

of Hughes, and more radical currents are developing in the Australian Labor Party under pressure of the industrial proletariat and revolutionary Socialism, but the tendency still remains characteristic of a Labor Party.

When the transport workers, miners and unorganized workers in New Zealand in 1913 determined upon a general strike, the skilled labor unions refused to strike and scabbed, while the Labor Party issued a manifesto against the strike. The struggle between the unions of the aristocracy of labor and the industrial proletariat became so keen that a new party was organized representing the industrial masses, the Social Democratic Federation.

The Irish Labor Party is the only labor party that does not express the full policy of laborism. It acquired a proletarian class policy after the Dublin strike in 1912-13 and cooperates with the unskilled workers. During the war, it adopted a radical oppositional attitude, but its recent decision to withdraw its parliamentary candidates in favor of the Sinn Fein candidates indicates an abandonment of the straight path of proletarian action for the tortuous ways of compromise with the Irish bourgeoisie.

The tendency of laborism, of a Labor Party, is the petty bourgeois tendency of compromise, of conciliation with Capitalism, of securing advantages for itself by betraying the masses of the industrial proletariat and accepting social-Imperialism.

An American Labor Party will express precisely the tendency and purposes of the A. F. of L. These purposes and tendency are notoriously reactionary. The A. F. of L. is not interested in the great industrial proletariat of unorganized, unskilled labor—the bulk of the working class; in fact, the A. F. of L. has repeatedly acted against and betrayed its strikes, particularly when directed by the I. W. W. The A. F. of L. is largely an organization of "job trusts" of the aristocracy of labor, which strives simply for petty advantages, and which has again and again united with Capitalism against Socialism and the proletariat. The A. F. of L., moreover, through its bureaucracy, has during the war been even more reactionary than the most reactionary elements of Capitalism, smugly satisfied that the war was bringing steady employment and high wages; and this bureaucracy, through Samuel Gompers & Co., directly united with Imperialism in Europe against Socialism and the awakening of the proletariat—even the British Labor Party was too "radical" for Gompers & Co. Gompers developed into an instrument of Lloyd-George and Clemenceau against the working class.

The tendency and purposes of the Labor Party, should it eventuate, will express the reactionary tendency and purposes of the A. F. of L. That is scarcely anything to jubilate about.

But, then, would a Labor Party be simply an evil? Not at all; it might indirectly promote progress by demonstrating on the larger field of politics the weak, petty policy of the A. F. of L., might in that way prove an educational force, and clarify the situation in a large degree. That is, providing that Socialism would adapt itself to the new conditions and would not become a cat's-paw for the Labor Party.

There are elements in the Socialist Party whose policy is not at all Socialist, but the policy of reactionary trades unionism and laborism, and who would welcome a Labor Party. These elements would insist that the Socialist Party identify itself in some way with the Labor Party, either become absorbed in the new party or a part of it, such as the Independent Labor Party in England. This would be disastrous to revolutionary Socialism, identifying Socialism with laborism. The Socialist Party should maintain its independence and Socialist identity.

But it must be admitted that the official majority policy of the Socialist Party is largely the policy of a Labor Party; and should the party retain this policy, it would stagnate and the Labor Party conquer. The organization of a Labor Party, accordingly, would be a call to the Socialist Party to recognize itself, to adopt a policy representing the tendency and requirements of the industrial proletariat, to reconstruct itself with the new revolutionary Socialist ideas now de-

veloping a new pulse in international Socialism—ideas which alone represent Socialism and Marxism.

The Socialist Party would have to irrevocably and uncompromisingly separate itself from a Labor Party and wage war upon it. Wage war—how? Not by promising more reforms than the Labor Party, but by a propaganda of revolutionary Socialism and industrial unionism, by awakening and directing the action of the great unorganized masses of the industrial proletariat. This would mean a broadening of the conception and practice of politics—a broadening fully in accord with Marxism and fundamental Socialism.

The A. F. of L. does not represent the elements of the real proletariat—the industrial proletariat massed in the basic larger industry. The A. F. of L., except in the case of anachronisms such as the miners represents the skilled workers, the aristocracy of labor, men who have skill and consider this skill "property." Their ideology is a petty bourgeois ideology, and their domination of Socialism and the industrial proletariat would prove a calamity. The answer to the A. F. of L. compromise and petty bourgeois policy is to awaken the industrial proletariat, and pull out of the A. F. of L. unions, such as the Miners, who belong with the industrial proletariat.

Socialism must have an economic basis—industrial power. But this will not be provided by the A. F. of L. or the policy of Laborism—did the British Labor Party use industrial power to secure for its delegates access to international conferences held outside of England? The industrial power of Socialism must come out of the militant proletariat in the larger industry, from the propaganda and practice of industrial unionism and industrial mass action.

Should the Labor Party eventuate, this reconstruction of the Socialist Party policy becomes imperative; thus reconstruction is equally necessary should the Labor Party not eventuate. The Socialist Party must attune itself to the rhythm of new ideas in international Socialism.

There is no magic in "labor,"—it depends upon what "labor" represents, its tendency and action. There is no magic in "Socialism," either. Both may prove reactionary and counter-revolutionary. The great task of international Socialism at this moment is its own reconstruction—the final struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism is on!

## Bolshevism in America

By John Reed

**I**N response to anxious queries from our capitalist acquaintances as to the danger of a Bolshevik Revolution in the United States within the next two weeks, we wish to settle the question once for all.

1. The American working class is politically and economically the most uneducated working class in the world. It believes what it reads in the capitalist press. It believes that the wage-system is ordained by God. It believes that Charley Schwab is a great man, because he can make money. It believes that Samuel Gompers and the American Federation of Labor will protect it as much as it can be protected. It believes that under our system of Government the Millennium is possible. When the Democrats are in power, it believes the promises of the Republicans, and vice versa. It believes that Labor laws mean what they say. It is prejudiced against Socialism.

Note: Organized Labor's candidate for Governor of California, Mayor Rolfe, was a very ordinary type of bourgeois politician. Through a technicality his name was removed from the ballot. This meant his certain defeat. Labor was asked why it didn't throw its weight solidly behind the Socialist ticket? "Oh," answered Labor, "the Socialists will never get elected. What's the use of throwing away your vote?" I am told that Labor wrote Rolfe's name on the ballot, and Stephens won.

2. American Labor disapproves of the Russian Soviets, the German Revolution, and other manifestations of "anarchy." To the American working class the British Labor Party is "going a little too far"; it seems to be dominated by "nuts." As for the French

and Italian movements, who cares what the "wops" do?

Note: On November 7th some Socialists had a pamphlet printed to celebrate the first anniversary of the founding of the Soviet Government. When they went to get it at the binder's, a member of the Typographical Union said, "I don't know whether I'll give you this stuff or not. It's all about the Bolsheviks. You guys ought to be arrested!"

3. With the exception of the Jewish workers, other foreigners, and a devoted sprinkling of Americans, the Socialist party is made up largely of petty bourgeois, for the most part occupied in electing Aldermen and Assemblymen to office, where they turn into time-serving politicians, and in explaining that Socialism does not mean Free Love. The composition of the English-speaking branches is: little shopkeepers, clerks, doctors, lawyers, farmers (in the Middle West), a few teachers, some skilled workers, and a handful of intellectuals.

Nothing is farther from the normal desires of the American Socialist party than a Revolution. It is really the refuge of almost all intelligent humble people who believe in the principles on which the American Republic was founded. It has never altogether approved of the Bolsheviks. It applauds the German Revolution largely because it thinks that the Germans will be more orderly.

4. There is no well-defined Left or Revolutionary wing in the Socialist party. This fact has driven many workers, dissatisfied with industrial conditions and disillusioned with politics, to join the I. W. W., a revolutionary organization dominated by Syndicalist ideas. As in France and Denmark, the Syndicalist philosophy has captured the imagination of the revolutionary proletariat; although in the United States there is a very small revolutionary proletariat. . . .

5. This is just another proof that in America the Socialist movement is divorced from the great mass of the working class. The main differences between this country and Europe is that in Europe the Labor Unions were organized by the Socialists, on class-conscious lines; while in America Organized Labor is in theory a defensive group of citizens with similar interests in a theoretical democracy where all men are equal.

6. In the United States the Socialists have some power. They can swing a million votes. The official majority in the Socialist party is more interested in "swinging" these votes than in Socialism. But they cannot compete with bourgeois reform groups like the Progressives, or the Democrats under Wilson.

7. Nothing teaches the American working class except hard times and repression. Hard times are coming, repression is organized on a grand scale. In America for a long time there has been no free land, nor opportunity for workers to become millionaires. The working class does not yet know this.

The very fact that for the next decade America promises to be the most reactionary quarter of the globe is sure to have its effect.

8. If Tom Mooney stays in jail, if wages go down, if Socialists are arrested and the red flag suppressed, there will be a revolutionary movement in this country in five years. Bismarck couldn't stop it in Germany.

The War Trade Board has laid plans for reopening trade relations with those sections of Russia not controlled by the Bolsheviks. We wonder is this another way of saying that business is to be continued with Stockholm.

Perhaps the new "Russian" Government recently organized in the Swedish capital has placed an order for writing materials with which to carry on its functions.

It looks very like Italian-determination for the Jugo-Slavs.

Speaking at Nottingham, England, the other day, "J. R. Clynes, ex-laborite, frankly admitted that he shared the views of the premier. . . ." says a press despatch. If his confession was voluntarily it ought to be considered in his favor,