

The Field Which We Must Combat

A Survey of the Entire Radical Movement in America.

The Socialist Party, The I. W. W.
The Communists, The S. L. P.
Anarchists, Non-Partisan
League.

*Propaganda Methods of Each
and How to Meet Them.*

“The Soap-Box University”

Copyright 1921

By JACK O'BRIEN, RACINE, WIS.

WILL YOU HELP?

Soap Box University belongs to our students. It is to your interest that its efficiency be increased to the highest possible standard. It should be developed to a greater factor for the American defense than the Rand School of Social Science stands today in New York in opposition to Americanism.

YOU CAN HELP—HOW?

Many of our students have books on Americanism and Socialism some of which are no longer printed, and while there is such a large assortment in the country it is our desire to fortify our school intellectually to meet every Socialist argument with a negative Socialist truth or a positive American declaration. We want to accumulate a library second to none in America along these lines. We have established a research bureau. We need books touching on economic, national, international, socialistic, political and American lines. These can be obtained by contribution from our students and others interested in the success of this gigantic institution. If you have a book which will be helpful and aid your school in preparing the material to mentally equip our army of Soap-Boxers, send it in to the Research Bureau, Soap Box University, Racine, Wisconsin.

If you do not desire to part permanently with the book you can loan it to us stating when sending the book how long we can use it, and during that period we no doubt can obtain some valuable information to aid our work. We also ask that you send in all radical literature, newspapers, clippings, anything that can fortify us in this great onward drive for a better American citizenship. Upon receipt of the book you will receive a letter of appreciation from our president, and a souvenir booklet which will aid you in your work.

HOW STRONG ARE YOU WITH US?

Deber...

21

1909

THE FIELD WHICH WE MUST COMBAT

It is natural that the beginner finds a vast confusion when he first approaches the contemporary Socialist movement. However well he may drill himself in the book-written theories of the movement, he finds that he cannot successfully combat Socialism unless he is equally well-drilled in the activities and persona of the movement. Above all, he must know the differences between the many Socialist sects.

When you meet a revolutionist in argument, nine times out of ten, he will endeavor to squirm out of your charges, by imputing them to some other revolutionary organization than his own. He will bring abundant proof from platforms, manifestoes, statements of principles etc. that his own particular organization is sacrosanct, even though others "who call themselves Socialists" are culpable. And thus, by such quibbles, he often escapes your argument. In order to insure success, the anti-Socialist propagandist must make a thorough study of each revolutionary organization and the differences which divide them, and thus be able to make particular as well as general attacks on Socialism.

The revolutionary movement in the United States is at this moment divided between the following organizations:

- The Socialist Party
- The Socialist Labor Party
- The Communist Party
- The Communist Labor Party
- The I. W. W.
- The Workers' Educational League
- The W. I. I. U.

The Amalgamated Garment Workers
The Amalgamated Textile Workers
The Amalgamated Metal Workers
The One Big Union
The Non-Partisan League
Anarchist Groups

Each one of these organizations will strenuously deny kinship with the other. And yet, with the sole exception of the Non-Partisan League, there is one common program to which every one subscribes—**THE OVERTHROW OF THE EXISTING SYSTEM**. All agree that what they call **CAPITALISM** must be completely overthrown and a new system of production, distribution and exchange substituted in its place. In other words they are all **REVOLUTIONISTS**, as distinguished from **REFORMERS** (who believe that the existing system should be preserved but reformed). This program of **SOCIAL REVOLUTION** is the common ground upon which Anarchist, Socialist, Communist and Wobbly all meet.

But after they have agreed that "**CAPITALISM**" must be completely overthrown, the Anarchist and the Socialist part company. For after the overthrow, the Anarchist proposes to reorganize society into decentralized, governmentless communes, while the Socialist proposes to establish an even more strongly centralized government than the existing one, and a government which will own and operate all the means of life.

Since the deportation of Emma Goldman, the Anarchists have been a very negligible factor in the American radical movement and the student will rarely meet one. And so we can dismiss Anarchism with this reference, suggesting that the student, if interested, continue his study of Anarchism in the works of Peter Kropotkin. It is Socialism which we are covering in this course. It is Socialism which is the great menace of the hour.

The Socialist Party, the I. W. W., the Socialist Labor Party, the Communist Party, the Communist Labor Party and the other union groups above mentioned are all So-

cialist organizations. That is, they all advocate, not only the overthrow of "CAPITALISM" but the creation of a Socialist system to take its place. Each one of them bases their ideas on the philosophy of Karl Marx. They all preach the Marxian Socialist solution. Let the student make no mistake about this.

In the bitterness of rivalry, each will deny the Socialism of the other, be it stated. The Socialist Party man, for instance, will scoff at the idea that there is a common link between himself and the I. W. W., when you mention I. W. W. to him in argument. The I. W. W., on the other hand, despising the alleged "yellowness" of the Socialist Party, will deny that the I. W. W. is a Socialist organization and will call himself an "Industrial Unionist." The Communist and the S. L. P., both of whom believe themselves to be the annointed high priests of the Marxian faith, charge that the Socialist Party man is not a Socialist at all but a Reformer, and he will prove it by copious libations from Karl Marx. But this is but the spite of factionalism. Whatever be their differences, otherwise, these organizations all base their programs upon the Marxian philosophy, or their interpretations of it, which makes them all undeniable members of the Socialist family. The refutation of each one must be accomplished by the refutation of the Socialist philosophy.

We will study this Marxian philosophy in the next lesson. For the present we can summarize it as the proposal to socialize the means of production, distribution and exchange; abolish rent, interest and profits; and administer industry collectively. Each of these revolutionary groups recognize this as its goal.

But what are the differences? Here we enter the realm of hair-splitting. We will take up each group serially.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

The Socialist Party is the most numerous and influential of the revolutionary groups. It has a dues-paying national membership of less than 30,000, in March, 1921, compris-

ing hundreds of locals. It polled 914,869 votes for the Debs-Stedman ticket in 1920. It has captured several offices in Milwaukee and New York, and in previous years it has attained political successes in Minneapolis, Minn., Butte, Mont., Schenectady, N.Y., Haverhill, Mass., Brockton, Mass., Berkeley, Cal. and Davenport, Ia. It has a powerful party press, including several daily newspapers. It has built up a propaganda machine second to none in the United States, and its activity is untiring.

The Socialist Party is the most conservative sect of the revolutionists—if conservative it can be called. Under its present Hillquit leadership its program is political opportunism. It is scrupulous to avoid even the appearance of lawlessness. It claims that Socialism (or the Cooperative Commonwealth, as it calls it) can be brought about by political action—by voting. Its aim is to gain a majority of votes and capture the government offices for Socialism. In order to get votes, it softens the revolutionary character of its real program when it goes before the public. It represents Socialism as a reformistic movement and it wages its campaigns, not upon the uncompromising issue of the Social Revolution, but upon such milder baits as Municipal Ownership, Government Ownership of Railways, Lower Taxes or Old Age Pensions. It appeals to all the floating discontent of the times, and hence its membership is a confused, “lawless” jumble of all kinds of protesters and dissidents.

The theory of the Socialist Party membership is that people can be interested and enlisted in the Socialist cause by denying the revolutionary implications of the Socialist philosophy and by representing the party as a mere law-abiding political party. They will strenuously deny their kinship to the “lawless” and “violent” I. W. W., for instance. But do not let yourself be fooled by them. The leadership of the Socialist Party is, at heart, just as revolutionary as any “Red” Socialist; its “conservatism” is only a pose to lure votes.

This is easily proven by unguarded statements by Socialist Party leaders on this subject.

Eugene V. Debs, for instance—four times Socialist candidate for President and idol of the movement, writing in the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW in February, 1912, declared:

“As a revolutionist I can have no respect for capitalist property laws nor the least scruple about violating them. If I had the force to overthrow these despotic laws, I would use it without an instant’s hesitation or delay, but I haven’t got it, so I AM LAW-ABIDING UNDER PROTEST—NOT FROM SCRUPLE—AND BIDE MY TIME.”

Were the Socialist Party attitude at variance with this Debs pronouncement, it certainly would not have nominated him as their presidential candidate in two campaigns since this appeared.

Even Victor L. Berger, who has long been rated as the most conservative leader in the party let slip the following in the MILWAUKEE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC HERALD on July 31, 1909:

“. . . in view of the plutocratic law-making of the present day, it is easy to predict that the safety and hope of this country will finally lie in one direction only, that of a violent and bloody revolution. Therefore, I say, each of the 500,000 Socialist voters and of the 2,000,000 workingmen who instinctively incline our way, should, besides doing much reading and still more thinking, also have a good rifle and the necessary rounds of ammunition in his home and be prepared to back up his ballot with his bullets, if necessary. This may look like a startling statement. Yet I can see nothing else for the American masses today.”

These quotations should be memorized by the student. They constitute a crushing reply to the Socialist Party man who attempts to tell you that he is not a revolutionist. The evidence of a Debs and of a Berger is irrefutable proof of the idea that is in the back of the Socialist mind.

Another point. The Socialist Party, like all opportunist organizations, passes through constant fluctuations of tactics. At times the “Reds,” who glorify direct action, will get

control and boldly preach armed revolution. At others, the "Yellows," typified by such leaders as Hillquit and Berger will gain the helm, and will censor extremism out of all the party pronouncements. At the present (1921), it is the "Yellows" who are on top. During 1918 and 1919, the example of Russian Bolshevism swept the "Reds" into control of the Party. But at the 1919 Chicago Convention, the Party split and two-thirds of the party membership seceded to form the outspokenly revolutionary Communist and Communist Labor Parties. This made it easy for the "Yellows" to regain control.

Also, the Socialist Party allows autonomy to each state organization. Hence some states in the party will be "Red" and others "Yellow." There are endless shadings of opinion within the party on these questions. But it can be safely said that, whatever they may publish for propaganda, armed revolution is the final goal of every Socialist Party devotee.

THE SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

The Socialist Labor Party, or S. L. P., must be thoroughly understood by the anti-Socialist, not because it is numerous, but because its members infest all public meetings and make a specialty of heckling. S. L. P. men pop up in the most unexpected places and times. And all of them are highly skilled debaters.

The S. L. P. is the remains of the original American Socialist Party. It was founded back in the late seventies. Until the split in 1898, it was the sole mouthpiece of Socialism in the United States. Under the leadership of the fanatical Marxian, Daniel De Leon, it had adopted an anti-A. F. of L. policy, and had launched an independent, anti-A. F. of L. labor union—the SOCIALIST TRADES AND LABOR ALLIANCE. But this policy split the party.

There was an element in the old S. L. P. who were firmly convinced that the success of a Socialist Party in America was only possible by friendship with the A. F. of L. Many of these men succeeded in becoming officers in the A. F. of L.

and they believed that it would be easily possible for Socialists to capture the leadership of the whole A. F. of L. by "boring-from-within" tactics, and turn it to the purposes of Socialism. But so long as the S. L. P. maintained its independent SOCIALIST TRADES AND LABOR ALLIANCE, Socialists would be branded as enemies by the A. F. of L. They met the situation by forming a new Socialist Party.

This was the origin of the present Socialist Party—launched thus by Victor L. Berger, Eugene V. Debs and Morris Hillquit. It soon took over practically all the assets of the old S. L. P. And yet a nucleus of the S. L. P. organization discontinued, grouped around their paper, THE WEEKLY PEOPLE, and it persists to this day.

As it grew smaller, however, the S. L. P. degenerated into hair-splitting and fanaticism. It ceased to fight capitalism, and devoted itself to fighting the new Socialist Party. Its speakers haunted every Socialist meeting and broke them up with their questionings. The WEEKLY PEOPLE became a vile sheet, filled with bitter and ridiculous personalities. In fact, if one wishes ammunition against the Socialist Party, he needs merely to read the files of the WEEKLY PEOPLE for the last twenty years. Here all the dirty linen of the movement will be found, gloatingly flaunted before the public.

Nor does the S. L. P. love the I. W. W. any better. S. L. P. delegates, after their old Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance had expired, participated in the first convention that launched the I. W. W., and there was an effecting scene in which Debs and DeLeon clasped hands again before the cheering delegates. And for three years, the S. L. P. continued to support the I. W. W. But once again, their narrow fanaticism drove them out. At the 1908 convention, the I. W. W., under the new leadership of Vincent St. John expelled De Leon from the organization. His following followed and during the ensuing years, they poured the vitriol of their bitterness against the I. W. W., just as before against the Socialist Party. The former they call "the Bummery"; the latter "the

Kangaroos". Still a third hate has been added to the S. L. P. repertory in the recently organized Communist Party.

What is the S. L. P. brand of Socialism?

The S. L. P. claims to be the true interpreter of Marx. They profess to care nothing about votes; they measure the strength of Socialism by the number of people who have mastered the Marxian economics. They advocate the "two wing" theory of tactics: in other words, there must be a political Socialist movement, or wing, on the one hand, and there must be an economic, industrial union wing on the other. Socialists, say they, must have a revolutionary Socialist union formed in the industries to back up the political ballot, if need be, by the strike. In politics they scorn opportunism, and they are contemptuous of reforms. It is only necessary to be right, they believe, and the world must inevitably come to them. And so they refuse to admit a single concession or compromise into the stiff-necked Marxian program.

At present, their dues-paying membership is something less than 3,000; their national vote in the 1920 election was 42,950. So fanatical are they that, out of even the small handful left, they expelled their principal leaders in 1919 over a quibble.

The only way to refute an S. L. P. speaker is by refuting the Marxian economics. He cannot be touched by the arguments which would demolish a Socialist Party man. The S. L. P. cannot possibly be convicted of violence or advocacy of violence, as they have made a fetish of what they style "civilized plane methods." In fact, S. L. P. men have gone so far as to be voluntary police informers against I. W. W.'s (1) in times of strike and violence. So necessary do they believe it to be to clear the way of "false" Socialist and labor organizations that their members have on several occasions "scabbed" on the A. F. of L. and the I. W. W. in times of strike, alleging that they believe it right to help Capitalism destroy false labor organizations

(1) For instance Boris Reinstein in the Passaic, N. J. Strike in 1913.

in order that the "true" labor organization may the quicker succeed. This is indicative of their dogmatic attitude of all questions. The dogmatism, the sectarian absurdity and the anti-scientific absolutism of the S. L. P. mind is the weak spot which the student should attack when he meets them.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE COMMUNIST LABOR PARTY

These two organizations are, at present, leading a nebulous and secret existence. Both are the offshoots of the "Left Wing" split in the Socialist Party 1919 convention, noted above. The difference between them was originally one of leadership, and a slightly more radical tinge on the part of the Communist Party. Recently, it is reported that they have amalgamated upon the request of Lenine into a so-called UNITED COMMUNIST PARTY, but the unity convention was held in secret and its actions are unpublished.

The Communist parties are the American branches of the Russian Communist Party, and affiliated with the Moscow Internationale. They believe in violent revolution and openly advocate it under the name of "mass action." They advocate entering politics, but not, as with the Socialist Party, with any hope that electing officials will accomplish the Social Revolution. They would only enter parliaments for propaganda purposes. The real revolution is to be accomplished on the barricades.

They do not, save under exceptional circumstances, support the I. W. W. Their members are urged to join the A. F. of L. and "bore-from-within." But note, that the Communist "borers-from-within" have a different object from the Socialist Party "borers-from-within." The former seek to get control of the unions in order to induce the unionists to pull off revolutionary strikes. The latter seek only to induce the unionists to vote the Socialist ticket.

All the Communists are, of course, rigid Marxians, of the Lenine rather than of the Kautsky school. But it must be remembered that the whole membership of the

Communists were, until very recently, members of the Socialist Party. This is an interesting commentary upon the revolutionary ideas which are fermenting in that professedly law-and-order body.

A few months after the two Communist parties were formed, Attorney General Palmer inaugurated his attack upon them and they were badly shattered. The Communist Party was declared illegal and membership in it was forbidden. It immediately went under cover. Most of the leaders of the two parties—Larkin, Ruthenberg, Bross Lloyd—are now in prison or under sentence.

The charge is often made by the Socialist Party that the Communists are controlled by police agents and spies. (1) How large the Communist membership is cannot be computed. It is mostly foreign—Russian, Lettish, Hungarian, Lithuanian, etc.—and at the time of the split, it carried about 70,000 members out of the old Socialist Party. Of course most of these have been lost.

In combating the Communists, the student need only use the arguments which we will later give against the Russian Bolsheviki, as the American Communists follow the latter in all particulars.

(1) This charge was made against Louis C. Fraina, who drafted the platform of the Communist Party at the 1919 convention. Fraina fled the country and, appearing at the Third Internationale at Moscow, he demanded and secured vindication.

THE I. W. W.

The above four organizations constitute the revolutionary POLITICAL PARTIES. But a large part of the revolutionists—perhaps the majority—do not believe that the Social Revolution can be accomplished by political action. They believe in "direct action" through revolutionary unions. They believe that Capitalism can be overthrown by means of a great GENERAL STRIKE, in which the workers of every industry will simultaneously lay down their tools and refuse to work until Capitalism abdicates. Another version of this General Strike theory

is that on a certain day, when labor has at last been solidly enough organized, the workers will NOT GO ON STRIKE but will enter the factories and simultaneously lock out the bosses and proceed to elect a managing committee from their own ranks to replace the old management.

We have had a recent illustration of an attempted General Strike in Italy. There we have witnessed the workers seizing the factories bloodlessly and locking out the bosses. And there we have seen the quick collapse which follows such an experiment. To get a picture of what a General Strike means to the American revolutionist, let the student read the story entitled THE DREAM OF DEBS by the Socialist writer, Jack London.

The Direct Actionist, having all faith in this General Strike, scorns to participate in politics. Political parties simply take the workers' energies away from more valuable tasks, he alleges. Furthermore, a successful Socialist Party cannot be trusted, he believes, because as soon as representatives of the "workers" gain public offices, they always become "corrupt" and betray the "workers", e. g. Briand, Noske, Scheidemann, John Burns, Kerensky, or in this country, George R. Lunn of Schenectady, or Mayor Barewald of Davenport, Iowa, and many others. The Direct Actionist, particularly the I. W. W. Direct Actionist, is strong for democracy and rank-and-file rule: he scorns leaders and representatives: his ideal is a "One Big Union", ruled by its rank and file at all times, and in which officials are merely clerical employes.

The I. W. W. is the highest expression of this Direct Action movement. It was organized in 1905, its founders being Bill Haywood, Eugene V. Debs, Mother Jones, William E. Trautmann and Father Hagerty. There is nothing else quite like it in the world: it represents a distinctly American conception of revolutionary organization, and it was evolved out of the long experiences of the Western Federation of Miners, the American Labor Union and even the Knights of Labor.

The program of the I. W. W. is clearly expressed in its preamble where it declares that it is an architectural move-

ment and, that by building revolutionary industrial unions in all industries "it is building the structure of the new society within the shell of the old." The I. W. W. has a chart, drawn by Trautmann, in which every industry and sub-industry in the productive process is represented as a spoke on a great wheel. Between these spokes every worker by hand or brain finds himself classified and fitted into a scheme of an industrially organized system. This chart is not only the conception of how the "New Society" is to be organized; it is also the precise form of unionism that the I. W. W. organizes the workers into today. Thus the process of revolution is made simple. All that is necessary, in the I. W. W. scheme, is to get the workers organized into these respective industrial unions, which altogether constitute "The One Big Union." Then by a General Strike, this One Big Union will take possession of the factories, abolish the political state, and the industrial unions will automatically stand forth—an already organized government. The conception is magnificent in its simplicity. In comparison to the vague idealisms of the Socialist Party it presents a clean-cut precise program.

But, although its tactics are fundamentally different from the tactics of the other Socialists, the economics and ideals of the I. W. W. are just the same. The I. W. W. bases its whole philosophy on the economics of Marx. The industrial state which the I. W. W. proposes to bring about by one step, is the same goal which the Socialist Party proposes to achieve in a more round-about manner. The quarrel between the I. W. W. and the Socialist Party is over the necessity of politics.

But how should one combat the I. W. W.?

Of course, accepting the Marxian premises, the logic of the I. W. W. method of revolution is irrefutable. The weak point in their program however, is the absolute democracy of the thing. Absolute democracy is unworkable. If all the workers in a given industry were equally alert and intelligent, a democratic administration of that industry would seem ideal. But we cannot plan a new society without studying the human material that we have to

work with. We must admit that this human material are blind-led sheep, swayed by all manner of demagogues and incapable of the will-force of self-discipline. To establish "absolute democracy" in our industries, and to have the workers own them, a la I. W. W., would simply enthrone the demagogue and the walking delegate. It would simply replace the present managers of the industries—whose management is based upon technical knowledge and executive genius—by other managers, whose management will be won only by good fellowship and popularity. And thus the morale of industry will perish.

Another weakness of the I. W. W. is his mistaken tactics. By drawing all the revolutionists out of the A. F. of L., the great body of union workers, and isolating them in a dual organization, he simply closes himself from the one audience whom he MUST talk to, in order to put over his plans. Inside the A. F. of L. unions, the revolutionists, by their mere force of solidarity and their superior abilities could easily capture the A. F. of L. for a "One Big Union" purpose. But instead they remain outside, antagonize the real union workers, and fail in their own attempts to build up a union of their own.

The only element of labor which the I. W. W. has succeeded in reaching on any large scale are the migratory workers of the west—the hoboos. Among the lumber jacks, the construction workers and the harvest hands, they have succeeded in winning a large but fluctuating following. And the copper miners, successors of the old Western Federation of Miners, are also largely Wobblies. Probably the total number who pay dues into the I. W. W. for any one average month will approximate between 35,000 and 40,000. The dues payments have risen as high as 100,000. Including those members who only pay irregularly, 100,000 is probably the national strength of the I. W. W. This, in comparison with 4,000,000 members of the A. F. of L.

The greatest impediment to I. W. W. growth is its suspicion of leaders. Notwithstanding the undeniable fact that unions can only be built by powerful and magnetic

leadership, the I. W. W. has made such a fetish of democracy as to drive out every capable leader who has risen from its ranks, for fear he become a Gompers. In this way Joe Ettor, Vincent St. John, William E. Trautmann, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, William Z. Foster, Walter Nef, and many other brilliant personalities have been lost. Even Bill Haywood has been stripped of every vestige of authority that he ever had in the organization and is only tolerated on condition that he accept subordinate roles. Such an absurd wastage of talent would doom even a hardier organization than the Utopian I. W. W.

THE WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL LEAGUE.

This organization is the successor of a more appropriately named organization—The Syndicalist League of North America. Its goal is very much the same as the goal of the I. W. W.—a “One Big Union” democracy of the industries. But it is composed of members of the A. F. of L.: its role is merely a propaganda league: and its tactics are to capture and revolutionize the A. F. of L. instead of forming an independent union. Its leader is William Z. Foster, the much discussed leader of the 1919 Steel Strike.

Mr. Foster, a former member of the I. W. W., broke with the Wobblies when he found he could not induce them to abandon their independent position and throw themselves into the A. F. of L. Foster's model is European Syndicalism, where conservative unions have been captured by the “reds” merely by “boring-from-within.”

He explained his tactics in a recent address at the Workers' Institute of Chicago (Jan. 17, 1921):

“The mistake (of the I. W. W. workmen) is that they fail to realize that the unions are controlled by 1 per cent of their membership. If 10 per cent of a union is at a meeting it is considered a good average and only one-tenth of that 10 per cent is in any position of leadership. If the radicals could capture that 1 per cent, they could control the unions.

That is the real function of the radical, not to break away from the old organizations but to organize a militant minority to fight the conservative element and break their power, gain control of the rank and file and then carry them along with them toward radical action."

Syndicalism gives the student the key to all those startling recent developments in the A. F. of L.: it gives him the key to the Steel Strike, and to the Coal Mine Strike, he will understand Seattle Duncanism, and he will understand Kansas Howatism. The insidiousness of Syndicalism is that it bears no label. It cannot be isolated, it passes for conservative unionism until the crisis comes and then it suddenly reveals the scarlet hoof. Only a handful of the Syndicalists are openly with Foster in this Workers' Educational League, but the A. F. of L. unions, especially in Chicago, Minneapolis, Seattle, Butte and Detroit are infested with them. The greatest present menace of the whole American "Red" movement is this little-known Syndicalism, it is stealthily growing every day.

THE W. I. I. U.

The Workers' International Industrial Union can be dismissed with brief notice. It is an S. L. P. imitation of the I. W. W. Prior to 1915 it copied the name I. W. W., and was commonly referred to as the "Detroit I. W. W." It differs from the real I. W. W. in that it endorses political action as a supplementary weapon to industrial unionism in the fight against capitalism. Its members are all members, or ex-members of the S. L. P. Its size is not over 2,000, although its agitators claim 10,000. It has no future, for it is dogmatic, pedantic and repellent to all the popular instincts of the American workers—even the radical American Workers.

THE 3 AMALGAMATEDS

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and its satellites, the Textile Workers and the Metal Workers, are organizations, committed to the overthrow of Capitalism and

largely dominated by Socialist Party influence. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers is the only organization among the three which possesses any job control; its membership is upward of 150,000 and it is one of the most powerful components of the American radical movement. The Amalgamated Textile Workers was created through its assistance in a kindred industry and has perhaps 15,000 members. The Amalgamated Metal Workers is composed of two groups of Socialist seceders from the International Association of Machinists, one of which seceded in 1909 and the second (the old Micrometer Lodge) in 1920. Its membership is all in New York and runs to several thousand.

These Amalgamateds, while bitter against the A. F. of L. are also adamant against the I. W. W., which they oppose because of its anti-political bias. It is the ambition of some Amalgamated leaders to make these three organizations the nucleus of an independent nation-wide labor union movement to replace the A. F. of L.

They have recently formed the UNITED LABOR COUNCIL in New York City in which they have also given representation to four other non-A. F. of L. unions—the United Shoe Workers, the International Carpenters, the International Hotel and Restaurant Workers and the Auto Workers' Union. Thus they are building up a powerful labor union Movement, Socialistic and revolutionary, outside the A. F. of L.

THE ONE BIG UNION

The One Big Union is a Canadian organization, resembling the I. W. W. in all respects except that it endorses political action. It has spread to some points in the Northwest, and the revolutionary Seattle unions under the leadership of James Duncan are very close to this Canadian group.

The most spectacular incident in the career of the One Big Union was the Winnipeg General Strike in 1919. This was probably the most perfect General Strike that the industrial union movement has yet produced, and its crush-

ing failure was a blow to the then growing movement. The One Big Union has never recovered from Winnipeg and its Canadian strength is limited to the Northwest.

THE NON-PARTISAN LEAGUE AND THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY

These two political parties cannot strictly be called revolutionary. Ostensibly, both are reformistic. Their platforms do not call for the overthrow of Capitalism. But they must be mentioned in this connection because like the A. F. of L. they contain insidious revolutionary "borers."

The leadership of the Non-Partisan League lays it open to the deserved suspicion that its aim is Socialistic. We refer the student to a booklet, **THE LEADERS OF THE NON-PARTISAN LEAGUE** which is distributed free to all who write for it to the Constitutional Defense League. If you are living in "Non-Partisan League" territory, you should study this booklet carefully as it gives you valuable data to be used in meeting the Townleyites.

The Farmer-Labor Party, whose presidential candidate in the recent election was Christensen, the I. W. W. lawyer, and whose vice-presidential selection was Max Hayes, the ex-Socialist Party leader, is also led by pronounced "Reds." One of the delegates at the organizing convention of the party in Chicago in 1919 remarked, as he gazed around at the delegates, "This reminds me of an old-time Socialist convention."

The Farmer-Labor element are very intimate with the Fosterites and the "borers-from-within." Foster himself is not in the party because he is an Anarchist and does not believe in politics. But Fitzpatrick, his associate in the Steel Strike is the dominating personality of the party. The aim of the founders of the Farmer-Labor Party, as expressed in their conventions, is to create a political party in America on the same plan as the British Labor Party—committed to no particular dogma, but combining all labor elements, both revolutionary and conservative, in a com-

mon labor party. Such a party the revolutionists feel sure that they can dominate.

But there is one stumbling block in their path and that is Gompers. In Great Britian all the trade union officials are with the Labor Party. But in the United States, it is only the anti-Gompers minority which can be reached. Gompers and his official family are immovably opposed to independent political action on the part of labor.

In 1920, at their first national election, the Farmer-Labor Party polled 252,435 votes. They have also had some successes in municipal elections. Their strength however is bunched in Illinois, New York City, Detroit, Missouri and Washington.

Such is the anatomy of the American revolutionary movement. As the student perceives, the Socialist movement is not at all the simple thing that it is considered. It is a complex and intricate network of finely shaded interpretations of Marx. And, although all of these sects are committed to a common Marxian program, each has a different method to attain it.

The student cannot successfully combat Socialism until he has thoroughly mastered these divisions.

Also, it will be seen from the above, that the Socialist menace in America can by no means be estimated as the 942,000 Socialist Party voters. For when we study this lesson we will learn that, to this quantity must be added I. W. W's., Borers-from-within, Amalgamated members, S. L. P's., Communists, Farmer-Laborites, Non-Partisan Leagues, Anarchists and all the combined rout of revolutionists who together constitute a "Red" menace of from two to three million vigilant and untiring foes of America. Such is our field. Study it carefully so when you meet your opponent you know what he has up his sleeve.

QUESTION SHEET—LESSON 1

1. Why is it necessary for the anti-Socialist propagandists to be thoroughly familiar with each Socialist sect?
2. What is the one program that all the Socialist sects in America subscribe to?
3. Give the distinction between a "Revolutionist" and a "Reformer."
4. Where does the Socialist and the Anarchist part company?
5. Repeat the temporary statement of the Marxian philosophy which we give in this lesson.
6. Explain and describe the "political opportunist" tactics of the Socialist Party?
7. How can we prove the real revolutionary intentions of the Party?
8. Is the Socialist Party always consistent in its policy?
9. What was the S. L. P. attitude toward the A. F. of L.?
10. Wherein did it differ from the attitude of the founders of the present Socialist Party?
11. What became the tactics of the S. L. P. after the 1898 schism?
12. Why do the S. L. P.'s hate the I. W. W.?
13. What do we mean by the "two wing" theory of tactics?
14. How strong is the S. L. P. today (1921)?
15. What is the best point of attack in the S. L. P.?
16. Explain the origin of the Communist parties?
17. What is their attitude toward politics?
18. What charge does the Socialist Party make against the Communists?
19. What line of attack should we employ against the Communists in confuting them?

20. What is Direct Action?
21. Explain two theories of the General Strike?
22. What is the I. W. W. (Direct Actionist) attitude toward politics?
23. What does the I. W. W. mean by "building the structure of the new society within the shell of the old?"
24. How would the I. W. W. accomplish the Social Revolution?
25. What philosophy does the I. W. W. base its economics on?
26. Give the criticism of the I. W. W., which is suggested by its "democratic obsession."
27. What is the great tactical mistake which the I. W. W. makes?
28. What is the I. W. W. strength?
29. What is the I. W. W. attitude toward leaders, and why is it impractical?
30. Explain Syndicalism?
31. What are Mr. Foster's methods?
32. Why is Syndicalism so insidious?
33. Define the W. I. I. U.
34. Wherein do the three Amalgamateds differ from the I. W. W.?
35. What is their ambition?
36. In what industries are they organized?
37. What is the difference between the One Big Union and the I. W. W.?
38. Why must we suspect the Non-Partisan League?
39. Wherein does the Farmer-Labor Party method differ from the Socialist Party method?
40. Why is a Labor Party handicapped in America?

What have you done to interest others in the Soap Box University during this week?

This lesson is unusually long and technical. If the

student prefers, he can divide it into two parts, answering Questions 1 to 19 inclusive in his first report, and answering Questions 20 to 40 inclusive in his second. It is much more vital that you master the facts in this lesson and master them thoroughly, than that you attempt to make speed. This lesson is the foundation lesson, upon which your whole future understanding of the revolutionary situation in America is based. It must not be scanted.

READ THIS LETTER OVER SEVERAL TIMES.

Additional copies for distribution obtainable at 15 cents per copy, prepaid; or

100	\$ 12.75
1000	\$111.00

Special rates in larger quantities. Address,

Literature Department,
Soap-Box University,
Racine, Wisconsin.

Are you a member of the Constitutional Defense League?

If not, why not?

Are you aiding to build up this intellectual force by obtaining members?

