

revolution was impossible in Russia, because of its economically undeveloped condition and because the proletariat was not organized into industrial unions; that the day of the Bolshevik victory was the day of their defeat; that the Bolsheviks should not have seized power, but should have labored hard and waited—precisely the policy proposed by the counter-revolutionary Mensheviks. The S. L. P. did not act upon the Soviet proposal for an armistice; and in this, the S. L. P., together with the N. E. C. of the Socialist Party, missed a great revolutionary opportunity and perpetrated a real betrayal of trust. This S. L. P. policy of partial repudiation and misunderstanding was pursued for months; now it is trying to atone, by claiming that it *was* for the Bolsheviks. But in what way? The S. L. P. does not understand the Bolsheviks; its attitude is something like this: what is good in the Bolsheviks is implicit in the S. L. P. program; what is not in the S. L. P. program, is not worth anything. They have forgotten nothing and learned nothing; they do not realize the infinite broadening of tactics made necessary by the new conditions and the experience of the proletarian revolution in action; they do not understand the functions of revolutionary mass action and dictatorship of the proletariat: we have the truth, have always had and always will have the truth: three cheers for the S. L. P.!

The official majority in the Socialist Party adopted a disgraceful policy toward the Bolsheviks. It never answered the call to agitate for the armistice proposal; it was silent about the great proletarian revolution in Russia, until the up-surg-ing feelings of the membership compelled them to speak—and then they spoke in the terms of the politician, in the terms of camouflage. They cheer for the Socialist Republic in Russia, and simultaneously they cheer for—the Socialist Republic in Germany, the bourgeois, counter-revolutionary republic of Ebert, Scheidemann & Co., which is betraying the Revolution!

The representatives and officials of the party refuse to penetrate beneath the surface of events, refuse to “take

sides.” They deny, as did Morris Hillquit, and still deny, I believe, that the International collapsed during the war; they speak much about the “revival of Socialism”—but *which* Socialism? They do not admit the fact that this Socialism is in relentless hostility to the old Socialism, that the implacable struggle against the old petty bourgeois Socialism is a phase of the “revival of Socialism.” They adopt this attitude, because their “Socialism” in fundamentals is identical with that of the Mensheviks in Russia, with that of Ebert, David, Scheidemann & Co. in Germany, with petty bourgeois “majority” Socialism everywhere. They do not want to accept the new, and so they pervert, disguise, and distort events.

Where do you see, in the official Socialist Party press, appreciation and analysis of the problems of the Revolution? Of mass action and proletarian dictatorship? Of the decisive struggle in Russia, of the decisive struggle in Germany—the struggle between “minority” revolutionary Socialism and “majority” petty bourgeois Socialism? Socialism is split asunder by the Revolution—but this fact is carefully concealed; it is concealed because the struggle in Germany and Russia against petty bourgeois Socialism and majority Socialism is a fundamental struggle developing implacably in international Socialism, of universal necessity and significance.

The “representatives” of the party cannot completely avoid the Bolshevik issue, so they adopt the policy of words, of camouflage. The Bolsheviks are acclaimed—miserably, in words; not daringly, in deeds. There is no clear call to the reconstruction of Socialism, no clear call to accept the new purposes and tactics of the revolutionary Third International, no clear call to the revolutionary struggle. Indeed, the N. E. C. of the Party has definitely aligned itself with moderate Socialism in Europe, with the betrayers of Socialism, by delegating, with Oneal and Work, who do not represent revolutionary Socialism, Algernon Lee to the International Congress. Lee is a typical petty bourgeois Socialist; he has been as silent as the proverbial clam concerning the revolutionary events in