

According to *The Rebel Worker's* logic, Victor L. Berger, who consistently denounces the I. W. W. and the Bolsheviks, and who was and still is a yellow of yellows, is the most formidable Bolshevik in the United States, since he has been considered dangerous enough by the Government to get a prison term of twenty years!

The distinguished and affable gentleman who edits *The Rebel Worker*, not satisfied with his adventure in (il) logic, tries sarcasm, with this result:

As you read the statement by the youthful politician who heads the Left Wing movement in the American Socialist Party in his article in the current issue of *The Class Struggle*, that "the I. W. W. is becoming conservative," you wonder whether he takes you for a fool, or is he taking himself. . . . Or both.

As our "Bolshevikjab" confere points out, this issue of *The Rebel Worker* is dated April 1—so fools must rush in. It is the spirit of the day, and of the jocular gentleman who edits *The Rebel Worker*. . . . But still not satisfied, this authority on revolution sarcastically characterizes as "intelligent" the following statement from a recent issue of *The Revolutionary Age*: "The emphasis on economic action is not in accord with the new conceptions of the Revolution." (!) And then he quotes Karl Liebknecht's last interview: "It is an idyllic but naive plan to try to accomplish a social revolution by voting. It is absurd. . . . Parliaments are finished with and useless." If the editor of *The Rebel Worker* read *The Revolutionary Age* seriously and not as a means of securing material for sarcasm, he would realize that we are thoroughly in accord with Liebknecht. But Liebknecht believed in political action, was even a parliamentarian! The revolutionary Socialist conception of parliamentary political action is that it is a means simply of preparing for the Revolution; but that when the Revolution is actually in action, parliamentarism and parliaments are no longer instruments of Socialism, but all the energy of the proletariat must be directed toward revolutionary mass action and proletarian dictatorship. Even during the Russian Revolution, the Bolsheviks participated in politics, actually elected members of municipal governments (not Soviets.) And did Liebknecht advocate the I. W. W. policy as expressed by *The Rebel Worker*? Was the revolution in Russia accomplished by means of industrial union action, or by means of revolutionary mass action, starting in the industrial plants, it is true, but going beyond the doctrinaire I. W. W. conception of the revolution?

Is there, in the accepted literature of the I. W. W., any conception of revolutionary mass action and proletarian dictatorship? Its theory that the proletariat must organize to seize the industries is not in accord with the proletarian revolution in theory and practice; the revolutionary proletariat must first seize the power of the state, must organize the new proletarian state of Soviets and proletarian dictatorship, after which it proceeds to seize industry and organize the new Communist regime and industrial administration, which the I. W. W. fatuously believes can be constructed "within the shell of the old" society. In its theory of the necessity for overthrowing the parliamentary state and organizing the new proletarian state of the organized producers, the I. W. W. is revolutionary and Bolshevik; but in its tactics to accomplish that, it starts with the wrong end, it refuses to accept the experience of the proletarian revolution in Russia and in Germany—that you must first conquer the power of the state by means of revolutionary mass action, and then put the I. W. W.-Communist plan of industrial and social reorganization into practice.

Let us make our position still clearer. *The Revolutionary Age* accepts and propagates industrial unionism. But we recognize its limitations. Our policy on the problems of industrial unionism, political action and the state is expressed in the Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing Section of the Socialist Party of New York City:

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

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

The attitude towards the state divides the Anarchist (Anarcho-Syndicalist), the "moderate Socialist" and

the revolutionary Socialist. Eager to abolish the state which is the ultimate purpose of revolutionary Socialism, the Anarchist (and Anarcho-Socialist) fails to realize that a state is necessary in the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism; the "moderate Socialist" proposes to use the bourgeois state with its fraudulent democracy, its illusory theory of "unity of all the classes," its standing army, police and bureaucracy oppressing and baffling the masses; the revolutionary Socialist maintains that the bourgeois state must be completely destroyed, and proposes the organization of a new state—the state of the organized producers—of the Federated Soviets—on the basis of which alone can Socialism be introduced.

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

There are Anarcho-Syndicalist elements in the I. W. W., and these are responsible for repudiating the policy of the Bolsheviks, the experience of the proletarian revolution in action. And this experience shows that Anarcho-Syndicalism is incompatible with the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship—as Lenin emphasizes.

We must get together, in accord with the new facts and conception of the Revolution. Old prejudices and dogmas must be discarded; the Revolution must be final in our judgment. To speak the old language after the revolutionary experiences of two momentous years, is to set one's self down either as a moss-back or as a reactionary. The I. W. W. is a vital factor in the American revolutionary movement; it can and should become even more of a factor by recognizing that the proletarian revolution in Russia has improved upon the I. W. W. conception of the Revolution. Life itself calls upon the revolutionists to make this adjustment to new conditions and the theory and practice arising out of these conditions.

To the Left

The following extract from the Hungarian paper *Nepszava*, for December 25, 1918, gives some indication of the forces at play in Hungary. The article was headed "To the Right or to the Left."

"There are two tendencies at strife with each other inside the Karolyi party. The one is conservative and the other radical. The leader of the Left is Karolyi. The Right, in spite of all its seeming revolutionism, is trying to save the old Hungary, to conserve the old class domination. (Strong objection to land policy, "Socialist agitation in Army," etc.) The Left realizes that the old order must be replaced by a new, not only seemingly, but in fact; that the rule of Capitalism can no longer be the bedrock foundation of society. In practice, the struggle between them takes the form whether the Karolyi party should or should not stay in the same government with the Social Democrats. Karolyi himself has pointed out very clearly the unbridgeable gulf between the two.

"It seems to me," says Karolyi, "there are here two conceptions of the world opposed to each other. The one is that of the working bourgeoisie and the working proletariat and the other of those who wish to uphold the old order, the capitalist system, in its own barrenness and injustice. . . . The latter are waiting the opportunity once more to snatch the power into their own hands. . . . I who accept the idea of private property only do so subject to the requirements of the present age. In the future this process will in any case develop. The change cannot be stopped, but I wish to prevent the use of explosives."

Nepszava concludes by denying that "the foreign situation demands that the Government of Hungary should gravitate to the Right. However strong the Imperialism of the Entente Powers may still be today, it is indisputable that Wilson . . . will definitely and logically hold to his principles and that the British Labor Party and the French Socialists, working in conjunction with him, desire the society of nations and respect the self-determination of the people and the rights of small nations."

Bolshevikjabs

In its last issue *The Rebel Worker* takes occasion to deal *The Revolutionary Age* a few body blows. In one place it quotes Solicitor Lamar to prove that the I. W. W. are the real R-r-r-revolutionary guys and in another place it becomes so angry at us that "The Wasp" is provoked to sting and so risk its life to appease its anger. But then we looked at the date line at the head of the issue and we saw it was April 1. We bit.

But seriously—does *The Rebel Worker* know what political action is?

Lots of people seem to be very much surprised that Hungary went Bolshevik, but after the way the bourgeois press did overdo that stuff about hunger bringing Bolshevism even the poor ignorant Hungarians couldn't help seeing that it was up to them to live up to their name.

We don't mind admitting that we are humanitarian enough to hope that they never find the guy who called it the Peace conference—there has been quite enough bloodshed in the world of late.

Comparing the verdicts in the cases of Villain, who shot and killed Jaures, and Cottin, who shot and did not kill Clemenceau, we have come to the conclusion that the greatest crime in France is failure.

Hotel Manager, Switzerland:—
Reserve one royal suite. Am on my way.
Peter of Serbia.

In our school days we were taught that x was an unknown quantity, but nowadays it appears the x signifies that the quantity is known and nobody likes it.

In view of the way in which our big corporations are endeavoring to establish business relations with Russia just now, we wonder will the munitions makers attempt to sell munitions to the Bolsheviks so that they may be able to institute the "Red" war on a larger and more efficient scale.

Jack Reed suggests that all the foreigners in this country had better join the Left Wing of the Socialist Party otherwise when they come to be deported they will not be allowed to land by the Soviet Governments of the various European countries.

We cull the following from *La Vague*, a French Socialist weekly: "The Bourgeoisie want more children?"

"Alright, let them have them—in their own homes."

The New York *World* has at last discovered that the ex-Czar of Russia is really dead and under the headline: "How Ex-Czar Died Is Finally Shown in Official Report" announces the fact to the public at large. Now that the matter is finally shown we hope that as a matter of common decency some other paper will not exhume the body.

"Japan Warns China Against Disclosing Secret Documents" says a headline. In other words no "open covenants of peace openly arrived at."

"Nations can quit the League" a headline announces. But why bother about that until they join it.

Japan, for instance, doesn't seem to be overwhelmingly in favor of joining unless she gets her own way. And while it was triumphantly announced a few months ago that Russia and Germany would only be admitted if they would promise to be good, it now seems to be that they don't want to have anything to do with it.

"Half a League, half a League. . . .
"Into the Valley of Death. . . ."

The real query just now seems to be whether to fight or feed the Bolsheviks, or both, or none, or—well figure it out yourself?

If they fight the Bolsheviks people become annoyed and go Bolshevik for spite, if they feed the Bolsheviks the breadlines will go Bolshevik in order to get fed.

"Givus a loafa bread"
"I ain't got no bread"
"Take that!"