

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of International Events

Vol. I, No. 27

Saturday, April 19, 1919

Price 3 Cents

Debs, Haywood and Mooney

THESE is a prison. Its walls are dark and grim and cold, its windows barred with iron. The air that penetrates through its harsh openings becomes fetid, the sun-light cold and sickly. There is a sting in this prison that blights the air and the sun, and often the human soul. In this prison, in which prevails a spiritual and physical twilight, where the light becomes misty as if in shame, there are cells, and cells, and cells—of cold brutal iron, small and mocking the great open spaces of the earth. They are repressive, these cells; the walls are of iron, lowering as if to press you down, and they are bolted with bolts of iron. In these cells are beings—some of them are still men, others are things that once were men, and others who never had the opportunity to become men.

The beings in this prison are varied in character, varied in pursuits; but they have one thing in common—they have transgressed against the Law, have violated that which is the evil-symbol of the supremacy of Capitalism. And the Law, not concerning itself with these men as human beings, is much concerned with them once they violated the Thing that Capitalism uses to maintain its supremacy.

In this prison, in one of the small, dark, cold cells, there is an old man, whose soul is young and whose spirit is eternal. This young-old man is a criminal, condemned to ten years of penal servitude. His days are spent in clerical work, his evenings in thought, and his nights—let us hope—in sleep. He is a criminal, and there is a warden who oppresses him, and guards who repress him. The oppression is broken only by the unconquerable spirit of his soul, the monotony varied only by the ardor of his revolutionary convictions.

That man is Eugene Debs.

Debs! A criminal? That man who has devoted himself to social service, whose flaming ideals light the way to freedom, who has wept with the broken and revolted with the rebel?

Yes—Debs! And in other cells are more of his character. Men who protested against injustice—Socialists and Anarchists and I. W. W.'s—who were a threat to Capitalism, and who were imprisoned by that Thing, the Law, the jackal of Capitalism.

Prisons, they say, are to repress those who violate the rights of man. But Debs has violated no man's rights, Debs has deprived no man of life or liberty. He has struggled to insure the rights of man, life and liberty have been ideals to which he has devoted all the mighty spirit of his mind and body. But he is in prison. He is there, because he spoke against the war and fratricide, because his ideal was to unite the workers of the world against Capitalism, because he is the symbol of that revolutionary movement which threatens to annihilate Capitalism. Debs is in prison as a revolutionary Socialist, as the representative of the oppressed proletariat. . . .

From this prison recently, there were released on bail William D. Haywood and some others of the scores of I. W. W.'s imprisoned by order of a bourgeois court. Nor did these deprive any man of life or liberty: they were active participants in the great social struggle to insure real life and liberty for the masses of the people. In these I. W. W.'s thrills the energy of the militant proletariat. Their hands are hardened by toil and their determination hardened by the implacable struggle of class against class. Their seamed faces are a litany of proletarian suffering. Their movement is a movement of the most despised and most despoiled of the working masses, aggressive and potential of a finer life. They have been brutally thrown out of towns where strikers required them—but their tormentors were not imprisoned; they have been lynched, but their lynchings still chuckle in satisfaction at the crime: they have been imprisoned illegally, but their captors and their judges are still at large, sleekly satisfied with things. Bourgeois morals, bourgeois law and the bourgeois soldiery have united against these I. W. W.'s. At a moment when

General Strike Call

Resolution adopted by "The General Strike Conference for the Liberation of Eugene V. Debs and All Political Class-war Prisoners," on March 23, 1919, at 232 North 9th St., Phila., Pa.

Whereas, Eugene V. Debs and other champions of the interests of the working class have been sentenced to long terms of imprisonment because they have had the courage to express their convictions, and have dared to affirm their loyalty to the working class; and

Whereas, these men and women are paying the price of their devotion to the interests of toiling humanity, under sentences more savage than any that have been imposed in Prussia and even in Czaristic Russia, thus proving that the instruments of law have been perverted into weapons of class oppression for vengeance and persecution;

Therefore, be it resolved, that we call upon the organized and unorganized workers of this country to declare a General Strike on May 1st, 1919, as the only effective step in the direction of securing the release of the class-war prisoners.

profiteers were transmuting the agony and the butchery of war into the gold of profits, these men struggled to organize the proletariat, to direct its action against the ruling class. They directed strikes—and they were arrested; they organized the workers to secure life and liberty—real—and they were imprisoned.

the predatory money interests of San Francisco. The employers determined to crush unionism, by means that are dark and infamous. There was a Preparedness Parade; a provocateur threw a bomb into the crowd (what an excellent opportunity to the ruling class: patriotic hysteria and dynamite, producing unthinking rage and hatred) and Mooney and other union agitators were arrested as the culprits. A corrupt District-Attorney, (agent of the Chamber of Commerce,) bribery, dishonesty, perjury,—all means necessary were used to convict them. They were convicted. Mooney was condemned to death: crush him, and crush the unions. But there was protest. There was proof of conspiracy and the innocence of Mooney. Insistent was the demand for a new trial: but the oppressors and their legal agents were in fear, a new trial might bring inescapable exposure of their sinister conspiracy. Under pressure of protest, Mooney's death sentence was "commuted" to life imprisonment. Clemency!—the vile and hypocritical clemency of the ravaging beast of capital. Mooney and labor—they were on trial, they are in prison. . . .

It is not three men who are imprisoned. It is you and I who are imprisoned, the workers, the suffering and the oppressed. They have imprisoned the militant proletariat. In Debs, they have imprisoned revolutionary Socialism; in Haywood, they have imprisoned revolutionary industrial unionism; in Mooney, they have imprisoned the militant elements of union labor. And they were conscious—these calculatingly malevolent representatives of Capitalism—of what they were doing. In these three forces—revolutionary Socialism, revolutionary industrial unionism, and the militant elements of union labor—the representatives of Capitalism recognized the developing threat to their supremacy. They decided to throttle the threat.

Their decision is suggestive. It should provoke our thought—and action. The unity of these three revolutionary, or potentially revolutionary, forces, means real power, a real proletarian threat to Capitalism. The action of our class enemy indicates our own action—unity for action and the conquest of power of these conscious forces of the proletariat.

Action! It is a mighty word. It is a mighty decision. But the decision must be invoked. Labor, speak and act!

The war was used against labor. As it was and as it is, so shall it be, unless revolutionary labor speaks—and acts.

The representatives of labor are being imprisoned. Our comrades are being caged. The representatives of Capitalism are not concerned in individuals, but in movements. It is our movement and its ideals—it is you and I—who are being imprisoned.

Shall you tolerate this organized conspiracy? Shall you allow this process of throttling the revolutionary movement to proceed?

They are using might against our movement—let us answer might with might, the might of the industrial proletariat! They are using coercion against our movement—let us coerce Capitalism and the representatives of Capitalism!

Speak? Yes; but not enough. *The time for action has come.*

Let labor use its industrial might. *We must develop and organize a political strike of the masses to force the release of our imprisoned comrades.* This is the order of the day. Out of the mills and mines and shops must come the workers, *they must down tools*, not for more wages or lower hours, but for a finer end—the release of our class war prisoners—a revolutionary act potential of larger things.

No evasion. No hesitancy. . . . Not through miserable appeals to those who have imprisoned our comrades, not through a ghastly "amnesty"—but through the militant action of the conscious proletariat must we open the prison gates. The iron battalions of the proletariat must answer Capitalism!

RUSSIAN SOCIALIST FEDERATED SOVIET REPUBLIC.

On whose side are you?

Workers' or capitalists'?

The peoples of the world are not divided by nationality, but by class. What interest have you in common with your master? Even if he is your fellow countryman, even if he is of the same race as you are, does that prevent him from robbing you? Does that prevent him from making you work for as many hours as possible, for as little money as possible? — Not in the least. Even during the war, when you the working people are sacrificing your lives, your all, the capitalists have continued to exploit you, and your families. They make profit out of food. They make profit out of the uniforms you wear. They make profit out of the guns you use. The war has been for them an Aladdin's Cave from which to draw wealth beyond the dreams of avarice. What has been for the masses the cause of death, destruction, ruin, and despair, has been for the capitalists a means of piling up colossal fortunes, both now and in the future. All profit is wrung from our class, from the sweat, and blood, and tears of the working people. It is the same in all countries. In England, in France, in Germany, in Austria, and in Russia. Does nationality count? — No! It is class that counts.

Working class or capitalist class, on which side are you? Capitalists have investments in all countries. Where their money is there their hearts are also. There is no patriotism for them. But they always remain loyal to their class. As against the working class the capitalists of all countries are united. — They understand the class war. There are only two camps, the workers' camp and the capitalists' camp.

In which camp are you? The interests of the workers of all countries are the same. No matter where you live, in England, France, Germany, if you are a workman you must work for a master, and he will only employ you if he can obtain a profit out of your labor. The workers are always opposed to the masters. In England great strikes are now proceeding, because while you have come here to fight for liberty, the master class at home wants to impose Industrial Conscription upon your fellow workers.

Real freedom, economic, and social freedom will only be achieved when the workers of all countries overthrow the master class, and take control in their own hands. We in Russia have done this. We have abolished Capitalism and Lordship in Russia. Your capitalists know that our revolution is a menace to them. They fear that the workers in other countries will follow our example. They are therefore supporting the Russian capitalists against us. They are determined to crush our revolution, and put the landlords, capitalists, and the Tsar back again.

And you have been brought here for that purpose. What are you, a workman or a capitalist? If you are a workman, then you must be on our side, for we are workmen too. We are of the same class. Learn from the capitalists, and be loyal to your class.

An injury to the workers of one country, is an injury to the workers of all countries.

If you help to crush our revolution, you will only be helping to fasten the shackles of wage slavery more firmly on yourselves. Refuse to do the work of our common enemy, the capitalist!! Join with us in the fight against capitalism, and war!!

Workers of all countries unite!!

To satisfy General March, U. S. A., who would like to see a specimen of the "potent" Bolshevik propaganda that produced a mutiny of American troops, we print this photographic reproduction of a Bolshevik leaflet circulated among Allied troops in Murmansk.

Some are still in prison, some are out on bail, pending an appeal to the supreme court; but their punishment is decided upon. They are rebels, not criminals; this makes them deserve imprisonment, surely, since they are more dangerous to Capitalism than the criminal. . . .

In this prison—in another city but still this prison, the prison of Capitalism—is Thomas Mooney, the union agitator and organizer. A worker—but an agitator, the crime of crimes. . . . Mooney threatened

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of International Events

LOUIS C. FRAINA Editor

Contributing Editors

JOHN REED
N. I. HOURWICH
LUDWIG LORE

SEN KATAYAMA
G. WEINSTEIN
EADMONN MACALPINE

ISSUED EVERY SATURDAY

By Local Boston, Socialist Party

H. G. Steiner, Business Manager
885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Bundle orders 2c a copy, Subscription \$1.00 for
six months (26 issues)

The Principles and Tactics of the New International

From the Call of Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviki)
for a Communist International Congress.

It is an urgent necessity that the first congress of the new revolutionary International be called. During the war and the Revolution the complete bankruptcy of the old Socialist and Social Democratic parties, and the second International, as well as the incompetency of the middle elements of the old Social Democracy (the so-called "centre") for live revolutionary action, has finally become evident. At present, however, the outlines of the genuine revolutionary International are distinctly coming into view.

As a basis for the new International, we consider necessary the recognition of the following principles, which we shall consider our platform, and which have been worked out on the basis of the program of the Spartacus group in Germany and the Communist party (Bolsheviki) in Russia.

1. The present is the period of the dissolution and the collapse of the whole capitalist world system, which will mean the complete collapse of European culture, if Capitalism, with its unsolvable contradictions, is not destroyed.

2. The problem of the proletariat consists in immediately seizing the power of the state. This seizure of the power of state means the destruction of the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie and the organization of a new proletarian apparatus of power.

3. This new proletarian state must embody the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in certain places also the small peasants and farm hands, this dictatorship constituting the instrument for the systematic overthrow of the exploiting classes and the means of their expropriation.

Not the fraudulent bourgeois democracy—this hypocritical form of rule of the finance oligarchy—with its purely formal equality, but the proletarian democracy and the possibility of the realization of freedom for the working masses; not parliamentarism, but self-government of these masses through their elected organizations; not capitalist bureaucracy, but organs of administration which have been created by the masses themselves, with the real participation of these masses in the government of the countries and in the activity of the Socialist structure—this should be the type of the proletarian state. The power of the Workers' Councils and similar organizations is its concrete form.

4. The dictatorship of the proletariat shall complete the immediate expropriation of Capitalism and the suppression of private property in means of production, which includes, under Socialism, the suppression of private property and its transfer to a proletarian state, under the Socialist administration of the working class, the abolition of capitalist agricultural production, the nationalization of the great business firms and financial trusts.

5. In order to insure the social revolution, for defense against enemies within and without, of assistance for other national groups of the fighting proletariat, etc., the complete disarmament of the bourgeoisie and their agents and the general arming of the proletariat is necessary.

6. The present world situation demands the closest relation between the different parts of the revolutionary proletariat and a complete union between the countries in which the Socialist revolution has been victorious.

7. The fundamental means of the struggle is the mass action of the proletariat, developing into armed and open war against the state power of capital.

8. The old International has broken into three main groups: First, those frankly social patriots who during the entire imperialist war from 1914 to 1918 supported their bourgeoisie and transformed the working class into hangmen of the international revolution.

Then there is the "Center," at present theoretically led by Kautsky and representing an organization of such elements, constantly wavering, not capable of following a definite plan of action and at times positively traitorous.

Finally the revolutionary left wing.

9. As regards the social-patriots, who everywhere in the critical moment oppose the proletarian revolution with force of arms, a merciless fight is absolutely necessary. As regards the "center," our tactics must be to separate the revolutionary elements, and to pitilessly criticize the leaders. Absolute separation from the organization of the Center is absolutely necessary at a certain phase of development.

10. On the other hand, it is necessary to proceed in a common movement with the revolutionary elements of the working class who, though hitherto not belonging to the party, yet adopt today in its entirety, the point of view of dictatorship of the proletariat, under the form of Soviet government; including the syndicalist elements of the labor movements.

11. It is also necessary to rally the groups and proletarian organizations who, though not in the wake as yet of the revolutionary trend of the Left Wing, nevertheless have manifested and developed a tendency leading in that direction.

Imitating Reaction

LET the United States boast of its democracy, and events taunt it with an expose of the fraud. Our legislative and executive system of government is considered the most democratic in the world. Now comes the Constituent Assembly in Germany, which is considering a proposal to establish a presidency on the American model, a proposal, says a correspondent to the New York Evening Post, "fairly well received. Many Germans favor Preuss' argument for a stronger executive than could be achieved with a dummy President and a parliamentary Cabinet, because they see dangers ahead from the antics of anarchical states like Brunswick and Bremen, from the pretensions of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils to be states within the State and from other symptoms of political indiscipline." In other words, presidential power, as fixed in the American Government, is considered an instrument for the suppression of the proletariat, for maintaining the supremacy of Capitalism. Making the world safe for—reaction!

Will They Impeach Him?

THERE has been a mutiny of American troops in Murmansk, Russia. These troops wanted to know why they were in Russia, since there had been no declaration of war by Congress. The Constitution provides that Congress alone shall declare war. There has been no declaration of war against Soviet Russia, yet President Wilson, as Commander in Chief of the Army, has sent troops to Archangel and Vladivostok, and has waged war against the Russian people. In the course of this war, hundreds of American soldiers have been killed and wounded. The actions of President Wilson are clearly and emphatically unconstitutional. The penalty provided for a President who violates the Constitution is impeachment. But not only have impeachment proceedings not been started, they are not even proposed. The Constitution, apparently, if it serves Capitalism, may be considered a scrap of paper. . . . Frequently, the argument is heard: "You cannot expropriate private property, since that is unconstitutional." Well?

Are They Still There?

THE mutiny of American troops in Murmansk again brings up the question of the withdrawal of troops from Russia. This is promised by the Government for July 1. In the meantime, reinforcements, apparently, are being sent to Archangel. But while the Allies are refusing to withdraw their troops from Russia, the Soviet Army is expelling them. The position of the Allies at Archangel is desperate; the fear is that the Soviet troops may drive them into the sea. Most of the Ukraine is now Soviet, the French being compelled to evacuate Odessa. British troops occupy a small slice of the Caucasus, while the Denikine and Don Cossack Governments are verging on collapse, the report being that the Bolsheviki may soon conquer all of the Caucasus. The Allies are still at Archangel and Vladivostok—but are they, really?

The "Labor Covenant"

THE imperialistic governments during the war recognized the importance of cajoling labor. of developing in workers the ideology of "carry on." In this task, they used the services of the moderate "Socialists" and trades union officials.—betrayers of labor, all. With the proletarian revolution in action or preparing to act, the imperialistic governments, through their Peace Conference in Paris, recognize the importance of the policy of cajoling labor, of making concessions in words while maintaining the oppression of labor in deeds. The Peace Conference, accordingly, instituted an auxiliary in the form of an "International Labor Convention." The task of this Convention was to consider international labor legislation and the "protection" of labor's rights. Its "Covenant of Labor," which is as much of a miserable compromise and as counter-revolutionary as the "covenant" of the League of Nations, has been accepted by the Plenary Council of the Peace Conference: this in itself is a condemnation. The "Labor Covenant" provides—in words—for an eight-hour day, "adequate living wages" for all labor performed, equal pay for equal work for men and women, and against child labor. With Capitalism on the verge of collapse and the proletarian revolution in action, these "concessions" (which, even, labor will never get unless it takes them) are a ghastly mockery of the oppressed. There is included a declaration, adopting the provision of the Clayton Act of the United States, that labor is not a commodity. This declaration, which the A. F. of L. hailed as a great victory, is mere jugglery, since under the conditions of Capitalism labor-power is a commodity, bought and sold in the labor market. The

"Labor Covenant" provides for an International Conference each year, consisting of representatives of the governments, a representative of labor and a representative of the employers in each country. This is loading the dice against the workers, since the representatives of the governments and the employers, representing capital, are a majority and control; and, moreover, none but the most yellow and conservative labor organizations will be represented. It is an excellent plan for capital and reactionary union officials; as well as, perhaps, the imperialistic aristocracy of labor; but fatal to the militant proletariat. That is precisely why Samuel Gompers enthusiastically acclaims the "covenant," in the preparation of which he was active.

The Monroe Doctrine

THE American press is acclaiming as a great victory the report that the Monroe Doctrine will be recognized and protected in the "covenant" of the League of Nations. This is another indictment of the proposed League, another indication that it is an imperialistic League against the nations and the peoples of the world.

A League of Nations that is real, and not imperialistic camouflage, requires certain precedent conditions. It requires, in the first place, the end of the subjection of "backward" peoples; but the revolts in India, Korea and Egypt are proof that the Paris Conference is confirming and tightening this subjection. It requires the end of "spheres of influence," which means the monopolization of undeveloped territory and raw materials by foreign capital in the interests of Imperialism. It requires the end, in short, of the policy of dividing the world among the Great Powers, the end of the arrogated suzerainty of the large nations over the small, of the strong over the weak,—the end of Imperialism.

The Paris Conference is ending none of these imperialistic evils. In fact, it accepts them and proposes to make them permanent. The acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine amply proves this fact.

Originally promulgated by President Monroe as a protection against the "Holy Alliance," against depredations of the monarchic nations of Europe in the Americas, the Monroe Doctrine has in the course of history developed into something altogether different. Originally a means for defense of republican rights, it has become a means for defense of American capital, a means of aggression against the small republics of Central and South America. President Cleveland, in the Venezuela dispute with Great Britain, altered the Monroe Doctrine; President Roosevelt, in his policy of aggression toward Colombia and the Caribbean republics, definitely transformed the Monroe Doctrine into an instrument of Imperialism; while President Woodrow Wilson has definitely completed the imperialistic transformation of Roosevelt by emphasizing the control of the United States in Central and South America. The Doctrine is now a means of assuring American capital priority of "rights" in Central and South America and of collecting usurious debts from weak governments.

The Monroe Doctrine, as President Wilson has made clear through Secretary of State Lansing, "is a national doctrine of the United States." This "national doctrine" arrogates to the United States hegemony over the American continents and abrogates the full independence of the other American republics. The abrogation of full national autonomy is necessary to any real League of Nations; but this must be accomplished by the free will of the nations concerned (which is impossible under Capitalism, realizable only through International Socialism.) The abrogation implied in the Monroe Doctrine, however, and incorporated in the "covenant" of the League of Nations, is imposed upon these nations by the might of Imperialism.

The minor American Republics, presumably, are to be included in the League. But their dependence upon the United States is recognized by this very League: how, then, is this a real League of Nations?—which must be a league of autonomous nations and free peoples.

This acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine by the Paris Conference is characteristic. The Conference is dividing the world among the five Great Powers. These Powers are to control the League absolutely through having five out of nine delegates on the Executive Council, a clear majority—and that in a League which is to include fifty or sixty other nations! This control (which makes the League an imperialistic alliance of five nations) is to maintain a particular Imperialism in supremacy, and to parcel out the world. The United States is to have hegemony over the American continents. Priority of "rights" is recognized in Europe for France and Italy, for Great Britain in any desirable part of the world, and for Japan in China. These are the deeds of reaction that mock the words of progress frequently and unctuously indulged in by the Peace Conference at Paris.

Left Wing and I. W. W.

THE world is in crisis, which needs the most resolute energy and flaming initiative of the conscious proletariat, imposes the imperative necessity of a concentration of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat for action and the conquest of power. This revolutionary unity is the order of the day. How accomplish this unity, this concentration of the real revolutionary forces of the proletariat? Our Russian comrades answer, in their proposal for an International Communist Congress and the New International of revolutionary Communist Socialism. The unity and concentration of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat must proceed upon the basis of general Bolshevik theory and tactics, in accord with the experience of the proletarian revolution in Russia and in Germany. The old concepts of petty bourgeois Socialism and Anarcho-Syndicalism have been consumed, while incomplete concepts of the Revolution have been completed, tempered by the revolutionary fires into the irresistible, flaming sword of the proletariat in action.

The conscious rebel has learned from the experience of the proletarian revolution in Russia and in Germany,—including the Bolsheviks themselves. The concepts of mass action and proletarian dictatorship in theory assume definite form in their realization as life itself. Theoretically, Marxism is in action in the proletarian revolution; partly, I. W. W.-ism; but each in a developed form, in definite expression, compelling an adaptation and revision of the old by the compulsion of experience. Marx projected the necessity of a new proletarian state and the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat; the proletarian revolution has developed this by organizing the form of this state,—the transitional state of the organized producers, the federated Soviets, implicit in Marxism and the Paris Commune, but in its final, definite form. The Soviet Government (which is itself temporary, serving the political function of suppressing the counter-revolution and crushing the old order) is developing a new "government" side by side with itself, the industrial administration of communist Socialism,—as projected in the concepts of industrial unionism. This, say the I. W. W.'s, confirms our theory; it does, but only partly, since the decisive thing is the character of the transition period, the means by which the proletariat constructs the industrial state of Socialism. And the experience of the proletarian revolution demonstrates (and is confirmed in theory) that the construction of this industrial "state" proceeds after the conquest of the power of the state by the revolutionary proletariat, under the control of proletarian dictatorship. And this vital phase of the revolution is not included in the old I. W. W. concepts,—although, perhaps, implicit; but there are I. W. W.'s who refuse to draw or emphasize this implication. . . .

There has been no revolutionary group in America who possessed the whole of the theory and practice of the Bolshevik-Spartacan revolution. And most of these groups still cling to their old concepts. There is now only one revolutionary group in complete accord, in its Manifesto and Program, with Bolshevism, and that is the Left Wing of the American Socialist Party. And our task is the unity and concentration of the revolutionary forces of the American proletariat on a Bolshevik-Spartacan basis.

Our contributor, Harold Varney, regrets "the growing coolness between our revolutionists of the Left Wing and our revolutionists of the I. W. W." But it is not the Left Wing that is cool to the I. W. W.—it is the I. W. W. that is cool to the Left Wing. Varney accuses us of "with deliberate evasiveness" having "endorsed 'revolutionary unionism'" and not specifically named the I. W. W. This is unjust. There is but one revolutionary industrial unionism in action, and that is the I. W. W.—a fact clear to all except the fool and the hypocrite. The Left Wing makes it clear that the I. W. W. is a vital phase of our revolutionary movement; but in the measure that the I. W. W. clings simply to its old concepts and refuses to supplement them with the concepts of the proletarian revolution in action, in that measure must the Left Wing assume a critical attitude toward the I. W. W., in the interest of the concentration of the revolutionary forces of the American proletariat on the basis of the proletarian revolution itself.

It is not the Left Wing, but the I. W. W. (that is to say, certain of the "leaders" of the I. W. W.) who repudiate the experience of Bolshevik-Spartacan practice. . . .

Varney himself makes this clear. Speaking of the disputes between the Parliamentarians and the Industrialists (and the Bolshevik Left Wing in the Socialist Party is a development of the old Industrialist Left Wing of the Party) Varney concludes:

Then came Bolshevism. With immortal letters of blood and iron, it wrote the answer to the problem. With the ruthlessness of destiny, it closed the doors of an epoch. Socialism was no longer hypothetical.

It came. And when it came, it was not Parliamentary. Victorious Bolshevism scrapped the State and proclaimed itself Industrialist. The controversy was no longer debatable. Russia gave to the American Industrialists the unanswerable argument of fact.

It did—but only in one sense: that the revolutionary proletariat must destroy the political state and establish an industrial "state." But this was not accomplished as the I. W. W. proposed (organize the majority of the workers industrially and then seize industry) but by means of revolutionary mass action, the conquest of the power of the state, proletarian dictatorship, and the organization of a partly political (proletarian) government under whose protection the new industrial state proposed by industrial unionism is being organized.

In this we see a confirmation and a supplementary of the I. W. W. concepts. But Varney says:

Possibly, the I. W. W., of all the world's movements, was shaken least by Bolshevism. . . . The final link in I. W. W. theory had been forged at last. But there was nought in the new happenings to compel a revision of belief. The I. W. W. had always been anti-parliamentary. The I. W. W. had always sought Industrialism. The I. W. W. had always preached Bolshevism while the Bolsheviks were themselves groping. [Surely this is vividly imaginative.] . . . The I. W. W. knew that Bolshevism was but the Russian name for I. W. W.

This arrogant assumption of having always possessed the "final truth," this refusal to admit that revolutionary experience has introduced a vital supplementary to the I. W. W. (an attitude equally characteristic of the moribund remnants of the S. L. P.) is wrong in fact and dangerous in practice. Bolshevism is not the Russian name for I. W. W.—and I. W. W.-ism is simply potential Bolshevism. Bolshevism does not require an I. W. W. "revision of belief," but it does impose a supplementary. That which was never adequately clear has been demonstrated by Bolshevik experience—the means for the conquest of power, the character of the transition period to Socialism. This is decisive.

"That movement will win America which reflects American economic conditions," says Varney, and proceeds to show an apparent contrast between Russia and the United States economically: precisely what the yellow Socialist did in Germany and is doing in our country. . . . "In Russia," says Varney, "the psychology of the situation indicated mass political action as the means of proletarian expression. In America and Britain, mass political action is unprecedented: mass unionism is the traditional proletarian weapon." But when unionism becomes revolutionary, it attacks Capitalism; it must use its power to conquer the state; its action then becomes political and develops into revolutionary mass action. Unionism is simply a phase of the proletarian revolution: mass action unites and concentrates the organized and unorganized masses for the conquest of power. Varney is still confused on the means: not the seizure of industry by the industrial unions (how utopian to imagine you can ever organize the overwhelming majority of the workers under Capitalism in industrial unions!) but the seizure of the power of the state by means of revolutionary mass action—that constitutes the tactic of the militant proletariat. The proletarian movement must be political in the revolutionary sense (parliamentarism being simply a phase.) It is not a problem of differences in the emphasis of industrial development, but of Capitalism and the proletarian struggle. The tactics of the international revolutionary proletariat are identical, with minor changes in emphasis determined by minor local conditions.

Let the I. W. W. align itself with the Communist International, with the policy of the Bolshevik-Spartacan revolution. Left Wing and I. W. W.! There must be unity and concentration of the revolutionary forces on a communist basis: will the I. W. W. reject this unity and concentration?

The Tactics of the Right

A National Executive Committee motion, made by N. E. C. member L. E. Katterfeld:

The "Amnesty" Conference

"That we instruct the Executive Secretary to cancel immediately all arrangements for the proposed 'Amnesty' Conference."

Comment: The proposal for an "Amnesty" Conference has fallen flat. The revolutionary elements both within and without our Party repudiate it.

They realize the foolishness of flirting with "liberal" and "reform" organizations that support Capitalism and deny the class struggle, to free the victims of the class war.

A Socialist Party Convention can accomplish far more for our imprisoned comrades than any "Amnesty" Conference that has not even power to act.

Our own membership look upon the proposal as a clumsy attempt to side-track the Party Convention for which there is a real need.

Under these circumstances an Amnesty Conference would be a miserable fizzle.

Waste no more of the Party's funds on it. Concentrate on the task of building our own organization to gain power for the working class. Then will the prison doors open and our comrades go free.

Levien — Bavarian Bolshevik

THE dominating personality in the proletarian dictatorship recently proclaimed in Munich, Bavaria, which is now engaged in a desperate civil war, is the Spartacan-Communist Dr. Levien. An interesting picture is given of Comrade Levien in *The Nation* by Oswald Garrison Villard (who is a bourgeois liberal, for which allowances must be made.) Mr. Villard is writing of a session of the Bavarian Congress of Workers' and Soldiers' Councils, held February 28, two days after the assassination of Kurt Eisner:

The session today of the Councils-Congress, composed of delegates from the Soldiers', Workmen's, and Peasants' Councils through the country, which was to have yielded its revolutionary control to the dispersed Landtag, was quite exciting in itself. Suddenly from the left there burst in armed men, yelling "Haende hoch!" For a moment we journalists failed to take it all in, until we were covered from the dais below and told to be quick about it. Some of these invading gentry had a revolver in each hand, and as everybody recalled the tragic events in this room just a week ago there were shouts of "Don't shoot, don't shoot!" The spectators had all been searched for arms, but we wondered, none the less, as it soon appeared that the object of the raid was the seizure of Bolshevik leaders, whether shots would not be fired, especially by the guard behind us. There are usually about eight guards to keep us in order, but when it occurred to me to look for them they had absolutely vanished. Dr. Levien and Kurt Muhsam, the two chief radicals, were seized at once. Levien was roughly thrown from his chair and beaten. The members of the Government present were as much in the dark as everybody else until the leaders of the party announced that the garrison of Munich, headed by my friend, the Minister of War, and by the commander of the city and the chief of police, had decided that the Councils-Congress should be no longer kept from doing its work by any group of Bolsheviks. The blunder was apparent at once. It certainly ends the career of the Minister of War. Fortunately, one of the youngest leaders was quick to see that if this Congress was to survive it must at once right the wrong against its parliamentary immunity. On his motion a committee was sent to demand the return of the seized members. In half an hour they were back, with Dr. Levien there—his head bound up, one hand rather swollen—and heard from his own lips what happened. They took him out into the hall, held revolvers to his breast and forehead, and told him to prepare for his end. By his coolness he probably saved his life. From others it appears that in twenty minutes he had talked his captors into lowering weapons and that by the time he was reached by the committee from the Landtag he had been freed by his guards, whom he had so thoroughly convinced of being misled that they pointed their revolvers at their own leader. Thus this *coup d'etat* came to naught.

Levien is the first real Bolshevik I have seen at close range. He is coarse, but obviously extremely able. He wears high Russian boots, and a torn and battered uniform (he served in the German army during the war), and has no income save his pay as a member of a soldiers' council. With his stained bandages he looks a pirate chief. Yet, unattractive as his personality is, his power attracts and fascinates. There was a typical young Russian woman-student literally kneeling at his feet. Levien was educated at two universities, has his Kant and Hegel at his fingers' ends, is master of three languages and three German dialects, at least, and has a splendid library (his sole possession, he says) in Switzerland, where he was studying when the war began. He knows exactly how to speak to the masses. "Why do you not make yourself dictator?" one of those present asked him. "I should need four strong men to see me through," was the reply, "and they are not to be had." He put his finger on the sore spot. There are no strong men standing at the front here; that is the great difficulty. I had already come to the belief that Levien's is the strongest personality here, unpleasant as it is. He can well afford to sit back and wait.

"France to get Syria" say the headlines; and underneath is a little paragraph explaining the word "get". We hear that the Syrians believe that the word is used in the American slang sense.

In Germany During the First Revolution

By A French War Prisoner

RUMORS in the air—rigorous suppression of all outside communication by the prison camp authorities,—here is something for informed souls to reflect upon, and for people who, by reading the papers up to that time, knew that military affairs were going from bad to worse, and that owing to the bad economic situation, a calamity indefinite as yet, but certain, threatened the monster of Capitalism and German autocracy.

Coming from some unknown source, on the evening of November 9, arrives this bit of news:—"The armistice is signed. It's all over at that." It was too good. After waiting so long for this news, no one could believe it. I leave to your imagination what kind of a night the captives passed, in anxious expectation of a confirmation. The morning of the 10th, the news was confirmed, and we prisoners were not the only ones to rejoice. The natives, with whom we were on good terms, were overjoyed—our guards forgot their duty, and all faces were beaming with happiness. But some drew back, and, not wishing to disturb the celebration, went off quietly, hiding their tears and thinking of the numberless victims—those whom they should never see again.

And yet the gaiety did not last—a cloud was spreading over the scene—other events of more serious import were expected, and soon we knew what to rely on. The revolution had first broken out in Berlin and was spreading from place to place. The sailors headed the movement vigorously. Councils of workingmen were being formed everywhere. Men came into the foreground, grouping the scattered forces about them, and led the way. The army itself lost the aspect of a flock of sheep. Discipline relaxed, the authority of the leaders was disputed, Soldiers' Councils were set up in every district. Then, inevitably meeting, these two elements,—the army and the people—united and formed Workers' and Soldiers' Councils everywhere:—*Die Arbeiter und Soldaten Rate*.—The revolutionary movement was winning. The Emperor and all his suite were fleeing to Holland. The old autocratic society was crumbling, the great military chiefs, whose strategy had failed, shrank into the background, and those who only yesterday bore such an arrogant air towards the "Gemeine," the masses, lost all dignity in their downfall.

This was the revolt of those who had been baffled, hungry, and sent out as cannon fodder, when at last their voices became too loud and too disturbing to the peace and quiet of those in power,—the revolt of those who, in the harsh undertaking of militarism, had let themselves be led too passively to the slaughter—(like many more, alas!)—and the glorious outcome of it all was the establishment of the sovereignty of the unhappy people, who now became the masters of their own fate—for which they had been considered so unfit.

What a lesson....

Such events could not be met with indifference by the prisoners of war, especially the revolutionists, who themselves were looking forward to a similar emancipation in their countries. The excitement burst forth in our camp. The new situation led us to decisive action. The revolution which had just overthrown the hateful rule of the sword, must now free us. At a meeting of all the prisoners, we drew up our demands: immediate release of all captives, lifting of the censorship, delivery of letters and parcels, information concerning the measures to be taken for our repatriation.

We were granted the first three demands, and in addition, the management of the camp was handed over to the French, with the promise of a favorable reply about repatriation after a necessary preliminary understanding with the "Soviet" of the region. In fact, a few days later, a delegation headed by the "Kommandatur" arrived, and read before the assembled prisoners a proclamation beginning with the word "Comrades!"—assuring us that we were free, urging us to maintain a standard of dignity and order, and to stay in the camp until our return. Moreover, they assured us that we should be repatriated as soon as possible, at the same time leaving those who wished to go back at once free to do so. Needless to say, many did not stay long, but went off without worrying about the difficulties of such a trip.

A few comrades and myself decided to take advantage of the opportunity of seeing what was going on with our own eyes. With a knowledge of some of the rudiments of German we set out to study and watch the revolutionary movement at close range. Our aim was to gain instruction from the events that were developing. To this, we took up our quarters in the nearest town, Ludwigsburg, where a "Soldiers' Council" had been established. There we were received by the president of this committee, and thanks to a de-rated lieutenant who had gone over to the side of

the revolutionists, and who spoke French remarkably well, we could discuss things. The representatives of the committee failed to produce any strong effect on us. We expected to see different men among the German revolutionists.—Indeed, some of them were different....—And on the question of the revolution these men spoke to us above all of the necessity of an understanding with the bourgeois classes, of class cooperation, of reforms, etc. (It is quite probable that these Social Democrats were acquainted with the program of our C. G. T.) They made it perfectly plain that what they feared most of all was "Bolshevism."

Seeing our astonishment, the de-rated officer added: "That's the way we feel here, at any rate, but if you

Turn to the Left!

Resolution of Local Queens County, Socialist Party (New York City) adopting the Left Wing Manifesto and Program:

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

Resolved, That, we, in Local Queens in Party Membership meeting assembled this 7th day of April 1919, adopt as our official expression the Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing Section of the Socialist Party Greater New York; and be it further

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

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

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

want more information, if you want to meet the active leaders of the revolution, go to Stuttgart, to the central committee of Workers' and Soldiers' Councils of Wurtemberg."

We agreed to this proposition, and, supplied with a passport, we set off for Stuttgart. It was a chance that proved of value to us. Our only guide was an address and a passport, but in the same compartment with us on the train, among a group of civilians and soldiers who should have great sympathy and consideration towards us, there was a young man, strong, well-built, shabbily clothed, who talked during the whole trip without stopping. He was giving a real lecture in favor of the revolution to those around him. He spoke of what the sailors had done in the last few weeks (he was one himself, in spite of his civilian clothes) and of the victorious march of the revolutionary movement across Germany. But from his point of view, actions must not stop there—the struggle was to be carried on until the social revolution became an actual fact.

His statement made such an impression on us, that when we arrived at Stuttgart, we went up to him frankly and told him the purpose of our journey. Immediately his face lighted up, and holding out both hands to us, he declared himself ready to take us wherever we cared to go. We walked across the city with him, talking and making ourselves understood after a fashion, and went to the Wurtemberg Chamber of Deputies—now the seat of the Central Committee of Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils. It was too early to see the secretary, so we made an appointment for later on with the members of the bureau, who received us as good comrades, and in the mean time our guide took us to see his aged mother, who seemed to get great pleasure from our visit. You may be sure that we were deeply touched by our warm reception.

Our guide, after donning his sailor's uniform, went back with us to the "Landtag," where, at the appointed time, we were brought into the presence of the secretary of the revolutionary party, a Liebknecht man. But since our command of German was most imperfect, and our German comrades knew no French at all, conversation, naturally, was not easy. Accordingly, after a somewhat limited exchange of ideas, which no one understood very well, a suggestion was made to put us in touch with Klara Zetkin, the famous German Revolutionist and Internationalist, who spoke French. They telephoned her to say that we wished to see her, which pleased her and we arranged for an interview that very evening. An automobile was placed at our disposal, and, still accompanied by our sailor

friend, we went to see Klara Zetkin. Since she lived in the suburbs of Stuttgart, in a distant villa, we had to cross part of the town, and go up along the mountainside through the woods. The night had already fallen, and we could look down over the great city as it lay spread out below, glittering in all its lights. After about half an hour's journey at fairly good speed, we reached our destination. When we rang, Klara Zetkin came to the door. Our sailor comrade introduced us, warm hand-clasps were exchanged, and we were led into a simply furnished dining room. On the walls hung pictures and silhouettes of workers at their toil. A huge dog and a great black tom-cat lay stretched out on a rug looking up at us curiously. They offered us chairs, and made us feel at home at once. "Comrades," said Klara Zetkin, "you are welcome, and I am glad to be able to talk with you. Come now, what would you like to know?"

Then we explained that we looked most favorably upon the Russian revolution, and that before going back to France, we wanted information on the causes and aims of the German revolution for our French comrades.

Here is the substance of Klara Zetkin's reply, which seemed to us that evening to be most pessimistic. She, with her long militant experience, did she foresee the bloody riots of Berlin, the death of Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, and the massacre of the German Communists by the troops of the Social-Democrats, the momentary defeat of the Spartacides?...

"For the causes of the revolution, you must see into the sufferings of the people, suffering greater than one can imagine, suffering endured since the beginning of the war, by the people who have had to reduce their needs more and more. Ah! Among the well-to-do classes, the misery of the destitute was not perceptible, although they did suffer somewhat from the shock. So much the better. Yes, it must be said that our people have suffered, and it is the excess of this suffering which made the revolution possible. A great evil for the sake of a great good... who knows?..."

"You are aware, comrades, that with us, as with you, treachery and renunciation by most widely known members of the Socialist movement, produced consternation and doubt among the masses of workers, and it is this which allowed the great crime to continue for so long. These men are largely responsible, you see, and the treachery of some of them was a great surprise to me.

"Fortunately, for the glory of the party, for the Internationale, and for Humanity, others have been able to raise the flag and to fight for the principles of human brotherhood in spite of everything. As for me, I feel that I have always done my duty as a Socialist. I have stood by the German minorities, and we did not spare our suffering, nor could persecutions and imprisonments hinder our propaganda. Wherever it was possible, we have carried the good word into the French, Russian, and Italian prison camps. And can we now hope that good results will crown our efforts?"

"The regime of autocracy has fallen indeed, the revolution seems to be victorious everywhere, but can one say how far the impulse that is behind it will carry it?... Foolish indeed would be anyone who would make prophecies under such circumstances.

"The great military chiefs cling to their privileges and influence, and are still counting on a large part of the army. The bourgeoisie is always in the foreground, and finds among our Social-Democrats invaluable aids in safeguarding its privileges. And for the struggle against the dangers which threaten the popular revolution, we are but a handful. But you can count on us to do our duty to the limit. The Spartacide groups will know how to be on the watch. And if there are people in other countries who seem to scoff because until now the revolution has been too peaceful... let them wait a while. The day when the forces of social conservation and domination try to get the upper hand, the day when our bourgeois, backed by yours, awakened from their stupor, shall try to stifle the legitimate aspirations of the people, that day, which is not far off, I am sure, they will find us before them, and there will be bloodshed. It is not to be wished for, but it is inevitable. That is why we are preparing for these coming struggles, what will be the outcome, the future alone can tell....

"As for our aims, they are yours, comrades,—we are fighting for a single cause: the abolition of empires and of armies, the absolute emancipation of the proletariat, the wiping out of the parasitic class, and the union of all the workers in the Internationale, where there will be no antagonism, no rivalry of interests."

"However sincere, however courageous we may be, we cannot succeed unless we have help from other countries. May the workers everywhere throw themselves into the revolution, and by their own progress aid us in our effort. Well, good-bye, comrades."

Labor in the War — and After

By "Half-Past Ten"

WE READ of strikes and "labor disturbances," but we hear nothing of those "faithful, loyal" workers who trusted their public servants and "patriotic" employers during the war. Here is a case which I think is classic. It lacks no detail of bureaucratic, empty promises, of patriotic-profiteering subterfuge.

In June 1918, the organized machinists of the B. F. Sturtevant Co., Hyde Park, Mass., applied to their employers for standard pay and conditions. They met refusal. Up until this time the union had been weak, having had a strike in the plant a few years previously and been beaten; but last June it was well organized again, and in a position to get the full advantage of the law of supply and demand in their commodity, labor-power. However, while the demand for labor was large and the supply small, making a condition when the price (wages) would rise, there were other conditions to be considered, conditions which abrogated this economic law. (The law is infallible when the supply of labor is large, thereby lowering wages; but is subject to human manipulation when the demand is great, thereby preventing a rise in wages.)

The country was at war. The workers were urged not to lose a minute or a motion that could further the interests of the country. It was said that the war was a war of production, that is, the side which could produce more than the other would win. It was even said that a workman was fully as important as a soldier, and that no man who had the interests of his country at heart would lose a day, an hour, or a minute of working time, much less strike and penalize an essential industry. That, it was said, would mean sacrificing the lives of their dear ones who were perhaps dying for want of the materials which the workers alone make. . . . You know the arguments, the Four-Minute Men told you all about it.

But some workers in different plants all over the country *did* strike—and won. Notably at Bridgeport, and in the ship-yards. They had been widely condemned, but got their rates and conditions. The general trend of public opinion, according to the voluble portion of the public, did not favor the use of power by labor. The consensus of opinion was that labor should wait in patience until after the war before resorting to extreme measures. (I never heard any one advocate that the employers should give the men what they wanted, and that the employers' side of the case would be adjusted after the war. The argument was all the other way.)

Having digressed somewhat to recall the conditions prevailing at the time, I shall resume the story.

Sturtevant's machinists had applied to the company for standard pay and wages, and been refused. They submitted their case to the War Labor Board, created

to handle precisely this class of dispute during the war. The case was referred to them because of the prevailing conditions. It was dangerous, for that matter, for the men to consider a strike at that time. The cry of "pro-German" would greet every move of the workers to improve conditions or at any protest against conditions. This cry of "pro-German" has since been shown to have been started by those who were "on the pig's back," at any indication that they were to lose their privileges. Even the "people's representatives" in Congress were subject to their dirty, crafty attack. Moreover, there were special laws passed at this time, such as the so-called Work or Fight law. In theory all males of draft age were compelled to work 36 hours weekly at some essential occupation. But there weren't any millionaires coming to our shop to wheel a truck. Some store clerks, who had to give up their former jobs and do "menial" work, have been fired since the armistice; I don't know what they are doing now. There were also stringent laws against "sedition." The army was raised through the Selective Draft. If a man had a family, he was given deferred classification. The threat was made in several papers that in case of a strike, the men would be drafted and placed in labor battalions, and put to work at their regular occupations on army pay.

You remember these conditions, and more which I have omitted. They all acted to prevent the men from striking to better their conditions. . . .

The War Labor Board considered the case of the Machinists and the Sturtevant Co. It sent a conciliator, Mr. Sullivan, to adjust matters. He obtained a temporary increase of 15% for the men and a promise that there would be a further adjustment whereby the men would get the standard pay of the craft, when the Board had decided the question as a whole in conjunction with other plants doing the same kind of work. Sturtevant was and still is one of those noble institutions believing in the sacred right of private contract. There are no two men getting the same rate for the same work.

The union stirred up the War Labor Board from time to time for a decision. But the Board delayed from day to day, week to week, month to month, reserving a decision for one reason or another.

Then the armistice was signed. Everybody was hysterically happy. That is, all the workmen were. I can't speak for the others. There was no work that day. We got the band out and paraded the town. In our working clothes, a cheering howling mob. We knew some of us would lose our jobs on account of the war's end. But what did any man care for a job when he knew that the workers no longer would be driven to be killed and to kill? In all, it was a

glorious day, but it was the day when the tables were turned on the workers. Where previously they had the power, if only they had used it, to enforce their demands, from that day on this power was gone. Their strategic position due to the war was no more.

It is true that another Four-Minute Man came to the shop, saying, "Stick to your jobs." He had word "direct from Washington" that our company "had contracts for three years more of Government work," and that the men were going to get a "square deal." What he told us about the demobilization of the army and its effect on the labor situation went right over our heads. We didn't get the threat—that is, some of us didn't.

Well, the union gave the War Labor Board another gentle prod to render a decision; in fact, several prods. There was also a tightening of discipline in the shop. Demobilization was going on. The "labor market" was "easing," the time was about right for the "law of supply and demand" to become operative *as applied to labor*. . . . Anyone who said too much now was Bolshevik; jail him, if possible, fire him at least. Plenty of labor. Lot's of it. Hire men cheaper, in fact. . . .

The union agitated the War Labor Board again and again; finally it secured a decision. The Board decided that the men should have standard rates, and that they should be retroactive. But the Board rendered no decision as to who should pay the men's back wages due under their decision. The management of Sturtevant say they cannot pay, that it is up to the Government to pay. They made their price using the old wage as a basis. (Their price to the Government was 70% above list prices, in some instances.) They cannot pay, cannot afford to pay; their argument is that as the Government decided the men should get more pay, the Government should provide the means.

The union applied to the Navy Department for whom the work was done, and were notified by Secretary Daniels that the Department would not pay.

The union has had legal advice that nothing can be done about it.

Apparently, nothing doing. A strike would be welcome to the company now, as all other departments would continue to work, and the condition of the labor market is such that they could probably break a strike and put the union out of business.

Meanwhile the men have practically given up hope. They have a "moral victory." It is conceded that the money is due them. The only trouble is that nobody will pay it, nor even agree who should pay it. Try it on your landlord or grocer. Tell him you concede the amount of the bill, but that some one else should pay it. I think this could be worked out into a system. If he puts you in jail for not paying him, call him a Bolshevik. That will shut him up.

Debs and Developing Mass Action in Toledo

By A. Schwarzenfeld

Secretary, Workers', Soldiers' and Sailors' Council

THE final speech of Eugene Debs, before going to prison, was to have been made in Toledo on March 30. Arrangements were made to meet Debs at Union Station Sunday morning. Mayor Schreiber declared that no demonstration would be permitted and that Debs could not speak in Memorial Hall. We decided to proceed with matters as arranged, and the names of twenty Reds were secured who were willing to go to prison.

Sunday morning was chilly, but all went to the station at ten o'clock. More than one thousand workers were there waiting for Debs. Word came that Debs was ill, but would come on the afternoon train. Then Comrade Mike Toohey, the local Socialist Party organizer, spoke to the crowd in the station for fifteen minutes. A police lieutenant threatened to arrest him if he did not stop speaking. I was asked to be ready to speak if Toohey was arrested. It was then decided to parade to Socialist Hall—a line four blocks long, singing revolutionary songs. "Down with the capitalists!" "Three cheers for the Bolsheviks!" We passed a police station, and two patrol wagons joined the parade. . . .

Socialist Hall was packed with workers and enthusiasm. The announcement was made that 300 Reds from Detroit were coming to Toledo in two special cars, and 500 of us went to the station to greet the reinforcements. Cheers and shouts greeted the Detroit comrades, an impromptu meeting was held, and then we adjourned to Socialist Hall, the situation being explained by Bob Topping, Treasurer of the Communist Propaganda League. On the way we passed Memorial Hall—5000 people were waiting for the hall to open to hear Debs. Here we got the news that thirty speakers had been arrested. The 300 Reds from Detroit were marshalled by the soldiers; and as they neared the hall the sang an adaptation of "The Red

Flag:" "Hold the jail for we are coming, Socialists stand firm; Side by side we battle onward, Victory will come." I began to speak, while the Detroit comrades held hands to prevent the police breaking through. Then the crowd swept the police away. I climbed a tree to speak, when detectives placed me under arrest. Six of the Detroit comrades went on sympathetic arrest. Then the crowd spoke; six policemen "went on strike," and six were injured, three being taken to the hospital. The crowd was beyond control—by the police.

At the prison we learned that more than seventy comrades were in cells. We organized a Soviet, and elected delegates to negotiate with the Chief of Police. Reports of events reached us. The police refused

to arrest any more Socialists, although a dozen Yipsel lassies insisted upon being arrested as a protest. The crowd took things into its own hands, and marched toward the prison, in spite of the soldiers. At the prison, the crowd demanded the immediate release of the imprisoned Socialists, under threat of breaking into the prison. After a parley, the Chief of Police agreed to release all the Socialists. In the waiting room, an American soldier said: "I went across to fight for democracy, and I'm still fighting for it." The Chief of Police then tried to "put one over" by keeping under arrest for assault a Detroit comrade. We insisted and the crowd insisted under threat of action, that all should be released. Then came a demand from the crowd that I should speak, and this ultimatum broke the will of the Chief of Police. All were released on our own terms. I spoke to the crowd about the necessity of Workers and Soldiers Councils; fifteen thousand men and women, with raised hands, signaled their intention to join.

This mass demonstration lasted two and one half hours. I believe it is the first time in the United States that 75 men under arrest were released two hours after arrest upon the threatening demand of a mass of people, acting on its own initiative. . . . One of the Detroit comrades expressed their sentiments thus: "When we read in the leaflet of the Workers', Soldiers' and Sailors' Councils that you were trying to develop mass action, our 'theoreticians' in Detroit said that mass action is mob action, and doesn't get anywhere. I see now that six months' agitation for mass action may bring preliminary results. If any one now wants me to tell them how mass action acts, I'll tell them I saw an elementary form of mass action that took 75 men out of jail." Out of this crude expression of mass action will develop the higher and final form, for the Revolution.

May Day Edition

May Day Edition of *The Revolutionary Age*, containing special articles and a proclamation to the workers appropriate for that day. A real propaganda number.

- May Day Leaflet

along similar lines to be used for free distribution at meetings, etc. We should make this an edition of a million.

Book your orders early.

The Revolutionary Age Book Dept

885 Washington St.

Boston, Mass.

Soviet Russia and the World

By L. C. A. K. Martens

Representative in the United States of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic

IN THE darkest hours of trial of the Russian Workers Revolution, during the past year, when the Russian masses striving for industrial freedom and brotherhood of men met with savage attacks, not only physical but in the form of an organized campaign of lies and abuse all over the world, the aim of which was to estrange the Russian masses from their fellow workers throughout the world and forever to discredit the cause of Socialism, the broad masses in America intuitively felt the injustice of the attacks and courageously they spoke out their minds in the face of the vilifiers. This the Russian people know, and they will not forget it. They take it as proof of the fact that international solidarity of the workers is not an empty word, but it is based on real common interests which make laboring masses in different parts of the world, in spite of language, race and national differences, understand their common aspirations.

Soviet Russia has now been in existence almost a year and a half. It has left behind itself the preliminary stages of the revolution. It has become deeply rooted in the consciousness of the workers and peasantry of Russia. Its power within Russia cannot be challenged by any group of opponents on their own accord. The forces of the enemies of the people are badly disrupted. Only with the help of foreign bayonets is it possible for a small group of former exploiters of Russia to make a stand against the united forces of the working people.

But the Russian workers know who are those Kolchaks, Denikines, Semenovs and others who are striving to overthrow the Soviet. They know that they represent the Russia of the Czar and the landlords, the Russia of the knout, the Russia which has gone forever and never will arise again. They know by experience that wherever the Kolchaks and Semenovs have even temporarily succeeded in establishing themselves it has spelt new slavery for the workers in those territories. This is one of the reasons why Soviet Russia not only has gained the unqualified and determined support of all the laboring masses of Russia, who are willing to give their lives in defence of the achievements of the workers revolution, but it has also lately convinced former opponents of the Government, such as "right wing" Social Revolutionaries and "Mensheviks" not only of the futility of the opposition to the Soviets and of armed intervention, but of the great dangers it involves to all liberty in Russia.

In Russia proper today you find no elements of any importance who are in favor of intervention. It

is also no secret I divulge, when I say that workers in military uniform who have been sent to Russia from other countries to fight the Soviets, after having been told that they are there in order to liberate the Russian people from the oppression of the Bolsheviks, can find there scarcely anyone who wants to be thus "liberated," but that on the contrary, the people want to be liberated from the Kolchaks. This has made many of the workingmen in uniforms quite puzzled, and I am sure that they are as eager to be friendly with the Russian workers as the Russian workers are eager to be friendly with them. The Russian workers cannot conceive why people of other countries can stand being induced to support reaction in Russia, and they are gratified to find that in every country in the world there is a determined will among the masses to end military intervention in Russian affairs.

After having established themselves physically and politically, and after having gotten the moral support of the vast majority of the Russian workers and peasantry, the Soviets are now confronted with the tremendous problem of reorganizing the economic forces of the country on the basis of common interest of the toiling masses without an opportunity for exploitation of labor. The great work of reconstruction has been hampered not only by the natural difficulties of the transition period, and by lack of many materials due to the economic isolation of Russia, but the necessity of defending the country against encroachments has of course also absorbed much energy which could have been used in constructive work. This is one additional reason why the Russian workers expect intervention in Russia to come to a speedy end, and I want to say right here that those who have been instrumental in making the Russian people expend much energy for the military defence of the country to the detriment of economic reconstruction are the last ones who have a moral right to blame or to accuse the Soviet Government of Russia for any shortcomings that may be found in its work.

In spite of all obstacles, however, we are seriously organizing all our powers in the work of reconstruction. Today when Soviet Russia sends her representative to the United States to establish economic relations between those two countries it does so conscious of her strength and of the problems involved.

The purpose of the Russian workers is to create in Russia prosperity and freedom and by their example of the ability of the working class to manage their own affairs, in practice to demonstrate the soundness of the principles of Communistic Socialism.

Efforts have been made to picture Soviet Russia as a menace to the peoples of the world, as a new militaristic power, which has designs for supremacy everywhere. Those who take such a stand either are unable or unwilling to understand the real nature of the aspirations among the suffering masses in the world. When we received the news of Hungary's having established a working class government along the lines of the Russian Soviet, we who know the facts, know that the revolution of Hungary was not as the Russian revolution was not, a thing engineered by a few agitators. The opponents of the workers revolutions, it seems to me, are either too profuse in their estimation of the genius and abilities of Bolshevik propagandists or then they quite pitifully underestimate the intelligence of people in their countries, when they believe or pretend to believe that social revolutions here or there can be accomplished just by having a Bolshevik propagandist deliver a few talks and spend a little money in propaganda matters. Revolutions are not being made that way. They spring out of the social conditions in each and every place. Just as the Soviet Revolution was the only logical outcome of the determination of the Russian workers to free themselves from terrible oppression, which they knew could not be abolished by retaining the foundations of the old social order, and the Soviet Government thus became the only hope of the downtrodden people, so the Hungarian revolution is an elementary force springing out of the conditions in that country.

The Russian revolution has been the object of attention in every country in the world. Much has been said about it and very much which is not true. It will be one of my main objects to place the Russian situation before the people of America in the light of actual facts, and I want once more to express my conviction that American workingmen and women, who up till now determinedly have refused to join in the chorus of vilification of the Russian revolution, will in the future as well retain their sympathy toward the Russian workers, and that they will translate this sympathy into an attitude of understanding and support towards my efforts to establish friendly relations between America and Soviet Russia, thereby letting Soviet Russia profit from cooperation with the rest of the world and letting the rest of the world profit from cooperation with Soviet Russia.

Problems of the Soviet Representative

By Nicholas I. Hourwich

THE conscious American proletariat the other day greeted the appointment of a representative of the Socialist Republic of Russia. Celebrations of this event are still going on. Everywhere meetings are being held to greet the Soviet Ambassador. Socialist and labor organizations all over the country are sending telegrams of greeting, letters promising aid and co-operation in every way that may assist the cause of Soviet Russia, represented here by L. C. A. K. Martens, which is actually the cause of the conscious proletariat of the world,—the cause of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

But the revolutionary Socialist organizations of the American proletariat would make a fatal error if they, starting with the idea that someone, without their aid, would take care of revolutionary Russia, limit themselves simply to greetings and promises. They must not fail to translate this into revolutionary activity.

Not for a single moment do we doubt the great importance of the purely diplomatic activity of the Soviet representative. Still less are we inclined to doubt the magic power of Russian gold—the magic influence of this gold upon the minds and attitude of the American plutocracy, which has already manifested itself in an obvious manner. . . . But, with all due allowances for this, we consider it necessary to sound a warning to the American workers—and to Comrade Martens himself—against exaggerating the importance of purely diplomatic and commercial activity here. We consider that it would be a fatal mistake should these purely diplomatic-commercial efforts become the centre of his activity.

Evidently, as concerns "diplomatic" activity, Comrade Martens himself does not entertain any sentimental illusions. In an interview issued by him the other day, he definitely and unequivocally stated: "The Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic does not care about political recognition by the United States. . . . All that we want is trade recognition." Comrade Martens perfectly understands that, in a

world of capitalistic relations, commerce "is the real thing, and all else—nonsense." "Commerce" will create definite social-economic relations, a definite "equilibrium of social forces," after which, as Comrade Martens puts it, "the flag—that is, political recognition—will follow."

We would like to go a little further with this absolutely correct, truly Marxian reasoning. We should like to emphasize that commerce itself, that is, the establishment of commercial relations between Russia and the United States, in its turn, will come only as a result of definite social relations, the establishment of a definite equilibrium of social forces,—the very equilibrium on which depends the success itself and the salvation of the Russian Revolution, in general.

Comrade Lenin has repeatedly declared that the final triumph (or, inversely, the ruin) of the proletarian revolution in Russia depends on *whether the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and proletarian revolutions in other countries come to the aid of the Russian Revolution*. And in this one finds the key to an understanding of the present political situation.

If revolutionary movements of the proletariat in other countries conquer, then the conquests of the Russian Revolution, the Russian Socialist Soviet Republic, will be saved; and, as a result, of course, will come "commercial and trade" relations and all sorts of other relations. If, on the contrary, revolutionary proletarian movements in other countries fail, a mortal blow will be struck at the Russian Revolution. And, in that event, "commercial and trade" relations will not help. We ought not to forget that the capitalist world, including capitalist America, is not very anxious for commercial relations with Socialist Russia, since the cherished hope of the capitalist world is something greater—to crush the revolutionary resistance of the Russian proletariat, to suppress Socialism

in Russia, and then swallow the whole of Russia, with all her commerce, trade and natural resources.

In the prevailing political situation, the revolutionary movement of the proletariat is the main thing, the centre of gravity; *it is everything*, both in the interests of proletarian Russia and in the interests of the emancipation of the proletariat of the world. The success or failure of the proletarian movement, *the growth of the Bolshevik movement* in countries still ruled by Capitalism, is serving, at this moment, as a barometer of the "favorable" or hostile attitude of capitalist governments toward Soviet Russia.

The establishment of commercial and trade relations between Russia and capitalist countries, with all its independent value for the economic life of Russia, is, for Russia, similar to the signing of the Brest-Litovsk treaty—a means to "win time." . . .

All this, in our opinion, draws the "line of behavior" for the revolutionary Socialist organizations of the proletariat in America, as well as for Comrade Martens as representative of the Russian Soviet Government.

The centre of his attention, the compass directing his activity here into proper channels, should serve the interests of the revolutionary Socialist movement of the American proletariat, the interests of the advance guard of the movement—the *left or Bolshevik wing of the American Socialist Party*.

We are fully aware in his manifold activity, Comrade Martens may not always or frequently be in a position to act openly and definitely *under the banner* of the left wing, though, *essentially*, he should always go under that banner; but he must carefully look after and be on the lookout in order not to give the prestige of Soviet Russia to the right wing, to the moderates and social-opportunists, and thereby, perhaps unconsciously, stab the left wing in the back. It is this left wing which is the bulwark and hope of proletarian Russia, which Russia has called to its International Communist Congress.

Imperialism — the Final Stage of Capitalism

(Continuation)

By N. Lenin

Translated from the Russian by Andre Tridon

IN FRANCE the domination of the financial oligarchy, (a book by Lysis, entitled *Against the Financial Oligarchy of France*, went thru five editions in 1908) assumes a slightly different form. Four leading banks have the exclusive right to issue stock. They constitute in fact a trust of large banks. That monopolistic combine reaps monopolistic profits from every emission of paper. When they float loans, the country in favor of which the emission is made never receives more than 90% of the actual cash subscribed. The banks receive a middlemen's commission of 10%. These banks made a profit of 8% on the Russian-Chinese loan of 400,000,000 francs, 10% on the Russian loan of 1904 amounting to 800,000,000, 18 3/4% on the Moroccan loan of 1904 amounting to 62,500,000.

Capitalism whose rise began with the small usurer reaches its last stage of development with usury on a gigantic scale. Lysis calls the French the usurers of Europe. All the conditions of economic life are deeply affected by this new avatar of Capitalism. Even if the population, the industries, commerce and marine transportation should stagnate, "the country could grow rich by making usurious loans." Fifty men, representing 8 million francs, control two billion francs deposited in four banks. The "participation" system which we have already explained has the following results: one of the leading banks, the Societe Generale, issued 64,000 bonds of a "daughter-concern" the Egyptian Refining Works. The bonds were issued at 150, which means that the bank made fifty cents on every dollar. The dividends of that concern proved to be fictitious and the public lost in that deal between 90 and 100 million francs. One of the directors of the Societe Generale was a member of the directing board of the Refining Works. Little wonder that the author we are quoting from should remark that "the French Republic is a financial monarchy; its financial oligarchy is all-powerful; it dominates both the press and the government." (51)

The very profitable issuance of securities, which is one of the main functions of finance capital, plays a most important role in the development and the acquisition of power by the financial oligarchy. "There is not one form of business activity" to quote the German magazine *Bank* "which assures as high profits as the flotation of foreign loans." (52)

"There is no bank operation which is as profitable as the issuance of securities." According to the *German Economist*, the flotation of industrial securities has brought in the following profits:

1895	38.6%
1896	36.1%
1897	66.7%
1898	67.7%
1899	66.9%
1900	55.2%

"From 1801 to 1900 the profits realized from the flotation of German industrial securities amounted to over one billion." (53)

If in prosperous times the profits of finance capital are remarkably high, in times of depression small and unprofitable enterprises go to the wall, and large banks "participate" in their purchase buying them for a song in their "rehabilitation" or "reorganization." When a bankrupt business is being "rehabilitated" its stock capital is decreased, that is the profits are divided up at a higher rate. Or if the profits dwindle down to nothing, new capital is poured in and being added to the former capital whose earning power was small, may now show profits. As Hilferding states aptly, those operations of rehabilitation and reorganization are a twofold boon for the banks: they always constitute a profitable deal and they give the banks a chance of extending their domination over embarrassed concerns.

Take for instance the Union Metallurgic Works of Dortmund, founded in 1872. Stock was issued to the amount of 40 million marks and the first year it rose to 170%, paying dividends of 12%. French capital cut in on the tune of some 28 millions. The Disconto Gesellschaft, the largest bank, whose capital amounts to 300 million marks, was instrumental in the organization of that concern. The stock of the Union Works paid no dividends. Stockholders agreed to a reorganization, that is they agreed to lose some of the money they had invested in order not to lose it all. The result was that in the past 30 years the books of the Union Works have shown a wastage of some 73 million marks which have just vanished. "At the present time the original stockholders have less than five per cent of what they originally invested but every time the concern was reorganized the banks made a little something." (53)

Another extremely profitable field for finance capital is speculation in real estate in the suburbs of fast growing towns.

Banking monopoly and transportation monopoly can here work jointly. The advance in real estate prices depends mainly upon good rail connection with the center of the town; those means of communication are controlled by large companies which, thru a system of "participation" and interlocking directorates, are allied to the banks. The resulting situation is what Eschwege, a German writer who contributes to *Bank*, describes as the "swamp;" frenzied speculation in suburban real estate, bankruptcies of building firms like Boswau and Knauer of Berlin, which secured 100 million marks thru the "solid and substantial" Deutsche Bank (the later of course working thru "participation," that is secretly, in a underhand way, and extricated itself after losing some 12 millions), the ruin of small investors and workingmen, who received nothing from the building companies, graft deals implicating the Berlin police and administration to secure information or construction permits, etc. (54)

The "American ethics" over which European professors and wellmeaning bourgeois express so much hypocritical indignation were in the age of finance capital the ethics of practically every large city in any on earth.

In Berlin in the beginning of the year 1914 a transportation trust was said to be on the point of being organized, which means that the interests of the three large transportation firms of Berlin were to be pooled: the electric railways, the trolley lines and the omnibus lines. "We knew that this was being planned," we read in *Bank*, "when we heard that the majority of the stock of the omnibus company had been acquired by the other two transportation companies. We might think that the men are engineering that deal because they hope, thru a united control of the transportation lines, to effect economies likely in the end to benefit the public. But the question is made much more complex by the fact, that back of that trustification of the transportation companies there are banks which can, if they wish, make the lines they have thus concentrated, serve their own real estate interests.

"To realize how founded this supposition is, we must remember how, at the time when the electric railway company was organized, the large bank which presided over the organization took good care of its interests. The interests of that traction company were closely bound up with those of certain real estate concerns.

"The Eastern lines of that company were to serve real estate tracts of land, which after the construction of the road that bank sold at an enormous profit for itself and a few interested individuals." (55)

As soon as monopolies establish themselves and begin to dispose of millions, they affect unavoidably every detail of the social life, regardless of political and other conditions. German economists like to boast of the honesty of the Prussian administration, and to cast aspersions upon the French "Panamas" and American political corruption. But the fact remains that conservative writers dealing with banking affairs in Germany are compelled to mention many facts which can no longer be classified as "purely financial operations" for instance the constantly increasing number of public officials who accept positions in banks. "How about the incorruptibility of the official who is longing to secure a comfortable berth in the Deutsche Bank?" The editor of *Bank*, Alfred Lansburg, wrote in 1909 an article entitled "The economic significance of Byzantinism" in which he discusses among other things William II's trip to Palestine and the "immediate consequences of that journey, the construction of the Bagdad railroad, that fatal big deal of German industry, which was more responsible for the "iron ring" which Edward VI endeavored to build around Germany, than all political failures."

Eschwege wrote in 1912 an article entitled "Plutocracy and Bureaucracy" exposing the activities of a

"Germany to pay until 1951" say the headlines. But, of course, in view of the way things are moving over in Europe this statement is to be looked on as an expression of hope rather than an actual statement of fact.

* * *

The small nations, who were all the rage some time ago, are fast losing their popularity owing to their persistent efforts to be made safe. They are to get 15% of the German indemnity divided up between them and for some strange reason they refuse to be satisfied. Belgium, in particular, is very much annoyed—but when we take into consideration the tremendous amount of advertising she got she may consider herself lucky that she is not asked to pay quite a sum to the allied press.

certain official, who was a member of the Trust Investigation Commission and who, some time after, was given a fat position with one of the trusts, the steel syndicate. Many similar cases which were not by any means fortuitous ones, compelled this conservative writer to admit that "the economic freedom guaranteed by the German constitution in many fields of economic life, is a meaningless phrase," and that when the plutocracy joins hands with the government "the broadest kind of political freedom cannot prevent us from becoming a nation of slaves" (57)

As far as Russia is concerned, I shall only give one example; several years ago, all the papers announced that a certain Davidof, director of the Credit Chancery, had left the government service to accept a position with one of the large banks at a salary which within very few years would make a sum of over a million rubles. The credit Chancery is an administrative office whose duty is to "unify the activities of the credit institutions of the government" and which subsidizes the Petrograd and Moscow banks to the tune of 800 to 1000 millions. (58)

Capitalism creates a distinction between the mere owning of capital and the placing of capital at the disposal of industry, between currency and industrial and commercial capital, between the capitalist living solely on the income from his money and the active business-men of all kinds putting capital at work.

Imperialism, that is the hegemony of finance capital, is a further step in Capitalism, which increases that distinction a thousandfold. The domination exerted by finance capital upon all the other forms of capital gives a commanding position to the pure and simple capitalist and to the financial oligarchy, it divides up governments into those which dispose of financial power and those which do not.

The statistics of stock flotations reveal to us the extent of that phenomenon.

In the "Bulletin of the Institute of International Statistics," A. Neumarck has published the most detailed and complete information about the issuance of securities the world over, information which has been frequently made use of in economic writings. Here are the totals for the past four decades.

Issues of paper for every decade in billions of francs.

1871—1880	76.1
1881—1890	64.5
1891—1900	100.4
1901—1910	197.8

In the seventies, the amount of paper issued was inflated by the loans floated as a consequence of the Franco-Prussian war and by the commercial activity of Germany. Generally speaking, the increase in the amount of securities was not especially rapid in the first three decades. It was only in the last mentioned decades that amounts total up very high, showing an almost twofold increase between 1901 and 1910. The dawn of the 20th century proves to be the turning point not only in the development of monopolies, cartels, syndicates and trusts of which we spoke in previous chapters, but also in the growth of finance capital.

Neumarck estimates at 815 billion francs the total value of securities held all over the world in 1910. Making allowance for probable duplication he reduces that figure to 575 or 600 billions. The table below indicates the holding for each country in billions of francs.

England	142	}	479
United States	132		
France	110		
Germany	95		
Russia			31
Austria Hungary			24
Italy			14
Japan			12
Holland			12.5
Belgium			7.5
Spain			7.5
Switzerland			6.25
Denmark			3.75
Sweden, Norway, Rumania and others			2.5

Total 600,000,000,000 francs

We can see at once that four wealthiest nations with holdings of from 100 to 150 billions are in a class apart. Two of them are the oldest nations and have the largest colonial empire: France and England. The other two are the most up to date capitalist nations as regards the development and growth of capitalistic monopolies in industry: the United States and Germany. Those four nations put together hold 470 billions worth of securities, that is almost 80% of the entire finance capital of the world. The rest of the nations stand in the position of debtors and vassals to the international bankers of those four nations, the four pillars of finance capital.

(To be continued)

Left Wing or I. W. W.—The Way to Unity

By Harold Lord Varney

(See Editorial, Page Three)

ONE cannot but regret the growing coolness between our revolutionists of the Left Wing and our revolutionists of the I. W. W. The bonds of sympathy seem straining. The hope for unity seems doomed. Aloofness is giving way to rivalry, and a situation which, a few brief weeks ago, seemed freighted with the possibility of a new and solidified alignment of all revolutionary forces, now threatens to repeat the old-time blunder and perpetuate the old time weakness of division.

How often it has happened in the labor movement of America that, not principles, but *men* have kept us apart. How manifold have been the struggling little groups which only lived to glut the vanity of their egoistic chiefs. They crowd the museum of our memories. The tragedy of labor has not been written by its adversaries. It has been self-created, and every defeat has been self-inflicted by labor's fatal division. For generations, one ineffable need has clangored in our ears. It has been unity which we lacked.

Not that the labor movement has not realized the problem. Picas for unity have been prolific. Programs have been haunted by the over-mastering desire to unite. Conferences have been summoned and delegates have gathered and departed—but always in vain. Unity has been a sentiment, but never a program. The divisions have been too stark.

And so the labor history of America has run its turbid course. Secessions have followed secessions, and with every crisis, new and puny groups have sprouted into autonomy. S. L. P. and S. T. & L. A.: Social Democracy and Socialist Party; I. W. W. and W. I. I. U.: Syndicalist League and One Big Union; Red Socialist and Yellow Reformist; Left Winger and Bolshevik. These are but the notable names in a long, forgotten scroll of schism.

But for this division, there has hitherto been a certain justification. Apart from personalities, the labor movement has been muddled in its ideology. On one issue at least, there has been a traditional cleavage of thought. On one side were the Parliamentarians: on the other were the Industrialists.

The Parliamentarians were obsessed with a political, geographical concept of the new society. They visioned a perpetuation of the existing state. Their propaganda was non-proletarian: their pleas were made to the workers as consumers—rather than to the workers as producers. They reduced the revolution to the absurd simplicity of the casting of a vote. Through long, sterile years, they exhausted their momentum in hectic and hopeless political attempts. In this group, belonged all the political Socialists and many of the present Left Wingers.

The Industrialists, on the contrary, were anti-Statists. They sought an industrial democracy—not a political millenium. The future society, to the Industrialist, was a world organized on the scaffold of a super-industrial union. Representation would follow the industry, not the map. A generation ago, the minds of the Industrialists had already emancipated themselves from the fetish of politics. They had already envisaged the distinction between the parliamentary and the industrial forms of Socialism. The industrial point of view found its reflection in a succession of left wing secessions: the S. L. P.—the I. W. W.—the Red split of 1912.

Until 1917, this breach was insuperable. It was a theoretical contrast and Parliamentarians and Industrialists clung stoutly to their formulas, justifying their belief by arguments which blinked the future. Theoretically, both sides proved their case. The future is an intellectual bank account which can never be overdrawn. But the dispute ended in theory. No stunning, smashing argument of *fact* had intervened, to give the verdict of finality.

And so, during this pre-1917 period, the divisions in the American labor movement were taut and rigid. On the Parliamentary Right, stood the Socialist Party, overshadowing all minor groups and seemingly impervious to change. And on the Left, the Industrialists, after many racking controversies, had gradually crystallized themselves into the I. W. W. Of course, the lines were not absolute. A fringe of Parliamentarians could be found in the I. W. W. and a similar fringe of Industrialists in the Socialist Party. And a negligible portion of the more impossibilist type lurked on the outside in the S. L. P. and the W. I. I. U. But, generally speaking, the Socialist Party and the I. W. W. were the miniatures of the state of intellectual contrast in this period.

Then came Bolshevism. With immortal letters of blood and iron, it wrote the answer to the problem. With the ruthlessness of destiny, it closed the doors of an epoch. Socialism was no longer hypothetical. It came. And when it came, it was not Parliamentary. Victorious Bolshevism scrapped the State and proclaimed itself Industrialist. The controversy was no

longer debatable. Russia gave to the American Industrialists the unanswerable argument of fact.

Like a tidal wave, the beliefs of the Socialist Party began to reverse themselves. Haltingly at first—then, tumultuously, as the passing months gave permanence to the Bolshevik regime, the political Socialists abandoned Parliamentarism. Bolshevism became a band wagon and they scrambled aboard. Like all new converts to ideas which time has made hoary, they became vociferous in their protestations.

Possibly, the I. W. W., of all the world's movements, was shaken least by Bolshevism. The I. W. W. welcomed the Bolshevik triumph with the joy of the expected. The final link in I. W. W. theory had been forged at last. But there was nought in the new happenings to compel a revision of belief. The I. W. W. had always been anti-parliamentary. The I. W. W. had always sought Industrialism. The I. W. W. had preached 'Bolshevism' while the Bolsheviks themselves were still groping. And the Wabblers felt like one who had long since swum to an island of ideologic truth, as he watched the Russian swimmers coming into port. The naive exuberance with which the new left wing American Socialists began to propagate Industrialism, was naturally amusing to those who had fought the Industrialist battle for nearly a generation. Bolsheviks—the new Left Wingers styled themselves, but well the I. W. W. knew that Bolshevism was but the Russian name for I. W. W. and that, after a few flights of Left Wingism, the Socialists would learn that every road of industrial revolution leads inevitably to the Industrial Workers of the World.

"How wonderfully eloquent are facts," says Trotsky. "How utterly powerless are words." And yet, the vagueness of their program suggests that the Left Wingers of America still stand at the turnstile of words.

Now, in this formative period, while the Left Wing

The Collapse of the Old World

By Gregory Weinstein

EVEN before the Russian revolution it had become clear to every observant revolutionary Socialist that the world would enter upon a road of great social changes, and that the war, regardless of who would be the "victor," would result in revolutions in all countries. The large masses—affirmed those Socialists—will not be able, after the war, to return to their old forms of economic, political and social life. Thrown out of their conventional places, worn out by the prolonged slaughter, these masses could not but harbor in the innermost recesses of their heart a deep hatred for the order of things which forced them to die on the battlefields and starve in the rear. Tempered in the fire of battle and learning how to use arms, the masses, sooner or later, would conclude that they have sufficient means to end this order of things: it would be necessary only to turn the weapons in their hands against the adherents and defenders of the old social order which turned them into slaves and fratricides.

The march of the Russian Revolution has completely vindicated the opinions of the revolutionary Socialists. Neither the magic of the bourgeois high priests nor the hunger and suffering which have fallen to their lot through invasion by international Capitalism, could interfere with the process of the Russian people taking power into their own hands, and with it destroy the ruthless and unjust society of oppression and violence, erecting on its ruins a society of Socialist fraternity and Communist labor.

Revolutionary events in Germany are developing the same tendency. The Spartacans follow the Bolshevik policy. In Hungary and Bavaria the proletarian revolution is triumphant. All power there is in the hands of the Communists—Bolsheviks, who are working in concert with the Russian Bolsheviks. Workers in other parts of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire are ready to join the revolutionary Hungarian and Bavarian proletariat. Even Czechoslovakia, which has been the main hope of the Allies, is seething with unrest.

The Allies have their hands full. And in their own countries revolutionary unrest is brewing. Italy and France are on a volcano. And even America, having suffered less than the rest from the war, is not calm. The strike wave is not decreasing, but rises higher and higher.

The old world is in the grip of a red revolutionary movement, which is growing larger and larger from day to day. And it is not able to disengage itself from the fiery grip.

groups are shaping themselves into permanence, it is vital that they strike the keynote of the hour. The only insurance that the present Left Wing movement does not go the ephemeral way of its forerunners, will be the economic soundness of its program. Will it voice the urge of the masses? Will it hew to the ruthless line of economic facts?

My criticism is that the Left Wingers have already stumbled at this identical point. Their program is splendid in its internationalism, but it has missed the essential note that could bind it to the American proletariat. It is obsessed with Russia and it blinds itself to the truth that Russia and America are economic entities, abysmally dissimilar. It ignores the surge of the American proletariat toward unionism, rather than mass action. It savors of ideology: it overlooks the concrete problems of the shop. It speaks a European language and American labor does not understand.

That movement will win in America which reflects American economic conditions. Such a movement cannot be created by a theory. Such a movement cannot be jettied out to us from Russia. It must be a growth—an emanation from the instinctive yearnings of American industrial toilers. Emissaries and acolytes from Bolshevism need not create it. It is here—full grown and conscious. Its roots are already deeply planted in the American soil. It is the Industrial Workers of the World which has caught the genius of the American Proletarian revolution.

We have learned nothing as economists if we have not learned that nations are industrial organisms—each with a different economic skeleton. One nation is agrarian; another maritime; a third, industrial. America is both industrial and agrarian.

Men's thoughts are moulded by their means of making a livelihood. Quite naturally then, the American and British proletariat reason otherwise than the Russian. There is a contrast of thought and instinct which reflects the immense contrast of Russian and Anglo-Saxon economic institutions. In Russia, the psychology of the situation indicated mass political action as the means of proletarian expression. In America and Britain, mass political action is unprecedented: mass *unionism* is the traditional proletarian weapon. It is mass unionism which the Left Winger must himself align with if he wishes to put teeth into his theories.

The programs of the Left Wing groups have straddled this issue. And in so doing, they doomed the future of their cause.

With a deliberate evasiveness, they have endorsed 'revolutionary industrial unionism'. But this is meaningless. The Socialist Party in its political platforms has done this before them. But what union? Why suppress the name?

Is it the American Federation of Labor which the Left Winger should join, to gain 'revolutionary industrial unionism'? Is it the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, which has so cravenly begged to be admitted to the A. F. of L.? Is it the W. I. I. U. with its pitiful handful of old men?

Capitalism, it would seem, has answered the question. There is only one union which Capitalism has penalized. There is only one union which has made an aggressive, uncompromising assault upon Capitalism, and into that union revolutionary labor is surging. In seeking for an ally, why look further—Left Winger—than the unconquerable columns of the I. W. W.?

If it is revolutionary industrial unionism which you seek, then you are spared the task of forming it. Frank Little and Joe Hill and the murdered ones of Everett and the crushed rebels of Leavenworth have paid the price and formed it for you. If it is Bolshevism that you yearn for, listen to the cries of the capitalist class who shout that the only form of Bolshevism which is to be feared in America is the I. W. W. If it is revolutionary numbers that you seek, the I. W. W. will come to you with an intact army, four fold larger than your own. And if courage, fortitude and stamina mean anything to you, who dream of mastering America, it is yours and at hand when you ally the Left Wingers with the Wabblers.

And so, the Left Wingers stand today at the crossroad of decision. They must commit themselves upon the I. W. W. issue. Events move too rapidly—issues are too taut to be silent. The crying shame of Leavenworth calls for redress and the I. W. W. must inevitably act—with the Left Wingers, if possible—without them, if necessary. Either there will be unity, or the programs of the Left Wing groups will cement a new division. The splendid hope of the present—the hope of a super-labor movement which shall unite the revolution—stands or falls with this issue of the I. W. W. Shall we be Bolsheviks in Russia and evasivists in America? Let our Left Wing program speak. On one hand is the A. F. of L.: on the other the I. W. W. They are fighting the final struggle. The Left Winger must choose between them.