

heading "Expulsion"—ah, that were Paradise enow! As De Leon said: "Men with diseased minds are only tickled when the product of their diseased minds is criticized. They care not how hard they are hit; all they want is to be noticed."

One of the factors which aggravated the situation in California was the close family relationship between many of the members involved in the disruption. Mothers-in-law seemed to have figured rather prominently, and in a way which seems to give the lie to the old mother-in-law tradition. Thus we find that when Robineau was expelled, his mother-in-law, Mrs. Hicks, promptly kicks over the traces, getting herself in a position where expulsion seems the only logical answer to her misconduct. A member of Section San Francisco, Mrs. Horstman, was recently expelled for slandering and attacking the Party. It turns out that Mrs. Horstman is the mother-in-law of Max Schwartz who, as a member of the Grievance Committee, submitted that infamous minority report in the Green case. Then we have the cases of the two Giffens, the two Ruizes, the two Schnurs, the two Platos, etc., etc. If one turns disrupter, the other relative follows suit. A case in point is Mrs. Ruiz. Whatever other qualifications the lady may have had, it is now certain that she never understood the principles of the S.L.P. Comrade Hass reports briefly the following incident:

"A short time before the September 22 session of the S.E.C. Mrs. Ruiz told me they were planning to get one of the boys [sons of Ruiz] an appointment to Annapolis and to my objections she replied that he

would be better equipped 'for the revolution.'"

And Comrade Hass adds: "He certainly would be better equipped—to take a place in the forces of the reaction."

There is probably little we can do about such a situation, except to exercise the greatest vigilance in admitting the wife (or husband, as the case might be) of one who is already a member. So aggravating has this situation become that the suggestion has been made that wives of Party members should be barred from membership! This would be manifestly unfair, and would, indeed, be a case of cutting off our nose to spite our face, if there were a possibility of such a suggestion becoming law. Let us, instead, make certain that when a wife desires to join the Party she is prompted to do so by her understanding and acceptance of S. L.P. principles, and not simply because her husband is a member, or because she thinks it will please him if she joins. Or vice versa. And the same applies to brothers and sisters-in-law, mothers-in-law and sons-in-law, etc., etc. Whatever we may do about this matter, it is well to remember that such relationships bring aggravating factors to bear on a disruptive situation.

The depravity of the leading disrupters has been fully exposed, and as in previous disruptive outbreaks the wonder is how such people ever became attracted to the Party—or, having become attracted, the wonder is that they succeeded in remaining members as long as they did. One incident should be mentioned which conclusively demonstrates the infamy of this crew. It concerns two of our active and loyal members,

man and wife, whose names, for reasons that will be readily understood, shall not be divulged at this time. The wife was born in Canada, and she entered this country some years ago on a visitor's pass. She overstayed her time, and subsequently she married in the United States. Knowing little about such matters, and in any case giving very little thought to her mode of entry, the incident had ceased to mean anything to her. She happened, however, to mention the circumstance of her entry into this country to one or two of those who have since turned renegades and traitors. Shortly after the expulsion of Ruiz and the other virulent disrupters, an agent of the Immigration authorities presented himself at the home of these comrades to investigate the "illegal" entry into the United States of the lady comrade, saying that the authorities had received a tip from some unnamed person that Mrs. — had no right to be in the country, and she ought to be deported. The matter awaits a final decision. The point is that only one or two of these disrupters knew about this matter, and to these suspicion narrows down. So utterly rotten was the particular disrupter, that he (or she) had no hesitancy about acting as informer to the authorities! Anything to get revenge on those who fought against the organization anarchists and the traitors. It is well, indeed, that we are rid of such scum.

The California disrupters have attempted to dramatize the *quantitative* aspect of the California disruption, as if this were something to be held against the National Office. To the extent there is cause for reproach and regret in the particular

number of individuals who were expelled in California, to that extent the contemptible disrupters stand all the more exposed in the pillory. Back in the minds of those who stress the quantitative aspect, disregarding the principle involved, lies probably the same thought which prompted the Kangaroos to say that De León was the only one left in the S.L.P. Well, if that had been so, it would have been to De León's credit, and to the everlasting discredit of those who deserted the ship. Commenting on this stupid statement, De León said:

"The Kangaroos have no choice but to take asylum behind the claim that 'De León is the only one left in the S.L.P.' They were driven behind that ditch because they were laughed out of their first ditch that 'De León bosses the S.L.P.' This ditch was wholly untenable, seeing that nobody in the S.L.P. depends for his living upon De León. It only goes to show that when people get rattled with their own lies they cut wondrous capers. These gentlemen are the obverse of Jehovah. Jehovah made something out of nothing; they make nothing out of something."

When a disrupter is put out of the Party, his first thought is revenge. The disrupter, being a species of anarchist (organization anarchist) does not look to material and factual circumstances for the cause of his trouble. He sees as that cause only the individual S.L.P. member whose duty it became to expose him and place him where he could do no more harm. And the anarchist, like the savage, must have revenge. Having no other means at his disposal, he

resorts to slander and vilification of those who opposed and exposed him. The hope is that the membership will take his lies and slanders at their face value, and forthwith turn the Party over to the slanderous scoundrels. Only a naive anarchist could succeed in persuading himself that a revolutionary organization such as the S.L.P. is made of such gullible and simple-minded membership material. In De Leon's rich experience with fakers, slanderers and character-assassins, he did, however, encounter some who permitted themselves to be stuffed, temporarily, at least, and oftenmost because they entertained the quaint notion that they must *disprove* an unfounded slanderous charge. Earnestly De Leon strove to drive the point home that any unsubstantiated charge is a slander; and that he who peddled slanders and lies should be treated to exactly the degree of courtesy and consideration to which any unscrupulous villain is entitled; that, in short, on the slanderer should be conferred the contempt that is best expressed in completely ignoring the slanderer. It was in keeping with this that the N.E.C. adopted at the May, 1935, session a resolution directing all subdivisions to return all lampoons (in whatever guise) to the disrupters and renegades who mailed them. Referring to these "freak-frauds," as De Leon expressed it on one occasion, he said: "It will be a symptom of the movement's vigor when such people will not receive a hearing, just as it is a sign of the movement's present [i.e., 1909] weakness that such people do get a hearing. It is the whooping cough stage of a movement." And chiding a correspondent for being

concerned about certain scamps being ignored by him, De Leon said:

"If you flip away some vermin that tries to bite you, and you then ignore the writhings of the thing as it lies in a ditch by the roadside, would that indicate you have any lingering love for the insect?"

One or two more quotations from De Leon on this subject will not, we believe, be spending too much time on a question which is of considerable importance to the Party—especially at this time when we may expect the reappearance of the lampoons which seem to bloom so regularly, only to be nipped by the cold frost of indifference. In 1909—after having faced twenty years of vilification, slander and all around lampooning—De Leon said:

"The man who proceeds from the theory that he needs proof to disprove the unproved statements and wildly uttered charges of the foe, is routed before he starts. The strong man in the field demands on the spot the proof of allegations against him; or the place when the proof can be obtained; and he will nail on the spot as an irresponsible flabbergaster . . . him who fails to satisfy him in either respect. Any other course would but invite flabbergasterism. One flabbergaster would otherwise be quite enough to set the whole country by the ears in doubts and confusion."

And a few years later (in 1912) he made this trenchant observation: "Not the least of the services that the S.L.P. is rendering to the Socialist movement in this country is that it gives the example of being impregnable to slander. Were the

S.L.P. the weakling that would lose heart before the hurricane of slander that beats against it, then no party of Socialism could ever hope to stand. Slander, once having experienced its destructive power, would ever be ready to practice its methods anew against any new Socialist formation, and would blow up the same to pieces. Be at ease. The S.L.P. cannot be overcome by any of the weapons in the arsenal of swindle."

In refuting the vilifiers, De Leon was not afraid of using vigorous language, though he *never* did so as a substitute for argumentation. On the contrary, he strongly denounced those who used invective as a substitute for logic. "Invective," he said, "has its place in discussion, but then the invective must be an incident of argument. When, however, there is no argument whatever, and insolent sneers only, then demoralization sets in." One of the S.P. fakers at whom De Leon directed many a thrust was Max Hayes who was, and perhaps still is, editor of a Cleveland A. F. of L. sheet. De Leon had nicknamed Max Hayes "Mamie Hayes," and invariably referred to him as "she" and "her." The following delightful Letter Box answer illustrates De Leon's effective method in dealing with such fakers:

"What answer Max Hayes made to the [*Daily People*] exposure of her false statement that wages had gone up? Let's think!—Oh yes, she answered that De Leon had drowned his own grandmother, or something equally to the point, truthful and conclusive!"

If we follow De Leon's example in this, as in other respects, the disrupter reptile can do no harm to

the movement. Flip the vermin off your garment, as De Leon would say, and let him writhe in the dirt where only vermin can be happy. If you leave them stewing in their own mendacity, the slanderers will soon tire. And if there at times arises one among us who can be influenced by such, the disrupters may gladly claim him as one of their very own.

It should be borne in mind, however, that not everyone expelled from the Party is necessarily a deliberate disrupter who forever must be kept out. Time and altered circumstances have frequently wrought wonderful changes in some who, through foolishness, lack of understanding or indiscretion, have found themselves outside the Party. About these De Leon said: "Let us cauterize, but not hack. Let bygones be bygones with whosoever turns over a new leaf. Let war be continued only on those who are incorrigible." In these words De Leon reveals himself to be as wise and understanding, as in other respects he could be relentless and unyielding. Let us remember this also, lest we turn the virtue of Party discipline into the vice of theological self-righteousness, i.e., of damning forever, and consigning to fire and brimstone, the foolish or thoughtless offenders who have seen the errors of their ways, and have developed the qualities that would now fit them for useful activities within the Party.

In recent months there have been some difficulties in Chicago, some of which, at least, would appear to be the result of misunderstanding. Comrades Campbell and Reynolds both wrote letters to the National Secretary, in which Comrades Knudsen and Procum were reported as

having made statements which, if made by them, would indicate that they are out of step, so to speak, with certain contentions and policies of the S.L.P. Vehement denials have been made by the two comrades with respect to most of the statements and views imputed to them. They have charged that both Comrades Campbell and Reynolds misrepresented them—in fact they (or at least Comrade Knudsen) have used some rather strong and unparliamentary language in referring to the Campbell-Reynolds letters. Comrade Culshaw, too, has written the National Office from time to time, but with particular reference to a chart allegedly prepared by Comrade Knudsen which was said to contain provisions for banking and insurance under Socialism. Comrade Culshaw insists (as Comrade Campbell has insisted) that he saw a chart prepared by Comrade Knudsen which made provision for banking and insurance under Socialism. Specifically Comrade Culshaw said in his letter to the National Secretary postmarked March 26: "You are on the right track. There is such a chart [i.e., containing banking and insurance] and I saw it." Comrade Knudsen denies emphatically that there ever was such a chart. In ordinary circumstances the matter would be of little importance, but since the question of veracity (on both sides) is involved it will be necessary to investigate fully this, as well as the other questions in doubt. And this will, of course, be done as speedily as possible.

What makes this question so puzzling is not the denial of Comrade Knudsen that such a chart ever existed, but that it is preposterous

to assume that he could have made such a chart. For if one takes the position that money (gold, silver, etc.) is needed under Socialism, it follows inescapably that banks will also be needed; and, indeed, not only banks, but insurance departments, unemployment insurance, old age pensions, and all the rest that go with a "transition period" of the kind that logically would call for a "dictatorship of the proletariat" a la Russia. How one can argue otherwise is incomprehensible. It is as if one were to explain human life in the arctic zone in terms that precluded existence and possession of furs and woolens. And with respect to Comrade Knudsen's contentions that we shall need money under Socialism, that we shall have problems with respect to distribution of articles produced *for use* which necessitate money, with all that that implies, one simply stands bewildered, unable to account for such glaring inconsistencies and such seemingly hopeless confusion. It is easy to expose error if it sticks consistently to its original premise. For error has its logic as well as truth. But when error deserts its premise, and seeks to argue from premises directly opposed to the very error under consideration, we face a well-nigh hopeless task in so far as the contender in behalf of the error is concerned. And when such a contender happens to be a loyal member, and an otherwise valuable and esteemed comrade, the difficulties are increased still more, since, without causing needless offense, it is not possible to sharpen the argument with what otherwise would be legitimate satire.

The contentions of Comrade Knudsen have been dealt with fully

in the series of editorials that recently appeared in the WEEKLY PEOPLE and there is no intention here of going over the same ground again. A few observations might be made, however, especially in so far as Comrade Knudsen's contentions link logically with the arguments usually made in support of a "transition period," a la Marx's "Gotha Program," a la Soviet Russia. Comrade Knudsen, in his letter of March 31, says:

"I was speaking of the 'early days of Socialism,' not Socialism when distribution is fully organized. Now I want also to state that this does not mean a transition period. I was talking of the days that follow the establishment of the Socialist Industrial Republic, when the State is destroyed. In the period when production is fully socialistically and industrially organized but when distribution is still in the process of being socialistically completed."

It would be difficult to present a comparatively simple question in terms of greater confusion and inconsistency. When Comrade Knudsen speaks of a period of early Socialism, he means by early Socialism what Marx meant when, in the light of the economic possibilities seventy years ago, he spoke (in "The Gotha Program") of the "first phase of Communist society." But it was precisely this "first phase" which today corresponds (or did approximately correspond in 1917) to Soviet Russia. That being so, it follows that such a period (or "phase") is precisely the transition period which necessitates a "Proletarian Dictatorship." Indeed, it is in "The Gotha Program" that Marx em-

ployed that phrase. So that if Comrade Knudsen accepts Marx's "first phase of Communist society" as equivalent to what the S.L.P. conceives to be the first phase of the Socialist Industrial Union Republic, he must accept all that goes with that. Marx implied the presence of the State—in the hands of the workers, a la Russia. Comrade Knudsen accepts all that Marx speaks of as being *economically* inevitable (in the light of the degree of economic development of seventy years ago), but he refuses to accept the logic implicit in such a situation—i.e., a transition period, the State, etc. He speaks of inequality, of rights, etc., as if these had existence independent of the economic development. Yet Marx, in the very pamphlet to which Comrade Knudsen refers, says: "Right can never be superior to the economic development and the stage of civilization conditioned thereby." In other words, an economic development (say as of 1936), infinitely superior to the one prevailing at the time Marx wrote, will reflect rights, and standards of equality, infinitely superior to the lower stage. For the same reasons that render superfluous a transition period in 1936 United States, all the other purely *transitional* measures are rendered superfluous.

Strangely enough, Comrade Knudsen lays great emphasis on distribution under "early Socialism." He considers it as something practically independent of production. And yet he refers again and again to "The Gotha Program" where Marx ridicules the very emphasis the Lassalleans laid on distribution. Comrade Knudsen says that in order to prove him wrong he must be shown

that "immediately on establishing the Socialist Industrial Republic distribution can be moved up to and equal to production in its degree of development. *Distribution will of necessity lay [lag?] behind, how could it do otherwise?*" As if answering Comrade Knudsen with respect to the great stress he lays on "distribution," and his conceiving production and distribution independent of, or in substantial disproportion to each other, Marx says: "...it was altogether a mistake to make much of the so-called *distribution*, and to lay on this the chief emphasis." And Marx adds: "Utopian Socialism ... followed the capitalist economists in regarding and treating distribution as independent of production, and hence represented Socialism as turning chiefly around the question of distribution. AFTER THE TRUE RELATIONSHIP HAS LONG BEEN MADE CLEAR, WHY AGAIN THIS BACKWARD STEP?" (Caps ours.) Indeed why? We might well ask this question of Comrade Knudsen in the very words used by Marx.

In his letter of March 31 (that is, after he had been *proven* absolutely wrong re his contention that money will be needed under Socialism) he says (speaking of the "early years of the Socialist Industrial Republic"): "Here some sort of money is needed, for it has a part to play in the distribution economy." "Distribution economy"—a strange term indeed on the lips of an S.L.P. man who is supposed to understand his Marx. The phrase emphasizes Comrade Knudsen's Utopian notion that distribution is something independent of production. He emphasizes this idea again and again: "I cannot

conceive," he adds, "of the total disappearance of money until distribution is finally organized to conform to Socialist production." He insists that money will finally disappear "when small-scale production is abolished." It is news, indeed, that here in the United States we are faced with "small-scale production." It is stranger news, yet, that even in the earliest days of the Industrial Republic "small-scale production" will persist for quite some time.

When Comrade Knudsen tries to reconcile his insistence on money under Socialism he pleads that he is talking about the early days under Socialism. The implication is that Marx argued that money would be needed during such a period. Even if we disregard the economic development since 1870, Comrade Knudsen would still be wrong. For in "The Gotha Program" (to which Comrade Knudsen refers for support) Marx very plainly says (speaking of Socialism "as it is just issuing out of capitalist society"): "What he [the worker] has given to it [society] is his individual share of labor. For instance, the social labor day consists of the sum of the individual labor hours; the individual labor time of the single producer is the fraction of the social labor day supplied by him, his share of it. *He receives from the community a check showing that he has done so much labor (after deducting his labor due to the common fund), and with this check he draws from the common store as much of the means of consumption as costs an equal amount of labor.*"

In his letter of March 31 Comrade Knudsen attempts to draw a distinction

between *labor voucher* and *labor check*. He accepts labor voucher, but rejects labor check. We have just seen that Marx specifically refers to *labor check*—and *this in the very work Comrade Knudsen quotes to justify his contentions*. Yet Knudsen rejects the labor check sanctioned by Marx, and he quotes Marx in support of his rejection of the labor check! The distinction drawn between labor voucher and labor check is unscientific—indeed, it is unreal and fantastic. There is no difference. There is only one way in which labor can be measured, and that is by its duration. "The quantity of labor, however," says Marx, "is measured by its duration..."

We have seen that Comrade Knudsen is proved wrong again and again, on each and every point, not merely by facts and logic, but by the very passages dealing with this question in Marx's works. It is impossible to account satisfactorily for this phenomenon. Why he should persist in his erroneous contentions in the face of the overwhelming evidence proving him wrong is, indeed, a mystery.

In other respects Comrade Knudsen has furnished cause for doubting his good judgment in matters vitally concerning the Party's interests. Thus he recklessly injected himself into the California disruption by writing a letter addressed to a number of comrades in that state, in which, with complete disregard of the tense situation prevailing, he discussed freely, and in derogatory terms, various members. To write a letter of such a nature under the conditions then existing in California was a case of playing with dynamite. If no serious damage resulted, it

must be attributed to luck. Again he wrote a letter to one of the most ardent supporters of the disrupters, one Max Schwartz, in which he attempted to assay the California situation dialectically, despite the fact that his approach was definitely metaphysical, or theological, if you like. But in any case, as an individual member he had no business to write such letters, and least of all in a disruptive situation. If a member possesses information that he thinks will aid the National Office in handling a disruptive situation, it is his duty to send it to the National Office. But this is precisely what Comrade Knudsen failed to do (until it was too late), though he found it proper and timely to write *individual* members. Persisting in his letter-writing propensity, Comrade Knudsen wrote a letter to Comrade Hass not so long ago, in which he attacked an article in the WEEKLY PEOPLE by Comrade Hass. Comrade Hass quoted from memory De Leon's famous statement about the possibility of a share of social wealth produced under Socialism equal to what it would now require \$10,000 to purchase. Somewhat carelessly, but with the obvious intent of quoting De Leon, Hass had said "every man, woman and child," whereas De Leon said every male, etc. It is not easy to understand why Comrade Knudsen should have thought it necessary to write such a letter unless he took issue with the fundamental idea. Here again, instead of admitting his mistake, Comrade Knudsen attempted to justify it, very much in the manner of his answers to the criticism of his money theories. As the N.E.C. Subcommittee said in its letter to Com-

rade Knudsen of April 9:

"6. With respect to your criticism of Comrade Hass's article, which criticism has justly been designated a 'flank attack' on the Party's position: You are 'rationalizing' rather than reasoning when you impute to Comrade Hass the view that 'every man, woman and child' will actually draw \$10,000 per year. If you really believe that this is Comrade Hass's view, then you must also believe that he contends that a child on its first birthday anniversary will receive its first 'pay check' of \$10,000! That, of course, is sheer nonsense, and you do little justice to Comrade Hass's intelligence to impute to him such a conception. Granted that Comrade Hass could have made his statement with more precision, there is still no excuse for supposing him capable of holding to such a grotesque idea. Isn't it obvious that Comrade Hass was merely quoting, from memory, the oft-repeated statement by De Leon? You ought to know that Hass could not have had in mind to refute De Leon—first, because there would be no point to his wishing to do so; secondly, obviously Comrade Hass did not have the facilities for making such studies and independent research work as would be required, which *might* have led him to conclusions differing from De Leon's. Since you agree with De Leon's statement, and since Hass, of course, merely paraphrased De Leon, there is no actual difference of opinion. For is it not also clear to you that if every *male* (i.e., supposed head of family) would receive as his share that which it *now* would take \$10,000 to purchase—is it not clear, we ask, that every child and woman

would be enjoying that income with the head of the family? Let us by all means steer clear of the metaphysical and theological, and stick to the clearly implied meaning of statements obviously drawn from Party sources, *and unmistakably intended as upholding Party contentions.*

"It may be of interest to quote here a different version of De Leon's reference to the equivalent of \$10,000, etc. The following is from 'Fifteen Questions,' page 83:

"While all the facts requirable for an exact estimate are not accessible, nevertheless, sufficient facts are, from which to induce and deduce the conclusion that—with our population properly organized; with all the machinery that is available, or that can be rendered available, in operation; and with a social system under which production is conducted for use and not for sale and profits;—then, only four hours a day, male adult work, that is, no more exertion than the healthy physical exercise that the body requires, and only for the period of 21 years, will yield to each an annual social share equal to what today it would require \$10,000 to purchase, and enable the workers to be mustered out at the age of 42, veterans in the War against Want, deserving of the rest and the further expansion that the dignity of a useful life and advancing years entitle them to."

"Again you bring into this discussion the personal equation. Granted that you were writing Comrade Hass as a friend—the fact remains that you criticized an article which had appeared in the WEEKLY PEOPLE and which (but for the admittedly somewhat careless phrasing)

clearly and unmistakably restated the Party's and De Leon's contention re affluence under Socialism. Why should you be wasting the valuable time of an organizer on the road (running the risk of getting him entangled in an involved and interminable discussion on non-essentials), not to mention wasting your own time? On general principles your habit of writing these long and involved letters to members is decidedly not one to be encouraged; and in the specific instances before us, and already noted (letters to Michel et al., to Max Schwartz, to Eric Hass, etc., etc.) your letter writing is definitely to be condemned."

In spite of the Sub-Committee's reasoned letter, Comrade Knudsen found it possible to ask: "Should I be branded a 'flank attacker' because I saw this lack of precision?" What Comrade Knudsen is concerned about is not the obvious meaning and intent of Comrade Hass's language, but a wholly incidental, and, in the given setting, wholly unimportant, loose generalization by Comrade Hass.

Now, all this would be comparatively unimportant if it merely involved one member, however esteemed and otherwise valuable that member might be. But it involves much more than that. It involves S.L.P. standards with respect to ability to think realistically and logically; to know what is essential and what is not; to distinguish between the exact words of Marx as applied to a concrete situation long since left behind, and the logical implications, hence *application*, of Marxism; care in quoting and citing

authorities in support of one's contentions, etc., etc., etc. And with regard to those who wish to function as educators of new and young members, it involves the grave responsibility of seeing to it that the principles of the Party are correctly taught the newcomers—to avoid, above all other things, furnishing cause for confusing the Party's position with other groups, in this instance specifically the Anarcho-Communists. And it is in this latter respect, particularly, that Comrade Knudsen has been exposing the Party to harm, with specific reference to his contentions re money under "early Socialism," rejection of the labor check, his contentions regarding "distribution," etc., etc., etc.

When we analyze Comrade Knudsen's contentions carefully, analytically and with total disregard of the personal element, and the non-essential, or merely temporary disturbing factors, we inescapably arrive at the conclusion that Comrade Knudsen's "early Socialism," is the transition period which the Anarcho-Communists say we must have in the United States before "real Socialism" ("Communism") is possible; the transition period, the necessity of which is indicated by Marx at a time, and under conditions, of scarcity, as for example 70 to 100 years ago when Marx wrote and labored. The difference between Comrade Knudsen and those who argued the necessity of a transition period, etc., is that whereas the latter correctly designate such a period *the* "transition period," and accept the logic of such a situation, Comrade Knudsen refuses to do so. He argues a condition of comparative scarcity (he

admits existence of "small-scale production"), yet insists that he agrees with De Leon that with little labor, other than what might be called healthy exercise, it is possible to supply everyone with an abundance of the good things of life. He argues in behalf of money, but rejects its inescapable concomitant, banking. He insists that distribution under "early Socialism" will be inadequate in its relation to production, yet he claims he agrees with the Party that the Socialist Industrial Republic is possible without serious dislocation. He argues that "bourgeois rights" will prevail, and since "bourgeois rights" imply class rights, he thereby admits the inescapable consequence, namely, *class strife*; yet he vigorously denies the need of political, i.e., State force to maintain order. And while denying the need of political force, he argues (in his letter of March 31) that there will be need of "a certain system of compulsion which in the organization and operation of production as well as in the distribution of products will be based upon some institution of compulsion." What else can that "institution of compulsion" be except the Political State? Yet Comrade Knudsen denies there will be a State. And as to force, when questioned specifically on that point he changes his view again, and says that what he means is "that under the early days of Socialism he who does not work shall not eat"! After arguing strenuously on matters that are entirely economic, and quoting Marx on these economic questions, he then suddenly turns around and says that "the psychological conditions cannot be changed until

we have lived for at least some time under Socialism....," and he adds that he thinks that that was what Marx was talking about when he spoke of the difficulties in "early Socialism," i.e., that it was not economic conditions but psychological conditions Marx had in mind when he commented on this in "The Gotha Program"! Altogether an almost hopeless confusion, and a series of contradictory positions on a number of important questions that normally admit of neither confusion nor contradictions.

Normally when a person argues in such illogical and contradictory fashion, the conclusion is drawn that he is the victim of conflicting emotions, that may have been produced by a variety of causes. One cause might be that such a person has read too much of Marx without fully understanding and assimilating what was read. Hence, having failed to grasp the essence of Marx, the *letter* of Marx is accepted without applying the principle to the profoundly changed circumstances. Comrade Knudsen might just as logically have quoted Marx from "The Communist Manifesto," and argued that we must agitate for "a heavy progressive or graduated income tax"; "confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels"; "centralization of credit in the hands of the State...."; "abolition of children's factory labor in its present form"; and all the rest of the "immediate demands" enumerated in the "Communist Manifesto." If we must accept Marx literally in "The Gotha Program" (written 70 years ago), why must we not accept him literally in the "Communist Manifesto," written 90 years ago?

Is the difference between European capitalism of 1847 and 1870 so much greater than the difference between Europe of 1870 and ultra-capitalist United States of 1936? No one in his senses would answer in the affirmative. Comrade Knudsen, having plenty of good sense, must realize the impossible position he has taken. He must further realize that if his contentions were accepted, the S.L.P. might as well go out of business. For with such contentions we could not argue logically for our 1936 Industrial Union Government program. — And with this we might well close the consideration of this subject so far as Comrade Knudsen is concerned.

Asininity and Menace of Reform in a Revolutionary Era.

The Anarcho-Communists, having no sense, and being in the main the disreputable slum element we know them to be, *can* and *do* argue in favor of accepting such contemporaneous measures as are enumerated in the "Communist Manifesto"; they do argue in favor of contentions and transitional measures that were

logical at the time Marx wrote "The Gotha Program." They do insist on imitating a European country where conditions were, and still are (largely), the very opposite of what they are in the United States. Their imbecility in these, and other respects, has become proverbial. We have not the time now to go into this question, or the important subject of "early Socialism," and all that is implied in the various contentions made by the Russian Communists (leaving aside now the stupid parroting by the American Anarcho-Communists). It is a subject that could be adequately dealt with only in a lecture, or expanded into a full-sized book. A few points might be made to indicate, not only the stupidities, but the villainies committed by those who so recklessly and unscrupulously misquote or misapply Marx. It is with regret that we have to recognize that responsibility for a good deal of this nonsense must be fastened on Lenin, who in so many other respects rose superior to his time and environment, but facts leave us no alternative.*

*Ten years ago the National Secretary of the Socialist Labor Party stated, in his report to the 1926 session of the N.E.C., the following:

"Through one of those strange contradictions which sometimes defy analysis, the foremost leader of the Russian Revolution, Nicolai Lenin, at one moment gives almost unqualified approval to the foremost Marxian Socialist of modern times, Daniel De Leon, and yet, the very next moment, so to speak, endorses the very elements, principles and tactics which constitute the antitheses to De Leonism and De Leon's work. It is not the purpose here to go into a detailed explanation of this seeming phenomenon. It is a subject which will form part of a critical analysis of Lenin and his work—a critical analysis that sooner or later will have to be made and which can

only be made by an S.L.P. man. The capitalist apologist or bourgeois liberal is, of course, incapable of appraising the character and work of such a man as Lenin, and the crowd of fanatical worshipers and agents provocateurs, that make up the burlesque crowd, are, of course, equally incapable of doing so. Such a critical analysis will reveal parallels and contrasts between Lenin and De Leon. It will reveal that while both men were Marxists, both were able to arrive at almost diametrically opposed conclusions with regard to policies and tactics. These contrasts cannot be explained on any grounds of personal idiosyncrasies or intellectual shortcomings or superiority. They can be explained only on the ground that one of these men was born and reared in Russia, the most backward of all modern great countries (eco-

In "The Gotha Program" Marx speaks of the "first phase of Communist society," and of the "higher phase of Communist society." It is important to remember that whenever Marx and Engels used the terms "Communism" and "Socialism" they meant by those terms the identical thing. They meant the identical thing for the reason that they *were* and *are* the identical thing, provided one understands by both terms the society based on the principles identified with Marxism. In the early period of the movement the Socialist movement was referred to as the *Communist* movement—hence "Communist Manifesto." The reason for this designation was the existence of visionaries who called themselves Socialists, i.e., *Utopian Socialists*, and in order to dissociate themselves completely from utopianism, Marx and Engels found it necessary to discard the term Socialism. Later, when Utopian Socialism ceased to have any influence whatever, the term Socialism was adopted. The important point to remember is that both Marx and Engels always regarded "Socialism" and "Communism" as synonymous terms. At no time did they regard "Socialism" as a phase of "Communism," or "Communism" as a phase of "Socialism." It is most important to note this. When En-

conomically speaking) and that the other spent his adult life in the United States, the most progressive (again economically speaking), the most highly developed capitalist country in the world. The fact of Lenin having been born and reared in Russia, with all things Russian forming a starting point for the development of his theories, placed him at a disadvantage. Though in the current sense Lenin was certainly an internationalist, yet in the most real and least spectacular sense he

gels prepared for publication one of his most famous works, he did not call it "Communism from Utopia to Science." He called it, "*Socialism from Utopia to Science*." When Marx and Engels issued their immortal manifesto they did not call it "Socialist Manifesto." They called it "*Communist Manifesto*." In each instance Marx and Engels meant the same thing, namely, what we today call *Socialism*, and more specifically *Marxian Socialism*. And when they spoke of *Communist society* they had in mind what at other times they designated Socialist society—the term now universally accepted as the proper designation of the classless, non-political, no-state industrial cooperative commonwealth.

Bearing all these things in mind it is with amazement and disgust that we turn to Lenin's treatment of the subject in his brochure entitled, "The State and Revolution." Here he says: "And here we come to that question of the scientific difference between Socialism and Communism...." "Scientific difference"! Scientific difference between two words that mean exactly the same thing! To be sure, Lenin does make the point that "that which is generally called Socialism is termed by Marx the first or lower phase of Communist society." But that explanation increases the iniquity of

was essentially a nationalist. Russian history, Russian traditions, Russian revolutionary experiences dominated almost completely his entire mind, and furnished him with premises that could but lead to conclusions peculiarly suited to, as they certainly reflected, Russian conditions. On the other hand, De Leon enjoyed the advantage of having as his environment the most highly developed capitalist country in the world."

this playing fast and loose with terms. For in referring to "that which is generally called Socialism" Lenin is guilty of surreptitious injection of premises—the injected premises being that Marx tacitly recognized a distinction between "Socialism" and "Communism," and that such a distinction in any case constituted a difference in *kind*, instead of a mere difference in *degree*. Marx, of course, did nothing of the kind. That Lenin could have been guilty of such a reprehensible juggling with terms and concepts is, indeed, amazing, until we remember that in other respects he has recommended the use of unscrupulous methods. (As, for example, when he counsels double-dealing tactics—see his advice in "Left Wing Communism," where he says "It is necessary...., if need be, to resort to strategy and adroitness, illegal proceedings, reticence and subterfuge, to *anything* in order to penetrate into the Trades Unions....." In what appears to be another version of the same statement Lenin is quoted—in an American Anarcho-Communist pamphlet entitled, "Should Communists Participate in Reactionary Trade Unions?" by Lenin—as advising the Communists to "practise trickery, to employ cunning, and resort to illegal methods—to sometimes even overlook or conceal the truth...." How literal the Anarcho-Communist unprincipled scoundrels have taken Lenin is well known! In this respect Lenin is the very opposite of Marx, Engels and De Leon who, in their stern intellectual probity and integrity spurned double-dealing tactics. As De Leon put it: "Pantomimes, mummery and double sense are utterly

repellent to, and repelled by, the Proletarian Revolution." However, what Lenin started, his followers have carried on, and with the added corruption which inevitably follows when an illogical or immoral principle is adopted by second and third-rate imitators of the one who originally laid down that principle. The nonsense about the difference between a "Socialist society" and a "Communist society" reached a new high last fall when Joseph Stalin, with much affectation of erudition, discoursed upon this "difference." The so-called "Stakhanov movement" furnished the text. The "Stakhanov movement" was nothing more nor less than a crude and instinctive effort made by a workingman, Stakhanov, to speed up production. As Stalin put it: "... the Stakhanov movement ... represents a model of that high productivity of labor which only Socialism can produce and which capitalism cannot produce." This naively absurd declaration is made by a man who knows that his words will be read by workers in the United States, where the "Stakhanov movement" would be considered outdated by reason of the fact that the productive technique and capacity of American capitalism far outdistances the relatively feeble efforts of the Stakhanovites! But the occasion furnished Stalin with the opportunity to serve a warmed-up dish of Lenin's hash about the difference between "Socialist society" and "Communist society." And what a hash Stalin serves! "The Stakhanov movement," said Stalin, "represents the future of our industry." So far so good. "It contains the kernel of the future cultural and technical

advance of the working class." Let that pass. But when he says that "it opens before us the road upon which alone can be achieved those higher records of labor productivity which are essential to the *transition from Socialism to Communism* and to the elimination of the difference between mental and manual labor"—when he utters such nonsense, we in the United States who have economically, industrially, passed that "initial stage" long ago, must smile, or roar, as our varying temperaments may prompt!

The mischief done by such nonsense is incalculable. One of its results is to maintain, and add to that sense of the unreal, the fantastic, and in most cases utterly burlesque character of what passes for Communism in such highly developed countries as the United States. Another result is the production of books by the horde of would-be intellectuals who are attracted to Anarcho-Communism as bees are attracted to honey, and who find a ready market for their literary groceries among the "faithful." With the most solemn faces, the Anarcho-Communist simpletons and fakers repeat, and embellish upon, the nonsense until we have a feeling as if we were visiting a Dr. Tarr and Professor Fether's *Maison de Santé*, or, in simple English, a lunatic asylum as described in Poe's tale. What these people fail to understand is that the more highly developed capitalism is, industrially and in every other way, the less need will there be of periods wherein all these painful efforts to increase production are vital, and the more unreal, accordingly, must such talk sound in a country such as the

United States, where most of these problems are already solved—*right within the shell of capitalism*. They fail to understand that "with the varying degree of development of productive power, social conditions and the laws governing them vary too." When they quote Marx on the difficulties to be encountered in the early phase of Socialist society, they fail to understand that the tremendous degree of development that has taken place since Marx obviously has caused a change in the social conditions, and in the laws governing them. They have completely failed to grasp the simple fact that economically, from the viewpoint of production capacity, we in the United States are now, *de facto*, in that higher economic stage implied in Marx's reference to the higher phase of Socialist society. And that, therefore, in this country all this talk about transition measures, *political dictatorship*, survival of capitalist practices, etc., etc., becomes unintelligible gibberish—as unreal, for instance, as if someone were to speculate on our being able to manufacture enough stage coaches so that everybody might take a ride!

This grotesqueness fostered by the Russian Communists, finds its counterparts in other lines. One of the most outstanding ones is the "new" *All* or *Huge* "People's Front." It is interesting to note how readily the Communists disregard Marx's words when they should not do so, while clinging to the *letter* of Marx when their common sense (if any) should teach them differently. If there is anything Marx and Engels emphasized, it was their condemnation of fusion, collaboration and all around logrolling with capi-

talist parties and governments. Yet, this is what is now urged upon the faithful from Moscow, and in the name of Marx! Dimitroff, the successor of the once incomparable Zinovieff (now languishing in who knows what prison camp)—Dimitroff, in his speech to the recent "Comintern Congress," enthusiastically, almost ecstatically, exclaimed: "But in the capitalist countries we defend and shall continue to defend every inch of bourgeois-democratic liberties which are being attacked by Fascism and bourgeois reaction, because the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat so dictate." "Every inch" of it, no less! One wonders if these words might have cooled Mr. Dimitroff's ardor: "Bourgeois democracy, while constituting a great historical advance in comparison with feudalism, nevertheless remains, and cannot but remain, a very limited, a very hypocritical institution, a paradise for the rich and a trap and a delusion for the exploited and poor.... At every step, even in the most democratic bourgeois states, the oppressed masses come across the crying contradictions between the formal equality proclaimed by the 'democracy' of the capitalists, and the thousand and one *de facto* limitations and restrictions which make the proletarians wage-slaves. And when the era of revolution has begun, Kautsky turns his back upon it and starts to extol the charms of moribund bourgeois democracy!" This was written by Lenin in castigation of "Kautsky the Renegade"! By the same token, and in the words of Lenin, why should not the present-day Russians be called "Stalin the Renegade," or "Dimitroff the Renegade"? Kaut-

sky, on this particular point, could not have sinned more grievously than Stalin and Dimitroff. Indeed, one can almost hear Lenin say: "And now, when the era of revolution has begun, Dimitroff turns his back upon it, and echoes bourgeois democratic hypocrisy, and starts to extol the charm of bourgeois democracy!"

Mr. Dimitroff was reported (in an Associated Press despatch in the New York *Sun* of August 31, 1935) as having urged the Communist party to support Mr. Roosevelt's campaign for re-election—an entirely logical proposal from the premises of Mr. Dimitroff and the Anarcho-Communists. The Anarcho-Communist papers have carefully suppressed all references to this suggestion from Mr. Zinovieff's successor. But already such "Socialistic" labor leaders as Dubinsky of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, and Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, have come out strongly in support of Roosevelt. And again, why not? The interests of the labor fakers are being well looked after by the kind Mr. Roosevelt. And so, if the "Farmer-Labor party" fails to materialize, or, materializing, if it kicks the Anarcho-Communists all over the political arena as La Follette did in 1924, we may yet witness the Communist party endorsing Franklin Delano Roosevelt!

In its relation with foreign capitalist powers, Soviet Russia has entered the game for all it is worth. While Communist parties were calling for a "united front" with the Ethiopians against Italy, Russia was blithely supplying the gangster Mussolini with oil so that he could continue his marauding expedition in

Africa. A despatch in the New York Times of September 8, 1935, states the facts succinctly: "While officially condemning Italy's Ethiopian campaign as an imperial attempt to subdue a free people the Soviet Union is furthering Fascist aims and profiting from them by exporting supplies to the Italian camps in Africa." And the despatch goes on to give particulars:

"Most of the freighters carry cargoes of wheat from Sebastopol and coal tar from Nicolaiev for new roads destined to cross the Ethiopian frontiers. The shipments were sold by the Soviet through the federal monopolies. Coal is also shipped from Theodosia and oil from Batum; but most of the fuel goes to Italy."

The Soviet Government insisted on cash, and the typical capitalist psychology is revealed when it is added that "the war business with Italy is more profitable to the Soviet than the trade with other Mediterranean countries...."

The lying Anarcho-Communist organ, the *Daily Worker*, has not dared to deny the substantial truthfulness of this account. The best they have been able to do is to try to belittle the significance of this unprincipled action by people who are supposed to be governed by Marxian standards. In its January 31 issue the sheet argues that Soviet trade with Italy has declined, that oil shipments have been cut, etc., etc. Its very effort is an acknowledgment that Soviet Russia is supplying Italy's marauding gangs with the means to carry on the war—in conjunction, of course, with capitalist countries. Whether this is done in greater or lesser degree, as com-

pared with previous years, is immaterial. Competition with such powerful combinations as Standard Oil has no doubt caused Soviet Russia to lose oil trade; this, and no other cause, is undoubtedly responsible for the falling off. The point of the Communist sheet is as imbecile as anything else emanating from that camp. For if it means anything it can only mean that Soviet Russia will sell so much, but no more, to the Italian bandit! What the *Daily Worker* in effect is saying by making this unique explanation is that it was *only* such a *leetle* bit of a baby!

The attitude of the Russian Communists toward the S.L.P. remains as hostile as ever. And so long as the Russians pursue their anti-Marxian tactics, this is not to be wondered at. One of the outstanding examples of the unprincipled and un-Marxian attitude toward the Marxian S.L.P. was the persecution of our Bulgarian comrade, D. Pancoff, who spent a few years in Russia, returning to the United States in the fall of 1933. The most degrading propositions were offered him if he would only renounce and denounce the S.L.P., but in Comrade Pancoff they found an uncompromising S.L.P. revolutionist. The story is told in detail in the WEEKLY PEOPLE of August 25, 1934. It will be included as an appendix to this report, but it is scarcely necessary to repeat the story here. His chief persecutor in Russia was one George Andreychin, a shady character who had been active in the Anarcho-Communist movement in America. Being a shady character from America, he naturally rose to high honors in Russia; for lying like

a trooper about the S.L.P. constitutes first-class credentials with the simpletons who have given credence to the stories told about the S.L.P. by every renegade from America, from Reinstein up or down. Comrade Baeff has recently informed us that this worthy gentleman is now enjoying the wide and open spaces of Siberia, where he was exiled for counter-revolutionary activities. There is such a thing as poetic justice. If Andreychin had remained in the United States he would probably be one of the great "leaders" here. Too bad the rest of the slum element in the Communist party do not likewise migrate to Russia. They, too, might, probably *would*, find peace and contentment in Siberia.

The reform madness of the Anarcho-Communists has reached its heights in recent years. There is no reform proposal so fraudulent, so idiotic, so typically petty bourgeois, but that the Communist reformers will annex it, and parade it as the very latest in revolutionary propaganda. That typical bourgeois philistine, Mr. Earl Browder, said in one of his snarls at the S.L.P.: "We Communists declare that only our *revolutionary policies* can bring victories for the workers in the day to day battles for *immediate demands*."!! (*New Masses*, May 28, 1935.) "Revolutionary policies"—to produce sops! This is not mere madness—it is bovine stupidity at its worst. Brazenly these reformers ally themselves with the most reactionary elements in society, the petty agricultural exploiters, and the urban petty bourgeoisie. In one of their election pamphlets (1933) they declare that "the most important allies of the American working class are

the poor and small farmers." And the pamphlet goes on to say that "it is possible to win over to the side of the workers broad sections of the lower petty bourgeoisie...." And it continues: "...the broad masses of the petty bourgeoisie in the towns and in the rural districts are its [i.e., the working class] allies in the struggle against the bourgeoisie!" With sublime scorn Frederick Engels, in his excellent "The Housing Question," lashes this sort of thing when he riddles what he designates "the alleged identity of the interests of the petty bourgeoisie and the workers." And he adds: "Bourgeois Socialism [read Anarcho-Communism] extends its hand to the petty bourgeois variety." Engels ridicules the reform proposals of the "bourgeois Socialists," which today are most noisily represented by the Anarcho-Communists. His execration of the reformers of his day sounds exactly like an S.L.P. criticism of the petty reform program of the Communist party. "It is obvious," said Engels, "that this whole reform plan is to benefit almost exclusively the petty bourgeois and the small peasant in that it *consolidates* them in their position as petty bourgeois and small peasants." This is, almost word for word, what the S.L.P. has said right along about the Communist party bourgeois reformers. The Anarcho-Communists yammer about the huge taxes supposedly loaded on the workers. "Taxes!", scornfully exclaims Engels. "A matter, to the bourgeoisie of deep, to the workingmen, however, of very slight concern. That which the workman pays in taxes goes, in the long run, into the value of labor power, and, accordingly,

must be borne by the capitalists. All these things which are held up to us here as highly important questions for the working class are in reality of essential interest only to the bourgeoisie, and in particular to the petty bourgeoisie, and, despite Proudhon, we assert that the working class is not called upon to look after the interests of these classes." Despite Engels, our modern Proudhons, the Communist party, consider themselves called upon to look after the interests of the petty farmers and the petty bourgeoisie everywhere. If they are confronted with such an utterance by Engels, they will probably say that if Engels had only had the chance to read Lenin and Stalin, he would never have uttered such counter-revolutionary language!

The worthy parent of the Communist party, viz., the petty bourgeois Socialist party, is apparently in the last stages of decay. Being the spawn of corrupt, anti-working class elements, it is dying the inevitable reform death. It started as a deliberate effort to destroy revolutionary Marxism in the United States, as represented in the S.L.P. It terminates its disgraceful career of reformism and opportunism after 35 years of constant lying about Socialism. It remains an object lesson which probably was needed, and which the workers will not let go unheeded. Having attempted to be all things to all men, it is ending by being less than nothing even to the reactionary capitalist interests which promoted its growth, and which no doubt had a hand in its being launched in 1900. A quarter of a century ago it was already being referred to, by one of its then lead-

ing members, as having become a hissing and a by-word with the American working class. It has acted as a hatchery for the most reactionary servants and agents of the capitalism, among whom may be noted such outstanding capitalist apologists as Walter Lippmann, John Spargo, W. J. Ghent and many others. Whenever the reactionary press needs a particularly effective vilifier of Socialism, they turn to the S.P., and select the one most likely to fill the particular need of the moment.

Mr. Norman Thomas has contributed rather materially to the hastening of the hour when the *coup de grace* might be administered to the contemptible thing which for so many years dragged the fair name of Socialism through the gutter. Curiously enough, it was Mr. Thomas who was picked in 1924 or so to put new life into the S.P., which already then was beginning to die with dry rot, its decline having been hastened by the La Follette *liaison* of 1924. Mr. Thomas was made the editor of a daily S.P. paper published in New York. In no time the gentleman ran through a small fortune in this publishing adventure. There is poetic justice here, too, in that the 1924 would-be resuscitator of the S.P. should be one of the chief instruments to put the wretched thing out of its misery. For no one seriously believes that the S.P. will ever be made to play any role in the times that lie ahead. There are, of course, no principles involved in the struggle between the two factions so far as Socialism is concerned. Mr. Thomas, as a "Marxian," is even more amusing than any one which the

"Old Guard" might offer. As social "scientists" they are the most ignorant and grotesque lot that has ever paraded on the colorful American scene. To assure his pals in the circles of capitalism that they have nothing to fear from his "left-ism," Mr. Thomas tells them (in his radio speech on February 2 last) that "we [i.e., the S.P.] are even willing to offer moderate compensation to those [i.e., the plutocrats] who will come along peacefully." That ought to fetch over the Rockefellers, the Schwabs, the Fords, the du Ponts, etc., etc.! Pompously this naive fellow struts the stage, alternately engaging in debates with his friend, Mr. Browder, who practically speaks the same language. The two worthies have debated the identical subject in a number of cities, being toured exactly as circuses are being toured. A veritable racket! The element of surprise in these "debates" has been worn pretty thin by this time. The general attitude of these reformers (S.P. as well as Anarcho-Communist) is summed up splendidly in the action of Alfred Baker Lewis, the 1934 S.P. candidate for governor in Massachusetts, who last fall wired congratulations to the elected capitalist governor of his state, the Ultramontane politician, James M. Curley. Said Mr. Lewis, the "Socialist," to the capitalist governor:

"Congratulations on your decisive victory over a banking-industrial machine which the people have come to despise. Your great victory is due to the support of organized labor and those persons who have felt the pangs of want in this depression.

"It is to be hoped that you will

show your gratitude to the class which elected you by refraining from allying yourself with their exploiters and by supporting badly needed social legislation.

"I do not expect that the defeated Republican candidate with his peculiar ideas of government will congratulate you, so I am doing it on behalf of the defeated candidates."

And these fakers and clowns parade as Socialists!! But, after all, Mr. Lewis, the S.P. reformer, is no worse than the Communist reformers who urge support of out-and-out capitalist programs, who are ready to fight "every inch" for decadent bourgeois democracy, and who were advised by Mr. Dimitroff to support Roosevelt this campaign.

Industrial Unionism, Strikes, Etc.

When the banner of Industrial Unionism was raised some 30-odd years ago, it was hailed, on the one side, with shouts of hosanna, and, on the other, with sneers, shrieks of rage and derision. Whatever were the defects of the original I.W.W. (De Leon said of it later, in 1911, for example, that "there is not now, and never yet was, an I.W.W. in point of structure")—whatever its defects, it represented a mighty step forward, and served to inspire and rally the revolutionary elements in the working class. With unerring instinct the S.P. politicians and the Gompers A. F. of L. fakers denounced it as all that was evil. Gompers and Co. naturally resented what they considered an intrusion on the field which they held to be their monopoly, and also, being faithful capitalist watchdogs, they were bound to resist anything which threatened to

upset the system of wage slavery, in which also, as labor lieutenants of the capitalists, they had a vested interest. The S.P. politicians, on the other hand, were bound to resist the menace of Industrial Unionism — first, because their chief excuse for existence was to serve as buffers and apologists for the A. F. of L.; and, secondly, because a union movement which seriously threatened to unite the working class on a truly revolutionary basis, would have spelled “finish” to their corner-grocer reform business; because, further, the thousands of literary hacks, pulpit-eers without pulpits, lawyers without clients, “professors” without jobs, journalists rejected by reputable capitalist papers, politicians without office, etc., etc., who flocked into the S.P. had found, ready-made, so to speak, a good market for their wares or various “talents.” Books, worthless as literature and as works on Socialism, or on economics and sociology, were turned out by what virtually amounted to mass production methods, books of the type satirically described by De Leon (in referring to the products of the charlatan, W. J. Ghent, whose “investigations” led him to conclude that there were “six distinctive economic classes in America today”!)—these literary groceries were described by De Leon as follows: “Frankly? Very frankly? What we think of Mr. W. J. Ghent’s style and books? The books can be epitomized in the style, which goes ‘about and about and all the way round to nothing and nonsense.’” Unfrocked or pulpitless clerics flocked into the S.P., finding, like the literary grocers, a ready field for them—congregations waiting for

a “pastor.” And so we had “Christian Socialist” churches not infrequently addressed by ex-Rabbis, or by those who failed to attain rabbinical distinctions; Sunday morning forums addressed by Reverend this or that (outstanding among these ex-preachers were Stitt Wilson, John D. Long, Charles H. Vail, etc., etc.), and all sorts of imitations of revival meetings and holy rollers. Hordes of lawyers descended on the hapless S.P. membership, reaping fortunes out of labor cases, and by defending the gold brick swindlers in the S.P. who every now and then landed in the law’s net. Mountebanks, who knew little of law, nothing about Socialism, but a great deal about swindling their “dear comrades,” flourished for quite a while, some of them turning to such sidelines as writing “histories” about Socialism—“histories” that would have caused Marx and Engels (and every decent and intelligent person) to groan with anguish. Third and fourth rate college professors rose to high eminence as “instructors” in the various “Schools of Social Science” (vide the New York Rand School), the product of their classes resembling nothing so much as some of the products turned out by Roman Catholic seminaries—ignorant, arrogant and ruined for life so far as Socialism was concerned. Would-be journalists, hack writers, dispensed their dull-witted comments to the gaping S.P. rank-and-file whose brains by this time had been fairly gouged out, and the more of these “journalists” that flocked into the S.P., the more papers and magazines became necessary. The question never was: Is such and such a paper needed? But rather: Can we

place that promising youngster who seems unscrupulous enough to be willing to lie effectively about Socialism? And so on and so forth.

This horde of exploiters of working class sentiment, these careerists, grafters and downright swindlers, constituted a formidable force, a vested interest, whose very lives depended on a continuation of the *status quo*, and who, therefore, recognized in Industrial Unionism the broom that would sweep them out of the labor movement, into oblivion, unwept and unsung. In the language of Marx, the specter of an all-powerful, all-pervading Industrial Union organization “summoned into the field of battle the most violent, mean and malignant passions of the human breast, the Furies of private interest.” Confronted with this horde, supported and lashed into greater fury by the Gompers fakers, and the plutocracy and their allies, the I.W.W. was doomed. Realizing that such an organization could not be killed outright or violently, the stratagem of setting up a bogus I. W.W. was resorted to. In 1908 such a concern was launched, which has become known as the “bummery” or the Anarcho-Syndicalist I.W.W. Realizing now that this emasculated I. W.W. was harmless, and recognizing in it, moreover, something that was now kin to themselves, the S.P. politicians opened their arms wide to the bogus I.W.W., and for a while the S.P. press featured with pride the Haywoods, the Gurley Flynns, and the rest. The honeymoon was of short duration, but when the parting of the ways came, it was not because of principles (as Wm. Zig-Zag Foster said: “I have no teachings or principles”), but solely for

the same reasons that thieves fall out: quarrels over division of the spoils.

During all this time the S.L.P. carried on its agitation for genuine Industrial Unionism, never yielding a hair’s breadth on principle. With the increase in revolutionary feeling, with the breakdown of capitalism, and increasing proof of the A. F. of L.’s being merely an auxiliary of the capitalist juggernaut of exploitation, the idea of Industrial Unionism has been revived in ever wider circles. Despite the stupidities of the Anarcho-Communists, despite their ignorance of the form and goal of Industrial Unionism, and their attempts to scuttle all efforts at presenting the true principles, the Industrial Union idea has persisted. Scenting danger again—to the capitalist system, as well as to the A. F. of L. and the vested interests now represented in the so-called Communist party—agitation for another bogus industrial union has been launched, this time through one of the rival chieftains of the A. F. of L., John L. Lewis, an ardent supporter of the capitalist politician, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The original bogus I.W.W. mouthed revolutionary phrases, but became a caricature of the genuine I.W.W. by reason of its non-political, hence anarchist, declaration. The proposed industrial union, agitated by Lewis, the Anarcho-Communists and the remnants of the S.P., not only is non-political (except in so far as it will be used to promote capitalist political interests), but in point of form it bears but a surface resemblance to the genuine Industrial Union, and its goal is the direct opposite of the latter. Desperate, indeed, must the

situation appear to be to capitalism and its trusted servants when such desperate methods are deemed necessary. History is here repeating itself.—First, it was the setting up of a bogus Socialist party, in order to scuttle the revolutionary S.L.P. That was the period of “Me too” Socialism. Everybody was a Socialist—a la S.P. History now repeats itself in this “Me too” Industrial Unionism. Everybody is now an Industrial Unionist—a la Lewis and Anarcho-Communism. De Leon once observed that this is a phase of the movement. “At a certain stage,” he said in 1906, “capitalists are ready to say: ‘We are all Socialists.’ So are the pure and simple Socialists, at the present time, ready to say: ‘We are all Industrialists.’ *It is the danger period of a movement when those, whose interests oppose, pretend to favor it.*”

Speaking of bogus industrial unionism brings to mind a statement made by De Leon shortly after the launching of the I.W.W. Said De Leon in 1906:

“Industrial Unionism does not mean a federation or confederation of the crafts engaged in one industry. It does not mean even the closely blending of those several crafts into one organization. It means the integral organization of the working class. That implies organization upon the high plane that presupposes the Socialist or Revolutionary conception of the economic organization, to wit, that the economic organization is the constituency of the parliament of labor; that the said parliament must be composed of the representatives of the several main divisions of industry; and that the said parliament is to

take over the reins of government, thereby abolish the Political State and thus establish the Industrial Republic.”

Other attempts are being made ceaselessly to prevent the organizing of the workers into genuine revolutionary Industrial Unions, notable among these being the company unions. This is one of the most sinister manifestations, for the reason, first, that it is hatched, so to speak, in the executive offices of the plutocracy, and, secondly, in that it bears a deceptive resemblance to the form of genuine Industrial Unionism. “The devil hath power to assume a pleasing shape,” said Shakespeare. So pleasing, indeed, that some who should have known better have all but fallen for the “pleasing shape” which they seem to see in company unionism. A typical incident, illustrating the fatuousness of hoping for anything from the company union as far as the Revolution is concerned, is found in the case of an expelled Cincinnati disrupter (an anonymous rat, by the way) who mailed to one of our members a newspaper clipping in which it was asserted that the employers are beginning to look upon the company union as a bugaboo, because some of them had shown tendencies to cut the company apron strings, and to gravitate toward the Lewis bogus industrial union movement. The disrupter rat gloatingly writes: “The writer a very long time ago tried to point out that the company union was a stepping stone to real industrial organization and that the S.L.P. couldn’t organize the slaves, but the captains of industry could and would organize them into a solid union.” The diseased mentality of

the anarchist (here primarily organization anarchist) enables this idiot to conclude that because the unenlightened workers are willing to be roped in by Lewis’s fake industrial unionism, therefore it is proved that company unions are a stepping stone to “real industrial organization”! The very fact that these workers look with favor on fake industrialism is, if not positive proof, at least a strong indication that company unionism prepared them as willing victims of the sinister move ostensibly launched by labor lieutenant John L. Lewis. What company unions do, as well as bogus industrial unionism, is to prepare the workers for the absolute slavery that is looming up, and which the S.L.P. has designated Industrial Feudalism. That, and not Industrial Freedom, is the point to which the road of company unions and bogus industrial unionism leads. And our Party cannot too strongly emphasize this important point.

The times we are passing through indicate, to the clear-minded, well-posted Marxist, the kind of organization that the revolutionary situation requires. The Frenchman Diderot, whose writings contributed so mightily to a shaping of the issues that culminated in the French Revolution, said: “The need produces the organ; the organization determines the function.” The need is the revolution. That need must be satisfied and in keeping with existing material circumstances. Hence revolutionary Industrial Union organization. Once organized on a proper basis, and headed revolutionward, the organization will respond to the functional demand placed upon it. First, the overthrow of capitalism.

Secondly, the functioning as the administrative organ of the new Socialist society. In this sense, the Socialist Labor Party is swimming *with* the current, whatever other artificial obstacles there may be to impede our progress toward the goal. The emancipation of the working class—that is the issue which is forcing itself through the mass of fake or secondary issues which serve to obscure that real issue, even as the issues of state’s rights, etc., served to obscure the real Civil War issue: the emancipation of the Negro. Instinctively the workers will respond when all else has failed. A Minneapolis comrade sends a clipping which shows how the workers will instinctively do the right thing if left free from the influence of fakers and misleaders:

“I have cut from the Minneapolis *Tribune* a news story of a ‘sit down strike’ here in Minneapolis. The clipping gives the details of the story. After years of barren results from ‘walk-out’ strikes, it should occur to the workers that the shop IS a weapon which it should not walk away from and leave in the hands of the enemy. As Comrade Johnson pointed out in the pamphlet ‘Industrial Unionism,’ these isolated cases of ‘sit down strikes’ (Hormel, Akron and others) may be a realization germinating in the minds of the workers that ‘to hold’ the shop is more effective than abandoning it. At the latest news reports, the men have resumed work and their modest demand, that a discharged employee be reemployed, has been granted. And after failing economic conditions develop a revolutionary psychology, it will not be so difficult, after all, for the working class to

understand that the mission of unionism is to take, hold and operate the industries of the nation for the use of the producers instead of for the exploiters."

And there are many other straws showing the wind to be in the same direction.

The S.L.P. will continue its agitation for genuine Industrial Unionism to the very last ditch, for that, and nothing else, means fighting for Socialism. As De Leon put it: "He who says 'Industrial Unionism' implies Socialism." We shall continue to expose fakers, charlatans and fools who would mislead the workers, prompted either by private material interests or by sheer ignorance. And we shall come out on top. For the working class *must* be organized, and it *can* be organized. As De Leon so graphically said: "There is no 'unorganizable proletariat.' The word proletariat implies 'organizableness,' as gun-powder implies explosiveness." We shall meet our enemies, the enemies of working class emancipation, at Philippi!

One of the questions that have caused us some trouble in recent years is the question of attitude toward strikes. There is never, of course, any question with regard to the attitude that S.L.P. men should take when confronted with a *bona fide* strike. He must, obviously, join his fellow workers in support of the strike. This we have emphasized again and again, and it is, of course, generally understood. And whenever there is reasonable doubt, an S.L.P. man *must* resolve that doubt in behalf of the strike. It is pertinent here to quote De Leon once again on this important point:

"The strike is that question that, as much as any and more than so many others of the many sub-questions raised by the labor movement, incites dangerous lures. It is a topic so beset with lures that, on the one hand, it offers special opportunities to the demagogue and the *agent provocateur*, while, on the other, it frequently threatens to throw the bona fide labor militant into dangerous proximity of thought with the out-and-out capitalist. Nothing short of calmest judgment can preserve the requisite balance of mind in the premises."

In another place De Leon, discussing the general strike, said:

"The strike is a move on the part of the workers for 'improved conditions.' In keeping with its object is the posture of the strike. Men who ask for 'improved conditions' do not ask for freedom. They ask for a lightening up of the yoke of slavery. That being the avowed posture of men on strike, their implied posture is the recognition of the capitalist's possession of the establishment struck against. They may, or they may not, have it in their mind that the capitalist's possession is wrong; they may, or may not, have it in their mind that the capitalist's possession is usurpation; they may, or they may not, have it in their mind to overthrow the usurpation as soon as they have the power. Whether they have any of these views in their mind or not, the essence of their posture is not affected thereby. Unable, for the time being, to assert their own right, they recognize possession as they find it, and only seek alleviation. The strike, accordingly, is not a revolutionary act.

The bare fact that workingmen on strike LEAVE the establishment in which they were at work is a recognition of the capitalist's possession, and of their own impotence to overthrow such proprietary rights.

"In view of these facts the term 'general strike' is a misnomer, and a contradiction in terms. The 'general strike' in the minds of those who use the term implies revolution. It implies, not the alleviation of conditions, but the overthrow of capitalist despotism. The endeavor to overthrow capitalism by the UN-revolutionary move, implied in the 'strike,' of pulling out of the establishments in which the men work, and leaving such establishments, the 'taking and holding' of which is essential to the revolution, in the possession of the capitalist class—such an endeavor is an obvious absurdity. Not the 'general strike,' but the 'general lockout' of the capitalist class is the term applicable to the thought in the minds of those who generally use the term 'general strike.'

"There is much in terms. Wrong terms are born of confusion, and they beget confusion. This is what is happening with all those, who, honestly, are now advocating the 'general strike.' The confusion of thought that causes them to use a wrong term is intensified by the wrong term itself. The consequence is that they advocate a move from which only two classes of men, both to be equally eschewed by the working class, could profit. These two classes of men stand at opposite poles, in seeming—they are, at one pole, the capitalist agents in the unions who are kept there to drive the workers into acts of foolhardiness; and they are, at the other

pole, the 'intellectual' or dilettante revolutionists, who crave for 'sport.' Neither would suffer. All the suffering would be borne by the duped workers.

"The day the working class is sufficiently organized to move as one man, that day will require no 'strike,' general or otherwise. It is the capitalist class that would then go on strike—with the workers in possession."

The last few lines sum up the entire matter: In a revolutionary period strikes, though manifestations of class revolt, are in themselves indications of working class weakness—and working class weakness is the result solely of being unorganized, or not being sufficiently organized.

Meanwhile it behooves every S.L.P. member to exercise that caution enjoined upon us by De Leon. If it were possible for this convention to do so, a clarification, or amplification, of the Resolutions on Strikes, adopted by the N.E.C., would be most desirable.

The Radio.

The Party has made greater use of the radio during the last year than ever before. We hope to make still greater use of it during the campaign, and the period following. For the record there is appended here a list of the talks delivered during the past year. They are listed according to speaker or broadcaster, or the local organization conducting the talk or series of talks:

Radio Broadcasts April 1, 1935 to
April 25, 1936.

Hass:

Klamath Falls, Ore., KFJI, Janu-

ary 27, 1936, 15 minutes; Portland, Ore., KWJJ, February 4, 1936, 15 minutes; Portland, Ore., KWJJ, February 6, 1936, 15 minutes; Tacoma, Wash., KMO, February 14, 1936, 30 minutes; Tacoma, Wash., KMO, February 16, 1936, 15 minutes; Vancouver, B.C., February 29, 1936, 15 minutes; Vancouver, B.C., March 2, 1936, 15 minutes; Spokane, Wash., KFPY, March 25, 1936, 15 minutes; Twin Falls, Idaho, KTJI, April 4, 1936, 15 minutes.

Quinn:

Newport News, Va., WGH, June 10, 1935, 15 minutes; Bridgeport, Conn., WICC, July 26, 1935, 15 minutes; Jamestown, N.Y., WOCL, August 15, 1935, 15 minutes; Erie, Pa., WLEU, August 16, 1935, 15 minutes; Akron, Ohio, WJW, December 1, 1935, 30 minutes; Altoona, Pa., WFBG, December 9, 1935, 15 minutes; Pittsburgh, Pa., WWSW, December 7, 1935, 15 minutes; Wheeling, W. Va., WWVA, December 6, 1935, 15 minutes; Springfield, Mass., WMAS, December 12, 1935, 15 minutes; Cincinnati, Ohio, WCPO (series), November 12, 1935, 15 minutes; Cleveland, Ohio, WJAY (series), November 30, 1935, 15 minutes.

Culshaw:

Toronto, Ont., CKCL, June 9, 1935, 15 minutes; Toronto, Ont., CKCL, June 16, 1935, 15 minutes; Toronto, Ont., CKCL, June 23, 1935, 30 minutes; Harrisburg, Pa., WEBQ, September 5, 1935, 30 minutes.

Aiken:

Portland, Me., WCSH, September 21, 1935, 15 minutes (also

flash, September 18, 1935).

Mack Johnson:

Tacoma, Wash., KMO, July 16, 1935, 30 minutes; Tacoma, Wash., KMO, September 28, 1935, 30 minutes; Portland, Ore., KWJJ, October 10, 1935, 15 minutes; Portland, Ore., KWJJ, October 14, 1935, 30 minutes; Klamath Falls, Ore., KFJI, November 8, 1935, 15 minutes.

Reynolds:

Altoona, Pa., WFBG, September 27, 1935, 15 minutes; Pittsburgh, Pa., KQV, October 10, 1935, 15 minutes; Jamestown, N. Y., WOCL, January 11, 1936, 15 minutes.

J. A. Pirincin:

Altoona, Pa., WFBG, July 1935, 15 minutes.

Herman Simon:

New Haven, Conn., WIXBS, December 1, 1935, symposium.

W. Woodhouse:

Akron, Ohio, WJW, March 4, 1936, 30 minutes.

A. M. Orange:

Springfield, Mass., WMAS, February 9, 1936, 15 minutes.

Ohio Series:

Cincinnati, E. F. Worthington, WCPO, 13 Tuesdays, October 1935-January 21, 1936, 15 minutes; Cleveland, Mrs. A. B. Storck, WJAY, 13 Saturdays, October 26, 1935-January 10, 1936, 15 minutes.

Oregon Series:

Portland, KWJJ, 52 Tuesdays and Fridays, March 3-August 20, 1936, 15 minutes.

Pennsylvania-Ohio-West Virginia:

WWVA, 13 Mondays, series beginning April 27, 1936, 15 minutes.

Washington:

KIRO, every Wednesday evening. Series began April 15, 1936, 15 minutes.

Plus flash announcements.

We experienced difficulties with some of the stations, and in a few instances we failed to convince the station managers that they had no right to refuse us their facilities. Those proving adamant were Stations KGER, Los Angeles, Calif., and Station WNBH, New Bedford, Mass. With the former station the National Secretary corresponded, the intention being to have the station on record as to the reasons for refusing its facilities to the S.L.P., with the view of taking the matter up with the Washington authorities. Nothing came of this, however, inasmuch as it was shown that under the law the station could do as it pleased about such matters. The erroneous idea had prevailed that if a radio station extends its facilities to one political party, it *must* do so to all others, on the same terms. On the contrary, the law provides that if a radio station extends its facilities to one candidate for public office, it *must* do so to all other candidates for the same office, and on the same terms. And since neither Comrade Hahn (in Los Angeles) nor Comrade Aiken (in New Bedford, Mass.) were candidates for public office, the law obviously did not apply. It should be added that in each case the station managers frankly admitted that they would not let the Party's message go on the air because

of its revolutionary character. It is perfectly all right to extol the merits of various brands of coffee, toothpaste, cosmetics and similar matters vital to the citizens! It is apparently rendering a social service to permit Senator Dumm to argue over the air why he, rather than Senator Blah, should be permitted to be a burden on the "public" treasury, and to argue in support of continuing a system of society which is keeping the mass of humanity in a condition barely above that of the jungle—or the pigsty. But to instruct the citizenry on how to put an end to these wretched conditions, in an orderly and efficient manner; to teach how to enable society to shorten and lessen the inevitable birth-pangs, or how to avoid social abortion—that, indeed, is not to be thought of as rendering a social service!

It is with pride and great pleasure that we report the success we had with respect to securing the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System free of charge for a national hook-up. The company had established a precedent in granting the facilities to Messrs. Thomas, Browder and Fish of the Socialist party, the Communist party and the Republicans, respectively. Immediately following the Fish broadcast, the National Secretary wrote a letter to the Columbia System, which, as a matter of record, is produced here:

"March 7, 1936.

"Mr. William S. Paley,
"President, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York, N.Y.

"Dear Sir:

"In the statement on the policy of the Columbia Broadcasting Sys-

tem which you made on January 15 you said:

"'Columbia will continue in allotting periods to *all parties* for controversial issues to consider the public's desire for news, for education....' (Emphasis mine.)

"And you stated further:

"'The [Columbia] network will continue to exercise its own editorial judgment with scrupulous fairness, *never shutting out one side or discriminating in favor of the other.*' (Emphasis mine.)

"Finally, Mr. Edward Klauber, First Vice-President of your company, in his letter of December 27, 1935, to Mr. Sabin of the Republican party, said:

"'We feel it to be our duty as a public service to devote a proper amount of time to the discussion of political issues without charge.'

"You have, since making these declarations, allotted free time to Mr. Earl Browder of the Communist party, and to Mr. Hamilton Fish of the Republican party. On behalf of the oldest political party of labor in the United States, the Socialist Labor Party, I hereby request that you allot to our Party the same amount of time, and at a similar hour, that you gave to Messrs. Browder and Fish.

"For your further information (or to refresh your memory), allow me to add the following brief comments with respect to the Socialist Labor Party:

"1. It is the oldest party in this country speaking the language of labor and Socialism, having enjoyed a continued existence for nearly half a century on its present basis—ten years before the founding of the so-called Socialist party, and thirty

years before the Communist party was organized. Since 1892 we have nominated candidates for President and Vice President, and participated in state and local campaigns throughout the country.

"2. It is the *only* political party which presents an out and out revolutionary program, making its appeal, frankly and exclusively, to the wage working class.

"3. It is the only political party, the platform of which contains no 'immediate demands,' nor enumeration of a string of reforms or palliatives. Unlike every other political party—none excepted—the Socialist Labor Party insists that reforms and palliatives, however labelled, are delusions and snares; that half measures, attempts at patching up the capitalist system, and compromises with sections of the capitalist class (whether higher or lower layers) have no place in the program of a revolutionary party of labor. We insist that capitalism *cannot*, and *should not* be mended; that it *must* be, and that it *will* be ended.

"4. With its single plank in its platform—the complete overthrow of capitalism—the Socialist Labor Party occupies a unique position among American political parties. It bases itself squarely on the principles of Marxian Socialism, as applied to Twentieth Century America.

"5. Despite—or rather, *because of* its revolutionary program, the Socialist Labor Party abhors violence in any form. Unlike the reformers (the Communists, the Social Democrats, etc.); we do not waste our time in futile and foolish street demonstrations that usually result in

anguinary riots, etc. We make our appeal, not to the passions or emotions of the working class; our appeal is, on the contrary, directed to the *reason*. In this respect we fully subscribe to Mr. Klauber's statement that 'appeals to the electorate should be intellectual and not based on emotion, passion or prejudice.'

"6. Finally, the Socialist Labor Party has no connection with any other political party or group. It is an American political party, its program and principles formulated in complete keeping with American political and industrial conditions.

"In conformity with the policy you have adopted, and carried out to the extent of extending your facilities to Messrs. Browder and Fish (and possibly others), I shall expect an early reply from you, indicating dates available from which we may select a fifteen-minute period. I shall then advise you with respect to the name of the person selected to present our program, submit advance copy of the proposed speech, and in other respects conform to the policies and procedure of your company.

"For such additional information as they may give you, I am enclosing the following documents:

A. The Platform of the Socialist Labor Party adopted in 1932.

B. Leaflet explaining our attitude toward the Communist party of America.

C. Leaflet explaining our attitude toward the so-called Socialist party.

D. Booklet entitled 'The Socialist Labor Party Program.'

"Very sincerely yours,
"Socialist Labor Party,
"Arnold Petersen,
"National Secretary."

An appointment was made with the director of programs, and after some discussion the National Secretary convinced him that the S.L.P. should have the same considerations extended to it that were extended to Messrs. Thomas, Browder and Fish. Accordingly, the S.L.P. goes on the air on April 28, from 10.45 to 11 in the evening, with Comrade John W. Aiken presenting the Party's revolutionary program. In all fairness it should be stated here that at no time was any attempt made to exercise censorship by the station as far as the proposed S.L.P. talk is concerned. With a minor amplification the talk submitted to the director of programs is exactly as it will be delivered on April 28 by Comrade Aiken. This will be the first time in history that the revolutionary voice of Marxism is sent through the air to such a vast audience. Its agitational value is incalculable. In monetary terms the cost, if it had to be paid for, would run into thousands of dollars.

Every effort will be made to co-ordinate our radio program as much as possible. There will be many and great difficulties to overcome. For one thing, radio speeches, in most cases, will have to be supplied to local subdivisions through the National Office. Comrade Hass will devote a few weeks after the convention to assist the National Office in these respects. Such questions as to how far to go in spending money for radio broadcasts, the relative importance of radio speeches, touring organizers, printing leaflets, etc., etc., will have to be determined. A great deal of information has been gathered which is at the disposal of the convention (or committee on ra-

dio, if such a one is elected) if desired.

Miscellaneous.

I. *Study Classes.* We have approximately eighty-eight study classes throughout the country. Though the methods of these classes can undoubtedly be improved, it can be said without boasting that they are on the whole doing great work for the Party, having become indispensable adjuncts to our organizational work. The aim is constantly to improve on the methods, to simplify the conduct of the classes, and to adapt them to local possibilities and special conditions as much as possible. There are proposed some constitutional amendments designed to aid in regulating the conduct of the classes and to eliminate, as much as that can be done, guesswork as to how *this* should be done, and whether *that* should be permitted. As for the rest, it is obvious that we cannot attain perfection, since the Party itself is continually learning, as are the instructors of the classes, not to mention the students. It is inevitable that in some cases there should be a tendency to cover too much ground in too short a time. Concentration should be the watchword here as elsewhere. What applies to the art of reading in general applies largely to formal study. The late Danish critic, Georg Brandes, once observed, with special reference to reading: "There is nowadays a superstition in favor of so-called general education—a phrase of which I confess I am a little afraid. If we read to obtain a general education, our reading easily becomes so general that there is no education in it.

.... From the particular, windows open out into the general. Better far read ten books about one thing or about one man than a hundred books about a hundred different things.... How ought we to read? First, with affection, next, with criticism, next, if possible, so that our reading has a central point, from which we may guess or descry connections, and lastly, with the aim of fully understanding and making our own the moral lesson to be found in every event narrated."

There is much wisdom in this counsel. De Leon once advised a student on what to read in language which somewhat parallels that of Brandes:

"If you have nothing else to do [said De Leon]; if you believe you are thoroughly posted upon and have nothing more to learn about history and social science; if you have appropriated to your mind all the treasures of English literature and the literature of such other languages as may be at your command; if you have no taste for the out-of-door exercises to engage your time; should that be the case, and only in case that is the case, will it be worth while to read on Monism."

The hint thrown out here by De Leon should not be overlooked. Study the essential, ignore non-essential matters, and above all else do not study or read merely to be able to shine. "Modesty," said De Leon, "is the twin sister of knowledge. Where there is no modesty, neither need knowledge be looked for." The object of our study, our reading, should be to improve our capacity to serve the Party—to enable us to instruct and direct those

who come to us for information, inspiration or guidance. Study classes should focus attention particularly on the important task of turning out capable S.L.P. speakers. There are many who think they cannot speak—the thought seems uppermost that speakers are born and not made. This is wholly erroneous. Given the opportunity and constant practice, every intelligent S.L.P. man who possesses the average ability to speak conversationally, can acquire ability to speak from the platform—*provided he has thoroughly mastered his subject.* On this point De Leon has given some excellent advice. Said he:

The best speaker is he who is best posted on his subject. Provided a man has no organic defect, he can speak well to the extent that he is posted. *A speaker's club [or study class] should, accordingly, devote its whole attention to posting its members on Socialism.* They will then be able to understand and digest the facts that they see. A good Socialist speech is but well ground corn, the grinding machine being Socialist knowledge, and the unground corn being the facts that are turning up."

In our study classes, if properly conducted, we possess instruments capable of producing sound S.L.P. agitators and teachers.

II. *Weekly People Clubs.* In a number of Sections local Clubs have been formed composed usually of wives of Party members, or sympathizers, the purpose of which is to raise funds through entertainments, socials, and in such other ways as the experience and ingenuity of these lady sympathizers and comrades may dictate. These clubs

have been a source of considerable revenue for the Party. The N.E.C. at its 1935 session, encouraged the formation of such clubs. An outline of the manner in which they may be conducted was incorporated in the printed minutes of the N.E.C. session of 1935. It is recommended that the convention look into the possibility of having such clubs formed wherever we have Sections.

The Weekly People Club may contain the germ of the solution to the problem of what to do with such Party members as occasionally get into the Party, but who do not assume any of the responsibilities of Party work, except attending entertainments, picnics, etc., etc. An auxiliary (not the Weekly People Clubs, necessarily) composed of such sympathizers who thoroughly accept the Party's program, but who for one reason or another will not, or cannot, accept the Party's discipline, etc., might furnish a means of keeping such individuals active for the Party without giving them an opportunity to harm the Party. They would pay dues, but they could not vote, nor otherwise affect Party decisions and policies. However, this is, after all, another story, but it seems worth some thought and consideration at the proper place and time.

III. *National Campaign 1936:* Preliminary preparations have been made for the campaign. The N.E.C. Sub-Committee issued a call for a \$100,000 National Campaign Fund, and we ask the endorsement, and further instructions regarding the method and goal with respect to the Campaign Fund. Undoubtedly the convention will also adopt resolutions for the guidance of the Nation-

al Office with respect to the conduct of the campaign, which we hope and expect to make the greatest in the Party's history.

In Memoriam.

During the four years many of our oldest and most stalwart members have crossed the great divide, and others, equally active, who distinguished themselves in Party service, have become incapacitated. Among those who have departed from this troubled terrestrial scene, may be mentioned particularly such S.L.P. pillars as August Gillhaus, who died a few days after the close of the 1932 convention of the Party. August Gillhaus was, indeed, an outstanding example of a typical proletarian, S.L.P. fighter. He served the Party in many important and responsible capacities, as organizer, as Presidential candidate, as member of the N.E.C. Sub-Committee, etc., etc. His death, and particularly on the very eve of an important national campaign, constituted a severe blow to the Party. Then there was that stalwart S.L.P. man, Richard Koepfel, editor of the Party's German paper *Volksfreund und Arbeiter Zeitung*; Fred Koch, sturdy S.L.P. fighter and coal miner; Donald L. Munro, who was S.L.P. Vice Presidential candidate in 1908. Recently his brother, D. R. Munro, died also. Both brothers were typical S.L.P. men who served the Party well with credit and distinction to themselves and the Party. And one who was with us as delegate in 1932, and who acted as chairman on the first day of that convention, is not with us on this great occasion. We refer to that incomparable S.L.P. member,

Patrick E. De Lee, who also served the Party for so many years as N.E.C. man. Indeed, N.E.C. sessions have never quite seemed the same since Patrick E. De Lee ceased to grace them with his presence. His devotion to the Party was of the most unselfish kind; he was totally free from rancor or petty considerations so far as the Party was concerned. His knowledge of Party principles, and particularly on organizational matters, rendered him well-nigh indispensable. His understanding of S.L.P. principle was coupled with a sparkling wit and keen satire, which, however, never descended to the personal. We miss, indeed, his "flashes of merriment that were wont to set the table on a roar." But his work goes on, directly through his Section, Section Rensselaer Co., which in a sense may be said to be his monument, and generally through the organization to the perfection of which he contributed so much.

Word H. Mills was another outstanding S.L.P. man, now no longer with us. One of his chief contributions to Party activities was his indefatigable efforts to spread the S.L.P. principles in Latin America. Since his death that work has practically ceased. The one who was supposed to continue it, in some measure, at least, soon became so preoccupied with efforts to aid in disrupting our Party in California, that he gave up all pretense of furthering the propaganda in Latin America. But the work that Comrade Mills did will bear fruit, nevertheless.

Still another exceptional S.L.P. man was lost in the death of Thor Borg, the vigorous and clear-headed

editor of our Swedish paper *Arbetaren*. It would be difficult to overestimate the contribution which he made to the Party's progress. He made of the *Arbetaren* a fighting organ, feared and respected in Scandinavian circles.

Others among the old-timers who passed on, and who were not so generally known, though they did their work for the Party as faithfully as those already mentioned, include H. Morgan of California, WEEKLY PEOPLE sub-getter *par excellence*; Peter C. Hall of Minnesota; Dr. Joseph Levitch and Julius Newman of New York; Chas. Schrafft of New Jersey; Stephen J. Surridge of Massachusetts; J. C. Vollertsen of Rochester and Wm. Purnell of Syracuse; Wm. H. Thomas and Wm. Kruczynna of Pennsylvania, both at various times N.E.C. members from their state. Yet another old-timer who is with us no more, Ed. Schade of Virginia, will be missed. Comrade Schade, despite his advanced age, continued almost to the very last to write the National Office, contributing freely to the Party's funds.

And finally one who, though not a member at the time of his death, nevertheless died, as he had lived, a typical S.L.P. man, Louis Meinecke of New York, who directed his family to turn over to the Party the sum of \$500, which was done, the amount constituting the initial entry in our 1936 National Campaign Fund.

Among our younger comrades who long before their time were torn from us, we note particularly Alvin Rueger of Evansville—a devoted and earnest worker for the Party; Karl W. Bolender of Rhode Island, also an indefatigable S.L.P. worker;

and last but not least our young Comrade Arthur C. Meyer of Dayton who died on the industrial battlefield, a victim of the cursed system to the destruction of which he had given many years of his still young manhood. And others whom space and time do not permit us to enumerate. Though they have departed from us, their spirit is with us, and in a very real sense their presence is felt. For this convention, even as the Party itself, is material substance of the very life-blood and tissues which they wove into the fabric of the invincible and indestructible S.L.P.

Conclusion.

When a social system, like any other organism, has exhausted all possibilities for further growth, disorders of every kind begin to manifest themselves. These disorders multiply with the progressive decay of the system. The process of dissolution, of degeneracy, becomes accelerated as past unsolved, and unsolvable problems pile up and, through their dead-weight pressure, force the system to sink deeper and deeper into the mire. The Marxian scientist, and no one else, perceives this clearly. More than that, the Marxist understands, as no one else does, the *why* and *wherefore*, as well as the *what* and *how* of the entire trend of social forces. Capitalism has come to the end of the rope. Not all the forces of present-day governments can do aught else than prolong the misery engendered by the decay so manifest around us on every hand. Outside of the Socialist movement all stand bewildered in the presence of what seems to them

the collapse of civilization. To the upholders of the system the alternative of Socialism, as much as the physical collapse of the system, spells the destruction of civilization. For to the bourgeois mind "civilization" is inseparable from the strife, the excitement of a world cleft in twain—the cleavage being between the working class and the capitalist class, i.e., the class subsisting on the unpaid labor of those who ceaselessly toil on terms no better than slavery's requital.

The reform tinkers who set out to rejuvenate capitalism a few years ago pessimistically reflect on ways of escape from the greater chaos they have created out of the chaos they found. Unemployment, relatively speaking, has increased, though nominally it has seemed to shrink. But for the artificial stimulants applied by the government the number would probably have doubled—provided a social cataclysm under such circumstances could have been prevented. The volatile and voluble General Hugh Johnson said a few months ago that "business recovery alone would not solve the unemployment problem, [and] that the government could not continue to carry the load...." That is one way of saying that the problem admits of no solution—under capitalism. We agree. The general added that if relief were shut off there would be "riot, rebellion or revolution in two weeks' time." The plutocratic paper, the *New York Herald Tribune*, observed a few weeks ago on the basis of what seemed to it to be the inescapable facts with respect to unemployment, "It means that a first-rate disaster is daily approaching."

A confidential FERA report, submitted to the Washington government last summer, said in part:

"But for the valiant efforts at relief that have been carried on so unremittingly now for the past three years throughout the nation, we should before now have had to cope with many outbreaks of mob violence. We have already seen the suspension of the civil law on the part of the 'embattled farmer' of the Middle West. Should conditions continue to drift from bad to worse, the complete destruction of society as we now know it is more than a terrifying possibility. So far we have been buying off revolution with soup kitchens. But the end is in sight. The difficulty this year encountered in raising the necessary funds should be our warning. And when funds for relief are no longer forthcoming, all the desperate millions require to rouse them to destructive action is one sufficiently fiery and desperate leader. It is quite within the bounds of possibility that such a leader may appear at any moment."

And if such a leader appears, and nothing but a leader, with the workers lacking Industrial Union organizations, and having no knowledge as to what to do, we have the perfect setting for industrial feudalism, with that leader (whatever his pretensions) performing the role of a Hitler, a Mussolini—in any case, that "leader" will almost certainly be recruited out of the slums, or near-slums. Remember Wm. Z. Foster's proud boast: "I am one who was raised in the slums."

On every side stark reaction, through its numerous and varied

agents and agencies, strains to secure a stranglehold on labor. The labor lieutenants are more active than ever, and they are no longer the old line crude, though cunning, fakers of the Gompers era. They wear the mask of Socialism to conceal their sinister purpose. Hillman of the "Socialistic" Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, and Dubinsky of the Ladies' Garment Workers Union, both of whom have climbed aboard the Roosevelt bandwagon which is driving straight in the direction of Industrial Feudalism—these two gentlemen are representative types of this new model of labor lieutenants. Strikebreaking agencies flourish openly, doing business as if their line was the most natural in the world—which it is in a capitalist world. The Bergoff strikebreaking agency in New York stands ready to supply, at a moment's notice, "mercenary armies for industrial warfare." A goodly percentage of this army consists of individuals with criminal records who are supplied with arms by these private agencies, and at the behest, and in the service, of such huge corporations as the Standard Oil Company and the like. It is said that Mr. Bergoff has boasted that "a single labor war sometimes nets him a million dollars."

Other forces of reaction are straining at the leash, eager to enter the fray. Outstanding among these is the Ultramontane Catholic political machine. Cardinal O'Connell of Boston recently sent a "pastoral letter" to 350 churches in the Archdiocese, with more than a million persons attending, wherein, in a typical political harangue, he ordered resistance to what he designates "Com-

munist"—by which he really meant Marxian Socialism. In a blazing headline in the sheets of the sinister Hearst (another reactionary panderer to the slums) he is quoted as saying: "It's Christ or Lenin." He might have come nearer the truth if he had said: "It's the Devil and O'Connellism, or Christ"—if Christ is to be conceived of as the rebel portrayed in the Bible. Another Roman Catholic politician, Father Edmund A. Walsh of the Georgetown University, howled recently: "The final conflict will be fought out between Communism [read Marxian Socialism] and the Catholic Church defending the cause of democracy." God save us from the kind of democracy which the Ultramontane politicians would defend!

In the American bastiles there languish victims of the reaction, outstanding among these being Tom Mooney, now in his twentieth year of unjust imprisonment. With a labor movement in this country guided by the spirit of Marxism, Mooney would have been a free man long ago. His continued incarceration serves but to emphasize the fact of the corruption, decay and dissolution of American capitalism. The Mooney case would be a blot on any decent civilized system, and unthinkable except under the foul thing called capitalism where such a thing as social morality is unknown except in so far as it is identified with the Marxian movement. Defending his shady transactions in a bond deal with the Cuban government, Mr. W. Rosenblatt, representing the Foreign Bondholders' Protective Council, exclaimed: "Let's forget the morality and get down to practical business."

We still live under a capitalistic system and that is the way things are done." Mr. Rosenblatt could not more truthfully and forcefully have epitomized the essence of the swinish system under which we live.

If we turn to Europe, the picture, if anything, is even darker. Under the leadership of such bandits as Hitler and Mussolini, and their kindred, their gangster governments are trampling under their bloody boots, or threatening to do so, whatever may stand in their way. Their moral code is the code of the underworld. They present a picture of capitalism, inherently rapacious, gone slummist with a vengeance. The peace of Europe, of the world, hangs in the balance. The powerful British empire has suffered the encroachments of the bandit Mussolini—not because they fear him, or Italian capitalism, but because they fear to do anything that may precipitate war. For though Great Britain might emerge victorious out of such a war, the price might, probably *would*, be too high. The out and out gangster governments have nothing more to lose through a war than through continued "peace." The Hitlers and Mussolinis have their "crowns" (more correctly speaking their *heads*) to save, and wars offer the needed opportunity, especially since war at the same time happens to be the lesser of the evils confronting their capitalist-imperialist masters. Premier Baldwin recently said: "The next war will be the end of civilization in Europe.... I believe that if such a thing were done, when that war came to an end the peoples of every country, torn with passion, suffering and horror, would wipe out every government in Eu-

rope and you would have a state of anarchy extend to the end of it as man's protest against wickedness in high places."

The immediate outlook is indeed dark—not because capitalism is going down in a twilight of horror and threatening catastrophe, but because the working class stands before this world chaos unable to assume direction of things—unable, because unorganized, industrially or otherwise. Unorganized, the working class is the embodiment of weakness, of helplessness. Organized, industrially and politically, with the Industrial Republic for its goal, the working class is almost almighty—invincible and unconquerable. The task confronting us of the S.L.P. is enormous. "Certainly the task is stupendous," said Daniel De Leon. "All the material that Socialism assails and all the perverse dispositions that capitalist oppression breeds are bound to array themselves against the S.L.P. But he who has no stomach for the fray had better not join the S.L.P."

And so say we now on the eve of this historic campaign. We must move as serious men and women, we must move as *one*, determined in our revolutionary purpose that capitalism must be destroyed, that the Socialist Republic of Free Labor must be reared.

Closing, let us recall the stirring and noble words of De Leon:

"All of us are fathers of children, or mothers of children; or have some aged relative who somehow or other depends upon us. In other words, we are all human. Upon our work depends the establishment of that social system un-

der which old age will enjoy the dignity of its years; under which womanhood will enjoy the dignity of her sex; under which childhood will enjoy the joys of its age. That future has been dreamed of by men whose hearts beat high, but the opportunity was not yet there because the material means to establish it were absent. Today the heart and hand are abreast of each other. The instruments are ready at hand and it will only be our fault if we fail to accomplish that desired solution.

... Wherever one of us will be

found there will be found an apostle of the gospel that says: 'We propose to raise the dome of the Cooperative Commonwealth, that Commonwealth under which no slave shall bend the back.'"

Fraternally submitted,
National Executive Committee,
Socialist Labor Party,
ARNOLD PETERSEN,
National Secretary.

New York, N.Y.,

April 25, 1936.

THE REPORT OF THE EDITOR OF THE WEEKLY PEOPLE.

GREETINGS:

Another four years have passed since we last met, four tremendously eventful years in the world at large. Of these events, we have barely been able, with our space and facilities, to record those which most strikingly point toward the inevitable decay of the capitalist system, emphasizing the dangers that threaten the working class of the world and of America, in particular, if the capitalist plutocracy should succeed in hamstringing the pending working class revolution and should establish an era of Industrial Feudalism, manifestations of which are already rampant in all capitalist nations and are portrayed in all their ugliness in the bandit governments of Italy and Germany where slummists, racketeers and outright criminals act as the henchmen of the puppet dicta-

tors, set up and supported by the highest national representatives of capitalist plutocracy. In our own country we have had to record the degenerating influences on the working class of large-scale doles and charity work, as well as the headlong rush of the capitalist system as a whole into ever greater entanglements, out of which not even magic, let alone human efforts, could possibly extricate the system and its political representative.

It is unnecessary, of course, to enter into any review of the work done by your official organ. Week by week it speaks for itself, and it is the reaction from the field rather than that of the office which might properly be heard at our conventions.

There is one reaction, however, a reaction from the field that I get

strongly, which even the most careful reader can no more than sense. That it is sensed, however, is certain. Every so often some one will comment on a certain issue, as to its excellence, every article, every item high class, clearly and interestingly written, dealing with some vital subject. This does not always concern special issues, such as May Day, Labor Day and such, where picked writers are requested to contribute. I have heard it as often about the usual issue containing what may be called "accidental" contributions. Compare almost any issue of the PEOPLE today with any issue of the dreary years between 1914 and 1918, or a number of years following, and you will realize the tremendous difference, in literary style as well as approach and treatment of the subject and clarity in the application of scientific Socialist interpretation.

During my first years as Editor, I often, for lack of original material, had to reprint from liberal papers articles on sociological generalities, good as far as they went, of course, or they would not have been chosen, but naturally lacking that firmness and particularization of Socialist interpretation which an article in our organ is expected to have.

The preparation of the special issues—expected to be S.L.P. propaganda issues from beginning to end—was more or less of a nightmare for years. I had to search the field with a powerful telescope, so to speak, in order to get contributors to fill the bill, and as a survival from these lean and hun-

gry years, in a propaganda and literary sense, I can recall no other than our splendid veteran writer, George W. Ohls, of Pittsburgh, who never failed to harken to the call and who, I sincerely hope, will continue to respond to many a call in the future and thus help to write "finis" to the capitalist system, the manifestations of which he has so often and wittily ridiculed.

As far as this end of our propaganda is concerned we are definitely out of the woods. The line of contributors, clear and keen and able to express themselves fluently, is growing apace. They spring up suddenly from all quarters, young persons, too, a dash and a spirit of defiance that is bound to show great effects soon—when we remember that these youngsters are more and more taking hold of the work in the field.

There is a new keenness, too, manifest in the readers at large. Nothing escapes. That the WEEKLY PEOPLE is read and read carefully is demonstrated repeatedly, not only by comments but by the use to which WEEKLY PEOPLE material is put by those who do the propaganda work among their fellow workers. If this keen watchfulness sometimes—as it of late seems to have had a tendency to do—takes the shape of "picking" at non-essentials—a comma upside down, as I express it, for the sake of illustration, or a phrase out of place, or some minor fault of expression—it may sometimes be irritating, but while it may be irritating to get such "complaints" against an article that is as full of meat as a sound nut, we are usually ready, upon second thought, to look at even this from the cheery side and to say: At least

there is no doubt that the WEEKLY PEOPLE these days is read to the last period.

Subscriptions.

Nevertheless, that the WEEKLY PEOPLE is eagerly and thoroughly read by those who get it does not in any way fulfill its mission as a propaganda paper among the working class at large. The subscription list is not, directly at least, my worry. It concerns the business department. I cannot, however, refrain from saying a word about it here.

It is exasperating, and becomes so more and more year by year, when we have prepared, at great trouble, an excellent propaganda issue—and what issue of the WEEKLY PEOPLE is not an excellent propaganda issue?—to be conscious of the fact that it reaches only the small circle of readers that it does. It is no comfort whatsoever that every line is avidly devoured by this circle of readers. In fact, it makes the exasperation still harder to bear. If the WEEKLY PEOPLE is so good for, so utterly indispensable to, a few thousand readers, then we know it is equally good for hundreds of thousands of our fellow workers, and should be made equally indispensable to them. We know that this had to happen before there can be any great turn in the sentiment of the working class, any hope of a decided move toward revolutionary Industrial Union organization.

Frequently, more and more frequently, we receive notes from new readers telling of their delight at having been introduced to the WEEKLY PEOPLE—many quite accidentally. These figure now in

dozens and scores only—what is the reason they do not figure in thousands? That is the query I leave with you, fellow delegates. Take it home and discuss it with your constituents, and see to it that it is answered in thousands of new subscriptions during the coming campaign. That is the one sure way of making our efforts count.

The Space Problem.

The cramped space of the WEEKLY PEOPLE has been my standing worry and complaint for years. The National Executive Committee hears it in between convention years. Last N.E.C. meeting that body gave its authority for the publication of eight-page issues—whenever possible. Net result—we might say—fewer eight-page issues in the past year than in immediately previous years. Of course, this was not caused by the decision, nor a sudden lack of material, nor unwillingness of anybody concerned. It is just the result of the physical inability of our plant to respond. The past year has been rich in the publication of pamphlet literature; other matters have come up to interfere, all of which will be dealt with by the National Secretary in his report. There was no use crying about it; the WEEKLY PEOPLE simply had to manage the best it could with the space available.

There is no doubt that the readers feel as "cheated" as we feel cramped. This is evident by frequent demands: Why doesn't the WEEKLY PEOPLE give more of this and that—more domestic news with large headlines; more news of the doings in Soviet Russia; more about happenings in Europe; more

comments on daily happenings; more labor news; more news of strikes, etc.; and more comment on all these! There, of course, is but one answer to all this: Even if it were within the physical possibility of the small office staff to do complete justice to all this, it is self-evident that there is no place to put it. As I have said more than once, our problem these days is an embarrassment of riches and becomes one of elimination rather than a search for material.

In recognition of this there flow in all sorts of suggestions for remedies: Cut down the Field Notes. What's the use of wasting a whole page on official notices of meetings throughout the country, each of which interests only a few who should know about them anyhow? Let each Section do its advertising locally. And again, why large book ads? And who is interested in the donation lists?

All these points would be well taken if the WEEKLY PEOPLE could be considered purely as a propaganda organ. But it cannot at this time, for, unless we have a special edition for information on Party matters for Party members, it is inevitable that the WEEKLY PEOPLE must serve the double purpose it does now. (Such an issue, no doubt, would be ideal, but there again our facilities rise up and protest.) So we must worry along much as we have done in the past. Some sort of report is inevitable on Party activities, and the Field Notes, for the present, serve that purpose, even if they do not attract the new and non-Party readers who look for general, perhaps more sensational, news, with many bright headlines.

The local notices are probably indispensable too as contacts and reminders to the membership. And certainly, as we have no other way of reporting to those who support us, we cannot afford to eliminate the donation lists. In the publication of these lists lies one of the distinguishing features between the S.L.P. and all the "radical" hat-passers of every stripe. The S.L.P. shows the source of every penny received and accounts to the membership for every penny spent. As to the book advertisements, they are an essential part of our propaganda. The old reader may see no use in having his attention perpetually called to books and pamphlets he has already read, but it is essential that the new reader get a quick introduction to our standard literature.

No complete remedy, then, is within our present possibilities. We can do nothing but peg along, do the best with our present facilities, and wait for some miracle to happen. No doubt it will happen some day, but in the meantime it is as well for our readers to recognize the causes for our shortcomings and, instead of issuing complaints and suggestions to accomplish the impossible, go to work to extend the circle of influence of our organ just as it is. For even as it is, cramped as we are for space, much as we are obliged to eliminate what we should like to include, we heartily believe that there is not one of our sincere readers but will agree that the WEEKLY PEOPLE stands head and shoulders over any would-be labor paper in the English-speaking world.

Let us then not worry about what we have not, or what, for the present, we cannot have, but all combine

to do the best we can with what we have.

The Knudsen Matter.

Some time in February letters commenced to arrive from Chicago that were decidedly disturbing, all of them pointing to Comrade Wm. Ross Knudsen as the center of some sort of controversy on various Party matters. We had just been driven frantic by the ugly California disruption and we were certainly not anxious to face another eruption anywhere else, and Knudsen's recent membership in California and an old-time friendship with those who had caused the trouble there did not tend to make us any easier. On the whole this matter concerned the National Office, so, though I was kept posted, I had no reason to inject myself into this affair any more than I should have had to have injected myself into the California disruption or carry it into the columns of the WEEKLY PEOPLE.

But suddenly this took on a new aspect when Comrade Knudsen, in a long letter to the National Office, took strong opposition to the Letter Box answer in the WEEKLY PEOPLE, November 2, 1935, to one C.S., Chicago, Ill., producing "proofs"—long quotations from Marx and Engels—that the Labor Note is utopian.

In this we were indeed seriously concerned, and the matter now directly concerned the WEEKLY PEOPLE.

I wish now to go back a little in time. From time to time in the past I received contributions to the WEEKLY PEOPLE from Comrade Knudsen. They have generally been excellent, dealing with industry, but here and there I detected a sort of

exaggerated note in the interpretation of capital statistics which had put me decidedly on guard with Knudsen's writings.

Some time the latter part of last year I received an article from Knudsen which he entitled, "Automobile Manufacturing and Karl Marx." I read it, laid it aside, re-read it, and, after a third reading, I had convinced myself that my first impression was correct. There was a serious defect in the interpretation of the statistics—a defect arising from a slip-up on Marxism. I had no desire to make an issue of it, so I simply marked the article, "Discarded," and had it put into the morgue.

Some time later, about the middle of December, I received another article, entitled "The Annual 'Inventory,'" also dealing with profits—or rather the lack of profits—this time in American industry at large. Although the covering letter was addressed to me, the article was enclosed in a letter to the National Secretary, and came to me with a note, "A.P. questions the veracity of the figures although he has gone over it but hurriedly." I went over it, anything but hurriedly, and as I did became more and more puzzled by Comrade Knudsen's interpretations. Neither was this article printed. Speaking to Comrade Petersen about it when the Knudsen matter had developed into some proportions, I said, "You glanced over the article and questioned the figures. I have gone into it thoroughly and don't care how correct the figures are, I question something more serious—the application of the figures. I have an earlier unpublished article from Knudsen with the same strange

kink. I believe he has slipped up seriously on essential points of Marxism." By this time we had also before us the Labor Note matter and had no doubt as to the slip on Marxism. However, to go back to the articles, the reason I spoke of them to Arnold Petersen was in answer to an inquiry Knudsen had made to the National Office re his article. I then wrote to Comrade Knudsen on February 7 as follows:

"Comrade Petersen has just handed me an extract from your letter referring to your recent article, that article he handed to me some time ago. The reason I have not published the same is that after two careful readings I still felt that there was some curious twist in the interpretation that did not exactly square with Marxian economics. I had intended to attempt an analysis of certain points and to write you a letter about it but pressure of work has made me push it aside. You know that right now, aside from the regular work and the California matter which has kept all departments over-busy, I have on hand the magazine and a lot of preparatory work for the convention. Besides, the points on which I feel there is a 'slip-up' in your article are so subtle that it is sometimes difficult to analyze them exactly. Yet, I cannot help feeling that, as in my mind, questions in regard to them would arise in the minds of our readers. I will try as soon as possible to point out more exactly what I mean."

Comrade Knudsen was evidently much perturbed that I should question his Marxian interpretation of which he felt certain himself, and asked me to let Comrade Zimmer-

man, who is rather an expert on figures and statistics, see it. Accordingly, when I learned that a special committee for the Sub-Committee, of which Comrade Zimmerman was one, had the Knudsen matter before it, I requested Comrade Petersen to ask these comrades to go through the articles and decide whether I had been wrong in my ruling not to publish. In due time, this committee reported to the Sub-Committee and from this report I quote the part which concerns the articles in question:

"Your committee had also referred to it articles Comrade Knudsen had sent to the editorial department for publication, but which were rejected by the Editor. One of these is entitled 'Automobile Manufacturing and Karl Marx,' and the other, 'The Annual "Inventory."'

"In the first mentioned, Comrade Knudsen makes the contention that the automobile industry, on the basis of the figures he gives, is slowly dying out and is gradually reaching the point where it will cease to yield profit. Comrade Knudsen points out that in 1933 the Chrysler Corp. earned \$30 net per auto produced; in 1934 about \$16. For 1935, according to Comrade Knudsen, the forecast is for a still smaller return per car. To quote Comrade Knudsen:

"'In fact, with competition pressing, and even a rise in the volume of cars produced, the danger exists of no profit at all. This is why Chrysler has cheapened his products in 1935, trying to escape the crash.'

"In the illustrations and prognostications of Comrade Knudsen there

is apparent a lack of understanding that the rate of profit for a large industry may decline, and yet the mass of profits increase. Your committee, for example, would point out that despite Comrade Knudsen's forecast, the earnings of the Chrysler Corp. for the year 1935 were the largest in its history, the total earnings being approximately \$35,000,000 and the earnings per share were \$8.07 as compared with net earnings of approximately \$9,500,000 or \$2.10 for the year 1934.

Your committee finds that there is a marked tendency on the part of Comrade Knudsen to speculate, a tendency which we cannot regard as a wholesome one, or of practical value to the Party, particularly when there is so much constructive work to be done. This tendency toward speculation is revealed not only in the article, 'Automobile Manufacturing and Karl Marx,' but also in the article previously referred to on 'The Annual "Inventory,"' which attempts to show that 'the American capitalist class does not have four years left to live, or rather sufficient funds to keep the system working for that period of time.' Comrade Knudsen qualifies this conclusion by saying that conditions must remain unchanged or get worse—in other words, conditions must materially improve to prevent this fatal termination of capitalism within the period mentioned. To draw such conclusions, and to make such prognostications from statistics drawn from capitalist sources, can serve no constructive purpose."

By the time this report arrived, the "Labor Note" and related matters had already been opened up in the WEEKLY PEOPLE.

I am, of course, not going to take up this on its merits. You have all read these editorials in the WEEKLY PEOPLE as they appeared. You have either approved or disapproved of them. That is for you to express yourselves on if you wish. The copies of the WEEKLY PEOPLE are here for any comrade to review in case that is your desire.

There is, however, one matter in this connection that I am obliged to bring before you and ask you to rule upon, viz., the propriety of having taken this matter into the columns of the WEEKLY PEOPLE.

In a group of letters addressed jointly to the Editor of the WEEKLY PEOPLE and the N.E.C. Sub-Committee, dated March 31, 1936, Comrade Knudsen takes up these matters at length. I know that the Sub-Committee has already dealt with most of the points raised in these letters and that the National Secretary will handle these in his report, so I have no desire to add to these matters, but there is one point in that letter that concerns me alone, hence I deal with it here. Comrade Knudsen writes:

"When I wrote that letter [re the Labor Note] it was not intended for publication. I was simply asking your and Comrade Petersen's advice. I surely was surprised when it appeared in the WEEKLY PEOPLE. I had not advanced these ideas in any talks that I had given, whatsoever, so the attack in the WEEKLY PEOPLE surely hurt. I cannot remember a time when a member was attacked in the WEEKLY PEOPLE. Comrade Reynolds had a long correspondence on the law of value, none of this ever reached the WEEKLY PEOPLE, so I surely am

at sea how my asking for advice became a controversy."

In another part of the correspondence of the same date (addressed to the Editor and Sub-Committee) there appears the following, discussing the case of Comrade Campbell, in particular, but which Comrade Knudsen may well consider as relating to his case as well:

"Now, in giving the following information it might be wrong but if so kindly advise me what I should do with it in respect to the clause on page 44, number four, in 'Disruption and Disrupters,' which reads, 'If a subject is brought up on which there are differences of opinion, discuss them without passion or personal rancor, and always within parliamentary rules, and never bring in doubt a member's loyalty and integrity.... Be careful not to confuse facts with the conclusions that one as an individual may draw from these facts. There may be general agreement as to facts, and yet a difference as to conclusions, parliamentary language must be strictly adhered to if we are to avoid trouble.'"

Whether or not Comrade Knudsen considered the long dissertation on the Labor Note as "merely asking advice," the fact is that he took issue with the Letter Box answer of November 2, 1935, to C.S., Chicago, Ill., and thus placed himself at variance with a well defined principle of Marxian economics. The question itself, coming from the organizer of Section Cook County, that gave rise to the Letter Box answer, showed plainly that there were varied opinions and possible confusion on this matter in Chicago. Cor-

respondence from Organizers Reynolds, Campbell and Culshaw that by this time we had in the office showed differences of opinion, and to judge by these letters a great deal of irritated discussion on several problems that sprang directly out of the money question. All these taken together, and not Comrade Knudsen's "asking for information" alone, caused me to open up these questions in the WEEKLY PEOPLE.

In Comrade Knudsen's complaint of the action of the Editor of the WEEKLY PEOPLE there are two distinct points involved: (1) Breach of Party propriety and precedent on the part of your Editor; (2) whether there was any necessity at all for treating this matter in the columns of the PEOPLE.

As to (1), I deny in toto that in taking this matter into the columns of the WEEKLY PEOPLE I committed a breach of Party propriety and precedent. As to propriety, the pamphlet, "Party Organization and Discipline," emphasizes above all that the organization cannot afford to allow any individual to "play monkeyshines" with either our organization or principles, and that it is the organization's duty to itself to take to task the individual who gets off the track before he can do injury to the organization.

As to precedent, there are many such in the Party. I shall designate two only:

(a) The "As to Politics" discussion. A dangerous tendency had been seen for some time creeping into the Party—the demand that the Party disband and turn all its property over to the I.W.W. Sandgren, a Party member, laid himself open

and De Leon did not hesitate one moment to come out in the open to expose the falseness of notions of either Sandgren or other Party members who stood by him. This was not an open "discussion" upon which Party members might legitimately disagree in public. De Leon denied this throughout and refused to open the columns for "general discussion." He handled the matter himself throughout, and for the sole purpose of exposing the erroneous notions of these Party members.

(b) In 1917-18, the then Editor of the WEEKLY PEOPLE (Edmund Seidel of sad memory) went off half-cocked on the Russian Revolution and other matters. Did the National Secretary, Arnold Petersen, modestly withdraw into Party chambers to discuss the matter? No, he lanced the boil in the columns of the WEEKLY PEOPLE, and who is there to say today that this action did not save the Party perhaps from serious disaster?

So there is precedent. But what is precedent? The first time a thing is done it has no precedent, and has to stand on its own legs or fall. So, for that matter, has every action, and I have no desire to hide behind either De Leon or Petersen, but willingly admit that if this opening up in the WEEKLY PEOPLE had never been done before, I would have done it anyhow, feeling there was absolute necessity for it.

And that brings us to point two: Was there any necessity, that is, any imminent danger to the organization?

I shall leave that to you to decide after reciting the circumstances.

We had the California disruption

before, which cost the Party a large sum of money and inestimable time and energy. Comrade Knudsen had injected himself into this matter. Letters had come from Organizers Reynolds, Campbell and Culshaw to show that all was not quite healthy in Chicago. I had Knudsen articles which showed a poor grasp of certain principles of Marxism. Then the outburst on the Labor Note which showed him completely off, with other subjects hanging on this in the offing. Were we to let this grow into another Party boil, which we certainly feared was growing? The objection may be raised that we cannot make a thorough Marxist of every member. Certainly not, and such members can be useful in a hundred ways, but not as speakers, writers, general propagandists or teachers of study classes. Comrade Knudsen was all that, and a convincing talker and a comrade who gets around considerably outside his own Section. If he was spreading non-Marxian ideas, it could easily become serious. Even if he gained no direct adherents, he would start discussions, that would divert the membership to technical hair-splitting away from Party work.

The only logical way was for the Party to tackle the matter openly and at once. But I did not do so hastily. We talked the matter over; I read every line that had come in about Knudsen to the National Office.

I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion the effect of the PEOPLE articles has been good. Many Party members in letters and otherwise have commented favorably on the editorials. I have had no objection entered.

I shall include here only two comments:

"Chicago, Ill., April 7, 1936.

"In reply to your letter of March 9, wherein you wish to have more information as to the meaning of Section Cook County's letter of March 5, regarding the editorial that appeared in the Feb. 29 issue of the W.P.

"Section Cook County's letter stated 'the fact is that letter box answer was not the cause of provoking any discussion, but just the opposite,' you wish to know if there is complete agreement with the ans. or if the discussion existed before the letter box ans.

"This question can best be answered by stating my reasons for asking the question. [That is, the question which caused the Letter Box answer of November 2, 1935.] When Comrade Knudsen made the statement that the labor check was utopian, and that we would need money under Socialism, it created considerable discussion, and caused some members to become confused, as to just what the Party's stand was on this question. I then decided to send the question to the W.P. letter box, hoping that it would clear up the confused members, but as you know Comrade Knudsen challenged the ans.

"As to the question of embattled factions. As I have already stated some members were confused, but as far as factions are concerned I do not believe any one took the same views as Comrade Knudsen, at least not openly.

"After the thorough manner in which this question has been taken up editorially I do not see how there could be room for doubt or confu-

sion in any one's mind. Whether or not Comrade Knudsen still holds the labor check to be utopian, I do not know at this time, I have had no statement from him.

"Fraternally yours,
(Signed) "Charles Storm,
"Organizer."

*

"Westbrook, Conn.,
"March 27, 1936.

"Mrs. Olive M. Johnson,
"45 Rose St., New York City.

"Dear Comrade Johnson:

"After reading the last editorial you wrote in reply to the ridiculous contentions of Comrade Knudsen, I could not refrain from writing to you.

"It certainly is cause for wonder how any one in the S.L.P. can hold such views, especially one who (I understand) has been in the Party for so long a time, and who has been nominated for the N.E.C. Certainly no one who holds such views can long remain within the S.L.P. for they are the very antithesis of scientific Socialism.

"It must be a weary task to have to continuously expose such obvious fallacies but there must be consolation in the fact that they are the exception and not the rule.

"With best wishes and kindest regards,

"Fraternally yours,
(Signed) "Alvin M. Gully."

*

As to the general effect, many comments have been made to show that, aside from Comrade Knudsen, altogether the discussion has had excellent effect in clearing many readers' minds on the money question

and related matters. As to this general effect, I can only express my regret that Comrade Knudsen should have been made the chopping block, but after you have become familiar with the whole correspondence and all the side issues, I feel that you will agree he asked for it.

And as far as Comrade Knudsen is concerned, there should be no cause for "disgrace," not even for regret on his part—if he has been made to see his errors. He should then be glad he was jerked up in time and not allowed to go further astray, and he should then work all the better for his temporary lapse. Of course, if he persists that he was right and the Party wrong—that is, if the convention decides he was wrong—that is another matter that does not belong here. I trust he is too good an organization man, however.

The May Day Magazine.

According to schedule, the May Day magazine, started last year with the idea that it would be a regular publication, came out this year. It was a hard task and there was a time when we thought we would have to give it up, since the California disruption was upsetting and overworking every department. We got over it, however, and *May Day* came out—quite a victory.

It is the first time the convention has had this magazine before it, with the idea of making it an annual publication. An expression pro or con of this venture may, therefore, be in order.

This annual magazine, we feel, deserves a place among our publications. It gives an opportunity to bring out much material that for various reasons is ruled out of the

WEEKLY PEOPLE, and gives a chance for a somewhat literary and artistic touch that we may very legitimately strive for, but which has to be neglected more or less in the stress of daily militant propaganda. Moreover, this *May Day* annual publication exemplifies the International May Day spirit. It is one of our ways of celebrating May Day—the student proletarian's way—that ought to become an institution with the passing years.

In connection with *May Day*, I feel it is only fair to give special mention to our artist sympathizer, Walter Steinhilber, who has drawn the beautiful cover design this year, as well as that of last year, and the *Forty Years* magazine of six years ago. In between Steinhilber has drawn a number of the very excellent cartoons for the PEOPLE and has designed the new covers for our pamphlets that have won such high praise and approval. The special mention of Steinhilber, however, should not be taken as a slight to our own Party artists, Comrades Armer, Herzl and others who for years and in innumerable ways have contributed to make our publications more interesting and beautiful.

There is much work for all sorts of talent in the S.L.P.

About Study Classes.

This topic may appear as no concern of this report of the Editor of the WEEKLY PEOPLE. But since study classes are a distinct part of our educational program and thus in more than one way dovetail in with the work of the PEOPLE, I shall include here some observations. I do not speak without experience. For seven seasons now I have myself conducted a study class and as

some of the students, like latterday Oliver Twists, have come back for more, season after season, I feel I have a right to consider the class a success. In a way this class is not to be compared with the average study class throughout the country; it consists *now* of advanced, more or less, picked students. But it was "green" once, and new recruits come in all the time, so I have gathered considerable experience. Besides I have had many other opportunities to observe study class work, not the least through questions that come into the Letter Box, from study class members or instructors, and articles that come in to the PEOPLE from budding propagandists.

Judging from the latter I can fairly conclude that there are many excellent study classes carried on throughout the country. There is a sureness of fundamentals and background that reflects thorough familiarity with our principal propaganda pamphlets and the study class essays. Recently, as one of the membership committee of Section Kings County, Brooklyn, I examined two applicants who had been members of Comrade Berlin's study class the past season. It was a pleasure to note their absolute sureness as to fundamentals and my own inability to trip them up even with somewhat tricky questions. This is the sort of membership we should expect in the future as a foundation for the Revolution, that the S.L.P. and it alone can build.

But I have noted other things about study classes, here and there, less satisfactory, that can and should be remedied with a little experience on the part of the conductors. There are two faults, mainly,

(1) the classes are made too technical, too cut and dried, and too much is demanded of green applicants. You can't bully economics into anybody's head. And it should ever be borne in mind that no student gets any more out of a class than he himself is willing and able to bring it. Hence, when you pick from the street—so to speak—twenty adults, you have twenty more or less set minds and twenty different capacities. Five may grasp quickly, eat up our theories and policies, as it were. Ten are average, and five, though anxious to learn, are slow, have a hard struggle with words and meanings. Here the teacher has the problem of being general enough to hold the attention of those of class one, and yet pay attention enough to particulars to carry those of class three along. It can be done, it has been done, but it requires both tact and a certain ability. Above all, the teacher must realize that he is not preparing every student in his class to be a writer or a speaker. If five out of twenty develop into agitators, the teacher has done well. Let the other fifteen become staunch, clear-headed rank and file men and women whom no one can fool or trip up and the S.L.P. is building on a firm foundation. And those five slow ones: Do not get impatient with them. If you aid them to get the principles of the S.L.P. soundly into their heads, you may find them—determined though silent—to the day of the Revolution carrying on the multitude of indispensable tasks necessary for our organization.

This fault of being too technical, of demanding a stereotyped answer of equal goodness—written out even—is so well set forth by Comrade

Hopp, organizer of New Jersey, in his report to the New Jersey state convention, that it deserves to be repeated here. More than one study class has gone down from these methods.

"We had high hopes of continuing this class [of Camden] and eventually organizing a Section in southern New Jersey this year some time. It failed. In attempting to put my finger on the reason for its failure I come back again and again to the method employed. It may be the reason and it may not. However, I think it was, it is for you to decide as you see fit.

"We had gathered together a group of six, apparently sincere workers who had attended practically all our outdoor meetings in Camden. One of them bought as much as five dollars' worth of literature at one meeting. All expressed a desire to join a study class and in the latter part of the season urged us to hurry up the formation of the class. Apparently they were eager to begin their revolutionary training.

"For a number of reasons it is not necessary to go into, the S.E.C. decided it better to turn it over to Section Philadelphia, which was done. I made the trip down for the organization meeting, outlined the purpose of the class and also what was expected of them. Section Philadelphia had assigned Comrade Ben Miller as instructor and he was on hand with his first lesson prepared. His lesson was as recommended on several occasions by various national organizers, the WEEKLY PEOPLE and if I am not mistaken the National Office also, a list of type-written questions to be taken home

by the student together with the pamphlet in question or to be studied and to prepare answers for the next meeting.

"I left Camden that night and the next report I received about the class was that it failed to meet, in fact no one but a sympathizer, who subsequently became a member, showed up besides the instructor. Now the question is: Why did these new members fail to come back? I have given considerable thought to this question and am convinced that we scared them away. Frightened them. This method of conducting a study class assumes every interested worker a student. Which is not true. These men were workers, dock workers, marine workers, common laborers and unemployed workers. Study was not, could not be their long suit. They were interested in securing their freedom, yes. But to assume they could be molded into students without any preliminary training was in my opinion an error. I believe, the method used by Comrade A. J. Taylor and Comrade A. Orange a few years ago in Newark more suitable than the one employed in Camden with 'green' material. You will remember that method, at least some of you will.

"A pamphlet was selected by the instructor and it was read in class by every member, taking turns paragraph by paragraph. At any time a student had the privilege of stopping the reader to ask questions on points not clear. The students were questioned by the instructor as to their understanding of what had been read if the students failed to question. Some were asked to discuss a previous chapter and this informal discussion method, combined with

the general reading, stimulated keen interest and students bid for the chance to answer questions. For a beginner in the science of Socialism I think this method leaves little room for improvement and it practically compels students to come back again and again. At least the class I took over in Newark at that time grew remarkably. Further, several members of this class are now clear, well informed members and attending advanced classes in the present class and a few have joined the Party. It gives the beginner a chance to take part and ask those particular questions which in some instances a stereotyped list of questions does not always make clear. It also instils confidence in the timid student when he observes the manner in which his fellow students take hold. I recall taking a dictionary to class to look up the exact meaning of words for the benefit of the class. Some workers are ashamed to ask the meaning of simple words for their own sake, but when the instructor in a tactful way brings up the meanings of words in doubt, showing as he does, the limited opportunities for workers to get a decent education under capitalism, the students do not feel their ignorance is being exposed. For these reasons, then, I am in favor of this informal discussion method of conducting BEGINNERS' study classes. After a desire for further knowledge or study has been implanted and our beginner can stand on his feet, then bring forth your prepared list of questions and written answers and I am quite sure workers will not be scared or frightened away."

I wish to digress to say that the

WEEKLY PEOPLE has never recommended any stereotyped set of questions to be handed to the student. Quite to the contrary. The following is a copy of a letter that has been sent out to any number of Sections and study classes that have asked for instruction as to the conduct of a study class. The suggestion to prepare a set of questions is for the guidance of the instructor alone and not to be handed out to the students. The following is the letter:

"In response to your letter re study classes, let me say, first, that the procedure in study classes depends a great deal on the instructor and the subject. If you are following the study course in the WEEKLY PEOPLE, I would suggest that you give one essay at a time for a lesson to be studied as much as possible along with the collateral reading preparatory to the class meeting. I would then suggest that the instructor have prepared and written out for himself as many questions as he possibly can extract out of the written text and put them to the students. After that, the essay might be read aloud, a paragraph by each student. Reading aloud is exceedingly important and a very good training both for speaking and for occasional platform reading of quotations. Some very good speakers will hem, haw and stumble if they come to the reading of a quotation during the speech. Class reading will do away with that hesitancy. If there is still time at the meeting, I would suggest a general discussion or calling upon students to tell what they have learned in short summaries of from three to five minutes.

"I should like to suggest that as near as possible you conduct your class as a CLASS, meeting at a certain hour, calling it together promptly and adjourning also at a set time, not allowing any hanging around for debating or 'rag chewing' after the class has adjourned. These habits, I think, are injurious both to study, order—and health. In New York, where we have long distances to go, practically none of us can get home for dinner after our work, so we eat our dinners and go directly to the class. I call it to order on the stroke of seven and adjourn on the stroke of nine unless there is a paragraph or so left in order to finish a chapter, when we might stretch it a few minutes. As soon as we have adjourned everybody goes home. It has worked excellently and the students come fresh and leave before they are fagged out."

(2) Running off into trivialities.

It is always a lot of fun to roam around. This is true of mental roaming as well as perambulating or running around in a car. But it does not get you anywhere in particular.

The study class teacher should set his face like flint against mental running around, alike in the alleys and byways of capitalism or in the dream castle of the Socialist Industrial Republic. I am giving here a number of questions that have come in from study classes that illustrate exactly what I mean:

"Can a tree in the forest have potential value?"

"Is a vacant lot in a city street a commodity?"

"If the capitalist maintains a private hospital in his factory for his employees, does that maintenance

come out of his surplus value or of his variable capital?"

"Is the tool of a carpenter who does his own contracting and seeks out a job himself capital?"

"Please answer how under Socialism homes would be owned and the procedure to take when one should move to another locality?"

"Are the workingmen's hands and arms capital?"

"When a man takes an axe or any other implement and chops a cord of wood or makes other commodities to be sold (disregarding his financial condition) is he or is he not selling a commodity other than his labor power and does he not enter the commercial field and does this man remain a wage worker?"

"Does not the worker when he is buying stock in the concern which employs him give back some of his wages, thereby merely swelling the surplus value, as well as whatever accrues to the capitalist class as surplus value?"

"Approximately what was the cost of government in 1929? (Or probably the question should be, What was the amount of taxes collected in that year?)"

"What was the amount of currency in circulation in that year?"

"Approximately how many labor hours are required to produce \$500 worth of gold?"

"Approximately how many labor hours are required to produce a \$500 Ford car?"

I want to emphasize again that the sort of discussion indicated by these questions is by no means usual in our study classes which, as I said before, have shown excellent results. It is, however, only by emphasizing the faults that we can overcome

them and that is the reason that I have called attention to these apparent faults which still are evident in some cases.

Unquestionably it was just a desire to roam that got Comrade Knudsen into trouble over the "Labor Note." The question comes up of money under Socialism. Instead of simply saying De Leon, Marx, Engels all point to the disappearance of the metal money commodity under Socialism, at the same time as all other products lose their present commodity character, Knudsen quite evidently launched into a long "explanation" of how money would have to be used at one time or another at least till things got settled and in running order. According to Section Cook County's own statement, this resulted in a lot of confusion. Hence the question to the Letter Box and with the answer Comrade Knudsen naturally felt "hit," so he had to object, and back up his objection with whole pages from Marx and Engels, which unfortunately for him killed his own argument.

Moral: Do not roam or allow the class to roam. Do not encourage hair-splitting. Do not philosophize or speculate. A study class does not aim at producing philosophers or hair-trigger arguers. Let the aim be to make S.L.P. members sound in the few fundamental principles of Marxism and De Leonism. When this has been done, and well done, those who are able to speak, write or compose songs and poetry will "feel the call" and come forth without much urging.

Conclusion.

S. L. P. members are not given to compliment, S.L.P. workers do not

need compliment. Mutual admiration certainly is the least of our faults—as it should be. But, for all that, it is good to hear, as we sometimes do, the exclamation: "It seems that the WEEKLY PEOPLE is getting better and better! How can that keep up?"

The explanation is simple, and neither contributors nor Editor need get swelled-headed about it. Leaving out De Leon who stands in a class by himself and does not brook comparison, the Party no doubt had every bit as able writers in, say, the '90's as it has today. But they did not live in our age of capitalist decay and did not have the illustrative material, easy to mold into expressive figures, that we have today. Their task was mostly to demonstrate the class struggle, show the progress of capitalism, and show up the labor faker, and with it teach Socialism theoretically. Now the theoretical truths are few and in themselves do not lend themselves to much variety, except under the touch of a De Leon's hand of genius. But it becomes altogether different when a multiplicity of rapidly shifting events rise up to demonstrate theories. Then one can dress the theories in styles that everybody comprehends. If, instead of talking abstract class struggle, you can dress the theory in recent events from Akron, down to the decentralization of capital—moving the factories South—then it is easy to talk language that the workers can understand. True, things happened in the '90's too, many awful things, big strikes and clashes even harder than those of today. But the decay was not so evident. Capitalism was still marching on and the workers still

clung to it with hopes of a better future, at least for their children. All that is gone today. And, moreover, events move so rapidly that variety in style, illustrations and approach is easy.

As an illustration take this year's May Day issue. I consider it just about a model of excellence for a propaganda issue—and that does not mean that your Editor is throwing a bouquet at herself either. On the contrary, perhaps the editorial page is the least outstanding. Run over the pages—no two of the articles on a similar subject; no two alike in tone; every one dealing with a live subject, right from the revolutionary working class front; and at the same time all sound on theory and every one and all together a splendid lesson in Marxism and De Leonism.

Such are the possibilities of approach today. No longer need be

heard the old cry that "the S.L.P. is shooting over the heads of the workers." We need not here stop and consider whether there was any sense to this charge or not—it is enough to know that a direct and simple everyday appeal is possible and easy today.

Well, then, since this is a fact, since the WEEKLY PEOPLE certainly speaks in simple terms the clear and sound working class language today and is the only paper in the English language in this country that does this, the last thought I want to leave with this 1936 historic convention is—Speed the WEEKLY PEOPLE! Get subscribers! To the end that—

CAPITALISM WILL BE DESTROYED!

Fraternally submitted,

Olive M. Johnson,
Editor WEEKLY PEOPLE.

PLATFORM OF THE SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

(Adopted at the 19th National Convention, April 27, 1936.)

The capitalist system has outlived its usefulness. If progress is to be the order of society in the future as in the past, this outworn system **MUST** give way to a new social order. Social development points in but one direction—to an Industrial Union Government, an administration of things in place of a political rule over men.

The avowed purpose of governments is to insure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to the useful members of society. Whenever a given social system, and its corresponding government, fails in or becomes destructive of these ends, it has outlived its usefulness, rendering it imperative for the exploited and oppressed class to organize its forces to put an end to the outworn economic and political system. This historic duty and necessity now confront the working class of America.

Social systems and their corresponding forms of government come into being as results of social and economic forces. The history of mankind has been the history of class struggles, with Progress ever as the aim. Ancient autocracies fell before ancient republics, the slave labor systems gave way to feudalism, feudalism broke down before the onslaught of capitalism. Capitalism, with its concomitant—wage slavery—is the world system which has been the vanguard of progress through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the United

States of America capitalism has reached the highest point of development; here also may be traced the most rapid decay.

When a ruling class can no longer live and exploit as previously, and the exploited class can no longer be fed and cared for while rendering useful social service, *the hour of Social Revolution has struck.*

At this crucial period, accordingly, the Socialist Labor Party, in National Convention assembled, April 27, 1936, reaffirms its former platform pronouncements and, in accord with international Socialist principles, declares:

For close to a decade now, millions of the working class have had to be fed by the exploiting masters, instead of, as heretofore, feeding and keeping the masters in luxury. The richest country in the world, with the highest degree of productivity in the world, has been turned into a gigantic poorhouse, with vast numbers of its useful and able workers turned into mendicants, suppliants for a hand-out to keep body and soul together. History's pages record no greater disgrace than this.

A decaying system creates nothing so surely as its own grave-diggers. The germs of destruction are active within American capitalism. Competition is the very life of capitalism; markets constitute the indispensable condition for its continued existence.

The early termination of capital-

ism was clearly indicated when the fact was revealed that a few giant corporations virtually control the entire production and distribution machinery of the nation. "Rugged individualism" has gone by the board. There is no possibility for the "average man" to become a capitalist. The small farmer, the small manufacturer, and the business man with small capital who still hangs on, are perpetually on the verge of bankruptcy. In most cases the farmer is but a tenant farmer or a "sharecropper" working for some banking house; the small business man is but a repair man or an agent of some large corporation.

The markets, foreign and domestic, are becoming extinct. A social system will flourish only while there is room within it for expansion. The possibilities for expansion in the United States of America seemed unlimited during its first 150 years. Ships, canals, railroads, bridges, roads, farms, machinery of all sorts were the crying need of expanding and progressing capitalism. This called for millions of workers, skilled and unskilled, in mines, mills, factories, on railroads, on the land, in shops, stores, offices and the technical trades. This, in turn, opened a tremendous market for other commodities — houses, furniture, clothing, food, and the so-called public service industries. "Prosperity" ruled; capitalism was in its full flower.

With the beginning of the twentieth century reaction had already set in. The frontier had gone; internal improvements were approaching a limit and commenced to slacken; American capitalism for a decade had been on a sharp look-out for

foreign markets. The era of imperialism was at hand.

In the world market America encountered Great Britain, a formidable rival, the erstwhile "workshop of the world." Germany, France, Japan were stepping up, with Italy and Russia in the offing. The World War brought the rivals together with a clash. World expansion turned into a battle of "survival of the fittest," with every one struggling with the view of destruction of all rivals. The *progress* of capitalism had stopped; decay and degeneration had definitely set in.

There was one avenue, however, where progress under capitalism **DID NOT STOP**, for that avenue and that alone leads to the future, viz., the invention and perfection of machinery. The World War gave this a tremendous impetus which has not relaxed since. As a result, production is keyed up tremendously. The increased productive capacity of the system demands more markets, and when no markets are forthcoming, the abundance of products results in social degeneration and decay.

To bolster up market prices by creating artificial scarcity, millions of dollars' worth of products have been destroyed—plowed under, or allowed to rot, or burnt or dumped in the ocean—and this was done while millions of workers were poorly housed, underfed and insufficiently clothed. Decay and degeneration of a social system cannot go further than that.

Ever more and better machinery is the demand of capitalism. As the machines go into a factory, the workers go out. Millions of those who are unemployed today will

never again under capitalism have regular, useful employment.

The Socialist Revolutionary hour in America is at hand. For forty-five years the Socialist Labor Party has been moving upward to this historic opportunity. The working class of America cannot afford to, must not, at the peril of its own existence, and that of future generations, allow to slip by this moment of opportunity to free the world from wage slavery.

Where a social revolution is pending and, for whatever reason, is not accomplished, reaction is the alternative. Every reform granted by capitalism is a concealed measure of reaction, exemplified by the NRA, AAA, TVA, CCC, WPA, etc. He who says reform says preservation, and he who says that reforms under capitalism are possible and worth while thereby declares that a continuation of capitalism is possible and worth while. But capitalism has grown into an all-destroying and all-devouring monster that must itself be destroyed if humanity is to live. Fascism, Nazism, Absolutism in government—in short, Industrial Feudalism—are but means in the attempts to preserve capitalism.

American capitalism, along with capitalism in the rest of the world today, is trembling in the balance between decay or progress, reaction or revolution. **THIS IS THE HISTORIC HOUR OF THE AMERICAN WORKING CLASS.**

The class struggle, which rages today, is destined to be the last. There is no exploited or enslaved class below that of the exploited working class. When the workers take possession of the government and the social means of production,

they are bound to do so in the name of society as a whole. That means the abolition of all classes, the abolition of private property and the inauguration of a Socialist Industrial Republic, where the means of production will be the collective property of society, operated by all able workers, for the benefit of all. Social or collective ownership—administered by an Industrial Union Government of, by and for the workers—of the already socially operated means of production will be the fulfilment of the promise implicit in social evolution throughout the ages!

At this crucial moment in history, the Socialist Labor Party of America, earnestly and deliberately, calls upon the working class of America to rally at the polls under the banner of the Socialist Labor Party, the only Party with a program that meets the needs of the hour, i.e., a progressive and revolutionary program.

The Socialist Labor Party also calls upon all other intelligent citizens to place themselves squarely upon the ground of working class interests, and join in this mighty and noble work of human emancipation, so that we may put summary end to the existing barbarous class conflict and insane contradictions between unlimited wealth and wealth production, and the poverty and wretchedness suffered by those whose labor created all this wealth.

We, therefore, call upon the workers of America to organize into Socialist Revolutionary Industrial Unions in shop, mine, mill and factory, and on the land, to provide a lever to place the land and the means of production and distribution in

the hands of the useful producers as a body organized into a national Industrial Union Administration to take the place of the present outworn political or territorial government.

So shall come into being the So-

cialist Industrial Commonwealth of Emancipated Labor — a commonwealth in which every worker shall have the free exercise and full benefit of his faculties, multiplied by all the factors of modern civilization.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE CONVENTION

Resolution on Economic Organization and Attitude toward Strikes.

Every political upheaval arises from economic undercurrents; every economic convulsion in class society of necessity has its political reflex and expression. It is self-evident, therefore, that the labor movement throughout the world should seek expression on the economic as well as on the political field. Without both a political party and an economic union the movement is crippled.

Because of this intimate and inevitable relation between the political and economic organizations of labor, the Socialist Labor Party in National Convention assembled in New York City, April, 1936, reaffirms its former position on the necessity of Industrial Union organization, viz.:

"The bona fide or revolutionary Socialist movement needs the political as well as the economic organization of labor, the former for propaganda and to conduct the struggle for the conquest of the capitalist-controlled Political State upon the civilized plane of the ballot; the latter as the only conceivable force

with which to back up the ballot, without which force all balloting is moonshine, and which force is essential for the ultimate lockout of the capitalist class.

"Without the political organization, the labor or Socialist movement could not attain the hour of its triumph; and without the economic organization, the day of its triumph would be the day of its defeat. Without the economic organization, the movement would attract and breed the pure and simple politician, who would debauch and sell out the working class; and without the political organization, the movement would attract and breed the agent provocateur, who would assassinate the movement; therefore, in order to maintain the uncompromising policies and tactics, the Socialist Labor Party of America condemns all efforts to blur the lines of the class struggle, by whomsoever attempted, efforts that aim at misleading the working class on the political field into middle class movements and confounding it with middle class issues; and on the economic field would seek to confine all efforts at working class organizations to a 'boring from within' collaboration with the capitalist-controlled labor lieutenants of

the pure and simple craft unions."

As capitalism approaches its final dissolution, the "Babel of tongues" becomes ever louder with the discord of contradictory voices. The economic field as the expression of the class struggle of the working class is no exception.

The American Federation of Labor for decades succeeded in posing as the economic union of American workers. What if the Socialist Labor Party proved it to be merely a "job trust" of a few favored crafts, a scab-herding concern as far as the working class was concerned; what if labor leaders were in reality "labor fakers," the well rewarded lieutenants of the capitalist class? What if the *Wall Street Journal*, spokesman of top-capitalists, fondly characterized the A. F. of L. as the strongest bulwark against Socialism? What of all this! The capitalist press advertised it as the labor movement; the Socialist party fawned before the fakers and the unions, fearing to lose a single coveted vote by uttering the most glaring facts about the A. F. of L. scab-herding and its essentially capitalist nature. The Communists, in turn, followed the precedent of the Socialist party mother, kotowed to the leaders, tried to "bore from within" the unions for votes and adherents, till they made such a nuisance of themselves that they were fired out in large groups, upon which followed the "new strategy" of independent unions—on paper. And when this too proved a total failure by lack of membership, there followed the latest "strategy" of accepting anew the A. F. of L., hide and hair.

Aside from a vigorous Socialist

Trade and Labor Alliance agitation in the 1890's, the short-lived Industrial Workers of the World opposition in 1905-1908, it is plain that the A. F. of L. bulwark of capitalism has had no effective opposition except the continued forty-five years' exposure of the iniquities of the organization and its leaders by the Socialist Labor Party. Under the glaring light of this exposure, the A. F. of L. has winced but it has never dared openly to join issue with our Party.

The A. F. of L. has practically had the economic field to itself, unchallenged except by the S.L.P. But it has never been a part of the genuine labor movement, which of necessity must be built upon the basis of the class struggle. The A. F. of L. is built upon a social-economic monstrosity, viz., the alleged "brotherhood of capital and labor." This has resulted in arbitration which implies equality between capitalist and worker, and in "collective bargaining," in which transaction the seller of labor power, the worker, has ever drawn the short end of the bargain against the ever more powerful capitalist group, "brotherly" assisted at the bargain counter by his A. F. of L. labor lieutenants.

The A. F. of L., however, could not organize the working class. It organized only the most favored crafts and left the major part of the working class on the outside, branding as "scabs" the very people it refused to organize, dividing the working class into hostile camps.

However, the scorpion of craft division and craft superiority carried in its own tail the poison that would destroy it. With the growth of large industry in the past forty

years the crafts have become of less and less importance. The workers, thousands upon thousands of skilled and well trained workers, kept out of the unions by limited memberships, high dues and high initiation fees, found the great industries—automobiles, steel, aluminum, oil, public service and what not—open to them, and the A. F. of L. craft unionists suddenly found themselves shut out of many of the most important classes of work in this country. Would-be leaders in these industries clamored for "vertical" organization, which the A. F. of L. with its present "horizontal" craft union set-up has proved utterly incapable of effecting.

Then from the leaders of the miners, the printing trades, the clothing workers, the electrical workers; etc., arose the "battle cry" of industrial unionism—adding one more note of confusion to the already bewildering Babel of tongues. What John L. Lewis and his kindred want, including his Social Democratic and Communist supporters, is not Industrial Unionism but a sort of amalgamated craft union that is capable of holding together certain of the major crafts in an industry, and forcing others into submission. Hence, by slightly imitating the Industrial Union form, they lay claim to the name, while the revolutionary spirit and goal of the unions are not only ignored, but opposed and combatted, and the spirit of the class struggle deadened by adherence to arbitration and collective bargaining in the workshops, and political adherence to a capitalist party.

Every genuine article, when it becomes known and about to be accepted, almost inevitably has its

counterfeit. The Industrial Union is no exception. The scientific Socialist Labor Party has had its counterfeit in the reformist Socialist party and a quack imitation in the Communist party. The Industrial Union had its initiation in the Anarcho-Syndicalist and now the Lewis movement. These are only the tributes that social lies pay to great sociological truths.

Nevertheless, it is not only the frauds, freaks and fakers who are paying tribute to the advancing Industrial Union idea. In increasing measure, the workers themselves are doing so. More and more we see examples of genuine, non-craft manifestations of solidarity in strikes. The workers ever more frequently thumb their noses at declarations of the leaders that theirs is an "outlaw strike." In the recent Goodyear rubber strike at Akron, the workers actually compelled the leaders to "come along" with the "outlaws," to a certain extent at least. Frequently we hear of "strikes on the job," or "sit down strikes," a tribute to the quarter of a century of S.L.P. agitation that the workers are bound to meet defeat as long as they leave the means of production in the hands of the capitalists. These "stay-on-the-job strikes" may well be considered as a dress rehearsal to the final "*stay on the job*" to take, hold and operate the industries. Not a general strike, but a general lock-out of the capitalist class, must be the watchword of the working class.

The Industrial Union idea is spreading. Workers are commencing to realize that productively they are cogs and wheels, composed of brain and muscle, in a giant social

mechanism of production. The idea is permeating the wide layers of the workers in shop and factory. But the structure of Revolutionary Industrial Unionism does not lend itself to the starting of sporadic small and scattered unions. Not only would these be easily defeated and scattered by capitalist attack but they would, in the nature of things, be no Industrial Unions at all. In the trenchant language of Daniel De Leon: "Industrial Unionism does not consist of little bits. Like Socialism, or the human body, Industrial Unionism is a complete organism." Isolated organizations that from now on are bound to spring up should aim at nothing more drastic than to hold together and maintain organization until large groups of workers get ready to move—whole industries, related industries, groups of industries. Thus only are the workers invulnerable, invincible.

For the worker today there is no hope except through social revolution, the overthrow of the capitalist system of private ownership of the means of life. The Socialist Labor Party advocates this change on the political field, establishing through the ballot our revolutionary right to abolish the present corrupt Political State and to institute an Industrial Government. But the Socialist Industrial Union of Labor alone can furnish the power with which to enforce the mandate of the ballot box. Economic power is the real power. With industry at our command, and completely controlled through the integral revolutionary Industrial Union, the revolution is won.

In view of this, be it

Resolved that the Socialist Labor Party in convention assembled in April, 1936, calls upon the workers of America to organize in shop, mill, mine, factory, on the railroads and on the land, to take, hold and operate the means of production. That is Socialism, that is the Industrial Republic of Labor; and be it further

Resolved, that in relation to industrial and trade groups engaged in economic conflicts with their masters, that this 1936 convention of the Socialist Labor Party reaffirms the declaration on strikes adopted at the Twelfth National Convention of the Party, July 1908, to wit:

"Resolved, That the Socialist Labor Party, while retaining its right to criticize and expose all wrongfully constructed and conducted labor organizations, and exercising its duty to do so, emphatically maintains its position that it is the duty of every member of the Party to stand on the side of the workmen whenever a bona fide strike or other conflict for improved conditions of labor occurs, either as a spontaneous action of the workers or as a result of action taken by any labor organization whatever."

Workers, rise in your might, organize to end wage slavery and starvation.

All power to the Revolutionary Industrial Union!

Resolution on Unemployment.

We are now in the seventh year of the so-called depression, with no sign of any remedy to the problem of unemployment, that has settled like an incubus on the chest of

the American working class. At its convention four years ago the Socialist Labor Party laid down the social-economic background of this problem as follows:

Unemployment is no new phenomenon under capitalism. A "reserve army" of workers has in fact come to be looked upon as part of the system's indispensable equipment. Even during the war, with 4,355,000 shipped abroad or held in training camps, and with industry producing madly for war purposes, it could not be said that there was ever a real scarcity of labor power, and during the peak period of "prosperity" from 1925 to 1929, the reserve army of unemployed already had grown to some 4,000,000.

Even with this formidable mass of unemployed, and a so-called boom period in industrial expansion, domestic trade and foreign commerce, there was already to be seen an ever increasing plethora of products, for the dumping of which on the public a tremendous system of instalment buying was instituted. The wages of the workers were mortgaged for months, even for years, in the future.

Then after the crash of 1929 unemployment grew apace. This was not always the result of complete shutdowns. It soon became evident that a new element was at the bottom of this unemployment crisis. Capitalist engineering experts named it "technological unemployment." To the scientific Socialist there was no mystery in the situation.

During the war and for purposes of destruction industry had

expanded out of all proportion to ordinary requirements. New inventions and discoveries were promoted and taken advantage of to the limit. After the close of the war, it took some years to re-adapt this tremendous productive machine to peace purposes. From 1925 to 1929 it was grinding out products incessantly; with all our boasted prosperity, and the supposed phenomenal purchasing power of the mass of the people, the storehouses were being overloaded.

Then the inevitable crash. Five, six, eight, ten, twelve million workers out of employment, and as many more working only part time at greatly reduced wages. And for all this, look wherever we will, there is evident the same over-abundance of products; food, clothing, houses are crying for purchasers, luxuries calling for users. All this makes it self-evident that the machines are now so powerful and efficient that with a few hours' human labor a week, given by all, they can produce unlimited plenty for every human being. Amidst such plenty, the workers of America are starving, freezing, degenerating, dying.

In the four years that have elapsed since this pronouncement of the Party, nothing has become plainer than that millions of those who have been and are now unemployed will never see regular employment again. Even while the "depression" has been bearing down on the nation, existing machinery has been further perfected and new and practically automatic machines have come into use. Industry today boasts 50 per cent business recovery, but

with the best will in the world, Rooseveltian New Deal statisticians can only conjure up 25 per cent re-employment, which shows that the chariot of employment is steadily losing ground in its race with industrial progress.

Toward the close of the Hoover Administration, a certain unorganized relief clamor arose throughout the land. Hoover, the self-satisfied, arch-conservative, simply closed his ears; the clamor, if it reached him at all, could not affect a person so ignorant of sociology, history and economics as actually to believe that prosperity was merely cooling her heels around the corner. Mr. Roosevelt unquestionably had his ear closer to the ground. He recognized plainly the revolutionary undercurrent. He adopted speedily and without red tape the expediency of throwing sops and handing out palliatives to the idle, and stopped the mouths of the grumbling capitalists whom he "soaked" for the "picnic" expenses, with the unqualified assertion that this sop-throwing alone had averted a revolution which threatened in the winter of 1932-1933.

The nation has been turned into a gigantic poorhouse. Some twelve millions are still without regular, useful, remunerative industrial employment. Millions of men with their families exist on the sops of outright charity, degrading and humiliating. Other millions have accepted the palliatives of made work, "boondoggling," useless, stupid "pyramid building," most of which, however, does not even leave a monument at which future generations might gaze. On the whole this "work," partaking of the nature of a hand-out, is every

bit as degrading as the outright charity itself. It kills the spirit of labor, the joy of creating something useful, while the bare existence it provides undermines physical health and courage.

Behold your image, you freeborn, independent American worker! Two generations ago your boast was that this was a land of opportunity where every man had a chance with every other to become a millionaire. Every male child born was then boastfully admired as "the future President of the United States." In another generation the Presidential notion had pretty well subsided; the hope of becoming captains of industry and millionaires was somewhat modified. The worker now was satisfied if he had steady work at hard labor so he could send his sons and daughters to college, so they could grow into "white collar" workers, clerks, engineers, lawyers, doctors.

AND NOW THIS GENERATION! White collar slaves and horny-handed sons of toil alike on the breadline, and alike humbled to look no higher than a boondoggling relief job for an existence. "What a fall was there, my countrymen!" And what an age of degeneracy and decay and social dissolution is bound to set in if the American working class does not promptly rise.

The productive machine of capitalism has broken down under its own weight. Overabundance of riches in the hands of the few spells starvation to the masses. In the words of Marx, a social want is manifesting itself which is throwing society into revolutionary convulsions.

A struggle is on between the capitalist class and the working

class, and the object of that struggle can only be the ownership of the means of production—the land on and the tools with which to produce the necessities of life.

At such a historic moment it is useless to talk of reforms that could serve only to patch up a system long ripe for overthrow. To beg for charity, doles, social insurance, shorter hours or staggered employment, in the face of a situation already so appalling, brands the beggars and pleaders as frauds or fools. Only a complete destruction of capitalism can abolish its multiple evils.

In the light of these facts, be it—

Resolved that the Socialist Labor Party of America, in National Convention assembled in April 1936, calls upon the working class of America to face these facts, understandingly and with a firm purpose. The problems presented can be met by the working class only by thoroughgoing organization of its overwhelming numbers on the political field, under the banner of the Socialist Labor Party, for the purpose of wresting from the capitalist minority the powers of State, now held and used for purposes of class domination and for protecting its usurped privileges; and organization on the economic or industrial field for the double purpose of

(a) setting against the economic power of the capitalist masters the economic power of a united working class, of using that power to safeguard and to enforce if need be the fiat of the ballot, with the revolutionary end in view of terminating, once for all, the devastating rule of the capitalist system and erecting in its stead the Industrial Socialist Republic; and

(b) setting up the integral industrial organization units which can and will carry on production, bolt the door to anarchy and disorder, and form the framework of the edifice of the Industrial Socialist Republic, a society where class lines will have disappeared and with them the capitalist Political State, which is but the reflex of class division.

Resolution on Absolutism in Government.

No doubt there were those who in 1917-18 honestly believed they were helping to make the world safe for democracy, but such could be only the simple-minded persons who had no idea of the workings of historic cycles. Only if the war had resulted in world Socialist Revolution could democracy have triumphed. However, outside of Russia—which has had to deal with its own problems in its own way in the midst of a capitalist world—the capitalist system managed to drag on, though with a rather precarious existence.

A student of the history of class struggles and of decadent systems approaching revolution could not fail to realize that so far from the world's becoming more democratic and liberal, we were entering a period of autocracy and suppression, with prospects of persecutions and atrocities. The "war for democracy" itself brought its suppressive measures—to be sure, under the apologetic title of war emergencies where actually no emergency existed. "War emergency," however, was no excuse for the

anti-bolshevik rage years after the war was officially ended, when the heads of the Post Office and Department of Justice, practically making and enforcing their own laws, instituted search and seizure, imprisonment and deportation, while the man in the White House, author and advocate of the New Freedom, looked silently on. Capitalism had started to run its course of final decay and dissolution, and it was not in the power of any man to stem the tide.

By surface appearances matters eased slightly, while the country ran riot in post-war prosperity during two giddy Presidential terms. But the freedom enjoyed was on the surface only. Bureaucracy was tightening its grip on the government, and prejudices, hate and overbearing group mentalities were fostered in such associations as the A. F. of L., the American Legion, the Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis and Chambers of Commerce.

Then arrived the so-called depression and, in due time, the misnamed Roosevelt "revolution." A new "champion of liberty" occupied the White House; the "forgotten man," the former small business man, the worker, was at last to come into his own. A new and "better" "war emergency" was proclaimed—not this time against the enemy without (Hun, Bolshevik or what not) but on the enemy within our gates, the "business depression." "Emergency laws" came thick and fast, passed at the behest of the President by a Congress bewildered, frightened and as completely ignorant of social-economic laws as a Fiji Island savage. President and Congress drifted together, steering

only by an unerring class instinct that said: *The capitalist system must be preserved.*

In this laudable cause of saving obsolete and decaying capitalism, the innumerable government-controlled alphabetic agencies were instituted. The CCC has regimented a large army of our industrially superfluous youth into camps where they receive a semi-military training and discipline, held subject to call by the government into any breach where it might appear more expedient to employ "civilians" than the militia or regular army.

The purported reason for creating the AAA was to aid the farmer to secure better prices—the route taken was to limit production—by paying for non-production and destruction of products. In reality, the process, so well under way in the Hoover days, of the small agriculturists' drifting into oblivion has actually been augmented in the last few years. While dribblets have fallen to the "dirt farmers," merely aggravating their misery, millions have been handed to gigantic corporations—producers of sugar, rice, tobacco, cotton, fruit, wheat, etc.—tightening the grip of corporations on agriculture, as on industry, and making impossible any further escape of the "poor man" to the land. The AAA, therefore, only punctuates the desperate effort of the top-capitalist class to maintain itself in spite of the volcanic rumblings which pronounce the system obsolete and unworkable. However much the great corporations may denounce government interference in business, they instinctively look to the government for aid and protection, and thus willy-nilly the reins of control cen-

ter in the government, which inevitably grows more bureaucratic, arbitrary and autocratic year by year as the capitalist system moves to its final collapse.

The NRA regimented business and compelled it to goosestep to government drum-beatings. The purpose was "revival," more markets, higher prices. In actual practice it proved to be a method of accelerating the process of eliminating the small business man and manufacturer and the concentration of industry and industrial power and tyranny—all, of course, in perfect line with the capitalist system running its course to complete fruition. The Supreme Court decision (according to President Roosevelt's caustic description, a survival of the "horse and buggy" stage of society) for the moment arrested the progress of the NRA toward complete political-economic bureaucracy, but it is safe to say "for the moment" only. The Supreme Court decision naturally caused no change of heart of the active bureaucratic forces in government.

The progress toward absolutism in government, however, is not a Roosevelt or New Deal invention. It is a manifestation of capitalism's inevitable progress toward the ultimate consolidation of plutocratic interest, as witness Italy, Germany and Austria, and already foreshadowed by events in Great Britain and France.

As Secretary of Commerce and as President, the autocratic Mr. Hoover, with capable Republican aid, went far toward perfecting the bureaucratic machinery which the "liberal" Roosevelt took over and turned to the best autocratic uses of the

New Deal alphabetic agencies. Absolutism in government is not a party monopoly, it is the unfailing accompaniment to a rotting and dying system attempting to bolster up and defend outworn institutions against the onslaught of the next class on the social ladder—in this case the progressive, revolutionary working class. Years ago De Leon pointed out: "In sight of the dread apparition [of social anarchy] society, instinctively alarmed for its safety, ever flies to the other extreme—absolutism. The move ever proceeds from the ruling class."

The vociferous Gen. Hugh S. Johnson was not speaking in the particular interest of either the Democratic party or the New Deal, but in the interest of decaying capitalism at large, when he proposed a reorganization of American government in close imitation of Mussolini's Fascist State, to wit:

What is needed here is six Assistant Presidents—not one Coordinator. The President himself is the prime Coordinator.

The business of government falls into six groups:

- (1) Fiscal and financial;
- (2) Defense;
- (3) Business (including labor, commerce and agriculture);
- (4) Public works, property, and communications;
- (5) Legal;
- (6) Foreign relations.

The Political State, a creature of class society, is the executive committee of the ruling class. Its all-important function throughout has been to hold submerged and exploited classes in submission. The present American Political State is

no exception. Its services are in the interest of capitalism — booming, progressive capitalism of the past; shivering, frightened, decadent capitalism of today. A high-minded Wilson may expatiate on democracy and a New Freedom, a liberal Roosevelt may prate of a New Deal for the forgotten man, but the consecrated efforts of the Political State go to strengthen the control of the economic capitalist master over the constituency, particularly to bending the working class into continued submission under the capitalist yoke.

With this background it ceases to be curious that liberalism in declarations and pronouncements go hand in hand with endeavors to clamp gag laws and arbitrary measures of various sorts upon the country — measures that annul the democratic rights established through the efforts of past generations, in many cases written in the blood of our fathers.

Protesting adherence to democracy and undying loyalty to the Constitution which guarantees free speech, free press, right of petition, freedom from search and seizure, and the privilege of citizens to advocate changes in government, however radical, the reptile press—led by such ugly reactionaries as Hearst and Macfadden — the Elks, the American Legion, the Rotarians, Kiwanis, "Liberty" Leagues, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and Chambers of Commerce—clamor for reactionary gag laws, contrary to the guarantees of our Constitution. In other words, the unerring instinct of capitalism's henchmen proclaims that capitalism must be preserved even if every vestige of liberty and every right of man gained in the upward struggle

of mankind has to be wiped out.

Disregarding the hypocrisy of "emergency" measures, these reactionaries bombard the Political State with legislation designed swiftly to wipe out every Constitutional guarantee.

In the New York State Assembly a bill has been introduced to change the election law so that independent parties will have to gather signatures of voters in each county amounting to one per cent of the total votes cast within the county for governor in the previous election. Half a score of other states have already passed laws restricting the ballot; or reactionary gag laws.

The federal government is now besieged with measures, such as a "Sedition" bill and an "Incitement to Disaffection" bill, ostensibly aimed at preventing advocacy of the overthrow of the government "by force and violence" in the army or among civilians, but so loosely and, at the same time, so subtly worded that any citizen, for almost any expression of disagreement with the government or "disaffection" to the industrial overlord in a strike may be taken up as a "peace-time" traitor and punished accordingly.

In the meantime local governments are clamping down on the citizenry with all sorts of laws, rulings and regulations. Teachers and students must take oaths of allegiance; children must daily be regimented through flag salutes; flag displays are ordered at all public gatherings, all of which smacks of autocracy and regimentation.

As citizens of the United States it is our duty to set our faces like flint against the abrogation of any of the freedoms and rights fought

for by the founders of this country and guaranteed by its Constitution. As members of the working class it is our duty further to oppose all such curtailments of the Rights which Progress has step by step wrenched from tyranny of the past.

We know, however, that any struggle to retain these rights gives but temporary relief. These rights in themselves do not imply freedom from exploitation and tyranny, and while capitalism continues and becomes more and more desperate in its decay, as it feels the chill of death, autocratic measures are bound to multiply. It is not, therefore, *because* of these measures, but *despite* these measures, that the working class must organize—with an aim not only to retain its ancient freedoms but to end capitalism and wage slavery for all time.

In view of these facts, be it—

Resolved, that the Socialist Labor Party, in convention assembled in April 1936, calls upon the workers to rally around its banner and cast a classeconscious vote to capture the political robber-burg of capitalism for the purpose alone of dismantling it, and at the same time calls upon the workers to organize in Socialist Industrial Unions prepared to take, hold and operate industry and form a basis for the future government of the Socialist Industrial Republic. Only where the working class, by means of efficient industrial and political organization and action, is enabled to take hold of the instruments of production and to carry on, may the trend toward absolutism in government be definitely arrested.

Resolution on the International Socialist Movement.

Four years ago the Socialist Labor Party convention in its Resolution on the Socialist International Movement laid down the following historic review:

Long before the outbreak of the war it had become evident to the Marxian Socialist that tendencies were creeping into the International Socialist movement that were decidedly unhealthy.

In fact, in 1875, when the then two Socialist wings of Germany—the Marxists and the Lassalleans—were about to unite, Marx issued a circular letter, intended especially for some of the leaders of the Marxist wing. In this letter, Marx analyzes and condemns the program, under which the fusion was to be perfected, as "bourgeois," "objectionable," "demoralizing," a "dickering in principles," a proof that "Socialist ideas were only skin-deep with the party"; and he warned that "everybody knows how pleased workingmen are with the fact of a union, but [he added] you are mistaken if you believe that this momentary success is not bought too dearly." And Bebel, then in prison for his revolutionary attitude, issued from his confinement a letter of protest declaring "he could not join in the fusion, and when his nine months were out, he would raise the banner of revolt against it."—The warning was disregarded; the bourgeois-labeled program was adopted; the fusion was perfected; the threatened revolt never set in.

Quite to the contrary, the Ger-

man Social Democracy sank gradually into what was known as "parliamentary cretinism," i. e., parliamentary idiocy, entirely abandoning the tactics laid down at an early date by the Socialist delegates in the Reichstag that the body should assert itself as a protesting voice only, keeping entirely aloof from parliamentary transactions, a policy admirably elucidated by the elder Liebknecht:

"This negative position may not be given up, else the party would give up its principle. Under no circumstances and on no field may the Social Democracy negotiate with the enemy. Negotiations can be conducted only where there is a common ground to stand on. To negotiate with forces that are hostile on matters of principle, means to sacrifice principle itself. Principle is indivisible. It is either wholly kept, or wholly sacrificed. The slightest concession on matters of principle implies the abandonment of principle. Whosoever parliamentarizes log-rolls; who log-rolls is bound by purchase."

For more than a quarter of a century the German Social Democracy held the leadership of the International Socialist Movement. More and more this movement sank into the quagmire of capitalist politics. At last a protesting voice arose (that of the Socialist Labor Party, joined by but few besides), when the French Socialist Millerand accepted a portfolio from the French Government in which sat also General Galliffet, "the butcher of the Commune."

"Millerandism" won the day at

the Paris Congress of 1900; and from that time onward "ministerial Socialism" and the possibility of parliamentary "cooperation of classes" were at least condoned by the International, even though not openly endorsed. The Socialist party of America trailed faithfully in the tracks of the German Social Democracy and reformism was written boldly into its platform, and compromise and political trading with capitalist parties became part of its accepted tactics.

Only a few voices were raised in the International against the dangerous road the movement was now following, and loudest of these was always the clear-sounding Marxian voice of delegate Daniel De Leon of the Socialist Labor Party of America. But in the flush of seeming success that was gathering up millions of votes, few cared to listen to a few "fanatics" who were still "harping on the class struggle." The "fanatics" of the Socialist Labor Party stuck to their uncompromising Marxian position, however, so to this Party, at least, it was no surprise when the German Social Democracy, and with it the entire Second International, collapsed at the moment of the outbreak of the war, the leaders each in their own camp turned "social patriots" and scurried to the aid of their respective governments against the "foreign enemy," despite the fact of previous long fraternal resolutions to the effect of the internationalism of the working class.

Thus closed an epoch in the Socialist movement, an epoch that

leaves practically nothing behind except its severe lessons.

The lessons have been many and bitter.

The "Socialistic" reform parliamentarism—that had grown out of the pre-war era of log-rolling with capitalist parties, out of Reichstag reform "socialism," "ministerial socialism"—after the war proved with a horrible certainty the correctness of the maxim laid down in the previous decade by the Socialist Labor Party: "He who says reform says preservation"; proved our contention that to attempt to reform capitalism is to declare that it is worth preserving, and that the would-be Socialist preserver becomes one with the capitalist preserver. In every part of Northern, Southern and Western Europe former Social Democrats for the past two decades have been Cabinet and political leaders, and have taken prominent parts as leaders of the League of Nations, ardently striving to reestablish capitalism. That they have allowed themselves to be used, only, for the greater part, later to be thrown away like an outworn shoe, only adds to the infamy of their betrayal of the working class and the Socialist movement.

Ebert, Scheidemann and the Social Democratic butcher of workers Noske of Germany, Millerand of France, Vandervelde of Belgium, MacDonald of Great Britain, etc., served only as a "radical" bridge during the threatening revolutionary upheavals after the war, for the conservatives to walk over into new power, with capitalism continuing its anti-social career.

Bad and treasonable as was this

conduct, it was, however, not the worst crime against Socialism committed by these false leaders and misdirectors of the International Socialist Movement. The real crime is the directing of the old rebellious spirit of the working class away from sound revolutionary channels into cringing and alms-begging reform channels.

Instead of holding to the policy, laid down by Wilhelm Liebknecht (following the precepts of Marx and Engels) that the working class should ask nothing from the capitalist governments, the Social Democracies started to plead for one palliative, one concession, one sop after another. When the workers got a bit troublesome, a sop was thrown; they then started after another measly sop, and then another and yet another, while all the time the capitalist robbery of labor continued and intensified.

As a consequence of this, the natural class instinct of the working class became stifled, a degrading sop psychology supplanting it. Instead of looking upon the capitalist government in its true light, as the executive committee of the capitalist class, whose true function it is to aid and abet the exploitation of labor by the capitalists, the misguided workers commenced to look at the government as a nurse, an almsgiver, as a "protector" and "friend" of the poor, downtrodden workers.

This attitude of the post-war workers toward the government—an attitude for which Social Democrats and other reform Socialists, together with the equally unprincipled, crumbs-begging Communists are entirely responsible—has served an excellent purpose for the Fascists,

Nazis and other autocrats in government, including the British Tories and our own New Deal Industrial Feudalist servants of our ultraplutocracy. Instead of the Marxian motto: *He who would be free must himself strike the blow*, and the sound old American revolutionary motto: *Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty*, the workers of the world have been maneuvered into a position where they look at the governmental servants of the capitalist class as saviors to lead them to a land of security with a "dole" or a pitiful charity job. This is Industrial Feudalism—perpetual exploitation, and the feeding of the workers at the trough of governmental charity.

Fortunately, however, the spirit of the working class has not been entirely and forever crushed. What the workers must realize is that the old leaders and the sop-taking, compromising reform policy must be completely thrown aside. A new generation is coming of age. A new forward spirit is seizing those workers that capitalism and charity can never succeed in degrading, nor "socialist" and "communistic" compromisers and log-rollers succeed in fooling and leading astray.

With Europe in the awful mess it is today, politically and economically, and practically devoid of any vigorous and sound Marxian movement and direction, the Socialist Labor Party of America is firmly convinced that the leadership in Socialist revolutionary activity must now be taken up by the workers of America.

Despite the dole and relief racket set up by the Communists, the foolish fawning on New Deal reformism

of the Communists, and despite the rallying of thousands of unattached and politically disgusted individuals to all sorts of wild sop schemes, such as Townsendism, Utopianism, Sinclairism, Father Coughlin's "Union of Social Justice," and what not, and the din which all these alms-begging and reform-pleading chants produce, there is evidence, nevertheless, of a strong current of sound classconsciousness among the workers everywhere.

In consideration of all these facts, be it—

Resolved, that the Socialist Labor Party in convention assembled in April 1936, declaring its allegiance to the general principles of International Socialism as laid down by Marx and Engels, reiterating the clear-cut adherence to the class struggle as enunciated by De Leon at every International Congress he attended, places itself in the position of the vanguard of the Socialist movement to which its long adherence to the above principles has unqualifiedly entitled it, and declares itself compelled to hold its solitary position, awaiting the time when a clear-cut classconscious Marxian Socialist movement shall have arisen in other lands ready to reject, on the one hand, the "bourgeois reform socialism" of the Second International, and, on the other, the saviors of "the remnants of bourgeois democracy," viz., the Anarcho-Communism that has attached itself to and operates under the label of the Third International; and be it further

Resolved, that we take the opportunity to extend the hand in fraternal relationship to the Socialist Labor Parties of Great Britain and Australia, our sister organizations,

neverly crippled for a time by the action of "intellectual" whippersnappers and self-seekers who had wormed their way into it, but cleared of whom the movement is again showing signs of activity and old-time vigor; and also to the groups which elsewhere in English-speaking countries are struggling to establish the Socialist Labor Party movement. The conditions are ripe for clear-cut classconscious Socialist political and industrial organization. The future belongs to the Socialist Labor Party.

Resolution on Soviet Russia.

Nearly a score of years have passed since the workers of Russia seized the helm of government in the Russian proletarian revolution. For nineteen years the Soviet Government has withstood every attack of united capitalism — i.e., united against working class progress toward Socialism—attacks consisting of economic blockade, military invasion, aid and comfort extended to counter-revolutions, non-recognition and economic boycotts—to say nothing of perhaps the foulest lying campaign ever indulged in against any enemy nation by the subsidized press and other propaganda agencies of capitalism.

All this the workers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia have been able to withstand and, what is more, have battled their way to a recognition among the nations of the world, a recognition that has gone so far that reputable exponents of capitalism have been forced to recognize the Soviet Government as the most —

perhaps the one and only—stable government of Europe today. While recognition by the capitalist robber league of governments may be considered of doubtful value—except for such economic interchanges as have become possible thereby—the recognition unquestionably carries with it a tremendous inspiration to the working class of all countries—an inspiration that says that in the filthy, degenerate aftermath of the war, a workers' government and it alone has been able to extricate itself from the poisonous swamp of collapse and carry forward the banner of human progress.

In the present chaos in which Europe finds itself, with all the capitalist wolves snarling at each other in one madly marauding pack, there has been raised at least one voice of sanity, order and peace, and that has been the voice of the Workers' Republic of Russia. Whatever the "entanglements" (some of which the Socialist Labor Party cannot approve) may be that Russia has entered into with neighboring nations, there has never been the slightest doubt that the real object of any rapprochement was peace. From the strong-fisted peace policy of Soviet Russia the workers of Europe may receive only courage and hope in this dark historic hour, a hope that is supported by the fact that Soviet Russia makes capitalist diplomats, statesmen and war lords tremble.

The last war produced as its one redeeming feature the gigantic Workers' Republic of Russia in the midst of collapsing capitalism. The next war—as even capitalist "prophets" and writers more and more frequently concede—may con-

ceivably bring about a working class governed Europe, striving toward Socialism. Therefore be it

Resolved, that with the remarkable internal progress of Russia in mind, as well as the great role she has played toward international stabilization and the inspiration of a new hope, the Socialist Labor Party of America, in convention assembled in April 1936, while maintaining its critical attitude toward the policy of the so-called Communist International with respect to its meddling in the affairs of the labor movement in other countries, and with respect, further, to its support of such fraudulent and wholly bourgeois reform outfits as exemplified in the Communist party of America, reaffirms its often expressed approbation and admiration of the great work of Socialist reconstruction in Russia, the gigantic steps taken in lifting that vast country of erstwhile reaction and degradation out of feudo-capitalist darkness toward Socialist enlightenment; and be it further

Resolved, that we heartily applaud the efforts of Soviet Russia toward international peace, by holding up to the spokesmen of international capitalism the mirror of the iniquities of capitalism, thereby pointing the way of the oppressed of the world toward progress and freedom in a Socialist Republic of Labor.

Resolution on the Mooney Case.

From time to time since the conviction of Tom Mooney on what, on the face of it, was manufactured and perjured evidence, the Socialist

Labor Party has emphatically expressed its conviction of Mooney's innocence of the foul crime for which he has, for twenty years, been incarcerated in an American bastille, the San Quentin penitentiary. Even as emphatically has the S.L.P. condemned the beastly California capitalist reaction for the savagery with which it has pursued its framed victim, in the face of world exposure and the condemnation of all decent men. As to the general status of this case we can, therefore, only reassert the strong resolutions we laid down in the Mooney case four years ago.

Since then, however, this savage reaction and its political henchmen have added another page to their infamy. After the Mooney defense had presumably exhausted every legal avenue for his release and Mooney's application for full pardon had been turned down again and again, the United States Supreme Court at last pointed out the fact that a habeas corpus proceeding could still be instituted in a California court. The Mooney defense went to work at once, but the California courts have turned the whole procedure into a farce by instituting a long-drawn-out "investigation" of the whole case, calling witnesses and hearing new and old evidence, turning and twisting in every conceivable manner, in the evident hope of wearing out both the patience and the last available resources of the defense.

In view of these facts, the Socialist Labor Party in convention assembled in New York City, in April 1936, reasserting and declaring its firm belief in the innocence of Thomas Mooney of the crime for

which he is convicted, and unqualifiedly condemning the perpetrators of the frame-up as well as all traffickers in labor troubles, Communists, Socialist partyites, and petty politicians of every stripe, who in any way seek to take advantage of the case for selfish reasons, calls upon the workers of America to organize into classconscious Socialist Industrial Unions, which alone will possess the power to back up with the industrial might of shop and factory, mill, mine and railroad, the righteous demand of the Socialist Labor Party to put a summary end to the capitalist system with all its injustice and misery. The key that will open Mooney's prison door is the key that will release the working class from wage slavery. That key is the power of the Socialist Industrial Union. The fact of such power alone, backing the sentiment of right and justice, is capable of throwing open the portals and causing the walls of every modern bastille of capitalist tyranny to crumble.

Resolution on the International Situation and Future War.

One definite thing Socialist propaganda in the past half century has accomplished—it has forced capitalism's spokesmen to drop the mask of hypocrisy. Time was when even the term "capitalism," designating the system of production for profit, was ardently resented as a term of undeserved opprobrium invented by fanatical and wholly unreasonable Socialists. The system under which we lived was "the best possible of

all systems," civilization in its finest flowering. Commercial advance agents, sent out to industrially undeveloped countries for the purpose of educating them to use American and European factory products, canned goods, hats, pants, shoes, etc., not to mention Bibles, whiskey and tobacco, were dubbed missionaries and the canned goods and pants education was mixed with liberal doses of "Christianity" and designated "civilization." It was all so noble, so uplifting, the self-imposed task of Europe and America to carry "the white man's burden."

The World War and its aftermath at least cleared the air of a lot of diplomatic stuffiness and political hot air. Germany made no bones about fighting for "a place in the sun," that is, an opportunity in world commercial competition. Only dullards failed to recognize that the "Kultur" England, France and eventually the United States took up arms to prevent from spreading was Germany's formidable advance into the markets of the world. Even our own war-time President, after he was through coining high-falutin war slogans, had a clear enough conception of history and sociology to state unmistakably the real cause of the war when, in his St. Louis speech, he said:

Why, my fellow citizens, is there any man here, or any woman—let me say, is there any child here—who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry?... This war, in its inception, was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war.... The real reason that the war we have just finished took place was that Germany

was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason why some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them. The seed of the jealousy, the seed of the deep-seated hatred, was hot successful commercial and industrial rivalry.

Still more picturesquely and frankly the blustering Mussolini recently described the Versailles Peace Conference as follows:

...there is attempted against them [the people of Italy] the blackest of injustices, that of withholding from them a little soil under the sun.

When, in 1915, Italy united her forces to those of the Allies, how many cries of admiration, how many promises there were!

But after the common victory, to which Italy had superbly contributed with 670,000 dead, 400,000 maimed and 1,000,000 wounded—when the nations gathered around the table of avaricious beasts, to us fell the crumbs of the sumptuous colonial booty for the others.

During twenty years we have been patient, while there grew around us a ring which wishes to suffocate our unbreakable vitality.

Thus, in the course of events, the term capitalism has had to be swallowed even by the staunchest upholders of the system, and political and diplomatic spokesmen have come to realize that it is small use to attempt to cover capitalist exploitation and commercial rivalries with a cloak of "civilization."

If the participation by the Soviet Republics of Russia in international leagues and conferences has accomplished nothing more, it has at least helped to unmask the capitalist sys-

tem and to drive the international diplomatic fraternity from behind the mask of hypocrisy. After one of Litvinov's blunt, keen and belligerent speeches, depicting international rivalry in its true social, economic, industrial and commercial aspects, it would indeed be either too hardy or too stupid for any of the assembled bourgeois statesmen to resort to pre-1914 diplomatic hypocrisy. After the Russian Socialist Workers' Revolution, a great deal of the self-assurance deserted the upholders of capitalism. Responsible spokesmen of the system knew full well that they could not trick and trip up the working class as easily as of yore.

It is indeed a tremendous step forward that capitalism has been compelled to face its own situation openly in the face of increasing working class criticism and opposition. Capitalist leaders have been compelled to recognize and face the precarious position of the capitalist system. There is no longer room for such old blusterers as the Lloyd Georges and the Clemenceaus; the Theodore Roosevelts and the Hoovers; the von Tirpitzes and von Hindenburgs, who wrapped themselves in the cloak of patriotism and shouted glittering generalities to the tune of: "God's in his heaven: all's right with the world."

The new spokesmen of capitalism know at least that they are up against something formidable. Not that this makes them any clearer and sounder. Rather it makes them all the more erratic, more frenzied, behaving exactly like cornered rats—and cornered rats is, in fact, the truest simile for capitalist nations today, particularly those under gangster governments such as Germany,

Italy, etc. The miserable "statesmen" are attempting to bolster up and save something that is so rotten that the very props they put up to support the capitalist system cause now crumbling and splitting. A graphic picture of the impossibility to meet the situation with capitalism intact and working was given on March 25, 1936, by the Scripps-Howard foreign editor, William Philip Simms:

I have been an eye-witness to most of Europe's troubles for twenty-five years. I have seen many a mess and muddle, but never have I witnessed so complete or so crazy a situation as that now confronting this quarter of the globe.

Despite what official communiques may say, and despite what individual delegates may opine, nobody seems to have the slightest idea which way he or anybody else is headed.

I stood on the red plush stairway that leads down from the council chamber of St. James's Palace as the secret meeting broke up late yesterday. Down they all came—the great leaders of modern Europe—headed by the British Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden. They were mostly smiling—behaving exactly like boys dismissed from classroom for shamelessly flunking their lessons. Which is precisely what they had done.

Everybody seemed vague. None had a constructive proposal—save one. And his proposal was to adjourn sine die until somebody thought up something.

It has become trite to assert that another world war is on the horizon. But even those who are convinced that a war is the only possible means of prolonging capitalism fear its ultimate consequence.

War clouds are again hanging

heavily over the so-called civilized world. The workers of Europe, America, the Orient and elsewhere may at any moment be again called upon or conscripted to fight the battles of their respective national capitalist governments.

There will be, however, one striking difference between a coming war and that of 1914-1918: the patriotic hokum and jingoism will (largely at least) have to be discarded. The aftermath of the last war in each country has been too bitter, the pretenses of fighting for democracy, for everlasting peace, for the welfare of the people in general, have proved so hollow that even the hardest old patriotic scoundrels may hesitate to beat those broken drums again.

The diplomatic top-hat fraternity has not even had the courage to resent the outburst of their Italian confrere, previously quoted. The harpoons put into their hides from time to time by the representative of Soviet Russia at international conferences, as well as the more and more outspoken tone of the press in general and the sound Socialist press in particular, have at last rendered all patriotic masquerade virtually useless. Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, America, Japan—in short, the whole international capitalist plunderbund is scrapping for markets, spheres of influence, territories, sources of natural raw materials, and all other things necessary for each and all to keep up such artificial stimulation as is necessary to keep the separate national units of sinking capitalism alive a little longer.

In each nation, moreover, back of the general capitalist interests, there

stands the particular capitalist interest of the munitions manufacturers. War preparedness, caused by fear, hate and interest, is their only peace-time stimulation for a market for their commodities, and they neglect no opportunity to enhance peace-time war appropriations and expenditures until each nation has built up a formidable war machine, officered by gentlemen whose trade is war and whose only chance for "honor" and advancement lies in hostilities, where, as a mere passing incident, millions of their "natural inferiors," the workingmen of the world, have their span of life cut short.

The real market for the war materials manufacturers, however, is only opened by a war. Economic interests being what they are in a society built on exploitation for profit, the manufacturer of war materials inevitably becomes a war propagandist, not even—as has been repeatedly proved—hesitating at stirring up the "enemy" forces to attacks on the "dear fatherland." With the present ramifications of international capital, economic interests of capitalists blandly disregard political boundary lines; hence the same firms are often active in several opposing camps. It has long been a saying that there are no brothers in business; it is equally evident that there is no patriotism in business either.

War is threatening; it may break out at any moment. The coming war, fought with bombs and poisons from the sky, will be a hundred times more destructive than the last war, for wars are no longer confined to the soldiers in arms. The bombing of cities, the poisoning of countrysides involve the civilian

populations, not even sparing the growing generation. And there is no power on earth can stop it unless the international working class rises in its organized might to put an end to the useless, outworn capitalist system of rivalry, strife and destruction.

In view of this damaging evidence against the capitalist system, be it—

Resolved, that the Socialist Labor Party, in convention assembled in New York City, in April, 1936, calls to the working class to take instant heed and arouse itself from its lethargy.

The workers alone can save civilization and humanity. This is not a time for silly masquerading by parades and fruitless demonstrations. This is the hour for serious and well-planned action. The talk of "physical force against physical force" is ridiculous; the workers are not even permitted to carry a gun, much less to train or drill. The days of the barricades are past, a poison bomb from the sky would put an instant finish to any silly stage strutting behind piles of bricks and rubbish. The workers' only might, power and *force* lie in the industries, in the productive machine which they alone can set in motion and which they control. Without food, clothing, housing, transportation, communication, instruments and ammunition, any army is useless.

Even in the last war, it took, according to Lord Kitchener, seven men in industry to keep one in the trenches. Modern wars are "industrial" in more respects than one. It is in industry, therefore, that war is "manufactured"; it is through industry alone that it can be stopped and forever ended—through the in-

tegral classconscious Socialist Industrial Union in shop, mill, mine, factory, on the land and on the railroad.

Workers, organize the Socialist Industrial Union to take, hold and

operate industry. That is the only "peace resolution" that has teeth in it.

All power to the Revolutionary Industrial Union!

APPENDIX.

A

Letter of Acceptance of John W. Aiken

*Socialist Labor Party Candidate for
President of the United States*

To the Members of the
Socialist Labor Party:

I have been chosen your candidate for President of the United States by your delegates to the 19th National convention of our Party. This is the second time I have been privileged to represent the Party on its national ticket. This time, as was previously the case, you may depend upon me to do my utmost to uphold the integrity of the Party and extend its prestige, firm in the belief that only the Socialist Labor Party of all the political parties in the field presents the solution to the economic crisis, and the method whereby the sorely oppressed workers of the land can work out their emancipation from the slavery imposed on them by a social system that also reduces them to poverty and misery.

The last four years of political and economic changes have vindicated the position of the Party and its analysis of the situation. We then pointed out that the capitalist profit system had reached a stage where it no longer could expand; that it had reached an impasse due to the inability of the workers, who constitute the majority of the pur-

chasers of the country, to buy the goods produced or producible; that unemployment on a large scale would continue. We predicted that all efforts to remedy the situation would prove futile. All this has now been demonstrated to be true.

So apparently futile has the policy of "priming the pump" become that we rarely hear it defended now. It has been exploded, for, despite the expenditure of billions of dollars on public works, unemployment still remains. Even where private industry has increased, it has been done by introducing more efficient methods, thereby increasing the number of jobless and dependents upon government assistance. Conservative sources concede the number of unemployed to be twelve million. If production were to be stepped up, the number out of work would also rise. Unemployment and a lower standard of living are the inevitable concomitants of the capitalist method of production. Political incantation and alphabetical formulae can never restore stability or general prosperity.

But that is only one side of the picture. If the conditions of brutish existence prevailing today were unavoidable, that is, if they were a necessary result of a low level of technical knowledge, there would be no use condemning the existing social order and its evils. The contrary is the case. It is generally recognized that we are capable of producing an

abundance. The fact is, however, that under a system of private ownership (capitalism) this very abundance becomes the source of want. In the face of this indisputable fact it takes a great deal of courage or ignorance to defend the profit system, or, for that matter, to question the right of the working class to seek the destruction of the system which imposes such conditions upon it.

The fact remains that the evidence of the decline of capitalist society is so conclusive that we no longer need devote as much time to that aspect of the social question as was formerly necessary. As far as the masses generally are concerned, the question they pose is: What plan does the Socialist Labor Party offer? It is right at this point that our clear and practical aim must be shown. Accordingly, we must emphasize that production for use, with each worker receiving the full equivalent of his labor, and the affairs of production carried on under a system of industrial representation, is the only way the social problems of today can be solved. Only such an arrangement will enable the products produced to be exchanged and consumed.

Furthermore, when we show the workers that capitalist industrial development has itself made possible effective workers' control and management of industry because of the degree of integration attained, we still further illustrate the practical nature of the Socialist Labor Party's goal.

Still another question, to which we must be ready to reply, will probably be frequently asked us in this campaign by interested workers.

That question is: How does the Socialist Labor Party propose that the industries be taken over? It is precisely in this field, the field of tactics on the means for accomplishing the goal, that the Socialist Labor Party is invincible. Our program is not arrived at by conceptions of logical niceties. Our conclusions are reached after a thoroughly objective and realistic study of revolutionary political and social history. This has convinced us that to accomplish the working class revolution in this country, it is first necessary to carry the class struggle into the political arena and demonstrate by the ballot the right of the workers to take over industry. That is one of the tasks of the Socialist Labor Party as the political expression of the American working class.

At the same time, realizing the ineffectiveness of pure and simple political action, the inadequacy of which has been proved time and time again in the last few years by the so-called labor and socialist parties in European countries, we constantly carry on propaganda for the organization of Socialist Industrial Unions, the actual "take and hold" organization, the revolutionary weapon of the workers, the only might capable of being formed in these pre-revolutionary days for backing up and enforcing the Socialist ballot.

Who can doubt the preeminent necessity of revolutionary Industrial Organization in the days before us, in view of the menacing drift toward war and fascism? The failure of peace treaties, the brazen disregard of "Kellogg pacts," the monumental fiasco of the League of Nations, and other international instrumentalities

for preserving peace and punishing aggressors, in preventing the rape of Ethiopia by Italy and the invasion of Chinese territory by Japan, are sufficient proof that the most sacred agreements solemnly arrived at by capitalist politicians hold out no hope for peace once the economic interests of capitalist States come into conflict. Nor can any country in these days of international commerce remain isolated from world affairs. Indeed, war is imminent.

On the other hand, the open and brazen espousal of capitalist despotism and dictatorship by many Americans, prominent in educational, political and business pursuits, foreshadows the abrogation of all civil liberties and Constitutional rights of the masses in the interests of a privileged few, if at the moment of the supreme crisis the working class is not organized into industrial battalions and prepared, as an industrial "army of occupation," to take over economic power. Classconsciousness and revolutionary purpose are the necessary prerequisites of successful Industrial Organization in the fight against Reaction and War.

It is a testimonial to the greatness of Daniel De Leon and the Socialist Labor Party that many years ago, long before Mussolini and Hitler were heard of, it was foreseen that the possibility of just what has happened to the working class of Germany and Italy and other countries could happen here. Then, as now, the Socialist Labor Party realized that the only effective bulwark against Industrial Feudalism is Socialist Industrial Unionism, a working class united on a Socialist basis

and ready to march into the industries and take over their administration.

In the time still at our disposal, the Socialist Labor Party will continue to carry on its propaganda for Socialist Industrial Unionism. If our message is unheeded and the Reaction is victorious, never can it be said of the Socialist Labor Party that it sacrificed the workers upon the altar of opportunism or failed at this historic hour to keep alive the revolutionary spirit. The petty capitalist reformism and "united front" nonsense of the so-called Communists and Social Democrats alone will be held responsible if the Reaction is enthroned. The struggle against Reaction is, in fact, the struggle against Capitalism.

So, comrades, our duty is plain. We must increase our activity a hundredfold in this campaign and thereafter until capitalism has been destroyed. We must ceaselessly expose the reactionary mountebanks masquerading in the name of labor and peddling their reform nostrums as something "practical" or "immediate." The message of Revolutionary Industrial Unionism must be brought to every worker in the country. I wish to say to you that I am prepared to do the part assigned to me in thus preparing the ground for the proletarian revolution, and I ask of you your complete cooperation in the performance of our common duty and grave responsibility.

Fraternally yours,
JOHN W. AIKEN.

Chelsea, Mass.,
May 17, 1936.

B

Letter of Acceptance of Emil F. Teichert

*Socialist Labor Party Candidate
for Vice President of the
United States*

To the Members of the
Socialist Labor Party:

America stands at the cross-roads today. It can either take the road leading to the Socialist Industrial Republic of Labor or the one leading to Industrial Feudal Autocracy. Which road it will take depends entirely upon the working class. The capitalist class will stop at nothing to prevent society from taking the road to Socialism, for its class interests impel it in the opposite direction.

The question is whether the working class of the world will be stronger or weaker than "a 'Holy Alliance' of capitalist interests." The working class will be invincible if it organizes on a proper revolutionary basis on the political, as well as on the industrial field for the twofold purpose of capturing and abolishing the Political State and taking full possession and control of the industries of the nation.

The petty layers of the capitalist class, whose security has been severely shaken by the capitalist breakdown, are driven to seek relief from their misery through reforms. In addition to the so-called Socialist and Communist parties, both of which give expression to petty capitalist interests, the Townsend movement, the Coughlin movement and

other equally inane schemes have been projected. All these reform movements, intent on propping up the capitalist system sufficiently to benefit the petty layers of the capitalist class, offer palliatives in exchange for the workers' political support.

As soon as reform schemes are found to be incapable of being put into effect, they are abandoned, only to be succeeded by an ever more idiotic set of reform proposals.

This process will continue until the working class organizes in its might for the revolution, at which time the reformers will be put to rout, utterly discredited; or, if the workers fail to organize to accomplish the revolution, the plutocracy will unhesitatingly abolish all civic rights and fasten the chains of slavery even more securely on the workers. And the reform schemes promoted by the reformers of all shades (which even now the Democratic politicians are offering as a check to revolution) accelerate the process that leads to Fascism, i.e., Industrial Feudalism.

The Socialist Labor Party is dedicated to the proposition that the capitalist system, based upon wealth production for the profit of the capitalist class, cannot be reformed but must be destroyed, and that it must be supplanted by the Socialist Industrial Republic of Labor based upon wealth production for use.

Aside from the numerous purely discontent-capturing agencies, the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class, who head the craft and fake industrial union movements, play a very distinct part in the prolongation of capitalism. Ostensibly their object is to unite the workers for

the purpose of securing better living conditions under capitalism. Actually they keep them united in opposition to their own class interests, for this so-called labor movement proceeds from the false premise that the workers are destined to remain enslaved for all time and that a community of interests exists between the masters and the slaves.

The American Federation of Labor has ever acted as a bulwark of capitalism and its spokesmen have boldly held that the revolutionary goal of the Socialist Labor Party was securely blocked as long as the A. F. of L. remained intact. The American Federation of Labor, however, has succeeded in gathering only a little more than three million workers into its ranks. This is primarily due to its job-trust character and the obsolete craft form, from under which America's mass production industry has largely knocked the props. This leaves approximately 86,000,000 organizable workers who at this critical period constitute the gravest threat that has ever menaced the capitalist class.

The fake industrial union movement, headed by the arch-labor faker, John L. Lewis, would unite all the organizable workers of one industry into one so-called industrial union. While this form of organization differs somewhat from the craft unions headed by Mr. Green, it proceeds from the same false premise, namely, that capital and labor have interests in common and that the destined lot of the wealth producers is wage slavery. Accordingly, its goal is not the ultimate capture of the industries for the workers, and the establishment of the Industrial Republic, but, on

the contrary, merely to obtain a "living wage."

Such an organization is desirable to capitalism, because it enables the capitalist class to deal with all the workers in one industry at one time or, as general Hugh Johnson put it, such unionization ought to be encouraged by the government for "with complete intra-industry tribunals for settlements of disputes, the decisions of which would be final," it could be used to bar lockouts and strikes. We have but to witness Germany, Italy and Austria to learn what effective use the capitalist class can make of this type of reactionary labor organization.

When millions of workers suffer privation in the midst of great plenty; when oncoming generations of workers are undernourished while food is being destroyed; when millions of the infirm and ill cannot be treated, yet the world's most highly developed medical centers and its most thoroughly trained physicians are at hand; when, in short, everything is within reach of the working class that would assure them the utmost comfort, security and well-being, but is denied them because the parasitic capitalist class owns and controls the means of wealth production, the time for a social revolutionary change is at hand.

That time has arrived in America, and the task of reconstructing society logically belongs to the working class. They alone can organize politically to capture and dismantle the Political State of capitalism provided they, at the same time, organize industrially to take over, hold and operate the means of wealth production under an Industrial Republic of workers.

In accepting the nomination of the Socialist Labor Party for Vice President of the United States, I am fully aware of the critical situation that confronts the working class and the heavy duty that rests upon me as one of its classconscious members. I will, to the best of my ability, urge the working class to appreciate the need for accepting the program of the Socialist Labor Party as the only solution to their problem and I will steadfastly express my firm conviction that their miserable plight cannot be remedied until the principle of integral Socialist Industrial Unionism has triumphed.

Fraternally yours,
EMIL F. TEICHERT.

New York, N. Y.,
May 17, 1936.

C

The Goal of Socialism.

(Radio broadcast by John W. Aiken, candidate for President of the United States, of the Socialist Labor Party of America, over Columbia coast-to-coast network, on Tuesday evening, April 28, 1936, 10.45 to 11 p.m.)

I am speaking to you in behalf of the Socialist Labor Party of America—a working class political organization, which has been in existence for nearly half a century on its present basis, and, since 1892, has nominated candidates for President and Vice President, and has participated in state and local campaigns throughout the country.

It is the original party of Marxian Socialism in the United States; despite pretenders to the name of

Socialism, it remains the only revolutionary party of the American working class.

The Socialist Labor Party is distinguished from all other political parties in three important respects:

First, we believe that the existing capitalist system cannot, by any reform measures, be made to work for the benefit of the working class;

Second, that a Socialist Industrial Administration must be set up, based on common ownership of the means of production and distribution, this Industrial Administration to take the place of our present political system of government; and the

Third unique feature of the Socialist Labor Party is the great importance it attaches to the organization of Socialist Industrial Unions.

All other political parties and movements have this in common: They believe benefits can be obtained for the masses through the enactment of reform legislation. Some assert the troubles of our time are due to insufficient money in circulation, others advocate a strict control of credit and a curb on the greed of the rich, while others, with lamentations and wringing of hands, bewail the passing of "rugged individualism." Still others proclaim the supposed efficacy of government ownership, liberal unemployment insurance, higher prices for agricultural products, and many other such reforms.

You will perceive that however diverse their proposals, they all agree on one thing, that is, that something can be done to help this or that element of the population. They seek to eliminate or mitigate the evils of capitalism, while, at

the same time, retaining the system which produce these very evils. These gentlemen are reformers, and the crime of the reformer primarily consists in fostering the illusion that the condition of the masses can be improved or made tolerable under capitalism. The Socialist Labor Party denies that, and proves capitalism must be destroyed, before any betterment in the conditions of the working class can be attained.

The growth of industry and its potentialities for good force on the minds of men recognition of the necessity for controlling the means of production, by socializing them. Capitalism, though it has contributed enormously to social progress, now stands in the way of further development, and rapidly approaches utter bankruptcy and collapse. It is production for profit itself which has broken down—not this or that institution of capitalism.

Whatever has happened has occurred in obedience to the inherent laws of capitalist society. In a competitive profit system, it was inevitable that wealth should have concentrated in a few hands, and that industrial development should have proceeded to the point reached today, where the markets of the world cannot absorb the products of industry, with resulting chronic unemployment and its attendant starvation and misery. And starvation in a world of plenty is a monstrosity. Production for use must supersede production for profit.

The second distinctive feature of the Socialist Labor Party is its conception of the nature of the Socialist goal. The integral organization of industry which has gone on apace with the growth of capitalism indi-

cates the FORM under which production for use must be carried on.

Political society, based on private property and territorial representation, has become inadequate with respect to administering effectively the complex and interdependent productive process. The Political State must go. In its place must be established a system of industrial representation under which all who contribute labor receive the full social equivalent of labor performed. The goal of Socialism in America is industrial, not political. The Socialist Labor Party alone teaches this.

The third aspect of the Socialist Labor Party's program, which marks it out from all others, is the emphasis it lays upon the organization today of the useful producers into Socialist Industrial Unions. These, we contend, are a necessary complement to Socialist political action. Accordingly, the Socialist Labor Party carries on an unceasing campaign to expose the futile and reactionary character of existing trade union organizations. The Socialist Labor Party is the only advocate of true Industrial Unionism.

The unions of today are, in the first place, under the domination of reactionary leadership. Lacking the virility that flows from a knowledge of economic and social laws, or, in any case, determined to maintain their positions at the expense of the rank and file, these leaders have resisted every attempt of clear-thinking members to infuse the labor movement with classconsciousness, and have thus contributed to the confusion prevailing among the workers today. Mark Hanna, that wily politician and capitalist protagonist of other days, correctly recognized the

role played by these misleaders of labor when he referred to them as the "labor lieutenants" of the capitalist class.

It should be recognized, too, that the rank and file of the unions, yea, the mass of the workers of the land, must bear a large measure of responsibility for the miserable conditions under which they live. The working class has allowed itself to be beguiled by individuals and organizations preaching a supposed identity of interests between capital and labor. The theory is that what contributes to an increase in profits contributes to the welfare of labor through the employment of more men or higher wages.

The disastrous consequences of holding to that opinion were never more apparent than today, as is attested by the fact that millions of workers have permanently been reduced to an unemployed beggar class, increasing in size, while the concentration of wealth goes merrily on, as each succeeding report on taxable incomes shows, and while, as is equally well known, the increase in industrial production through the years has been accomplished with fewer workers. The direction of relative wages has been downward, as the accumulation of capital in the hands of a few goes upward.

In the face of these tendencies, unavoidable as long as capitalism lasts, the bargaining and class collaborating practices of fifty years of struggle have been proved useless so far as achieving a larger measure of security and well-being for the workers is concerned.

Socialist Industrial Unionism recognizes the capitalist class as a robber class, a class whose advancement

is in direct proportion to the impoverishment of the workers. The working class must demand the unconditional surrender of the ruling class, press for it on the political field and organize on the economic field into Industrial Unions, to take and hold and operate the means of production and distribution.

Let it be understood, however, that the so-called Industrial Unions which have become popular in the past few years, even where thoroughly industrial in form, imply no progress in correct labor organization—principally because they lack the Socialist goal.

Daniel De Leon, the founder and teacher of Socialist Industrial Unionism, long ago classified such organizations, when he said:

"Caution must be observed, lest one attach to the term Industrial Unionism more than there is in it. Industrial Unionism does not of itself mean the economic body necessary for the revolutionary act. The form of Industrialism may subserve the most reactionary of schemes. It is with Industrialism as with the alphabet. Without the alphabet there can be no good literature; but the alphabet may also furnish vulgar words."

This observation of De Leon, and the warning to build Industrial Unions, become clearly more important as the disintegration of capitalism continues; for the inability of capitalism to recover and stabilize itself and recognition of that fact by the ruling class, lead that class to sponsor reactionary movements designed to drive into the ground by violence the natural rising discontent.

Whether we move into a Socialist Industrial Republic, based on common ownership, or one plunged into Fascism, depends upon whether at the moment of crisis there are the requisite number of useful members of society organized economically on a Socialist basis. Unionism, lacking in Socialist inspiration, never can constitute a barrier to the victory of reaction, as is amply proved by the ease with which Hitler and Mussolini rose to power, crushed numerically strong working class organizations, and destroyed civil liberties.

Remember, then, that the Socialist Labor Party is the political expression of revolutionary Socialism, having the twofold purpose of taking over political power via the ballot, and spreading the idea of Socialist Industrial Unionism, the might behind labor's ballot, so that the organized workers on the day of political victory, or in the hour of supreme crisis, may take over industry. This is the road to Industrial Freedom and Democracy.

D

Revolution vs. Reform.

(Radio broadcast by John W. Aiken, candidate for President of the United States, of the Socialist Labor Party of America, over National Broadcasting Company hook-up, September 23, Herald-Tribune Forum.)

In these days of widespread unemployment and dependence upon government relief, there are few who will deny the existence or serious nature of the problems that face us. Usually, however, when these problems are discussed, the belief is advanced that in good time and by the

passage of appropriate legislation a practical solution will be found. A study of the proposals of all other political parties, and the platform statements of their representatives, will reveal the remarkable uniformity of their political ideals. Despite the surface disagreements of the representatives of these out-and-out capitalist or reform parties, they are fundamentally agreed that something should be done along the lines of improved housing, old age assistance, unemployment and health insurance. Whatever differences of opinion exist between them have to do only with the details of their respective plans.

It may be instructive to inquire into the basic political faith which makes possible such unity of thought between such strange bedfellows. Quite obviously it is the belief that under capitalism the social evils of today can be eliminated, or at least substantially softened, not all at once, but by a step at a time. In accordance with this viewpoint, unemployment, for instance, can be conquered by the passage of an effective unemployment insurance law, and if in the course of time this proves inadequate it may be supplemented by additional legislation. What is this but the exploded theory that the solution of the acute social problem is to be found via evolution rather than by a fundamental social change, that is, revolution? It is as if one were to argue that the cure for acute appendicitis is to massage the infection!

This theory of gradualness in a revolutionary epoch has had a most amazing history. As all of us know, it was adhered to by conservatives in all ages, by those desirous of main-

taining the *status quo*, but it is not quite so well known that his theory has also appeared in the ranks of international Socialism.

In recent times it had its inception in the German Socialist movement of the last century, at a time when the Social Democratic party of Germany was rapidly acquiring political strength. The Marxian theories formulated in 1847 proclaimed an intensification of the class struggle and a widening in the chasm separating workers and capitalists. According to Marx, the development of capitalist industry inevitably created increasing unemployment and insecurity for the workers, with resulting poverty in the midst of actual and greater potential abundance. Such contradictions, Marx declared, could only be solved by the overthrow of the capitalist method of production.

Beginning in the 70's, these teachings were repudiated by many professed followers of Marx, and for a time, not only in Germany but all over the world, revolutionary Marxism was all but submerged by an avalanche of criticism in an attempt to prove that Marx was wrong. These repudiators of Marx (known as revisionists) argued that by means of so-called progressive social legislation the condition of the working class could be materially improved, that the class struggle could be softened and revolution rendered unnecessary. Among some, revolution was agreed to theoretically, but in practice the event was assigned to a far and distant future. The Socialist Labor Party of America alone remained true to the teachings and traditions of Marxism, as it does to this very day.

Despite Socialist Labor Party opposition, the reformist trend continued and finally culminated in the betrayal of the cause of Socialism in the World War by Socialist leaders and politicians going over to their respective governments for the defense of "nationality," "democracy," "culture" and other abstractions which concealed ruling class interests. For a time after the Russian Revolution of 1917, it appeared that the ideals for which Marx had worked would again dominate Socialist thought, but the insistence of the Russians that the workers of all countries obey the decrees issued by Moscow soon demonstrated that an essentially Russian program was inapplicable to other countries, particularly the United States.

Now under slogans such as "in defense of remnants of bourgeois democracy" and "against war and fascism" (utterly meaningless in themselves, and under the present circumstances), working class interests have been abandoned in favor of an alliance with capitalist elements for the preservation of the existing system. Revolution, these reformers say, may be necessary some time, but let's not talk about it now. These so-called Socialists and Communists (echoing the cries of the petty capitalist elements) seek only to reform capitalism, and as means to that end advocate unemployment insurance, old age insurance, and health insurance. The espousal of such reform measures by these reformers show them to be under the historically false, disastrous, and deadening influence of the theory of progress via reforms in a revolutionary period. As well speak of a Declaration of Independence with immediate de-

mands! They have leaped on the capitalist political omnibus all headed for a supposed Utopia under capitalism.

But capitalism cannot be mended; it must be ended. The most liberal unemployment insurance law imaginable would not solve the jobless problem. As a matter of fact it would accelerate the displacement of labor. Employers would seek to eliminate from their payrolls as many workers as possible so as to be no longer responsible for them. The concentration of wealth would continue, poverty, dependence, and the slums would still persist, the market for goods at home and abroad would diminish, while monetary and credit inflation would be extended. There can be no solution for the present crisis within the existing social order, a crisis which inevitably intensifies, due to the contradictions engendered by production for profit. To declare otherwise is to hold out promises that never can be realized.

There are, of course, the usual optimists who argue that business is getting better and if the government is taken out of business, recovery will be certain. That is a very nice theory but displays a total lack of understanding regarding the nature of this crisis as compared with previous ones. Today, differently from the past, increased production does not indicate a corresponding increase in employment. Some authorities have noted this anomalous situation, among them Mr. Leonard Ayers, who said, "We are achieving normal levels of industrial production while at the same time there is a huge continuing amount of unemployment." The uto-

pians and social dreamers of today are those who imagine that through legislation business can provide work and security for the millions divorced from industry.

Though capitalism now blocks further advancement, there has been solved, during its existence, the problem which mankind has battled with throughout the ages. That problem was how to produce enough to assure all a full and happy life, with little physical exertion. The technique of production and scientific discoveries of the uses to which our natural resources may be put have now made possible the banishment of poverty. Production for profit, however, stands in the way of the people's enjoying a potential and possible abundance. The integration of industry, the discipline and organization wrought by machine methods, have created the conditions for the setting up of a better social order, particularly in the United States, which, accordingly, is rotten ripe for the establishment of Socialism.

With these facts in mind, the Socialist Labor Party proposes to use the ballot box for the purpose of determining the right of the working class collectively to own, as it now operates, all the means of production. The mission of the Socialist Labor Party having been performed, the test of strength at the ballot box having been determined in our favor, the political government would thereupon adjourn, since there no longer would be any need for political institutions. The workers in the industries, organized in integral Industrial Unions, would take over the actual management of the country's affairs. An industrial adminis-

tration, planning and coordinating production, would take the place of our present political government. Representation by industries would supersede representation by geographical districts. People would vote from where they work, instead of, as now, from where they sleep.

Such a system of industrial representation and planning would insure efficient management and an intelligent approach to industrial problems, in marked contrast to the anarchy and planlessness of production under capitalism. Under the indirect form of supervision which exists today, politicians are asked to legislate for industries of which they have little or no intimate knowledge. Certainly, the workers in industry are infinitely more capable of making wise selections for representatives from among their own ranks, under a Socialist Industrial Democracy, than they are today when called upon to elect politicians, whose chief function is to prepare intricate laws for the protection of private property—a matter in which the workers have no concern.

This Industrial Union Government would be true democracy. There would be neither room for nor need of a dictatorship under such circumstances. Hence, the Socialist Labor Party insists that its program is truly a vindication of true, representative government, and the *only* effective antidote to fascism. For what can be more truly representative for the vast majority of the people (the workers) than to base their representative government on the industries wherein they, and they alone, and in such fabulous abundance, produce the wealth society needs.

The Socialist Labor Party is no pure and simple political party. Recognizing the possibility that the present ruling class will refuse to abide by the clearly expressed desire of the majority at the ballot box for the abolition of the capitalist system, recognizing that an attempt may be made to defeat the working class and suppress the revolution by violence and bloodshed, the Socialist Labor Party urges the workers to organize into genuine Socialist Industrial Unions to enforce the decision rendered at the ballot box. Being in possession of the economic resources of the nation, the workers would be able to cripple any attempts of reactionaries to practice violence against the workers. The Industrial Union would thereby assure a peaceful solution to the social problem, and continue to serve as the administrative organ of the new social system.

As the capitalist system continues to decline and consequently imposes increasing unemployment upon labor; as it becomes apparent that the politicians of all parties are incapable of restoring stability within the framework of the capitalist system, recognition is more and more forced upon the vast majority that the present order is inimical to progress. To all such the Socialist Labor Party points the way to correct political and economic organization, the combined activities of which alone will guarantee victory for the exploited workers and the establishment of a social order where all may live a full and happy life.

Political Potpourri

(By Arnold Petersen, in the *Weekly People*, October 17, 1936.)

"Get thee glass eyes;
And, like a scurvy politician, seem
To see the things thou dost not."
—Shakespeare.

The campaign of 1936 presents a social system in dissolution. The political clothes designed to cover the economic body (grown to maturity long ago) and which have been stretched and patched again and again, have finally reached that stage where neither stretching nor patching is any longer possible. Ragged, worn threadbare, and incapable of lending support even to patches, the old garment is falling to the ground bit by bit, and desperate measures are being taken to cover society's economic nakedness. The "economic royalists"—like the royalists of old—think that the body can be covered with, and fully protected by, a cloak of political and economic absolutism. The reformers, in varying degrees, and under various deceptive designations, believe (some sincerely, others pretending) that sufficient patches would recondition the old garment—not as a *new*, different suit, but as the old political garment, warranted to wear a good while longer. The revolutionists contend that the suit is worthless, not merely because it is worn out, but also because a *political* suit fits the economic body as well as pinafores fit the grown person; that, in short, an *industrial* suit of clothes is needed.

The disintegration of capitalist

society in America, and the complete dissolution which is foreshadowed in the immediate future, is revealed to a remarkable degree in the confusion and corruption that are given expression in the platforms of the parties of capitalism and reformism, and in the speeches and writings of the candidates and their supporters. Let us briefly review these candidates and their programs—announced or implied. In doing this we shall observe a remarkable uniformity among them all which establishes the fact that *all* are concerned about *how* capitalism shall be preserved, hence in what degree, and in what particular manner it shall be mended. And we shall contrast these with the demand of the Party of Revolution (the Socialist Labor Party) which unreservedly and logically declares that capitalism cannot be mended; that it must, and *will* be ended.

Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. Roosevelt became President at what was the worst crisis in American history. Capitalism had become a runaway horse. There were but two courses open to the ruling powers at that time: Continue along the lines of the "economic royalists" as symbolized in Herbert Hoover and permit the runaway horse to plunge society over the precipice of social cataclysm, or social revolution, as the case might be; or attempt to catch the "runaway horse" by the tail, and if possible stop him long enough to consider what to do with the "horse" next. Roosevelt decided to grab the "horse" by the tail, in the doing of which he was carried off from the course laid down by the Democratic

"horse doctors" of 1932. But that is the way of runaway horses: Once you grab them by the tail, you cannot let go except at the price of your own safety, or life—yet, to hang on is also fraught with danger.

In grabbing the horse by the tail Mr. Roosevelt did not change the direction in which the horse was running—or, to drop the metaphor, he did not change the direction of capitalist retrogression. He succeeded, temporarily, in slowing down the rate of speed of the retrogression, in giving what seemed a semblance of new life to the system. All he has accomplished is to have given capitalism time to catch its breath, so to speak, giving it still greater power to make the *inevitable* plunge over the precipice with greater force, and with less hope than ever of preventing that final plunge.

Mr. Roosevelt is one of the shrewdest politicians in American history. Agile-minded, glib-tongued, and varicolored, he has been fairly successful thus far in wriggling out of tight places, and uncomfortable left sticks. Like his predecessor, Woodrow Wilson (though a greater politician than Wilson, he is by far his inferior as a scholar) he possesses a two-chamber form of mentality. He can connive with the most unscrupulous politicians, while at the same time uttering the most moving and pious phrases. On the one hand, he appears as the staunch defender of capitalism; on the other, he professes sentiments and beliefs which, taken at their face value, place him as a champion of the new social order. Woodrow Wilson thundered that he would hang as high as Haman any Wall Street financial pirate who would tinker

with the financial fabric to the extent of plunging the country into a panic. A few years later he was eating out of the hands of these financial corsairs, exemplified by the Morgan bankers in particular. (Incidentally, Mr. Morgan showed a rare sense of humor when he named his private yacht "The Corsair"!)

In 1916 Mr. Wilson championed the cause of peace, securing his reelection to the slogan of "He kept us out of war!" On October 6, 1916, at Omaha, Neb., *six months before war was declared*, he projected peace as the issue of the campaign, arguing that America was too proud to fight (though ready to do so) and that *it needed a cause worth fighting for!!* A half year later Wilson led the country into the bloodiest and most imperialistic war of all times.

Mr. Roosevelt, in his acceptance speech delivered in Philadelphia on June 27, spoke out in terms reminiscent of Wilson's "Hang Haman" speech. He spoke of the modern plutocrats as "economic royalists," implying that they were the equivalent of the defenders of the British crown in 1776. He spoke of these plutocrats having founded "new economic dynasties," of their having established a "new industrial dictatorship." He designated their rule as "economic tyranny," and the condition of "the average man" as "economic slavery." Quoting "an old judge" as saying that "necessitous men are not free men," he posed as the champion of those whose necessities compel them to sell themselves into wage slavery. Yet, fatedly, he has made the rule of the "economic royalists" more secure than ever. He has helped to preserve the system out of which inevitably grow "eco-

conomic royalists," "economic dynasties," "economic tyranny," "industrial dictatorship," and "economic slavery." He has done so because he had no choice in the matter. *Reforms in a revolutionary period inevitably lead to reaction.* The ship of the Political State is, and must be, guided by the Polar Star of economic slavery. Its port is and must be the port of industrial autocracy. Its guiding star never can be the North Star of liberty, nor its port the port of humanity. For the Political State reflects private property, and private property implies classes, which, in turn, imply slavery.

That Roosevelt has helped to save capitalism for the capitalist class is not disputed by thoughtful and intelligent men. The editor of the *Baltimore Evening Sun*—a staunch champion of capitalism—said recently.

"I am for Roosevelt precisely because I, like *The Sun*, believe in a free competitive system under capitalism governed democratically. *I believe that Roosevelt is the great bulwark of capitalism, conservatism and democracy*"—capitalist "democracy," of course, i.e., *industrial autocracy!*

We may well let this stand as Mr. Roosevelt's platform declaration. For, willy-nilly, he must proceed on the road that fatedly leads to Fascism or Industrial Feudalism—or be driven out of office.

Alf Mossman Landon.

No more colorless, pitiful personality has ever been offered as a Presidential candidate than the pathetic figure of the Kansas governor. Obviously chosen (and among the prime

"choosers" were Hearst and Banker Aldrich of the powerful Chase National Bank) for his innocuousness and expected pliability, he would, if ever elected, be the ideal errand boy of the plutocratic rulers. But will he be elected? It has been said that when the economic ringmasters crack the whips, the voters do the right thing by the masters. That is not always so. Moreover, not all the plutocrats agree that Roosevelt is their enemy, as we have already seen. Though pathetically eager to serve the industrial feudalists (as witness his present feeble plutocratic lispings as contrasted with his earlier support of Rooseveltian reform measures), he lacks the ability to give color and cogency to his pleas. As one views him on the speaker's stand, one marvels that the "great brains" of the plutocracy could have chosen one so inarticulate, so weak, so obviously inflated artificially with the breath from the plutocratic body. As he stands before his audience, stammering, myopic eyes glued to his manuscript, seldom looking up, one thinks of a third-rate country parson or school master beseeching his parishioners to see to it that he is kept in food and raiment against the winter! Or one thinks of Robert Burns's wee mouse, gray and pathetically helpless. Poor Landon, the spitball of the "economic royalists"! If this man is elected President, it would mean that the hour is very close at hand when the plutocracy can, with safety, remove the mask, and step forth boldly as the industrial dictators we know them to be. And yet, were these industrial dictators the wise men some think them to be, they would get behind Roosevelt, and in

sure their rule for a while longer, though they would have to continue to pay for this insurance, as undoubtedly they did when Roosevelt first took office. It would be a slower, a more circuitous route, but a surer one, to their objective—the industrial feudal castle—

"Where bastard Freedom waves
Her fustian flag in mockery
over slaves."

The intellectual prostitutes, those who earn their bread in the service of the plutocracy, have found it difficult to swallow Landon. But they managed it at last! Typical among these is the master of Jesuitical casuistry, Walter Lippmann, who recently returned from the silences of a long summer and announced that he would vote for Landon, giving as reason that there is safety in a multitude of counselors who are so hopelessly at odds that "nobody can do anything about nothing." In short, he prayed for a return of that period in Hoover's administration when Congress was told daily by the plutocratic press and spokesmen: "Congress, go home!", and when adjournment of Congress was regarded as a blessing and a distinct gain! And such intellectual bankruptcy is hailed by the Landon camp followers as cogent reasoning! Verily, the flatness of capitalism causes these intellectual molehills to appear as towering mountains!

Lemke and Coughlin.

Lemke unquestionably represents the one clearly discernible manifestation of outspoken absolutism in America. Lemke, himself, is scarcely superior to the "pride of Kansas," though he has a little more personality, and speaks with more force.

But back of him stands the sinister figure of the howling Detroit priest, who represents Ultramontanism rampant. His candidacy will remain a gesture, but a sinister and menacing gesture. He is a reminder that the possibility of a renaissance of darkest medievalism is by no means precluded. The vulgar priest, livid with prelatical rage, fulminates in the approved style of Ultramontanism. Arrogant, insolent, with unbridled passion and unrestrained venom, he poisons the very atmosphere. His presence is an affront to civilization, even such as it is at the moment. His ranting accusations against Marxism (which he, for the sake of convenience refers to as "communism") are brazenly false, maliciously dishonest. And though Marxism, genuine Socialism, flings the lie back in the face of the slanderer, with a paraphrase: "We tell thee, churlish priest, thou liest in thy howling throat"—yet, for the moment, this monstrous apparition of medievalism holds the center of the stage, filling it with ghostly noises that drown out the voice of reason, the pleas of social science, or Marxism. And, though silenced this year, the raucous voice of the ranting priest will resound again—or that of one like him. For he belongs to a brotherhood that will survive to the end of class rule, and the ghost of which will not be laid until capitalism is buried deep in the very muck and slime of its own making. Cardinal Hayes, of New York, recently called upon "young Roman Catholics of the country to be prepared to take up arms and die, if necessary, in defense of the United States and its Constitution." This was said in connection with a savage

and malicious attack on Marxism, and obviously was intended as a call to duty in defense of capitalism and the vested property rights of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. In other words, with an eye to just such a situation as later developed in Spain, this saintly man (pal of Al Smith, and, like him, a product of the "sidewalks of New York") urged, in effect, the young Catholics to overthrow, by force and violence, a Socialist government, when and however democratically established. To prevent the establishment of industrial self-government, or its forcible overthrow wherever or whenever established by the will of the majority, is, in fact, the avowed aim of Ultramontanism, and the most spectacular and audible representative of Ultramontanism, and its allies, at the moment is Coughlin, and his "front," Lemke.

Norman Thomas.

When one listens to Mr. Thomas, one scarcely knows whether to weep or to laugh. He is so pathetically eager to appear as a dyed-in-the-wool Socialist, and yet he lacks everything that goes to make a sound Marxist. He has repeatedly repudiated the very cornerstone of Marxism, the Law of Value, wholly oblivious to the fact that if the Law of Value is wrong, then Socialism is wrong and impossible of realization. He denies the need of revolution, while in the same breath he pretends to oppose reforms. And while decrying reform, he stands on the platform of the so-called Socialist party, which is packed with reforms!

When he speaks, he does so with that quaver which marks the parson. He is always acting, always consci-

ous of the effect of his words, which roll off his tongue in unrelated sequences. His speeches reveal a man in a never-lifting fog through which only one thing is discernible—Norman Thomas, the darling of the ladies who love to gather in the parlors to discuss "Socialism" (as Mr. Thomas himself pronounces it) and other (to them) strange and exciting cults.

There is no essential difference between Mr. Thomas and the other reform candidates, including Mr. Roosevelt. In fact, Mr. Thomas testified to the oneness of aim with Mr. Roosevelt when he declared that the latter had stolen the thunder of the S.P., and used it in the service of capitalism. As Mr. Thomas put it: "He [Roosevelt] has adopted and adapted some Socialist ideas [read "Socialist party reform ideas"] and used them as props for a shaky, falling structure. Without their support it would have already collapsed." Mr. Thomas here declares that he and his party supplied the planks needed to shore up capitalism, and that without these planks capitalism would have collapsed! Hence, according to Mr. Thomas himself, he and his party saved capitalism!

Mr. Thomas's notion apparently is that you can exorcise capitalism out of existence and that in the "void" created, and with the heavenly breath upon the waters, a new world will be created *ipso facto*. He seems to believe that if you talk long enough, you may talk the exploiters deaf, dumb and blind, and thus in an unguarded moment, sneak "Socialism" over on them! Not understanding Socialism, his misconceptions and illusions are understandable, but that fact does not render his pernicious

activities, and foolish talk, less culpable.

It is impossible to believe the man wholly sincere. He *knows* there is something wrong with his party, and he tries to cover up the wrong through verbal acrobatics, and by resorting to casuistry. He thinks of himself as a combination of a Lenin and a Roosevelt, though he possesses neither the scientific learning and unscrupulous Machiavellism of Lenin, nor the polish and craftiness of Roosevelt. And so he winds up by being simply another, though somewhat refined, Hillquitian anti-Marxian opportunist and special pleader. If the unthinkable were to happen, and he were suddenly entrusted with authority and responsibilities such as were given to Leon Blum, he would do exactly as Blum did—as every reformer, whatever he calls himself, will do who plays the game of capitalism by competing with out-and-out capitalist politicians on reforming their system. At the time of assuming office Blum (who had shortly before been mobbed in the streets of Paris and who, therefore, had become the kind of hero and martyr Mr. Thomas likes to think himself to be) said:

"Our task is to extract from this social regime whatever it may still hold of justice and well-being. By acting thus we may hope to prepare for the advent of our own society."

"Our own society"—and what might that be? Obviously nothing else than a caricature of capitalist society. He preceded the above statement with a definite disavowal (according to a United Press despatch) of "any intention of overthrowing capitalism," desiring, instead to

"work within the present framework of capitalist society." And that is precisely what Thomas would do, what every reformer and anti-Marxian Social Democrat would do, and does.

Recently Mr. Thomas has appeared as an apologist of Landon, and, in turn, he has received the praise of the capitalist press. Thus he furnished Landon with a splendid opportunity to cover himself after he had made a rather bad slip in his declared attitude toward strikes and unionism. Even his old pal, Heywood Broun, now a devotee of that other illustrious Kansan, Mr. Browder, had to take a crack at him, saying that Mr. Thomas "seemed to be a little muddled on the problem himself," and that poor as Landon may be, "he is good enough at the game to make Norman Thomas look like an ungifted amateur." Mr. Raymond Clapper, the Scripps-Howard special feature writer, said recently: "He [Thomas] sounded like a Liberty League lawyer." Lovingly, the plutocratic New York *Herald Tribune* (which suppressed Aiken's *Herald Tribune* Forum speech) said, apropos of his helping Landon out of a tight place, that "...Norman Thomas, whatever one may think of his doctrines, is among the fairest fighters our political scene affords...." The *Herald Tribune* would not even say that much for Mr. Roosevelt!

And so Mr. Thomas remains a pathetic figure, walking around in circles in a hall of mirrors wherein all the reflections are of a posturing, gesticulating, but utterly futile Norman Thomas—self-acknowledged savior of capitalism.

Earl Browder.

The Presidential candidate of the Anarcho-Communist gentry is, like the Republican candidate, a Kansan. This may, or may not, account for the points which they, rather strikingly, have in common. Both are colorless, both speak as if they were reciting high school orations, and both insist that the paramount issue is the preservation of "our [bourgeois] democratic institutions." ("Thus we conclude," says the Anarcho-Communist mountebank, "that the direct issue of the 1936 election is not Socialism or capitalism, but rather [bourgeois] democracy or fascism"!!) In addition, neither candidate shows any sign of having ever originated one single thought, and both have obviously taken orders from above, and changed front over night, so to speak. Up until the Moscow meeting of the Third International in 1935, Mr. Browder was in blissful ignorance of the value of American democracy. Prior to August, 1935, Mr. Browder, together with his party, made a specialty of reviling American democracy, slandering, in particular, the Socialist Labor Party for insisting that the *first* trial of strength must be at the ballot box. When the Russians decided (contrary to Lenin's express dicta) that the "remnants of bourgeois democracy" were more important than a struggle for Socialism, Mr. Browder promptly discovered the virtues of American "democratic institutions," and he and his party made a complete *volte face*, at the same time making of himself and his party the laughing-stock of the world.

Mr. Browder is a splendid example of a nonentity being "made" into

a "celebrity" by high-pressure salesman's methods. And in inflating this empty gas-bag, capitalist representatives, and the capitalist press in general, have been the chief factors. Intellectually, and in every other way, the man is below par. Apart from the usual Anarcho-Communist effrontery, he is no more than an efficient errand-boy. His utterances reveal him as a phonograph somewhat in need of adjustment, and playing rather outlandish, and sometimes cracked, records. Above all, the platform he runs on is indistinguishable (except for a few phrases) from the platforms of the old parties, or the parties of Lemke and Thomas.

With all this in mind, it is somewhat difficult to pin any personal responsibility on Mr. Browder for his own utterances, but, after all, this is a Presidential campaign, and the gentleman *does* make a pretense at running for the office of President, despite his servility and his valiant indirect campaign in favor of Roosevelt. When a reporter asked Browder: "Why do you state your position negatively?", he answered: "We state our position negatively because we don't want to create any impression that we are for Roosevelt.... We are not telling people to vote for Roosevelt. We are telling them to vote against Landon." This is a crooked an argument as it is possible to conceive of. Browder knows, as we all know, that when the voters go to the ballot box, they do not vote *against* anybody. They vote *for* certain candidates, and possibly *for* or *against* certain local measures. Obviously where only two candidates have the chance to get elected (barring wholly unexpected

developments, that would have to be almost catastrophic in nature), to say that the one must at all costs be defeated inescapably means that at all costs the other must be elected. When, therefore, Browder urges people to vote *against* Landon, he knows that he thereby urges them to vote for Roosevelt. Imbecile, indeed, is he who thinks anyone but morons can be deceived by such tactics. His Jesuitism and sophistries are the anarchist philosophy all over again. There was a time when anarcho-syndicalists used to catalogue the detailed acts of sabotage which the workers should not commit, in order to suggest, craftily, that these were the very things they ought to do. Mr. Wm. Zig-Zag Foster was an expert at that in his day. When an anarcho-syndicalist, with a grin, would suggest to the workers that to throw emery dust in machinery would cripple that machinery, he thereby told these workers how they, most effectively, might wreck the machines in a certain plant. And many were the deluded workers who acted on such agent-provocateurish hints. If Browder sincerely believes in what he says, then he is even more stupid than one had been led to believe him to be.

The platform of Browder and his party, accordingly, is that capitalism must be preserved lest we get something worse than capitalist exploitation, misery and poverty! And the reform demands of the Anarcho-Communists are in keeping with that chief "plank."

Odds and Ends.

Mr. D. Leigh Colvin, of the Prohibition party, represents what certainly is a lost cause. Perhaps he re-

alizes that, for at the Herald Tribune Forum he pathetically assured his listeners that his party, too, offered unemployment insurance, old age pensions, etc. But whether his "cause" lives or dies beyond this campaign, he represents simply another variant of reformism.

The American Labor party is a made-to-order "party." It is made up of the reactionary and corrupt elements that constituted the "old guard" in the S.P., and of representatives of various craft unions, labor fakers, etc., etc. It is simply a "suction pump" for the Democratic party in New York state—another instrument of capitalist class interests, a device for picking up stray votes for Banker Lehman and his friend, Roosevelt.

The Platforms.

The *New Republic* recently made what it considered a comparative analysis of all the party platforms. It paid the Socialist Labor Party the compliment (though not intended as such) of excluding *its* platform. However, the analysis of the *New Republic* does strikingly establish the fact that there is no essential difference between these platforms. The one party among the capitalist and reform parties which stands somewhat apart from the others is the Republican party, with its insistence that the government should keep its hands off business, whereas all the others, in varying degrees, insist that the government must "own" or regulate industry. But even the Republican party is, de facto, brought into the same fold by the pledges and commitments made by candidate Landon. (And the record shows, of course, that under Republican ad-

ministrations, government and big business are essentially one, with big business doing the dictating). All these parties agree that the Constitution should be amended or adjusted, thereby all agreeing that capitalism must be preserved; all demand that the budget must be balanced, or that taxation should be increased or decreased, as the case might be, thus affirming capitalist economics, and all again agreeing that capitalism must be preserved; all favor legislation as regards labor, thus agreeing that wage slavery must be maintained, and the status of the workers as wage slaves recognized and regulated; all agree that something must be done for the bankrupt, economically superfluous, and on the whole reactionary petty farming element; all demand "social security" (meaning "security" under capitalism!), unemployment insurance, old age pensions, etc., etc., thus, again, agreeing that capitalism must be, or will be, maintained indefinitely; all agree on some sort of tinkering with respect to foreign relations and wars, instead of demanding, and organizing for, the eradication of the cause of wars—capitalism; all demand some sort of control of banking, monetary reforms, etc., etc.—and all, of course, are in favor of free speech, etc. — even Mr. Landon! (It seems, however, that the Coughlin party forgot to come out in favor of free speech, which, more than likely, was due to no accident.) There is, then, no serious difference among these capitalist and reform parties as to *principles*; the differences are solely as to methods and degrees.

The Socialist Labor Party Against the Field.

Of all the parties in the field the Socialist Labor Party alone sounds the tocsin of revolt against capitalism. It alone declares that capitalism is rotten-ripe for overthrow, that it cannot and should not be mended. It alone recognizes, and declares, that reforms are measures of reaction, serving the purpose of bolstering up (if possible) the capitalist system, without which it would long ago have collapsed. Hence it is the Party of Revolution against the field of reaction. And at this momentous hour, at this supreme social crisis, we reaffirm all our previous declarations, and rededicate ourselves to the solemn and historically necessary task of working class emancipation.

Persistently, consistently, patiently, and with an eye solely to the goal, the Socialist Labor Party, in its never ending educational and organizational efforts, is laying the foundation for the Socialist Republic of Labor. *That foundation is revolutionary Industrial Unionism.* Our present capitalist system rests on *political unionism*, that is, a union of political territory, the logical culmination of which is *the political union form of government, or the class State.* The Socialist Republic must rest on, must, indeed, be the very essence of *Industrial Unionism*, that is, a union of industrial constituencies, the logical culmination of which is *the Industrial Union form of government, or the Classless Industrial Commonwealth.*

Through the capitalist darkness of chaos and corruption there shines a strong light, the beacon of Marxism, held aloft by the steady hand of the Socialist Labor Party. Un-

troubled by the confused clamor of the misled and bewildered multitude; unconcerned by the noise of politicians, petty or otherwise; serene amid the clowning of the ephemeral reform players who make their exits and entrances, finally to pass off the boards, to be heard of no more; with ears and minds attuned to the vital needs of the age; with single-mindedness and scrupulous and sole regard for the interests of the revolutionary proletariat, and that alone; secure in its knowledge that truth alone unites while error inevitably scatters, the Socialist Labor Party marches irresistibly toward its great goal, nor ever swerving a hair's breadth from the straight and direct, hence shortest, road leading to it, with a conviction more profound and more firmly anchored than ever before that capitalism *must* be, that

**CAPITALISM WILL BE
DESTROYED.**

F

Post-Election Reflections.

(By Arnold Petersen, in the *Weekly People*, November 28, 1936.)

Collectivism, deprived of the fundamental principles of fraternity and self-government, is by the very nature of things a liberty-sapping doctrine.

—Georg Brandes (1881).

The result of the recent national election held few, if any, real surprises for the Marxist. That Roosevelt would be reelected was practically a foregone conclusion. If he had been defeated, if the bourbons represented by the Liberty Leaguers, for instance, had elected their candidate, the continued security of

the capitalist system (resting on a none too secure basis under the best of conditions) might have been endangered to an alarming degree. When a social system has reached the stage of retrogression where it can no longer function normally and expand, any action (apart from the direct play of economic forces) which tends to stimulate the processes normal to its existence, would obviously bring it closer to its logical, and ultimately inevitable, climax. Roosevelt represents "ideal" or collective capitalism. The State, under the *aegis* of Roosevelt, was more and more approaching the status of the *ideal* capitalist, as Marx and Engels termed it. The time has passed forever when individual capitalists, or capitalist groups, might be permitted to play ruthlessly with the laws of capitalism, or even to take the fullest, or a relentlessly logical, advantage of these laws, in total disregard, not merely of fellow-capitalists, but of "totalitarian" capitalism itself. In the interests of collective capitalism individual capitalists had to be curbed. They have been restrained under the Roosevelt regime, and to the extent that they were, to that extent capitalist "recovery" has proceeded apace. "Reform if you would preserve [capitalism]," warned Roosevelt. He is right, with this important modification, that no matter how much reform is played up, capitalism will proceed irresistibly toward its doom. The difference between a Rooseveltian reform regime and a ruthless plutocratic rule lies chiefly in the tempo of retrogression. For in the end, no matter who had been elected on November 3, the "victorious" candidate would have had to resort

to all that is essential in the Roosevelt reform program, lest the system blow up. Society, said Marx, "can neither clear by bold leaps, nor remove by legal enactments, the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth-pangs." In other words, the "legal enactments" of Roosevelt may prolong the agony of society's birth-pangs by deferring artificially the hour of "accouchement," even as the attempted "bold leaps" of the plutocracy might have shortened the birth-pangs, but at the risk of a social abortion. For even as force is the *midwife* of the old society, pregnant with a new society, so it may also become the *abortionist*, destroying the old society along with the aborted one.

It is fatuous to suppose that "normal" capitalism can be restored, and indefinitely maintained. There are many things that one may be in doubt about in this most uncertain world. Of one thing the discerning, scientific Marxist is sure: Capitalism cannot possibly survive much longer! It has run its course, it must yield to the next superior form of society even as feudalism yielded to capitalism a century or two ago. It must do so because it cannot serve the interests, either of social evolution or of the majority of society. It must do so, moreover, because it has itself engendered the substance and structural form of the new social order, Socialism, or collectivism based on fraternity and self-government. Collectivism, as Brandes points out in the text of this article, is not necessarily a good thing. Collectivism may be an unmitigated evil, as witness Italy and Germany

today where collectivism has become another word for black reaction and vulgar barbarism. But whatever may be the temporary aberrations, *fraternal collectivism, industrial self government*, is bound to assert itself in the end as the superior and supreme form of social administration based on social and economic freedom. And so, out of evil, will (as often before) come good. "The dissolution of the latter [feudal society] set free the elements of the former [i.e., the economic structure of capitalist society]." (Marx) And so we may say now: "The dissolution of capitalist society is setting free elements of the future Industrial Union form of Government — i.e., Socialism."

It is equally fatuous to suppose that the road to Socialism lies via reforms. Not only does it run counter to the logic of the situation to suppose this possible, but all previous experience denies and disproves the assumption. Reform, as Roosevelt correctly observed, means preservation. Four years ago we said: "He who says reform, says preservation." Roosevelt would seem to have borrowed his now famous phrase from S.L.P. literature! However, it is no more possible to preserve indefinitely particular social systems beyond their obvious limits of expansion, than it is to preserve indefinitely individual life beyond the natural limits. The theory that the life of capitalism can be indefinitely maintained would seem to be based on the assumption that a social system can be frozen into a static condition. Leaving aside the question as to whether this is a desirable condition or not, it should be clear that it cannot be done, certain

ly not indefinitely. Life implies motion. But heedless of logic, those who contend for the *status quo* insist that they are also for progress, that they believe in evolution. Progress—what for? Evolution—to what end? Economically, "evolution" under retrogressive capitalism implies more and more labor-displacing machines, more and more concentration of capital, more and more elimination of "useless labor," of "lost motion," all of which spells a greater ripeness (or rottenness, as one prefers) of capitalism. Reforms, preservation of capitalism, imply a continuation of the class struggle, of the class division in society. The more capitalism would be reformed, the more the classes would crystallize, the sharper would be the class divisions, and the more powerful and relentless would become the central organ of capitalist "order," the State, until the point would finally be reached which American Marxism has designated Industrial Feudalism, or Absolutism, with the industrial barons more securely in possession of political and economic power than ever, and the wage slaves reduced to the level of helots, of economic serfs.

Accordingly, those who support and advocate reforms, on whatever pretext, inescapably aid in promoting Industrial Feudalism, or fascism, to use the more popular, though somewhat misleading term — somewhat misleading, that is, in this country. One understands thoroughly why Roosevelt should insist on promoting reforms. He wants to save capitalism. He thinks it can be done—no doubt the wish is father to the thought. But it is *his* system; he is a beneficiary of it, he

and his class. From his own premises he goes about it as intelligently as possible. But what shall we say of the simpletons who in the name of Socialism, of labor, plead for reforms (which is to say that they urge preservation of capitalism), and who even went so far as to support Roosevelt, the best friend the robber system of capitalism ever had! And what shall we say of those who, in the name of Socialism, denounce capitalism, disavow reforms, and then present a string of "immediate demands" (reforms) as "stepping stones"!! Or, what shall we say of those who shout Marxian phrases, denouncing reforms, demanding the social revolution, and then ignore the all-important question of organizing the instrument, the "machinery" of the revolution—those who think that the destruction of capitalism is sufficient, who think that Socialism will establish itself like spring following upon the heels of winter? Yet we saw the Communist party mountebanks and the Socialist party simpletons do precisely these things! Affirming revolution (or at least implying revolution), they turn around and support the very forces that make for reaction — forces that are the mortal foes of Socialism, the sworn enemies of working class emancipation!

*

The Socialist Labor Party in the last election, as in previous ones, correctly appraised the situation, and adopted a program in keeping therewith. It was the only Party—as it is at this moment—which based itself squarely on working class interests to the exclusion of the interests of the petty bourgeois, whether he calls himself a farmer or a cor-

ner grocer. The Socialist Labor Party alone correctly analyzed the capitalist crisis, and pointed to the urgent need of organizing the workers, in Industrial Union battalions, for the unconditional overthrow of the capitalist system, and to conduct the processes of production for use. We know, and shall never tire of proclaiming the fact, that, until the workers do organize into Socialist Industrial Unions, things will go from bad to worse, reforms or no reforms, out and out. plutocrat or shrewd capitalist reformer in the White House.

That business in general has improved for the moment is undeniable. That the lot of the working class is improved we deny. Despite the fact that many capitalist plants are turning out increased quantities of commodities, *the army of unemployed remains substantially the same as it was two or three years ago.* There are still 11,000,000 men and women who have no work, and no other regular means of keeping fed, clothed and sheltered. Business booming, and 11,000,000 or more unemployed! What a contradiction, judged even by normal capitalist standards! This situation confirms, with a vengeance, the contentions of Marx when he said (summing up a brilliant analysis of the causes that produced the "surplus population" under capitalism): "The greater the social wealth, the functioning capital, the extent and energy of its growth, and, therefore, also, the absolute mass of the proletariat and the productiveness of its labor, the greater is the industrial reserve-army"—i.e., the unemployed. That is to say: "The greater the social wealth, the greater the number of permanently

unemployed." And there is profound wisdom in these words, with their direct and obvious application to the present situation in this, the fourth year of Rooseveltian reformism: "The greater this reserve-army [i.e., unemployed] in proportion to the active labor-army, the greater is the mass of a consolidated surplus population, whose misery is in inverse ratio to its torment of labor. The more extensive, finally, the lazarus-layers [i.e., lowest layers] of the working class, and the industrial reserve-army, *the greater is official pauperism.*" In the reign of Roosevelt II. "official pauperism" is termed being "on relief"! The fact that under capitalism we have a permanent "surplus population" has been given official governmental recognition since the last election. Works Progress Administrator Harry L. Hopkins, addressing the United States Conference of Mayors on November 17, so told the conference. He called attention to the fact of upward of 11,000,000 unemployed at a time when business is supposed to be within 10 per cent of the 1929 boom level (the unemployment figure is probably much higher); he asserted that at least 7,000,000 would remain unemployed in 1937 even if business attained the highest pre-depression level. Here, too, his figure is no doubt much too low, the indications being that the number of unemployed will double, or possibly even treble, during the next four years. But apart from the question of the exact number of unemployed, the significant fact remains that it is officially recognized and admitted that so long as capitalism continues there will be millions of permanently unemployed

workers — *useful and productive workers who will never again have a regular job.* They will constitute a surplus "crop" of the commodity labor power, and are catalogued exactly as are the surplus crops of wheat, pigs, etc. Well may Mr. Hopkins say, as he does, that it is time "the people" start considering "what they want to do about them." Wheat may be burned, and little pigs may be turned into fertilizer, but millions of rebellious workers are not so easily disposed of, although the "economic royalists" of the House of du Pont (about to be joined, through marriage, to the reigning House of Roosevelt) would probably suggest that 11,000,000 workers would make excellent cannon fodder. (In 1914-1918 the du Ponts made a quarter of a billion dollars through the slaughter of American workers, at a time when there were only a few million unemployed. The prospect in the next slaughter, with many times that number of unemployed, must fairly shake an economic royalist!)

The tremendous sweep of the Roosevelt victory is, in a sense, a measure of the almost incredible stupidity of the Republican party's campaign strategy. Despite the fact that it was generally known that immense profits were being made by the huge corporations (with no corresponding increase in employment, or in the wages of those employed) the plutocratic bourbons supporting Laundon pretended that they were almost on the verge of bankruptcy. (That is, on the front page; on the financial pages, which workers are not supposed to read, the figures belied the editorial and front-page hammerings.) That in reality the

anti-Roosevelt plutocrats were perfectly at ease, and prepared to adjust themselves to whatever situation the election might produce, is proved by the streamlets of bonuses to workers, and floods of dividends to stockholders, which were released immediately after the election. So little did the election of Roosevelt worry Wall Street that the plutocratic New York *Herald Tribune*, two days after election, announced "Stocks Mount 1.6 points on Election News." Undoubtedly fearing that the workers would make demands for increased wages, etc. (and possibly also because they want to forestall the government's projected "tax-raid" on their surpluses), the corporations began to increase wages, offer bonuses, etc., as exemplified in this headline: "Chrysler Gives 4 Million Bonus [to 67,000 wage slaves]." But a subsequent headline tells us that an "additional \$24,000,000 Chrysler Dividend Puts '36 Total at \$53,808,000." Four measly millions to 67,000 useful producers, but \$54,000,000 to a few hundred or a few thousand idle parasites! Keeping in mind the fact of 11,000,000 or more workers out of work; millions upon millions on relief; misery and poverty stalking the land—remembering all this, let us look at some more recent headlines indicating unparalleled plutocratic prosperity: "Mack Trucks Net \$364,311 in 3rd Quarter" [\$650,000 higher than '35]; "Net Income Up to \$1,083,604 for Radio Corp."; "Dividend Boost, Bonus Voted by May Stores"; "Two Standard Oil Concerns Vote Extra Dividends of \$35,000,000"; "Colorado Fuel Net \$338,658 in 3rd Quarter — Shows Big Gain Over '35"; "Gulf Oil to

Cut Big Melon—Directors to Order \$113,450,000 Stock Distribution Plus Cash Dividends"; "New York Central Net Income Rising"; "Montgomery Ward Big Extra Seen." And this by way of a footnote to the back-fire 10 per cent wage increase by the U. S. Steel Corporation: "Passing Steel Wage Rise to Consumers"—i.e., to the manufacturers! "General Motors Cuts a Melon of \$75,250,000"—and a measly \$10,000,000 bonus to be divided among thousands of workers! "Allegheny Steel Earnings Rise in 3rd Quarter"; "Water Works Net Income up to \$4,704,186"; "United Power & Light Net Up to \$4,112,392"; "International Nickel Net Up to \$9,572,105"; "Hiram Walker Profit Expands to \$4,796,120"; "Eastman Kodak Votes Addition of \$7,377,057." (And a subsidiary of General Motors announces a wage increase—which it piously calls a \$250,000 "appreciation fund" of a 5 cents, *five cents*, wage increase!) "Western Maryland Votes \$7 Initial on 7 per cent First Preferred"—but that was done to prevent the government—which so loyally protects the property of "Western Maryland"—from getting the money in taxes, as is so neatly explained this wise—"The payment (was) made to reduce tax liability under the 1936 revenue act.....!" "Anaconda's Net Income Amounted to \$9,940,132 for nine months"; "Best 9 Months in History for Alcohol Firm Net Profits for the Period \$924,813....."; "Du Pont Joins March by Cutting up \$22,000,000 'Melon,'" and columns of similar items showing phenomenal profits, with indicated, or implied, unbelievably wretched conditions for

the workers. Truly, the "New Deal" has been good to the plutocracy! Truly, indeed, the reformers who supported, directly or indirectly, the reelection of Roosevelt, have been more than kind to the bloodiest and most rapacious ruling class in history—the American plutocracy!

Who won the last election? Assuredly not the 11,000,000 workers who are being told (by the very Administration they, or millions of them, voted for) that they are, in the words of Marx, "surplus population"; surely not the employed workers who will be exploited more fiercely than ever before, and of whom millions will be added to the surplus population; surely not even the petty property-owning farmers and business men who will be driven into bankruptcy in a few years, if not sooner. *The victors are the members of the American plutocracy and their lackeys and retainers.* They alone won, for their social system has been given a new lease of life (however brief) and their interests will be well looked after by the Roosevelt Administration if they will only be reasonable. The rest of the country lost.

The Socialist Labor Party alone stands vindicated as this amazing campaign is closed. Its principles (the principles of Marx and Lenin) alone survive as a living throbbing program of emancipation for the working class. It alone represents the future—all others represent the dead past. However much reformers may attempt to revive and maintain capitalism, the system is doomed. The Law of Value (despised by plutocrat, yet bowing to it; ignored by reformers, yet routed by it!) decrees that less and

less socially necessary labor time shall be required to produce commodities. Hence commodity values will continue to go crumbling, including the *value of labor power*. For the greater the productivity of labor, the lower its value. It is doubtful that the working class (*as a class*) receives more than 10 per cent of the total product of its labor. The capitalist, pro-Roosevelt, Scripps-Howard newspaper, the New York *World-Telegram*, printed an editorial in its issue of November 10, pointing out that in 1935 "out of every \$7 of additional wealth created and sold the worker got \$1 and the employer \$6." If a newspaper representing capitalist interests admits that "the employers kept for themselves 83 per cent of the increased output and passed on to their employees in increased wages only 17 per cent," we may feel sure that the share now going to the workers is scarcely more than 10 per cent—especially if we view the matter from the standpoint of the workers *as a class*—i.e., as a unit which, as such, benefits by, or suffers from, whatever changes are effected economically.

Ever fewer will be the markets for the ever mounting quantities of surplus commodities, ever more desperate the struggle for surviving capitalist nations and groups. And ever closer is approached the hour of social cataclysm—or deliverance for the working class. This situation, and the figures cited above, spell *revolution*. The workers will be driven, inevitably, toward the Socialist Labor Party and its revolutionary program. They will *have* to organize in the only logical way conceivable, into Socialist Industrial

Unions. They must do so as a means of preserving their very lives. With the workers it is not, as Roosevelt told the plutocrats, a case of reforming in order to preserve. With the workers the question must be posed thus: *Revolution*, if you would be preserved! The reform meat of the exploiters becomes poison to the workers, and, *vice versa*, the *revolutionary diet* of the working class means "poison" to the plutocracy as a class.

We of the Socialist Labor Party have no choice but to continue as heretofore. We will do so, confident that something is *bound* to break, and because, in any case, any other course leads backward, into the morass of capitalist slavery. With ever greater energy, with more determination than ever, with all the intelligence and skill that we can command, we must spread our program, and hasten the advent of *bona fide* industrial organization. Our watchwords must be—

"No compromise with capitalism!"

"No common front with the class enemies of the workers!"

"In working class unity alone lies strength!"

"All power to the Socialist Industrial Unions!"

**CAPITALISM MUST BE
DESTROYED!**

G

Chaos, Corruption—and Light

(By Arnold Petersen, in the *Weekly People*, February 8, 1936.)

"....Fret, and rave, and gabble,
Like the laborers of Babel."

—Dean Swift.

This is an age of chaos, confusion, contradictions and conflict. It is an age wherein infamy, corruption and charlatanism are enthroned, and truth, purity of thought and integrity of purpose are trampled under foot. It is an age of heroic sacrifice, and of the vilest selfishness, egotism and servility to vested property interests. It is an age of glorious promise and of deepest despair. It is an age of Revolution, and of the starkest reaction.

It is an age of Dissolution.

Charles Dickens opens his colorful "Tale of Two Cities" with a note which might have been written for today:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the age of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way...."

Though all this confusion and these contradictions logically follow from the fact of a social system in dissolution, not all the confusion is inevitable; a good deal of it is deliberately planned by the plutocrats and their reform poodles alike, for

the purpose of confounding and dividing the real foe of the capitalist robber system, the revolutionary workers of the land. The reaction, however, is by no means entirely united at this stage. The plutocracy, having recovered from the scare of 1933, is boldly aiming at unconditioned power, and the total submergence of the workers. The middle layers of the capitalist class, sensing the danger to essential and general capitalist class interests if the plutocracy has its way, are in favor of a program that leaves the workers enslaved, and yet content—after a fashion. The lower layers of the capitalist class, in the name of "Social-Democracy," seek to rescue the petty bourgeoisie, including the petty bankrupt farmers, from complete extinction, pleading for farm subsidies and state ownership of the industries. Below the Social Democracy—yet within the category of those supporting a petty capitalist program of reform—lies the Anarcho-Communist reform group, half submerged in the slime of slumism. Divergent as are the immediate interests of these groups, they are at one in their acknowledgment that revolutionary Marxism cannot triumph in this country of full fledged industrialism; they are at one in their insistence that only through a long period of "gradualness," of "steps at a time," of reform and compromise with other capitalist groups, can the "people" attain a degree of well-being. *Above all, they are in complete accord that the Political State, in one form or another, must be preserved, though it has been conclusively demonstrated that its social usefulness has definitely ended.*

The plutocracy does not believe the State should own and operate industry—that is, not yet. When the plutocracy can say, in complete accord with the then (possibly) established facts: "The State, 'tis we!" (à la Italian Fascism and the Hitler bandit state)—then the plutocrats will not object to "state ownership," which then will represent a merging of unconditioned political and economic power in the hands of the masters of industry. The lower capitalist layers, realizing that the plutocracy cannot be overthrown by them, and naturally resisting extinction, clamor for more and more control of industry by the State, in the fatuous hope that the State itself will remain unaffected by the fact of its becoming the *de facto* manager of industry, whether through decrees, bureaus, or the various "alphabet" boards. State ownership is not the avowed aim of this group, but it is inevitably driven in that direction, with the alternative of surrendering abjectly to top-capitalism. The Social-Democratic and Anarcho-Communist reformers—utterly unimportant at this stage—definitely proclaim their goal to be state ownership of industry, and regulation of the workers' lives through politicians allegedly acting in the interests of the wage workers. But one and all, plutocrat, middle capitalist, petty corner-grocer, or two-by-four farmer—all demand the continuation of the State, all howl for some sort of reform, whether so designated or not. *And in ultra-capitalist countries the continuation of the State means inescapably continuation of wage slavery.* Let there be no mistake about that.

At one, then, in their ultimate

goal, the plutocrats and the reform poodles of varying degrees, nevertheless, do not pull so well together at the moment. This has been best illustrated in the assault of that sinister representative of the plutocracy, Alfred E. Smith, upon the Roosevelt reformers. Smith is the demagogue *par excellence*. Of low cunning, vulgar, ignorant, steeped in superstition, and allied with the plutocracy on the one side and Ultramontaniam on the other, he wraps the flag around himself and the powerful interests whose current spokesman he is—notably the bloody Du Pont interests who sponsor and finance the so-called American Liberty League, of which Smith and his fellow-Ultramontane ally, Raskob, are prominent members. Rushing to the defense of his plutocratic allies, Smith denounces Roosevelt as a "Marxian" and an agent of "Moscow." Accepting the Social-Democrats as Marxian Socialists, he takes their platform and challenges the "New Dealers" to show the difference between the Roosevelt program and that of the Social-Democrats and the Anarcho-Communists. And, of course, there is no essential difference! In the name of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln, he brands Roosevelt and his crew as supporters or imitators of "the godless Union of the Soviets." In his Bowery idiom of our English speech this vulgar politician (born and bred in the utterly corrupt Tammany Hall) tells his admiring audience (with its multi-millionaires headed by the Du Pont robber band) that the "young brain trusters [i.e., the Roosevelt "New Dealers"] caught the Socialists [i.e., the

petty capitalist reformers] in swim-

ming and they ran away with their clothes."

Among those present at the Smith performance, and applauding this funny "joke," was Alice Roosevelt Longworth. She must afterward have made a wry face at recollection of the fact that the 1912 ultra-capitalists made the identical charge against her father, the late Theodore Roosevelt, the New York *Sun* at the time actually publishing a cartoon showing Debs in the "old swimming hole," with "T.R.," grinning teeth and all, walking off with his clothes!

Beating his breast, and pounding the table, the demagogue Smith denounced Roosevelt as a demagogue; hailing Jefferson and Jackson, he excoriated Roosevelt as the enemy of Jackson and of "Jeffersonian Democracy." But a few weeks earlier Roosevelt beat *his* breast, and sawed the air, while comparing himself to Jefferson and Jackson, meanwhile berating the "Marxians." The "Marxians," that is, the S.P. and C.P. reformers, denounce both the Roosevelt and the Smith groups, going so far as to claim that, not the Roosevelts and Smiths, but the reformers are entitled to the mantle of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln! (Vide *Daily Worker* editorial, January 27, "That's why he can't bear to hear the Communist Party, *as it follows in the footsteps of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln*....")

And so they are flinging names and designations hither and yon, confusion without end! Roosevelt is a Moscow agent, but he is also a Jeffersonian! Smith is a Jeffersonian, but he is also a plutocrat and politically the very negation of Jeffersonism! The S.P. and C.P. re-

formers are tendered recognition by the plutes as "Socialists" and "Marxists," though their principles and program are the direct opposite of Marxism, being merely a variant of Roosevelt, i.e., capitalist, reformism, the effect of which inevitably tends to accelerate the tendency toward Industrial Feudalism. And though labelled "Marxists" by the Smith-Roosevelt groups, the Anarcho-Communists try to snatch from Roosevelt and Smith alike the somewhat threadbare mantle of "Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln"! Again—what chaos, confusion, contradictions and corruption!

Opposed to the entire crew of plutocrats, of Roosevelt, Thomas and "Zig-Zag" Foster reformers, stands the Marxian Socialist Labor Party. The Socialist Labor Party does not merely claim to be Marxian—it *is* Marxian. Even as Marxism is the very antithesis of reform and reformism, so the Socialist Labor Party is antithetical to each and every one of the present-day political groups, be the designation—self styled or otherwise—"Jeffersonian" or "Marxian." The only logical opponent of the plutocracy is the Socialist Labor Party, and vice versa. There can be no compromise between exploiters and exploited. The plutocracy and the Socialist Labor Party alike recognize this. There can be no truce in the class war—no "people's fronts," huge or otherwise. The plutocracy and the Socialist Labor Party both recognize this. There can be no halt in the march toward ever greater concentration of industry. The plutocracy and the Socialist Labor Party agree on that. The struggle is over this fundamental question: Shall capital-

ism be preserved in all its essential parts, or shall capitalism be utterly destroyed? All else is immaterial and irrelevant. The "struggle" put up by the reformers, of whatever shade or degree, is but a dull exhibition of shadow-fighting. Whatever claims may be advanced by the reformers—be they "New Dealers," Social-Democrats or Anarcho-Communists—in the name of labor, are fraudulent or visionary, and constitute, in any case, treason to the revolutionary interests of the working class. While the plutocrats scheme and plot; while the reformers wrangle, and betray the workers; while the labor fakers sell out the workers, the Socialist Labor Party, steadily, indefatigably, ceaselessly, propagates the principles of Marxism, teaching the workers the "one thing needful"—*how to organize to put an end, now and forevermore, to the beastly system of capitalism, the robber system wherein the exploiters, like beasts of the jungle, snarl and struggle over how much of the wealth produced by, and robbed from, labor, shall go to which capitalist group.*

Persistently, consistently, patiently, and with an eye solely to the goal, the Socialist Labor Party, in its never ending educational and organizational efforts, is laying the foundation for the Socialist Republic of Labor. *That foundation is revolutionary Industrial Unionism.* Our present capitalist system rests on *political unionism*, that is, a union of political territory, the logical culmination of which is *the political union form of government, or the class State.* The Socialist Republic must rest on, must, indeed, be the very essence of *Industrial Unionism*,

that is, a union of industrial constituencies, the logical culmination of which is *the Industrial Union form of government, or the Classless Industrial Commonwealth.* Socialism, or Marxism, being the direct antithesis of capitalism, the respective governmental concepts must be, *are*, direct opposites.

Through the capitalist darkness of chaos and corruption there shines a strong light, the beacon of Marxism, held aloft by the steady hand of the Socialist Labor Party. Untroubled by the confused clamor of the misled and bewildered multitude; unconcerned by the noise of politicians, petty or otherwise; serene amid the clowning of the ephemeral reform players who make their exits and entrances, finally to pass off the boards, to be heard of no more; with ears and minds attuned to the vital needs of the age; with single-mindedness and scrupulous and sole regard for the interests of the revolutionary proletariat, and that alone; secure in its knowledge that truth alone unites while error inevitably scatters, the Socialist Labor Party marches irresistibly toward its great goal, nor ever swerving a hair's breadth from the straight and direct, hence shortest, road leading to it, with a conviction more profound and more firmly anchored *than ever* before that capitalism *must* be, that

CAPITALISM WILL BE
DESTROYED.

H

Radio Speeches.

A list of S.L.P. radio talks broadcast between April, 1936, and October 31, 1936, follows:

JOHN W. AIKEN:

New York City, WABC (national hook-up), April 28, 1936, 15 minutes.

Buffalo, N.Y., WBNY, July 7, 1936, 15 minutes.

Akron, Ohio, WJW, July 12, 1936, 30 minutes.

Detroit, Mich., WMBB, July 15, 1936, 15 minutes.

Minneapolis, Minn., WCCO, July 29, 1936, 15 minutes.

Minneapolis, Minn., KSTP ("interview"), July 29, 1936, 15 minutes.

Tacoma, Wash., KMO, August 18, 1936, 15 minutes.

San Francisco, Calif., KGO, August 31, 1936, 15 minutes.

New York City (Herald Tribune Forum), NBC network, September 23, 1936, 15 minutes.

Peoria, Ill., WMBD, September 27, 1936, 30 minutes.

Akron, Ohio, WJW, October 9, 1936, 15 minutes.

Wheeling, W. Va., WWVA, October 12, 1936, 30 minutes.

Altoona, Pa., WFBG, October 19, 1936, 15 minutes.

Reading, Pa., WRAW, October 24, 1936, 15 minutes.

New York City, WEVD, October 31, 1936, 15 minutes.

ERIC HASS:

Hamilton, Ont., Can., CHML, June 12, 1936, 15 minutes.

Detroit, Mich., WMBB, June 16, 1936, 15 minutes.

Tacoma, Wash., KMO.

JOHN P. QUINN:

Minneapolis, Minn., WTCN, June 23, 1936, 15 minutes.

MACK JOHNSON:

Jackson, Mich., WIBM, October 30, 1936, 15 minutes.

V. L. REYNOLDS:

Buffalo, N.Y., WBNY, September 19, 1936, 15 minutes.

Akron, Ohio, WJW, September 29, 1936, 15 minutes.

Newport News, Va., WGH, October 29, 1936, 15 minutes.

E. H. CULSHAW:

Akron, Ohio, WJW, July 9, 1936, 15 minutes.

R. H. CATCHING:

Spokane, Wash., KFPY, June 10, 1936, 15 minutes.

A. M. ORANGE:

Buffalo, N.Y., WBNY, August 4, 1936, 15 minutes.

J. A. PIRINCIN:

Louisville, Ky., WAVE, August 9, 1936, 15 minutes.

Harrisburg, Ill., WEBQ, October 12, 1936, 30 minutes.

Springfield, Ill. (3), WTAX, September 30, 1936, October 1, 1936, 15 minute each.

Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Des Moines, Iowa, WMT, KRNT, October 3, 1936, 15 minutes.

ED. A. TEICHERT:

Roanoke, Va., WDBJ, September 28, 1936, 15 minutes.

E. L. O'BRIEN:

New London, Connecticut (4), WINLC, September 29, 1936, October 25, 1936, November 1, 1936, November 2, 1936, 10 minutes each.

WISCONSIN:

WHA and WLBL, October 14, 19, 21, 27, 29, 1936, 15 minutes each.

PORTLAND, ORE:

KWJJ, twice weekly, March 3, 1936, August 28, 1936, 15 minutes. Continued through September, October, November.

SEATTLE, WASH.:

KIRO, weekly, April 15, 1936, to May 4, 1936, 15 minutes each.

PENNSYLVANIA, etc.:

WWVA, weekly, April 27, 1936, to January 18, 1937, 15 minutes (39 talks delivered).

ARKANSAS (Little Rock):

KLRA, weekly, July 23, 1936, to October 29, 1936, 15 minutes (about 13 talks delivered).

TACOMA, WASH.:

KMO, three times weekly—starting August 4, 1936, 15 minutes.

Making a total of about 240 radio broadcasts during the campaign.

I.

The Vote.

(From the report of the National Secretary to the N.E.C. session, May 1937.)

We had planned to get the Party's ticket on the ballot in at least 22 states. There is no question about our qualifying in 21 states, but all we finally succeeded in doing was to get on the ballot in 18 states. Ruthlessly, on the merest pretext, our petitions were thrown out in the two important states of New York and Ohio. Due partly to inaction of a criminally negligent state secretary, H. G. Wise, we failed to get on the ballot in Indiana. Even then the objection of the election officials was purely technical, but at least they had a fairly good pretext. While we had

originally hoped to get on the ballot in California, it was soon realized that to spend upward of \$6,000 in order to have the Party's ticket placed on the ballot in that state, could not be justified. It is obvious that we are facing greater and greater obstacles with respect to getting on the ballot. Ohio and New York furnish eloquent testimony on that score. The number of signatures required is being constantly increased by the reactionary politicians, and then, after getting them after tremendous and heart-breaking labor, and at great expense, the political gangsters find a way of disqualifying us, and usually in such a way that we can secure no redress within the time left before election. In Ohio we took the matter to court, but on a technicality the high court of the state decided against us. There was talk of appealing to the United States Supreme Court, but nothing came of it, partly at least, because apparently the Party's Ohio attorney inexcusably failed to take certain action within the time said to be required by law. The circumstances in connection with the case of New York State are familiar to you from the articles, etc., published in the WEEKLY PEOPLE. It was decided to try to get a write-in vote, and to that end the New York State membership distributed 225,000 leaflets, entitled "Political Gangsterism," furnished by the National Office. The National Office worked feverishly to turn out this huge quantity of leaflets in the closing days of the campaign, and the membership in the state responded nobly to the call for this extra tremendous exertion. But all in vain, at least so far as getting the vote counted

was concerned. Whatever reports we received showed a small vote, and obviously the write-in vote was either not counted, or appropriated by one or the other of the gangster parties.

In Ohio the fee for filing the petitions is \$195. Since the petitions were rejected, one would assume that this amount would be refunded, but not if the political gangsters can help it! I have exchanged letters with the Secretary of State at Columbus, who recently succeeded the gentleman who handled the matter of our petitions, and whose office received and kept the \$195, and while the gentleman is a veritable Gaston of courtesy, no hope is held out for the return of the money, the claim being that once the State Department gets its clutches on such money, it will require legislative enactment to wrest it from them. So, as we see, in the State of Ohio the politicians have perfected the game to the point where they charge minority parties nearly \$200 in order to have their petitions rejected! One can understand the anger and indignation of our New York and Ohio comrades at such unblushing political gangsterism, but it will not do to get discouraged, or to say, "What's the use?" We must find a way of meeting this new situation, and, if need be, we must increase our forces, and our efforts, in order to get the higher number of signatures, which in New York State means 50,000 signatures in the state, and 56,000 for candidate for mayor in New York City, if a law just passed in the Senate is concurred in by the Assembly, and approved by the governor. If the governor should fail to veto this outrageous

bill (sponsored by a limb of Tammany Hall) it may be decided to test its constitutionality on the ground that in effect it denies minority parties the right to petition to get on the ballot. We certainly cannot, and we do not propose to, submit meekly to the crooked and reactionary attempts of these politicians to disfranchise us, which, of course, is what they succeeded in doing in New York and Ohio. It is a question that requires hard thinking, and careful handling, and I submit it to the N.E.C. in the hope that some way may be found at this time to deal effectively with the situation.

In the State of Washington two attempts were made to make it difficult for a minority party to get on the ballot. Fortunately the most reactionary bill was defeated. While both bills were objectionable, the one adopted at least does not impose insuperable barriers. Our Washington comrades fought the reactionaries, and it is noteworthy that none of the loud-mouthed shouters for civil liberties were on hand. Single-handedly the Washington Socialist Labor Party defeated the reactionaries, and our comrades deserve credit for an important job well done.

In two additional states we came close to being kept off the ballot due to neglect on the part of our own people, namely, in Connecticut and in Oregon. In the latter state those chiefly responsible for the neglectful manner in which signature-gathering was handled are now out of the Party, even as the scamp in Indiana has been placed where he can no longer sabotage the Party. The Connecticut case will be dis-

cussed later.

The following are the states where we succeeded in getting on the ballot:

Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin.

The total vote counted and officially reported is 12,777. We shall, of course, never know how many votes were cast for the Party last election. We do know with a reasonable certainty that if the voters of California, Indiana, New York and Ohio had been allowed to vote our ticket, the total would probably have exceeded 50,000. The politicians, and the editorial harpies, will sneer at the small vote, but they will say nothing about the dirty work they did to prevent our getting the larger vote to which we were entitled. The same political and editorial gangster element chided Lincoln similarly, sneering at his small vote, and the fact that it was sectional. Lincoln answered them:

"The fact that we get no votes in your section is a fact of your making, and not of ours. And if there be fault in that act, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you show that we repel you by some wrong principle or practice. If we do repel you by any wrong principle or practice, the fault is ours; but this brings you to where you ought to have started—to a discussion of the right or wrong of our principle."

And so we say to those agents of the reaction, and their reformer-

"The fact that our vote is small is largely a fact of your making, and not of ours. And if there be fault in that fact, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you demonstrate that our principles are wrong. If they are, then the fault is ours, but this brings you to the point where, in honor and decency, you should have started—to a discussion of the right or wrong of our principles. But this you will not do, this you dare not do. And so you attempt to kill us with a conspiracy of silence, and you keep us from getting a larger vote through crooked methods and trickery."

But let them sneer at the S.L.P. vote—it will yet prove their undoing. Were the vote only 1,000—aye, even 100—it would still be more formidable and effective than the millions cast for wrong principles. For the S.L.P. vote, small or large, is freighted with social dynamics of rare potency. And as old Dr. Johnson used to say: "Though we cannot [now] outvote them, we will out-argue them!"

J.

Political Gangsterism.

By Arnold Petersen, in the *Weekly People*, October 31, 1936.

"Who is it speaks of defeat. I tell you, a cause like ours knows no defeat! It is the power of powers!"

—ADAMS.

The politicians and labor fakers in the state of New York have succeeded in forcing the Socialist Labor Party off the ballot in the state this campaign. Like the faithful tools of capitalist interests we know them

to be, they will regard this as a victory for the Roosevelt party, and a defeat for the Socialist Labor Party. They will be wrong, for it may well turn out to be the kind of victory they will bitterly regret ever having "won." "There are some defeats," said Montaigne, "more triumphant than victories." This is one of them.

Early in the present year the schism in the "Socialist party" between the so-called "old guard" faction, and the Thomas faction, deepened. Subsequently the split took place. It was very clear (despite pretences and camouflage) that the "old guard" element wanted to insure the re-election of Roosevelt. Ever obedient to the wishes of the labor fakers, and desiring in any case to promote their reform program (even though it were done through a Roosevelt) the "old guard" and allies very early must have decided upon the "American Labor party" idea. Early also, accordingly, must have been their recognition of the fact that to secure a place on the ballot they would clash with the Socialist Labor Party. In the state of New York the S.L.P. has been compelled, for years, to appear on the ballot under the designation "Social Labor Party." Much to our chagrin, and humiliation, we were compelled to drop the word "Socialist" to which the S.L.P., logically and alone, was entitled. For the New York election law provides that no two parties may appear on the ballot under a designation which, in whole or in part, contained the name of another party. Since the fake "Socialist party" succeeded in becoming an official party early in the present century, the S.L.P. was compelled to use

the word "Social" instead of "Socialist."

For the same reasons that compelled us to drop the word "Socialist," the word "Labor" would have to be dropped if another party became an official party under the designation "American Labor party." Conversely, if the Socialist Labor Party succeeded in getting on the ballot, that monstrosity, the "American Labor party," would be legally barred—or they would have to choose another name. But "Labor" meant everything to these fakers. In the name of "Labor" they hoped to corral a large vote for Mr. Roosevelt. Hence, the board of strategy of the Democratic party in New York state decided to prevent the Socialist Labor Party from getting on the ballot. Hence, further, this board of strategy got together with the "old guard" S.L.P. fakers, and their labor faker allies, to plan the most effective means of accomplishing this. We can only surmise as to what this plan was, but to the seasoned S.L.P. man the plan was perfectly clear. They assumed, and rightly so, that the S.L.P. would be "on deck" the first day of filing petitions in order to establish priority claim to the word "Labor." Hence, they waited a whole week before they filed their own petitions. Between the time that the S.L.P. filed, and the so-called "American Labor party" presented their signatures at Albany, agents of the Democratic—"American Labor party" machine evidently visited signers in Putnam County, N.Y. *For it was in that county that "duplication" of signatures was established.* Under the election laws of New York, if signers of petitions sign two lists, *the signatures on both*

lists are rejected. The S.L.P. could not afford to lose the rejected signatures. The fake "American Labor party," having plotted the "duplication," could afford to lose them. Hence, the rejections left the S.L.P. short in Putnam County, while the "American Labor party" had plenty, and to spare. And if only *one* signature were short in one county, the ticket as a whole failed.

Originally, the Secretary of State, Flynn (Roosevelt's New York man Friday), overruled the objections filed against the Socialist Labor Party. That left him, legally, clear of any charges that he had acted in any prejudiced manner against the Socialist Labor Party. But when the matter came before the courts the judges *assumed* that the same names in both sets of petition lists were duplications in fact, and not, as we claim, one set of original signatures (on the S.L.P. petitions) *and a set of forgeries on the "American Labor party" petitions.* In short, by recognizing both sets of signatures as bona fide, the judges decided that the "American Labor party" signatures were *not* forgeries, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, and despite the fact that no handwriting experts were called in to testify. And it was on this, shall we say, "judicial opinion" (!) that the adverse decision against the

S.L.P. was rendered; on this "judicial opinion" that the Farley-labor faker political gangsters were upheld.

*

For forty years or more the Socialist Labor Party has appeared on the ballot in New York state. Desperate, indeed, must be the plight of the forces of capitalism when they have to resort to methods such as these to prevent the workers of New York from casting their vote for the Party of Revolution. But, as already stated, these forces will rue the day they connived to force the Socialist Labor Party off the ballot in New York. For whatever may happen to our vote in New York, the thermometer of the revolutionary temperature will register the same. We must exert ourselves as never before. We must show these political gangsters and labor fakers (the Hillmans, the Dubinskys and the rest of them) that the "victory" they have "won" will cost them and their capitalist allies dearly. This time we must depend on our supporters to vote by writing in their names on the ballot.

As to the future, we shall see.

In the words of Wm. Lloyd Garrison:

"We may be personally defeated, but our principles, never."

SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY PRESIDENTIAL VOTE, 1936

CALIFORNIA	not counted
COLORADO	336
CONNECTICUT	1,228
ILLINOIS	1,921
INDIANA	not counted
IOWA	252
KENTUCKY	294
MAINE	129
MARYLAND	1,305
MASSACHUSETTS	1,305
MICHIGAN	600
MINNESOTA	961
MISSOURI	292
NEW JERSEY	346
NEW YORK	not counted
OHIO	not counted
OREGON	500
PENNSYLVANIA	1,424
RHODE ISLAND	929
VIRGINIA	36
WASHINGTON	362
WISCONSIN	557
 TOTAL	 12,777

Aim of the Socialist Labor Party.

The Socialist Labor Party never relents in its efforts to further the emancipation of the working class from economic slavery. It points out the existence of two classes: The capitalist class, which owns everything worth owning, and which does not contribute one iota of wealth to society, and the working class, which produces all the social wealth existing, a class which carries our entire civilization on its shoulders, and which owns absolutely nothing worth owning, nothing but its **LABOR POWER**, which is bought and sold in the market along with other merchandise. The Party's platform declares:

"Where a social revolution is pending and, for whatever reason, is not accomplished, reaction is the alternative. Every reform granted by capitalism is a concealed measure of reaction."

In the very nature of things, capitalism is a robber system, conditioned upon the continued exploitation of labor. Against such a social system the Socialist Labor Party raises its voice in emphatic protest. It demands that the ownership and control of the socially operated tools of production be turned over to the industrially organized working class. Social evolution decrees that the Political State (government based on territory) must go, and that in its place there must be established the Industrial Union Government of, by and for the workers, that is, government based on industry instead of territory.

SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY,
61 Cliff St., New York, N.Y.

S. L. P. ORGANS

English.

WEEKLY PEOPLE, 61 Cliff St.,
New York, N. Y., per year \$2.00

(Members of the Party are referred
to Art. II, Sect. 44 and 45, Party
constitution.)

Foreign Language.

A MUNKAS, Hungarian weekly,
346 E. 86th St., New York, N.Y.,
per year\$2.00

RABOTNICHESKA PROSVETA,
Bulgarian weekly, P.O. Box 368,
Granite City, Ill., per year \$1.50

RADNICKA BORBA, South Slavo-
nian weekly, 3413 St. Clair Ave.,
Cleveland, O., per year\$2.00

The foreign language press of the S.L.P.
performs a very special and necessary
function. Its chief object is to reach the
foreign wage workers in the language they
speak and understand. Members and sym-
pathizers should direct the attention of
their foreign fellow workers or friends
to one of the above papers. Have all sub-
scriptions sent to the address given.

Twentieth National Convention Socialist Labor Party

April 27—April 30, 1940

Minutes, Reports, Platform, Resolutions, Etc.



Published 1942
National Executive Committee
Socialist Labor Party
61 Cliff Street
New York, N.Y.