

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A JOURNAL OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST RECONSTRUCTION

VOL. I, No. 12

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1918

PRICE, 10 CENTS

Meyer London—A Socialist Disgrace

THE circle of Socialist reaction, of the betrayal of fundamental principles by representatives of Socialism, is completed. Germany produced its Scheidemann, Parvus, Sudekum and Wolfgang Heine; France its Albert Thomas and Marcel Cachin; Austria its Dr. Renner and Victor Adler; England its Hyndman and Henderson; and the United States its Russell, Spargo, Walling and Meyer London.

There are members of the Socialist Party who are fond of the sport of denouncing Spargo, Walling & Co. It is a comfortable and safe procedure to kick the dead. But these very same comrades are utterly silent about the infamous attitude of Meyer London, his flouting of the declarations and instructions of the party, his betrayal of fundamental Socialism. Even prior to America's entry into the war, London acted against international Socialism; and since, his conduct has been completely reactionary and demoralizing. Socialism should have its own independent class policy on war and peace; but Meyer London has accepted the policy of the government; American Socialism is compelled, by the declaration it adopted a year ago, to co-operate with the minority Socialists of Europe and support the Bolsheviks; yet Meyer London accepts the policy of the majority Socialists and denounces the Bolsheviks.

Eugene V. Debs publicly declares his adherence to fundamental facts and principles, and is indicted. His courageous action was an inspiration to the party, a rebuke to the wavering. And then Local New York nullifies Debs' action by renominating Meyer London for Congress.

The recent state convention of the Socialist Party of New York adopted a resolution calling upon Meyer London to introduce a bill in Congress for the recognition of the Russian Soviet Republic. This "Socialist" representative in Congress did nothing of the sort; and shortly after appeared in print criticizing the Bolsheviks and coquetting with the counter-revolutionary forces.

As if the nomination of Meyer London were not sufficiently demoralizing, Local New York nominates Edward F. Cassidy and Algernon Lee, both of whom repudiate the accepted attitude of the party on the war.

There is danger ahead, comrades! There is an active movement in the party to castrate its international Socialist attitude. The openly pro-war group, which is small, is exploiting the fears, prejudices and opportunism of the moderates to put over reactionary candidates and policy. Not all who voted to re-nominate Meyer London want his policy; many, if not the majority, voted affirmatively on the plea that to repudiate London would mean losing the district—the plea made by Alder-

man Beckerman. But what kind of a victory is it to elect a man to Congress who betrays Socialism and brazenly flouts the party? Rather no representatives in Congress than a man who repudiates the attitude of the party.

When Meyer London speaks in Congress, he speaks not as the representative of the Twelfth Congressional Dis-

trict, but as the representative of the Socialist Party. To have Meyer London represent the Socialist Party is to link the party with the European social-patriots and betrayers of Socialism, when it should be linked with the intrepid Italian Socialist Party, the French minority Socialists, the Independent Socialist Party of Germany, and the Bolsheviks.

Socialist Reconstruction in Europe

Revolutionary Socialism in Europe is making rapid progress under the impact of the war and the proletarian revolution in Russia. At the Congress of the Socialist Party of Norway, held in March, the left wing secured practical control of the party and revolutionary resolutions were adopted. The moderates introduced resolutions against the dictatorship of the proletariat, against general strikes and revolutionary mass action, against military strikes. All these resolutions were defeated. The resolutions of the left were adopted, as follows:

I.
Socialism cannot recognize the right of the ruling class to exploit the working class even when this exploitation is supported by the consent of the majority in the national parliament. The Norwegian labor party must, therefore, insist upon its right to use mass action or revolutionary measures in its struggle for the industrial liberation of the working class. As a party whose most vital issue is the class struggle, it cannot be indifferent to this struggle when it is being conducted by other class organizations. The Congress, therefore, greets with joy the creation of Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils in Norway and sees in them an expression of the self-reliance and self-activity of the working class population.

II.
The Congress hereby calls upon the workers of Norway to prepare and organize a strike on a national basis, with the support of labor union action, against military and defense service. We demand, furthermore, that a general strike be prepared to prevent war, and the declaration of war.

III.
Whereas, the National Labor Union Congress has refused to support a military strike; and,
Whereas, separate organizations have been formed for those who are liable to military service; be it,
Resolved, That there is no possibility of united action between the two main organizations in this matter; and be it further,
Resolved, That military strikes are fully compatible with Socialist principles—that the working class, therefore, cannot relinquish the right to use this weapon in the struggle for its own emancipation.

man Beckerman. But what kind of a victory is it to elect a man to Congress who betrays Socialism and brazenly flouts the party? Rather no representatives in Congress than a man who repudiates the attitude of the party.

When Meyer London speaks in Congress, he speaks not as the representative of the Twelfth Congressional Dis-

trict, but as the representative of the Socialist Party. To have Meyer London represent the Socialist Party is to link the party with the European social-patriots and betrayers of Socialism, when it should be linked with the intrepid Italian Socialist Party, the French minority Socialists, the Independent Socialist Party of Germany, and the Bolsheviks.

London's nomination was confirmed by a vote of 42 to 38.

The *New York Call* did not print a single word about this opposition to Meyer London; neither did it state that the Central Committee had repudiated Meyer London, nor by what vote the Committee subsequently confirmed the nomination.

The most discouraging feature of the whole affair is not the votes cast for Meyer London by those who agree with him, but the votes cast for him by comrades who disagree with his policy. These latter votes were cast because of opportunism and motives of expediency. And opportunism and expediency are the worst foes of revolutionary Socialism.

A Socialist party is a social-revolutionary party, and not a party for the acquisition of office; it is an instrument of the proletarian revolution, and not an instrument of petty bourgeois politics. To nominate a man for office simply because he may be elected, and in spite of his misrepresenting our Socialist principles, is a petty act of petty bourgeois politicians, and not a gesture

worthy of revolutionary Socialism. A Socialist party that does not at all times adhere to fundamental principles is a party that builds upon sand; it is, moreover, a party that, when the test comes, will act precisely as did the opportunistic, petty bourgeois Social Democratic Party of Germany.

The Socialist Party of the United States is now being put to the test, and the test must be met in spite of the policy of evasion adopted by the opportunists. It is the test of principles and the test of the class struggle. We have hopes that the party will on the whole meet this test adequately, in spite of all and everything.

Shall our party be a party of Leibknecht, Lazzari, Lenin and Trotzky, or shall it be a party of Scheidemann, Thomas, Hyndman and Meyer London? This is the great issue in our party, in every party affiliated with the Socialist International. Comrades, upon you rests the responsibility. Repudiate Meyer London! Repudiate the policy of confusion and compromise!

Blood that Doesn't Count

THE *New York Call* is doing an excellent piece of work by re-printing what Roosevelt, Taft, Nicholas Murray Butler, the intellectual and newspaper hirelings of reaction generally, said about the Kaiser in the years preceding the great war. The praise and adulation they lavished upon the imperial murderer makes interesting and significant reading today. The *Call* quotes an editorial in the *New York Times* of June 8, 1913, celebrating the Kaiser's twenty-fifth anniversary of his reign, which burns verbal incense at the shrine of the Chief of the Huns. One sentence in this editorial is particularly instructive: "Since he (Kaiser Wilhelm) has ruled Germany he has not shed a drop of blood." Indeed? The Kaiser shed the blood of workers in strikes and demonstrations; his military hireling murdered scientifically and ruthlessly, 90,000 out of 100,000 of the Herreros in German Africa; more persons were murdered in minor colonial wars. Is this blood which doesn't count? But that is the psychology of capitalism. France was "at peace" for forty years, and yet France shed the blood of thousands of persons in colonial wars; the same is true of England and the United States. Mexico, the Philippines and Central America—the blood shed there also doesn't count. And that "is the hell of it." A nation may be shedding blood copiously, but if it is the blood of strikers, if it is the blood of natives shed in colonial wars—the "nation is at peace." It is dirty and disgusting; and the tragic part of it all is that this attitude prevails among conservative labor organizations. But history is relentless; and out of the colonial wars developed this great war.