

of Socialism and unionism intermingled." And to cap the climax of absurdity, a resolution demanding for small nationalities "the right to live their own lives on their own soil and to develop their own culture" concluded with a declaration in favor of a Zionist state—"the re-establishment of a national homeland in Palestine on a basis of self-government." The general resolutions of the convention were obviously framed with the intention of getting support from any and all groups, irrespective of whether the things resolved about were attainable or in conformity with a central principle of social action.

But maudlin jingoism was not the only sentiment of the convention. There was a good dash of hypocrisy. Imagine J. P. Holland, president of the New York Federation of Labor, at a convention for "labor and democracy"! It was the patriotic and democratic Mr. Holland who some months ago was responsible for the Federation passing a resolution asking the state government to suspend the labor laws, including the child labor laws, as a measure of war. This was a demand disgusting in its cruelty. It would have meant destroying the meagre safe-guards placed around the unorganized and the unskilled. Secure in their own strength and reeking with smug complacency, Holland and his cohorts were willing to offer up the children and the unorganized workers as a sacrifice on the altar of their country. Labor and democracy! And the hypocrisy was emphasized by a "manifesto" in which the renegade Socialists claimed to be "working hand in hand" with Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg!

In point of delegates and convictions, the convention physically and spiritually was dominated by the American Federation of Labor, a domination emphasized by the selection of Samuel Gompers as president of the Alliance. The reactionary character of the deliberations was an expression and an affirmation of the general attitude of the A. F. of L., an attitude that has made the A. F. of L. the bulwark of reaction in this country.

The Socialist Party, having in the past refused to take an uncompromising attitude against the principles and practice of the A. F. of L., is now reaping what it has sown. It is a matter of

incontrovertible fact that the Socialist representatives in the councils of the A. F. of L. have, as a rule, assisted in strengthening the control of reaction. And that the A. F. of L. is the centre of reaction in this country is indisputable. Its narrow craft-and-caste interests exclude any large consideration of proletarian policy. It refuses to organize the bulk of the workers, limiting its activity to protecting the interests and jobs of an aristocracy of labor. It is seeking to secure a place in the governing system of the nation, to rise to power and caste privilege upon the neglect and betrayal of the great mass of the workers, the unorganized and the unskilled. In short, the A. F. of L. has pursued a policy inimical to the totality of proletarian interests and strengthened capitalist reaction, but instead of declaring war upon this reactionary attitude, the Socialist Party concluded a humiliating peace with the reactionary and generally corrupt representatives of the A. F. of L.

The policy being reactionary during peace, a similar policy during war became a matter of course.

The worst feature of the situation is that the A. F. of L. is using the war and the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy to strengthen its position, not as against the government and capitalism, but as against its radical union competitors. The A. F. of L. has surrendered to the government. It has not secured the recognition as a governmental factor that it aimed for and which the British unions have achieved. But having failed in one direction, the A. F. of L. seeks compensation in another. Accordingly, it is using the war to wage a bitter fight for the destruction of the I. W. W. and of the radical and secession unions represented in the Workmen's Council. The American Alliance Convention did not issue a single murmur of protest at the brutal, worse-than-Prussian assaults made by the government and its representatives upon the I. W. W. Nay, on the floor of the convention of the Alliance a shameful street-gutter attack was made upon the I. W. W. and William D. Haywood by John P. Holland and cheered by the delegates—among whom, incidentally, was a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church.

The renegade Socialists at the convention, among whom were