

The way to wage war upon a Labor Party, should it eventuate, is not to promise more reforms than the Labor Party, is not to plead and placate, but to develop the revolutionary consciousness of the proletariat, to awaken to action the great, unorganized industrial proletariat, which is the dominant force in industry, and which will determine the destiny of the Revolution. This would mean a broadening of the conception and practice of politics—a broadening fully in accord with Marxism and fundamental Socialism. The A. F. of L. does not represent the elements of the real proletariat—the industrial proletariat massed in the basic larger industry. The A. F. of L., except in the case of anachronisms such as the miners, represents the skilled workers, the aristocracy of labor, men who have skill and consider this skill “property.” Their ideology is a petty bourgeois ideology, and their domination of Socialism and the industrial proletariat would prove a calamity. The answer to the A. F. of L. compromise and petty bourgeois policy is to awaken the industrial proletariat, and pull out of the A. F. of L. unions, such as the Miners, which belong with the industrial proletariat.

As against the Labor Party, a *Socialist* Party; as against the aristocracy of Labor, the masses of the industrial proletariat; as against A. F. of L. unionism, industrial unionism; as against conciliation with Capitalism, the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism.

There is no magic in “labor”—it depends upon what labor represents, its tendency and action. There is no magic in “Socialism” either; both may be reactionary and counter-revolutionary. The great task of Socialism is its own reconstruction—this animates its policy on all problems.

\* \* \*

Socialism must have an economic basis—industrial power. That is one argument made in favor of a union Labor Party. But does conservative unionism use its industrial power for large purposes? Is it using it for the release of Tom Mooney?

Did the British Labor Party use its industrial power to secure for its delegates access to Conferences held in other nations?

Socialism must possess industrial power. But industrial power emerges only out of the class consciousness and revolutionary activity of the proletariat. Socialism must have industrial power, but this will develop not out of parliamentarism, not out of unity with a reactionary Labor Party, but out of the aggressive mass action of the industrial proletariat, out of awakening the masses to independent revolutionary activity, out of industrial unionism.

The moderate Socialist has never concerned himself with the struggles of the revolutionary Socialist to develop industrial power by means of industrial unionism; the moderate Socialist thinks of this only when it may promote reactionary purposes, never when it may promote the Revolution.

But the task of developing this industrial power is important. The coming period of strikes will provide an excellent opportunity for the development of more effective forms of organization, for the construction of industrial unionism, for the building up of a revolutionary labor movement. This is a task that Socialism cannot shirk. The argument that the Socialist Party is a political party, and therefore cannot concern itself with problems of union organization, is a miserable subterfuge; a *Socialist* Party is a party of Socialism, of the proletarian class struggle, of the Revolution; and it must concern itself with every problem that affects the revolutionary struggle and the coming of Socialism. The problem of unionism, of revolutionary industrial unionism, is fundamental,—all the more, since in its theoretical phase, the construction of an industrial state, the abolition of the political state, contains within itself the norms of the new proletarian state and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

A revolutionary union movement—that must be an integral phase of our activity. Life itself will determine the