the founders of scientific Socialism, that there are two dominant classes in society — the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; that between these two classes a struggle must go on, until the working class, through the seizure of the instruments of production and distribution, the abolition of the capitalist state, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, creates a Socialist system. Revolutionary

Socialists do not believe that they can be voted into power. They struggle for the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat. Then comes the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism, of which Marx speaks in his "Critique of the Gotha program": when he says: "Between the capitalistic society and the communistic, lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds to a political transition period, in which the state cannot be anything else but the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Marx and Engels clearly explain the function of the Socialist movement. It is the "moderate Socialists" through intellectual gymnastics, evasions, misquotations and the tearing of sentences and phrases from their context, who make Marx and Engels sponsors for their perverted version of Socialism.

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM

At the present moment, the Socialist Party of America is agitated by several cross-currents, some local in their character, and some a reflex of cleavages within the European Socialist movements. Many see in this internal dissention merely an unimportant difference of opinion, or at most, dissatisfaction with the control of the party, and the desire to replace those who have misused it with better men.

We, however, maintain that there is a fundamental distinction in views concerning party policies and tactics. And we believe that this difference is so vast that from our standpoint a radical change in party policies and tactics is necessary.

This essential task is being shirked by our party leaders and officials generally.

Already there is formidable industrial unrest, a seething ferment of discontent, evidenced by inarticulate rumblings which presage striking occurrences. The transformation of industry from a war to a peace basis has thoroughly disorganized the economic structure. Thousands upon thousands of workers are being thrown out of work. Demobilized sailors and soldiers find themselves a drug upon the labor market, unless they act as scabs and strikebreakers. Skilled mechanics, fighting desperately to maintain their war-wage and their industrial status, are forced to strike. Women, who during the war have been welcomed into industries hitherto closed to them, are struggling to keep their

jobs. And to cap the climax, the capitalists, through their Chambers of Commerce and their Merchants and Manufacturers' Associations, have resolved to take advantage of the situation to break down even the inadequate organizations labor has built up through generations of painful struggle.

The temper of the workers and soldiers, after the sacrifices they have made in the war, is such that they will not endure the reactionary labor conditions so openly advocated by the master class. A series of labor struggles is bound to follow — indeed, is beginning now. Shall the Socialist Party continue to feed the workers with social reform legislation at this critical period? Shall it approach the whole question from the standpoint of votes and the election of representatives to the legislatures? Shall it emphasize the consumers' point of view, when Socialist principles teach that the worker is robbed at the point of production? Shall it talk about the Cost of Living and Taxation when it should be explaining how the worker is robbed at his job?

There are many signs of the awakening of labor. Strikes are developing which verge on revolutionary action; the trade unions are organizing a Labor Party, in an effort to conserve what they have won and wrest new concessions from the master class. The organization of the Labor Party is an immature expression of a new spirit in the Labor movement; but a Labor Party is not the instrument for the emancipation of the working class; its policy would be in general what is now the official policy of the Socialist Party — reforming Capitalism on the basis of the bourgeois state. Laborism is as much a danger to the revolutionary proletariat as "moderate" Socialism; neither is an instrument for the conquest of power.

CAPITALIST IMPERIALISM

Imperialism is the final stage of Capitalism, in which the accumulated capital or surplus of a nation is too great to be reinvested in the home market. The increased productivity of the working class, due to improved machinery and efficiency methods, and the mere subsistence wage which permits the worker to buy back only a small portion of what he produces, causes an ever-increasing accumulation of commodities, which in turn become capital and must be invested in further production. When Capitalism has reached the stage in which it imports raw materials from undeveloped countries and exports them again in the shape of manufactured products, it has reached its highest development.

This process is universal. Foreign markets, spheres of influence and protectorates, under the intensive development of capitalist industry and finance in turn become highly developed. They, too, seek for markets. National capitalist control, to save itself from ruin, breaks its national bonds and emerges full-grown as a capitalist League of Nations, with international armies and navies to maintain its supremacy.

The United States no longer holds itself aloof, isolated and provincial. It is reaching out for new markets, new zones of influence, new protectorates.

The capitalist class of America is using organized labor for its imperialistic purposes. We may soon expect the capitalist class, in true Bismarckian fashion, to grant factory laws, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, sick benefits, and the whole litter of bourgeois reforms, so that the workers may be kept fit to produce the greatest profits at the greatest speed.

DANGERS TO AMERICAN SOCIALISM

There is danger that the Socialist Party of America might make use of these purely bourgeois reforms to attract the workers' votes, by claiming that they are victories for Socialism, and that they have been won by Socialist political action; when, as a matter of fact, the object of these master class measures is to prevent the growing class-consciousness of the workers, and to divert them from their revolutionary aim. By agitating for these reforms, therefore, the Socialist Party would be playing into the hands of the American imperialists.

On the basis of the class struggle, then, the Socialist Party of America must re-organize itself, must prepare to come to grips with the master class during the difficult period of capitalist re-adjustment now going on. This it can do only by teaching the working class the truth about present-day conditions; it must preach revolutionary industrial unionism, and urge all the workers to organize into industrial unions, the only form of labor organization which can cope with the power of great modern aggregations of capital. It must carry on its political campaigns, not merely as a means of electing officials to political office, as in the past, but as a year-round educational campaign to arouse the workers to class-conscious economic and political action, and to keep alive the burning ideal of revolution in the hearts of the people.

POLITICAL ACTION

We assert with Marx that "the class struggle is essentially a political struggle," and we can only accept his own oft-repeated interpretation of that phrase. The class struggle, whether it manifest itself on the industrial field or in the direct struggle for governmental control, is essentially a struggle for the capture and destruction of the capitalist state. This is a political act. In this broader view of the term "political," Marx includes revolutionary industrial action. In other words, the objective of Socialist industrial action is "political," in the sense that it aims to undermine the bourgeois state, which "is nothing less than a machine for the oppression of one class by another and that no less so in a democratic republic than under a monarchy."

Political action is also and more generally used to refer to participation in election campaigns for the immediate purpose of winning legislative seats. In this sense, too, we urge the use of political action as a revolutionary weapon.

But both in the nature and the purpose of this form of political action, revolutionary Socialism and "moderate Socialism" are completely at odds.

Political action, revolutionary and emphasizing the implacable character of the class struggle, is a valuable means of propaganda. It must at all times struggle to arouse the revolutionary mass action of the proletariat—its use is both agitational and obstructive. It must on all issues wage war upon Capitalism and the state. Revolutionary Socialism uses the forum of parliament for agitation; but it does not intend to and cannot use the bourgeois state as a means of introducing Socialism: this bourgeois state must be destroyed by the mass action of the revolutionary proletariat. The proletarian dictatorship in the form of a Soviet state is the immediate objective of the class struggle.

Marx declared that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes." This machinery must be destroyed. But "moderate Socialism" makes the state the centre of its action.

The attitude towards the state divides the Anarchist (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 fail to realize that a 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 "unity of all the classes," its standing army, police and bureaucracy oppressing and baffling the masses; the revolutionary Socialist maintains that the bourgeois state must be completely destroyed, and proposes the organization of a new state — the state of the organized producers — of the Federated Soviets — on the basis of which alone can Socialism be introduced.

Industrial Unionism, the organization of the proletariat in accordance with the integration of industry and for the overthrow of Capitalism, is a necessary phase of revolutionary Socialist agitation. Potentially, industrial unionism constructs the basis and develops the ideology of the industrial state of Socialism; but industrial unionism alone cannot perform the revolutionary act of seizure of the power of the state, since under the conditions of Capitalism it is impossible to organize the whole working class, or an overwhelming majority, into industrial unions.

It is the task of a revolutionary Socialist party to direct the struggles of the proletariat and provide a program for the culminating crisis. Its propaganda must be so directed that when this crisis comes, the workers will be prepared to accept a program of the following character:

(a) *The organization of Workmen's Councils*; recognition of, and propaganda for, these mass organizations of the working class as instruments in the immediate struggle, as the form of expression of the class struggle, and as the instruments for the seizure of the power of the state and the basis of the new proletarian state of the organized producers and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(b) *Workmen's control of industry*, to be exercised by the industrial organizations (industrial unions or Soviets) of the workers and the industrial vote, as against government ownership or state control of industry.

(c) *Repudiation of all national debts* — with provisions to safeguard small investors.

(d) *Expropriation of the banks* — a preliminary measure for the complete expropriation of capital.

(e) *Expropriation of the railways, and the large (trust) organizations of capital* — no compensation to be paid, as "buying-out" the capitalists would insure a continuance of the exploitation of the workers; provision, however, to be made during the transition period for the protection of small owners of stock.

(f) *The socialization of foreign trade.*

These are not the "immediate demands" comprised in the social reform planks now in the platform of our party; they are not a compromise with the capitalist state, but imply a revolutionary struggle against that state and against capitalism, the conquest of power by the proletariat through revolutionary mass action. They imply the new Soviet state of the organized producers, the dictatorship of the proletariat; they are preliminary revolutionary measures for the expropriation of capital and the introduction of communist Socialism.

PROGRAM

1. We stand for a uniform declaration of principles in all party platforms both local and national and the abolition of all social reform planks now contained in them.

2. The party must teach, propagate and agitate exclusively for the overthrow of Capitalism, and the establishment of Socialism through a Proletarian Dictatorship.

3. The Socialist candidates elected to office shall adhere strictly to the above provisions.

4. Realizing that a political party cannot reorganize and reconstruct the industrial organizations of the working class, and that that is the task of the economic organizations themselves, we demand that the party assist this process of reorganization by a propaganda for revolutionary industrial unionism as part of its general activities. We believe it is the mission of the Socialist movement to encourage and assist the proletariat to adopt newer and more effective forms of organization and to stir it into newer and more revolutionary modes of action.

5. We demand that the official party press be party owned and controlled.

6. We demand that officially recognized educational institutions be party owned and controlled.

7. We demand that the party discard its obsolete literature and publish new literature in keeping with the policies and tactics above-mentioned.

8. We demand that the National Executive Committee call an immediate emergency national convention for the purpose of formulating party policies and tactics to meet the present crisis.

9. We demand that the Socialist Party repudiate the Berne Congress or any other conference engineered by "moderate Socialists" and social patriots.

10. We demand that the Socialist Party shall elect delegates to the International Congress proposed by the Communist Party of

Russia (Bolsheviki); that our party shall participate only in a new International with which are affiliated the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviki), the Communist Labor Party of Germany (Spartacus), and all other Left Wing parties and groups.

Document No. 2

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 on-sweeping 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 aggression 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 justified 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 Utopiaism, or a method of recreation. 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 tactics. 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 their 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 Mensheviks 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 parliamentary 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 a struggle for the 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 bourgeois 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 practice 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 construction 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 revolutionary 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.

ism, 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 industries; 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 unconscious 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 autoocracy, 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 politically, 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 dictatorship is to render itself unnecessary; and it becomes unnecessary the moment the full conditions of Communist Socialism materialize. While the dictatorship of the proletariat performs 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 autonomy 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 "center" 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 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!