

talism exists, the workers will suffer. Capitalism must be overthrown; the workers must organize their own state of the producers in the shops; they must take possession of the shops, of all industry.

Capitalism is in a revolutionary stage. Capitalism is shaking. Capitalism cannot exist much longer. Every strike must be a small revolution, organizing, educating and disciplining the workers for the final revolutionary struggle.

## Turn to the Left!

**T**HE American Socialist Party is in a condition of feverish theoretical activity. Pressing problems are being met in a spirit of self-criticism. New forms of action in the social struggle are being accepted. Old methods, old tactics, old ideas, which in the test of the war have proven incapable of furthering the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, are being seriously analyzed and repudiated.

The membership of the Socialist Party, the majority, is instinctively class conscious and revolutionary. It was this membership that compelled our officials to acquiesce in the adoption of a radical declaration against the war—which most of the officials sabotaged or converted into an innocuous policy of bourgeois pacifism. When the Bolsheviks conquered, the majority of our officials were either hostile or silent; some weeks before, the *New York Call* had stigmatized the Bolsheviks as "anarchists." But the membership responded; they forced the hands of the officials, who became "me too" Bolsheviks, but who did not draw the revolutionary implications of the Bolshevik policy. These officials and their machinery baffled the will of the membership; more, the membership baffled itself because it did not clearly understand the theory and the practice implied in its instinctive class consciousness and revolutionary spirit.

While our N. E. C. accepts the Berne Congress and refuses to call an emergency National Convention, locals of the party are actively engaged in the great struggle turning to the left, to revolutionary Socialism. Groups within the party are organizing and issuing proclamations, determined that the party shall conquer the party for revolutionary Socialism. Two of these proclamations were published in the last issue of *The Revolutionary Age*. They deserve serious consideration and discussion.

The manifesto of the Communist Propaganda League of Chicago is a concise document. Its criticism of the party is summarized: "the party proceeds on too narrow an understanding of political action for a party of revolution; that its programs and platforms have been reformist and petty bourgeois in character, instead of being definitely directed toward the goal of social revolution; the party has failed to achieve unity with the revolutionary movement on the industrial field." Its proposals for democratizing the party—*mass action in the party*—are excellent; it repudiates the old International and the Berne Congress, and asks: "Identification of the Socialist Party with class conscious industrial unionism; unity of all kinds of proletarian action and protest forming part of the revolutionary class struggle; political action to include political strikes and demonstrations, and to be in cooperation with industrial mass action; no compromising with any groups not inherently committed to the revolutionary class struggle, such as Labor parties, People's Council, Non-Partisan Leagues, Municipal Ownership Leagues, and the like." The manifesto is too abstract in its formulation; but it is a clear expression of the left tendency.

The manifesto published in our last issue under the caption "Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing of the American Socialist Movement" was formulated and adopted by a group of comrades in New York City, a group started by a bolt of delegates from a general meeting of the Central Committees of the Greater New York Locals, after the meeting refused to discipline the "Socialist" Aldermen who are betraying Socialism and the party. It is a comprehensive document, and its tendency is that of revolutionary Socialism. But in many of its formulations it is unfortunate and hasty, giving the impression of not clearly understanding the problems under consideration.

We shall not discuss minor points, such as including the Socialist Party of Italy among the parties whose "official press . . . suddenly reversed its position and called for resistance to the invader"—the Italian Socialist Party has always been against war, and it is a Bolshevik party.

There are more serious things. The moderate, parliamentary Socialists, says this Manifesto, "lost sight of Socialism's original purpose; their goal became two-fold—'constructive reforms' and *Cabinet portfolios*, of the means to an end they made an end in itself."

This is either an unfortunate formulation, or a complete misunderstanding of revolutionary political action. The implication is that "constructive reforms"

and Socialists accepting "cabinet portfolios" in bourgeois governments are a means to an end, that they are a part of Socialist political action. They are not. "Constructive reforms" and "Cabinet portfolios" are the finest expression of moderate Socialism, of its perversion of political action, of its policy of gradually "transforming Capitalism into Socialism" by means of legislative reforms and co-operation of classes. "Constructive reforms" and "Cabinet portfolios" are not Socialist political action, but a betrayal of political action: real Socialist political action tries to arouse that revolutionary mass action of the proletariat which alone can conquer Capitalism and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. But, we believe, this is precisely the idea of the New York Comrades, since the implication of their unfortunate formulation is directly contradictory to other parts of their manifesto.

But this unfortunate formulation, or misunderstanding, persists. In another part the Manifesto says: "We contend that such political action is a valuable means of propaganda and further, that the capture of legislative seats is an effective means of capturing the political state, but—and here is the vital point for the moderate 'Socialist' goes no further—we hold that this capture of the political state is merely for the purpose of destroying it." (Our italics.) This is not at all the revolutionary conception. The political state is not "captured" by means of votes: it is overthrown by means of revolutionary mass action, by means of the seizure of power by the revolutionary proletariat. The parliamentary struggle, as the Manifesto itself says elsewhere, is agitational; its chief purpose is and can alone be the development of the revolutionary consciousness and mass action of the proletariat, which can seize power and establish the transitional "state" of Socialism—the state of Soviets, of the organized producers, functioning temporarily as a dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Manifesto further says that "the Socialist ballot must be supported by the might of 'the industrial organization of the working class'." This is laying the emphasis on political action, while the creative revolutionary action lies in the industrial and revolutionary mass action of the proletariat. The Manifesto accepts De Leon's formulation of this vital tactical problem; but revolutionary Socialism in Russia and in Germany has improved upon De Leon's conception, and emphasizes that the conquest of the power of the state is not a parliamentary act, but an act of revolutionary seizure through proletarian mass action breaking loose in a revolutionary crisis. And it is the task of the political party of Socialism to prepare the proletariat for action in this crisis. This conception of industrial organization leads to another statement of the Manifesto: "Only the economic organization [this means, we presume, revolutionary industrial unionism] of the working class can build the new society within the shell of the old." Acceptance of this formulation depends upon whether it is relative or absolute. The doctrinaire industrial union conception, accepted by the Socialist Labor Party, is that when the whole working class, or an overwhelming majority, is organized industrially, then they may seize industry and establish the industrial state. But this, clearly, is utopian. The conditions of Capitalism do not allow this gigantic organization of the proletariat; all that industrial unionism can accomplish is to organize the working class *partially* into industrial unions, to establish a centre around which action might unite, to develop the ideology of the industrial state; but you can "build the new society" only under the shield of the dictatorship of the proletariat; only when the working class has seized the state power, and organized its new, transitional state, can the ideal of industrial unionism constructing the new communist society be realized.

The Manifesto accepts proletarian dictatorship, but does not emphasize or clearly express its functions and its character. Its conception of the function of the "industrial organization" clearly indicates its lack of understanding. Moreover, the Manifesto does not mention the necessity of revolutionary mass action (although it is implied)—that mass action which is the basis of the new Socialist tactics, of the proletarian dictatorship. In this the Manifesto is contradictory: in one place it says the state will be captured by the capture of legislative seats; in another place it says: "revolutionary Socialists do not propose to wait until the vast majority of the people vote them into power." That is the policy of revolutionary Socialism, but this formulation is contradicted by other portions of the Manifesto, by other interpretations of political action. It must necessarily imply the acceptance of revolutionary mass action as the means for the conquest of power by the proletariat.

In its demand "that the Socialist Party of America issue a call for an international congress of those groups of the Socialist movement that participated both in the Zimmerwald Conference in September,

1915, and the Kienthal Conference in 1916, and of those groups that are in agreement with them to-day," the Manifesto seriously compromises its left wing attitude and its international policy. The Zimmerwald Conference was a "centre" conference, dominated by Karl Kautsky and the Independent Socialists of Germany, the left being compelled to withdraw and issue a declaration of its own; the Kienthal Conference was of a similar character. The Spartacans would not participate in an International harboring the Independents. Our international policy must be that only the Communist Party of Russia and the Communist Labor Party of Germany have the right to call an international Socialist Congress, that we shall participate only in an international in which participate these two groups, that the New International must be an uncompromising, aggressive, clear expression of revolutionary Socialism.

There are other criticisms that might be made, such as that the Manifesto should definitely repudiate the Labor Party: its whole tendency is against a Labor Party, but the repudiation should be explicit.

Our problems are great problems, and only by mutual criticism, by self-criticism, can we conquer. The party is in a state of transition, the left wing itself is only just developing; there is a great task of education and clarification ahead, in which all should participate. The Manifesto gives too many indications of different views and formulations having compromised with each other; the American left must have a clear theory and an uncompromising policy. Theory is itself a social force; and our theory must be in complete accord with Marxism and the proletarian revolution in Germany and in Russia, in accord with the developments of life itself. Then we shall conquer!

## Bolshevikjabs

**M**R. HUNTINGTON, who has been a commercial attache in Russia, a kind of advance booking agent for Capitalism, is giving some very interesting information to the Senatorial Committee which is, or at any rate thinks it is, investigating Bolshevism. We cull the following from the *New York Times* report of the proceedings:

"In answer to a question as to whether or not a report were true that several Russian Grand Dukes had been thrown into a well and then bombarded with hand grenades by Russian Red Guards, Dr. Huntington said that he understood the report was correct. He said that his information came from an American business man of standing who was in the town at the time of the slaughter. *The bodies were afterward recovered.*"

If the hand grenades were part of the commerce to which Dr. Huntington was attached it is no wonder that this mission was unsuccessful and we would like to say that he should not be blamed for the failure as even the most ignorant and primitive people dislike buying bum goods twice.

While the investigation is going on and as there seems to be a difficulty in locating the Bolshevik money that has come into this country we would like to respectfully suggest that the committee cast an inquiring eye on the prohibitionists.

Tom Mooney's case, Frank Little's murder, the Bisbee deportations, the reduction of wages, the increase in unemployment, have all left the A. F. of L. cold, but prohibition is precipitating a labor revolt. The grim spectre of a general strike stalks behind the "drys." We should remember that these Bolsheviks are a desperate band and will turn to anything to accomplish their fell purpose. While we have been keeping strict watch on ferocious, dirty-looking, wild eyed, long haired foreigners, is it not quite possible that the sanctimonious looking gentlemen in the plug hats and shabby Alberts are the real agents of the Bolsheviks?

The indignation of the committee on learning that the Bolsheviks are not in favor of the freedom of the press is really heroic. Wait till it discovers Burleson's existence!

Now that deportations are becoming fashionable we hope that Congress will see the urgent necessity of speeding up the building of transports.

We have come to the conclusion that this is a foreign country. The strikers in Seattle are foreigners, the Butte miners are foreigners, the Patterson weavers are foreigners, the Lawrence workers are foreigners, the New York and Philadelphia clothing workers are foreigners. In fact all the 100 per centers seem to have died of the flue . . .

P. S.—The compositor says: "All but Indians are foreigners."

Is Japan's threatened war on China going to be "the last war?"