

riage a mockery, Capitalism attributes all these vile things to the Soviets.

Congress is Capitalism—corrupt, perverted, bankrupt. It investigates—but the proletariat is preparing for action.

Which International?

THE facts of the war and of the developing proletarian revolution stress the need of international solidarity and action: Socialism is not Socialism, but a miserable petty bourgeois thing, unless it is international in purposes and in action.

Socialism, accordingly, must have an international expression. But the International of Socialism must be a real International, an International pledged to the proletarian revolution, and not an aggregation of petty bourgeois Socialists, social reformers and social-patriots.

The "International Congress" which has been holding sessions at Berne is the final proof of the fact that moderate Socialism is petty bourgeois and counter-revolutionary. It is not clear whether it was called by the "Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist Congress" or by Camille Huysmans of the old International Bureau, or by both. But the old International and its Bureau are dead—dead through their own criminal activity in supporting the war and disrupting the international solidarity of Socialism. They have no mandate to represent Socialism; they have no mandate to call an International Congress that a revolutionary Socialist can respect. Let the dead bury their dead.

Whom did this congress consist of? It consisted of the reactionary Labor Party of England, and its bourgeois Henderson; of reactionary British Trades Unions; of the Ebert-Scheidemann Socialists; of the "centre" Socialists of France who are favoring a "Wilson peace;" of the wholly reactionary Hjalmar Branting; of other "right" and "centre" Socialists, all of whom either favored the war of Imperialism or pursued a counter-revolutionary policy of bourgeois pacifism. The final act of stultification performed by the Congress was its desperate efforts to get Samuel Gompers—"our" ultra-reactionary, unspeakable Gompers—to participate. That the Independent Socialist Party of Germany participated is another indication of the fatal compromise policy of that party. That Fritz Adler participated is an indication of his uncertain temperament, and does not alter the character of the Congress.

This Congress did not include the Bolsheviks and the Spartacans in its call—as well it might, since these courageous, intelligent representatives of revolutionary Socialism would never commit stultification by participating in such a Congress, and have repudiated the Congress. The Italian Socialist Party and the Socialist Party of Switzerland repudiated the Congress as reactionary. Revolutionary Socialism everywhere has repudiated the congress. The Belgian Socialist Party refused to participate because the "majority Socialists" of Germany were invited—not because these were "yellow Socialists," but because they were German!

The Berlin *Vorwaerts*, the Ebert-Scheidemann organ, counter-revolutionary during the war and after the war, said just before the Berne Congress convened:

German Socialists will accept with deep satisfaction the summons addressed to them. From the first day of the war it has been their passionate effort to reunite the torn threads of international relations and to give their foreign comrades an account of their attitude... Upon the fate of Germany and the result of peace depends to an endless extent the future of Socialism. To save Germany from the downfall with which a peace of violence threatens her is to save the world and Socialism... We trust in world Socialism, not Bolshevism, but in a peaceful democracy of labor which will come sooner or later." (Our italics.)

The unctuous hypocrisy and nationalistic spirit of this pronunciamento are not its most important features. Clearly, it indicates that the Berne Congress was to act against Bolshevism. And it did! The majority of the delegates were against the Bolsheviks, against the proletarian revolution; Bolshevism was denounced in the gutter style of the bourgeois press, particularly by Hjalmar Branting of Sweden. Arthur Henderson had said: "The problem of the best policy to adopt toward Bolshevism in Russia will also be discussed at the conference." The only policy of the Socialist toward Bolshevism in Russia is to pursue the revolutionary class struggle in his own country, not to discuss in conferences the form of condemnation or of camouflage. The decision was to designate a "commission to study" Bolshevism in Russia! Clearly a revolutionary act!

The delegates indulged in the highly Socialist activity of discussing "responsibility" for the war—that is to say, whether the Central Powers or the Allies were responsible. The French and German "Socialists" had lively tilts on this problem. That Imperialism was responsible, and that the revolutionary

struggle against all Imperialism was imperative—this was not in the consciousness of these "Socialists."

The Congress, moreover, indulged in the miserable activity of discussing the League of Nations—they approve of the League of Nations under Capitalism. Their attitude was clearly that of President Wilson, the attitude of bourgeois democracy and reaction. It was not a Congress of Socialists, but of bourgeois liberals. It was a congress of treason to Socialism.

But what could one expect? The "Socialists" represented had been clearly counter-revolutionary during the war: convening in an "international" congress could not and did not alter their policy. They had been united with bourgeois democracy: they maintained that unity. The Austro-German delegates were afraid of the penalty that might be imposed upon them by defeat; the Allied Socialists were afraid that their nations would be deprived of the "fruits of victory."

Europe was on the verge of the proletarian revolution; and these "Socialists" act against the revolution, dicker and compromise with Capitalism. The situation insisted upon the struggle for a revolutionary peace, for a Lenin peace; but this "Socialist" Congress favored a bourgeois peace, a Wilson peace. At a Socialist meeting in Paris, at which Thomas, Renaudel and Longuet were shouted down, the revolutionary Socialist Lorient issued the slogan that the Congress did not issue: "President Wilson is an able man who is seeking to save the bourgeoisie, but he must not be followed. The moment has come to choose between him and Lenin." But this policy was too revolutionary and aggressive for the yellows at Berne.

The Berne Congress is the last convulsive gasp of the old International. Its corpse is now a stinking carrion. There must be a new International, an International of revolutionary Socialism, of the final struggle and victory.

This problem of the International is an acute one. It is the test of one's revolutionary convictions. Our party by the usurpatory action of the N. E. C. in designating three delegates to "represent" the Socialist Party at the Berne Congress, is officially committed to the yellow International. This act the party must emphatically repudiate.

We do not want an "International" of the social-patriots, of moderate petty bourgeois Socialism. We do not want a "centre" International of Zimmerwald and the Independent Socialists of Germany. We want and will have a revolutionary International, an International which recognizes the revolutionary character of our epoch, of those Socialists who will consciously and aggressively wage the revolutionary struggle.

There cannot be any compromise on this issue. There cannot be any compromise with the past. The old International expressed moderate Socialism; it became an obstacle to the revolutionary development of the proletariat, petty bourgeois and counter-revolutionary; it must be repudiated. Under the stress of life itself, Marxism and Socialism, perverted by the petty bourgeois International, are coming into their own, vital and vitalizing, preparing to storm the bastions of international Imperialism. In this great struggle, we must use the revolutionary spirit of Socialism, we must abandon the old compromising policy, we must repudiate whoever and whatever hesitates and wavers.

There is a new International, which does not have to hold a Congress in order to realize itself—the International of revolutionary Socialism in every country, which does not yearn for showy conferences, but which wages the Socialist, proletarian war against Capitalism. This Socialism and these groups, and these alone, are worthy of organizing the Third International.

At its recent congress in Moscow, the Communist Party of Russia decided to convoke an International Congress at which revolutionary Socialism alone will participate. It issued a program for international revolutionary Socialism based upon the programs of the Communist Party of Russia and the Communist Labor Party of Germany, which declares that at this moment there is only one Socialist struggle and that is the struggle for the overthrow of the international system of Capitalism; that the immediate task of the revolutionary proletariat is to struggle for the seizure of power and the dictatorship of the proletariat; that it is necessary to disarm the bourgeoisie and arm the proletariat as a phase of initiating the final struggle against Capitalism; that a fight without mercy must be waged against the social-patriots who oppose the revolution.

This is the policy of the international proletariat. The Bolshevik-Spartacan International is an International of revolutionary Socialism.

Which International, comrades of the Socialist Party?

Bolshevikjabs

WE have decided that comment from us on the Senate Committee which is investigating Bolshevism and the witnesses who have appeared before it this week would be "painting the lily and to the rainbow adding another hue."

* * *

Lots of people in the United States are foregoing dinner but Senator Borah is apparently the only one who gets any publicity out of it.

* * *

We wonder how the idea got around that a League of Nations meant a league of all nations?

* * *

If it was a league of all nations there would be nothing to be in league against.

* * *

Now that the German workers are finding out that being "good" in the Ebert-Scheidemann sense is not going to save them we wonder what they will do?

* * *

"German Assembly Quits In Mourning After Armistice" says a headline. Which is this bourgeois Assembly mourning most—the Armistice terms or the impetus given by them to the Spartacan movement?

* * *

Who said secret diplomacy? President Wilson is coming to Boston and will deliver a public address on the Peace Conference. Isn't that open diplomacy?

* * *

The New York *Tribune* in a recent issue gives a map of the world showing the territory controlled by the League of Nations and it marks this territory black. More Bolshevik propaganda!

* * *

Mr. William Hard writing in the *New Republic* suggests that "perhaps Mr. Hoover was slightly misunderstood when Senators seemed to assume that he would take a loaf of bread and show it to Lenin and offer to let him have it if he would stop being a Bolshevik."

* * *

No wonder Seattle "labor leaders" are annoyed—Mayor Hansen is getting all the publicity and credit for breaking the strike.

* * *

We hope that Herr Scheidemann will enter a vigorous protest against Emperor-President Ebert turning Bolshevik and confiscating 1,000,000 marks a year.

* * *

As we have often remarked before these Bolsheviks are a poor lot no matter what way one looks at it. They have established a dictatorship in Russia and have been acting the part of despots for some time, but now the New York *Times* publishes the news that the Bolsheviks are arming the workers and even the school children. Surely there is something wrong here! Bourgeois dictatorships never did anything so foolish. They invariably disarm the people and arm their own particular gang of thugs who will do exactly as they are told. Now that the people of Russia are being armed and, as we know from the press reports, that the Bolsheviks represent nobody, we may await with confidence their complete overthrow almost any day.

* * *

In view of the fact that some of the European countries have refused to accept the deportees and that Congress is determined to ship them out of the country we are beginning to glimpse what is meant by "the freedom of the seas."

* * *

J. J. McEntee, Business Agent of the New York District of the International Association of Machinists, is reported as saying that "I have been unable to learn of any labor men who were deported or are in danger of deportation" and thinks that the members of the Micrometer Lodge are wrong in characterizing the affair as a "shameful act." Mr. McEntee has apparently a very narrow conception of the term "labor men." Perhaps after a few more Seattles, gentlemen of Mr. McEntee's ilk will find that their ideas must undergo a thorough revision. What does the Micrometer Lodge say?

* * *

The press first reported that Premier Clemenceau's assailant was a workman, then he became a Russian, now, he is a "moderate" anarchist, tomorrow he may become a Socialist or an I. W. W. and then we would have another excuse for the deportations.

* * *

"Mrs. Inch threatens to name rich men" says the New York *World*. We had no idea the Bolsheviks had become so powerful. Such a threat in Moscow, according to all accounts, would make anyone tremble, but in New York...