

terminated part of the organized workers of Germany at least would have begun open warfare upon the imperialistic-militarist clique a few years earlier than actually was the case.

To prepare and arrange for such political mass action a close unity of industrial and political bodies as well as a thorough and militant organization of the workers is necessary. This is one of the reasons why the C. L. P. not only declares for revolutionary industrial unionism, but also makes it the duty of all its members to join the forces of industrial unionism already in existence in this country and to work actively in their ranks. Here, once more, the S. P. may claim a close similarity of views, inasmuch as the Chicago Convention of the old Party likewise went on record in favor of industrial unionism, as opposed to craft unionism. But on this question, too, the S. P. is like the platonic lover who entertains friendly relations with several ladies at the same time. Great care was taken not to offend the sensibilities of the American Federation of Labor. And this is only natural. A Party whose main object in life is the gathering in of votes must be careful not to estrange the sympathies of so large a body of voters as the A. F. of L. actually includes. If we recognize the absolute necessity of the industrial form of labor organization for the effective enforcement of the workers' demands, we cannot be content to advise our class concerning the proper method and form, but must assist and co-operate with it in the actual work. But the "actual work" means not only the upbuilding of the union movement on industrial lines but also the destruction of craft unionism. You, comrades of the Socialist Party, cannot, therefore favor industrial unionism and the A. F. of L. at the same time. You must know that the A. F. of L., as fundamentally constituted today, is a hot-bed of reaction and a bulwark of capitalism, and you must say so. In its double-faced treatment of the question of unionism the Socialist Party reflects the attitude taken by important groups among its supporters, the United Hebrew Trades of New York for instance, and similar bodies. The question of industrial unionism has become too big an issue to allow it to be the plaything of clever politicians.

The communist movement in the United States has at present two branches—the Communist Labor Party and the Communist Party. This chapter of disunion of the revolutionary political forces in America is the saddest of all, and shall not be extensively treated at this time. But this must be said, that the formation of two parties became a necessity after it was evident that the Communist Convention would not admit those of Left

Wing delegates who had no credentials for the Convention called for September 1st. The consequence of a submission to the demands of the Communist Party Convention would have been to estrange a goodly number of earnest and sincere revolutionary Socialists from the Communist movement, Socialists who at this time when the American born workers are still conservative, are doubly valuable on account of their American nativity.

The C. L. P. is convinced that eventually there must and will be only one communist political organization in this country and it did everything in its power during and after the Chicago Conventions to bring about the needed unity of forces. But without avail the latest attempt of the C. L. P., a plea for an informal meeting of the two National Executive Committees for the discussion of a basis for unity, has also been refused by the N. E. C. (the Central Committee) of the Communist Party. The C. P. demands unconditional surrender and surrender is impossible. Thus in spite of unity of purpose and principles, the struggle for supremacy between the communist organizations must continue until the membership forces the end of this suicidal warfare.

The C. L. P. feels sure of its ground and is determined to live up to its revolutionary principles. It is certain to survive, for its spirit is that of the undefeated, unconquered, class conscious revolutionary working-class. L.

### The Dynamic Class Struggle

There are no classes; consequently there can be no class-struggle. Such is the official theory of our capitalist government.

To be exact: There may be classes; there may even be what is commonly called a class-struggle. But the government does not, officially, take cognizance of the fact. Following the famous logic of the ostrich it sticks its head into the sand of a shallow theory of equality, while at the same time the hind quarters invariably kick with a dexterity of the equally famous mule Maude, never missing its object, the working-class. The head in the sand must establish the alibi of the ruling class should the workers lose patience and inquire into this disagreeable state of affairs.

But the class-struggle is there, is a fact. Just as it manifests itself through the mule-kicks of the capitalist govern-