
Manifesto of the Left Wing Section of the Socialist Party of America.

As modified by Local Cuyahoga County, Socialist Party.

As published in *The Ohio Socialist* [Cleveland], February 26, 1919, pg. 2. Document was checked back to the original version, published as a pamphlet in 1919 (see Comintern Archive f. 515, op. 1, d. 4, l. 33-40) and reprinted in *The Class Struggle* [Brooklyn], May 1919, pp. 209-216.

Italicized segments represent addenda to the New York version that were published in the Ohio version; bracketed and struck through sections represent deletions from the New York version missing from the Ohio version.

INTRODUCTION

The members of the Socialist Party of America are entitled to an explanation for the issuance of this pamphlet by the Left Wing [Section] Group.

First of all, be it understood, we are not a secessionist movement, nor do we contemplate splitting the party. We are a very active and growing section of the Socialist Party which is attempting to reach the rank and file with our urgent message over the heads of the powers that be, who, through inertia or a lack of vision, cannot see the necessity for a critical analysis of the party's policies and tactics.

The *daily* [official Socialist Party] press is [in the main] closed to us; therefore we cannot adequately present our side of the case.

In the various discussions that arise wherever party members or delegates assemble, both sides grow too heated for calm, dispassionate judgment.

Therefore we have decided to issue our Manifesto and Program in pamphlet form, so that the rank and file may read and judge our case on its merits.

Comrades — and this is addressed exclusively to members of the party — the situation is such that a careful study of our position is absolutely imperative.

We come to you, the court of last resort, for judgment.

MANIFESTO

Prior to August 1914 the nations of the world lived on a volcano. Violent eruptions from time to time gave warning of the cataclysm to come, but the diplomats and statesmen managed to localize the outbreaks, and the masses, slightly aroused, sank back into their accustomed lethargy with doubts and misgivings, and the subterranean fires continued to smoulder. *Surely, the people reasoned, no one would be so mad as to precipitate a world war!*

Besides, they [Many] trusted blindly—some in their statesmen, some in the cohesive power of Christianity, their common religion, and some in the growing strength of the international socialist movement. Had not the German Social Democracy exchanged dramatic telegrams with the French Socialist Party, each pledging itself not to fight in case their governments declared war on each other! A general strike of workers led by these determined Socialists would quickly bring the governments to their senses!

So the workers reasoned, until the thunder clap of Sarajevo and Austria's ultimatum to Serbia. Then, suddenly, the storm broke. Mobilization everywhere. [Everywhere] Declarations of war. In three or four days Europe was in arms.

The present structure of society — Capitalism — with its pretensions to democracy on the one hand, and its commercial rivalries, armament rings, and

standing armies on the other, all based on the exploitation of the working class and the division of the loot, was cast into the furnace of the war. Two things only could issue from the flames: either international capitalist control, through a League of Nations, or Social Revolution and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Both of these forms are today contending for world power.

The Social Democracies of Europe, unable [~~or unwilling~~] to meet the crisis, were themselves hurled into the conflagration, to be tempered and consumed by it.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

At first the question which agitated Socialists' minds all over the world was: Why have they failed? All sorts of extenuating circumstances were pleaded in their behalf — "defensive war," and "a low type of civilization menaces a higher type," and "Socialism must fight on the side of democracy," and "Socialism is not free from the virus of nationalism." All these excuses equally begged the question.

We know that great mass demonstrations were held in every European country by Socialists protesting against their governments' declarations of war and mobilizations for war. And we know, too, that these demonstrations were suddenly rendered impotent by the complete surrender of the Socialist parliamentary leaders and the official socialist press [~~with their "justifications" of "defensive wars" and the safeguarding of "democracy"~~].

Why the sudden change of front? Why did the socialist leaders in the parliaments of the future belligerents vote the war credits? [~~Why did not Moderate Socialism carry out the policy of the Basle Manifesto; namely: the converting of an imperialist war into a civil war — into a proletarian revolution? Why did it either openly favor the war or adopt a policy of petty-bourgeois pacifism?~~] Why did the official socialist press in Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, etc., suddenly reverse its position and call for resistance to the invader? In short, why did the dominant Socialists support their governments?

We shall attempt to answer these questions.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERATE "SOCIALISM"

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Social Democrats of Europe set out to "legislate Capitalism out of office." The class struggle was to be won in the capitalist legislatures. Step by step concessions were to be wrested from the state; the working class and the socialist parties were to be strengthened by means of "constructive" reform and social legislation; each concession would act as a rung in the ladder of Social Revolution, upon which the workers could climb step by step, until finally, some bright, sunny morning, the peoples would awake to find the Cooperative Commonwealth functioning without disorder, confusion, or hitch on the ruins of the capitalist state.

But what happened? When a few legislative seats had been captured, the thunderous denunciations of the Socialist legislators suddenly ceased. No more were the parliaments used as platforms from which the challenge of *militant* [~~revolutionary~~] socialism was flung to all corners of Europe. Another era had set in, the era of "constructive" [~~reforms~~] and cabinet portfolios — the "cooperation of classes," the policy of openly or tacitly declaring that the coming of socialism was a concern "of all the classes," instead of emphasizing the Marxian policy that the construction of the Socialist system is the task of the revolutionary proletariat alone. "~~Moderate Socialism~~" accepted the bourgeois state as ~~the leaders,~~ *social reform legislation. All powers to shape the policies and tactics of the Socialist parties were entrusted to the parliamentary leaders. And these lost sight of Socialism's original purpose; their goal became twofold — "constructive reforms" and Cabinet portfolios, of the means to an end they made an end in itself. Moderate Socialism, in the hands of these parliamentary leaders, was now ready to share responsibility with the bourgeoisie in the control of the capitalist state, even to the extent of **defending the bourgeoisie against the working class** — as for instance during the first Briand Ministry in France, when the official party press was opened to a defense of the shooting of striking railway workers at the order of the Socialist-Bourgeois Coalition Cabinet.*

“SAUSAGE SOCIALISM”

This situation was brought about by mixing [~~the democratic cant of the eighteenth century with scientific Socialism~~] *pure scientific Socialism with bourgeois reforms and the democratic cant of the eighteenth century*. The result was what Rosa Luxemburg called “Sausage Socialism.” *The Socialist parliamentarians forgot that a chain is no stronger than the weakest link. They* [~~The “Moderates”~~] emphasized petty-bourgeois social reformism in order to attract tradesmen, shopkeepers, and members of the professions, and, of course, the latter flocked to the Socialist movement in great numbers, seeking relief from the constant grinding between corporate capital and awakening labor.

The Socialist organizations actively competed for votes, on the basis of social reforms, with the bourgeois-liberal political parties. And so they catered to the ignorance and prejudices of the workers, trading promises of immediate reforms for votes.

Dominant “moderate Socialism” forgot the teachings of the founders of scientific Socialism, forgot its function as a proletarian movement — **“the most resolute and advanced section of the working class parties”** — and permitted the bourgeois and self-seeking trade-union element to shape its policies and tactics.

This was the condition in which the Social Democracies of Europe found themselves at the outbreak of war in 1914. Demoralized and confused by the cross-currents within their own parties, vacillating and compromising with the bourgeois state, they fell an easy prey to social-patriotism and nationalism.

This is the explanation of the failure of the Socialist movements of Europe in the crisis of 1914.

SPARTACIDES AND BOLSHEVIKI

But revolutionary Socialism was not destined to lie inert for long. In Germany, Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg, and [~~Otto Rühle~~] *Clara Zetkin* organized the Spartacus group. But their voices were drowned in the roar of cannon and the shrieks of the dying and the maimed.

Russia, however, was to be the first battleground where “moderate” and revolutionary Socialism came to grips for the mastery of the state. The breakdown

of the corrupt, bureaucratic Tsarist regime opened the floodgates of revolution. *Centuries of oppression had paved the way.*

Three main contending parties attempted to ride into power on the revolutionary tide: the Cadets, the “moderate socialists” (Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries) and the revolutionary socialist[s—~~the~~] Bolsheviks. The Cadets were first to be swept into power; but they tried to stem the still-rising flood with a few abstract political ideals and were carried away. The soldiers, workers, and peasants could no longer be fooled by phrases. The Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries succeeded the Cadets. And now came the crucial test: would they, in accord with Marxian teachings, make themselves the ruling class and sweep away the old conditions of production, and thus prepare the way for the Cooperative Commonwealth? Or would they tinker with the old machinery and try to foist it on the masses as something just as good?

They did the latter, and proved for all time that “moderate Socialism” can not be trusted.

The Socialists began to understand why dominant “moderate Socialism” had broken down. “Moderate Socialism” was not prepared to seize the power for the workers during a revolution. “Moderate Socialism” had a rigid formula — “‘constructive’ social-reform legislation within the capitalist state” — and to that formula it clung. It believed that bourgeois democracy could be used as a means of constructing the socialist [~~system~~] *order*; therefore it must wait until the people, through a Constituent Assembly, should vote socialism into existence. And in the meantime, it held that there must be established a Government of Coalition with the enemy, the bourgeoisie. As if, with all the means of controlling public opinion in the hands of the bourgeoisie, a Constituent Assembly could or would ever vote the socialists into power!

Revolutionary Socialists hold, with the founders of scientific Socialism, that there are two dominant classes in society — the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; that between those two classes a struggle must go on, until the working class, through the seizure of the instruments of production and distribution, the abolition of the capitalist state, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, creates a Socialist [~~system~~] *order*. Revolutionary Socialists do not [~~believe they can be voted into power. They struggle for the~~]

conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat. Then comes the transition period from capitalism to socialism, of which Marx speaks in his *Critique of the Gotha Program* when he says: "Between the capitalistic society and the communistic, lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds to a political transition period, in which the state cannot be anything else but the dictatorship of the proletariat.] *propose to wait until the vast majority of the people vote them into power; but, "if the proletariat during its struggle with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class; if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and as such sweeps away by force the old conditions of production; then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class."*

Marx and Engels clearly explain the function of the socialist movement. It is the "moderate Socialists," through intellectual gymnastics, evasions, misquotations, and the tearing of sentences and phrases from their context, who make Marx and Engels sponsors for their perverted version of Socialism.

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM

At the present moment, the Socialist Party of America is agitated by several cross-currents, some local in their character, and some a reflex of cleavages within the European Socialist movements. Many see in this internal dissension merely an unimportant difference of opinion, or at most, dissatisfaction with the control of the party, and the desire to replace those who have misused it with better men.

We, however, maintain that there is a fundamental distinction in views concerning party policies and tactics. And we believe that this difference is so vast that from our standpoint a radical change in party policies and tactics is necessary.

This essential task is being shirked by our party leaders and officials generally. *In view of the impending change in the tactics of organized labor in this country, we must hurry to readjust the Socialist movement to the new conditions or find ourselves left behind by the march of events.*

Already there is formidable industrial unrest, a seething ferment of discontent, evidenced by inarticulate rumblings which presage striking occurrences. The transformation of industry from a war to a peace basis has thoroughly disorganized the economic structure. Thousands upon thousands of workers are being thrown out of work. Demobilized sailors and soldiers find themselves a drug on the labor market, unless they act as scabs and strikebreakers. Skilled mechanics, fighting desperately to maintain their war-wage and their industrial status, are forced to strike. Women, who during the war have been welcomed into industries hitherto closed to them are struggling to keep their jobs. And to cap the climax, the capitalists, through their Chambers of Commerce and their Merchants' and Manufacturers' Associations, have resolved to take advantage of the situation to break down even the inadequate organizations labor has built up through generations of painful struggle.

The temper of the workers and the soldiers, after the sacrifices they have made in the war, is such that they will not endure the reactionary labor conditions so openly advocated by the master class. A series of labor struggles is bound to follow — indeed, is beginning now. Shall the Socialist Party continue to feed the workers with social reform legislation at this critical period? Shall it approach the whole question from the standpoint of votes and the election of representatives to the legislature? Shall it emphasize the consumer's point of view, when socialist principles teach that the worker is robbed at the point of production? Shall it talk about Cost of Living and Taxation, when it should be explaining how the worker is robbed at his job?

There are many signs of the awakening of labor. ~~[Strikes are developing which verge on revolutionary action; the trade unions are organizing a Labor Party, in an effort to conserve what they have won and wrest new concessions from the master class. The organization of the Labor Party is an immature expression of a new spirit in the Labor movement; but a Labor Party is not the instrument for the emancipation of the working class; its policy would be in general what is now the official policy of the Socialist Party — reforming Capitalism on the basis of the bourgeois state. Laborism is as much a danger to the revolutionary proletariat as "moderate" socialism; neither is an instrument for the~~

~~conquest of power.~~] *The organized trade unions, against the definite commands of their leaders, are resorting to independent political action, in an effort to conserve what they have won and wrest new concessions from the master class. What shall be our attitude toward the awakening workers?*

On the basis of the class struggle we shall go among them, impregnating them with revolutionary socialism; we shall teach them solidarity; we shall teach them class-consciousness; we shall teach them the hopelessness of social reform; we shall teach them the meaning of revolution. And the industrial unrest, the ferment of discontent, will compel them to listen!

CAPITALIST IMPERIALISM

Among the many problems immediately confronting us are those new questions springing from capitalist-imperialism, the final and decisive stage of capitalism. How shall the Socialist Party meet these problems?

Imperialism is ~~[the final]~~ that stage of Capitalism, in which the accumulated capital or surplus of a nation is too great ~~[to be reinvested in the home market]~~ for the home market to reinvest or absorb. The increased productivity of the working class, due to improved machinery and efficiency methods, and the mere subsistence wage which permits the worker to buy back only a small portion of what he produces, causes an ever-increasing accumulation of commodities, which in turn become capital and must be invested in further production. When Capitalism has reached the stage in which it imports raw materials from underdeveloped countries and exports them again in the shape of manufactured products, it has reached its highest development.

This process is universal. Foreign markets, spheres of influence and protectorates, under the intensive development of capitalist industry and finance in turn become highly developed. They, too, seek the markets. National capitalist control, to save itself from ruin, breaks its national bonds and emerges full-grown as a capitalist League of Nations, with international armies and navies to maintain its supremacy.

~~[The United States no longer holds itself]~~ *The new situation the Socialist Party must meet. From now on the United States will no longer hold itself aloof, isolated and provincial. It is reaching out for new mar-*

kets, new zones of influence, new protectorates; not alone, and not in competition with other capitalist nations, but in cooperation with them. They will divide the world among them. And the League of Nations will be the instrument through which they will work.

The ~~[capitalist]~~ master class of America ~~[is using]~~ will soon attempt to use organized labor for its imperialistic purposes. *But a restless and discontented working class cannot pile up profits. Therefore in this country we may soon expect the ~~[capitalist]~~ master class, in true Bismarckian fashion, to grant factory laws, medical laws, old age pensions, unemployment insurance, sick benefits, and the whole ~~[litter]~~category of bourgeois reforms, so that the workers may be kept physically and mentally fit to produce the greatest profits at the greatest speed.*

DANGERS TO AMERICAN SOCIALISM

There is danger that the Socialist Party of America might make use of these purely bourgeois reforms to attract the workers' votes, by claiming that they ~~[are victories for Socialism and that they]~~ have been won by Socialist political action when, as a matter of fact, the object of these master class measures is to prevent the growing class consciousness of the workers, and to divert them from their revolutionary aim. By agitating for these reforms, therefore, the Socialist Party would be playing into the hands of our American imperialists.

On the basis of the class struggle, then, the Socialist Party of America must reorganize itself, must prepare to come to grips with the master class during the difficult period of capitalist readjustment now going on. This it can do only by teaching the working class the truth about present-day conditions; it must preach revolutionary industrial unionism and urge the workers to turn their craft unions into industrial unions, the only form of labor organization which can cope with the power of great modern aggregations of capital. It must carry on its political campaigns, not merely as means of electing officials to political office, as in the past, but as a year-around educational campaign to arouse the workers to class conscious economic and political actions, and to keep alive the burning ideal of revolution in the hearts of the people.

FOR NEW POLICIES AND TACTICS

We believe that the time has come for the Socialist Party of America to adopt the following course of action: To throw off its parliamentary opportunism and to stand squarely behind the Soviet Republic of Russia, the Spartacus group in Germany, and the revolutionary working class movement in Europe. Thus it will be ready when the hour strikes in this country — and it will strike soon — to take the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat in its struggle with the capitalist class instead of obstructing its path with the palliative of parliamentary reforms and lead the workers forward to the dictatorship of the proletariat, the final phase of the class struggle necessary to the ushering in of the Cooperative Commonwealth.

POLITICAL ACTION

Realizing that the vital difference between revolutionary socialism and “moderate socialism” lies in their varying conception of political action, and realizing, too, that on this point revolutionary socialists are most misunderstood and misrepresented, we append a detailed explanation of the scientific socialist conception of political action.

Since we assert with Marx that **“the class struggle is essentially a political struggle,”** we can only accept his own oft-repeated interpretation of that phrase. The class struggle, whether it manifest itself on the industrial field or in the direct struggle for government control, is essentially a struggle for the capture and destruction of the capitalist political state. This is a political act. In this broader view of the term “political,” Marx includes revolutionary industrial action. In other words, the objective of Socialist industrial action is also “political,” in the sense that it aims to undermine the state, which **“is nothing less than a machine for the oppression of one class by another and that no less so in a democratic republic than under a monarchy.”**

PARTICIPATION IN ELECTIONS

Political action is also and more generally used to refer to participation in election campaigns for the immediate purpose of capturing legislative seats. In this sense also we urge the use of political action as a

revolutionary weapon.

But both in the nature and the purpose of this form of political action, revolutionary socialism and “moderate socialism” are completely at odds.

From this point, the “New York” and “Ohio” versions of the Left Wing manifesto differ greatly. The ending of the “New York” version appears first below:

Political action, revolutionary and emphasizing the implacable character of the class struggle, is a valuable means of propaganda. It must at all times arouse the revolutionary mass action of the proletariat — its use is both agitational and obstructive. It must on all issues wage war upon capitalism and the state. Revolutionary Socialism uses the forum of parliament for agitation; but it does not intend to and cannot use the bourgeois state as a means of introducing Socialism; this bourgeois state must be destroyed by the mass action of the revolutionary proletariat. The proletarian dictatorship in the form of a Soviet state is the immediate objective of the class struggle.

Marx declared that “the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes.” This machinery must be destroyed. But “moderate socialism” makes the state the center of all its action.

The attitude towards the state divides the Anarchist (anarcho-syndicalist), the “moderate Socialist,” and the revolutionary Socialist. Eager to abolish the state (which is the ultimate purpose of revolutionary Socialism), the Anarchist and Anarcho-Syndicalist fail to realize that a state is necessary in the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism; the “moderate Socialist” proposes to use the bourgeois state with its fraudulent democracy, its illusory theory of “unity of all the classes,” its standing army, police, and bureaucracy oppressing and baffling the masses; the revolutionary Socialist maintains that the bourgeois state must be completely destroyed, and proposes the organization of a new state — the state of organized producers — of the Federated Soviets — on the basis of which alone can Socialism be introduced.

Industrial Unionism, the organization of the proletariat in accordance with the integration of industry and for the overthrow of Capitalism, is a necessary

phase of revolutionary Socialist agitation. Potentially, industrial unionism constructs the basis and develops the ideology of the industrial state of Socialism; but industrial unionism alone cannot perform the revolutionary act of seizure of the power of the state, since under the conditions of Capitalism it is impossible to organize the whole working class, or an overwhelming majority, into industrial unions.

It is the task of a revolutionary Socialist party to direct the struggles of the proletariat and provide a program for the culminating crisis. Its propaganda must be so directed that when this crisis comes, the workers will be prepared to accept a program of the following character:

- (a) **The organization of Workmen's Councils;** recognition of, and propaganda for, these mass organizations of the working class as instruments in the immediate struggle, as the form of expression of the class struggle, and as the instruments for the seizure of the power of the state and the basis of the new proletarian state of the organized producers and the dictatorship of the proletariat.
- (b) **Workmen's control of industry,** to be exercised by the industrial organizations (industrial unions or Soviets) of the workers and the industrial vote, as against government ownership or state control of industry.
- (c) **Repudiation of all national debts** — with provisions to safeguard small investors.
- (d) **Expropriation of the banks** — a preliminary measure for the complete expropriation of capital.
- (e) **Expropriation of the railways and the large (trust) organizations of capital** — no compensation to be paid, as “buying out” the capitalists would insure a continuance of the exploitation of the workers; provision, however, to be made during the transition period for the protection of small owners of stock.
- (f) **The Socialization of foreign trade.**

These are not the “immediate demands” comprised in the social reform planks now in the platform of our party; they are not a compromise with the capitalist state, but imply a revolutionary struggle against that state and against capitalism, the conquest of power

by the proletariat through revolutionary mass action. They imply the new Soviet state of the organized producers, the dictatorship of the proletariat; they are preliminary revolutionary measures for the expropriation of capital and the introduction of communist socialism.

In contrast to this original text, the “Ohio version” of the Left Wing manifesto reads as follows:

We contend that such political action is a valuable means of propaganda; and further, capturing the political state, but — and here is the vital point, for the “moderate socialist” goes no further — we hold that this capture of the political state is merely for the purpose of destroying it. The nature of socialist parliamentary activity should be purely destructive.

“Moderate Socialism” aims to “simply lay hold of the ready-made machinery and wield it for its own purposes” — the attainment of Socialism. And so the “moderate” falls into the error of believing that parliamentary activity is constructive — that he can eventually legislate socialism into existence.

This error leads to two dangerous practices: (1) making parliamentary activity an end in itself, and (2) making essentially destructive political action the instrument for constructing the Socialist order.

To avoid these dangers, and to strengthen labor's political arm, the Socialist ballot must be supported by the might of “the industrial organization of the working class.” Only the economic organization of the working class can build the new society within the frame of the old.

REVOLUTIONARY INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

*“Moderate Socialism” constantly overlooks this fact. We must continually remind the working class that **labor's economic organizations are naturally the school for Socialism. All political parties, and without exception, whatever their complexion may be, warm up the working class only for a season, transitorily.***

Only through his industrial organization can the worker receive training in the control of production. It is by means of this weapon that the working class will even-

tually take over and hold the mines, mills, and factories, not for the purpose of destroying them but for their permanent control and development. Thus, the only thing worth taking from capitalist society and keeping — the highly developed means of production and distribution — will be won for the working class by its **revolutionary economic organization**.

Because of its constructive nature, our economic arm, unlike our political arm, may take “a little at a time.” Our economic movement is not unlike a military movement. All means are used to win a war — infantry attacks, heavy and light artillery, bombardments, sieges, and guerilla fighting. In the industrial struggle the working class employs strikes, boycotts, and the like. The political movement, however, has for its object only the storming of the political citadel of capitalist tyranny; therefore the political arm cannot compromise. Our political movement should be the essence and incarnation of our revolutionary arm. With Liebknecht we say, “To parliamentarize is to compromise, to log-roll, to sell out.”

SYNDICALISM AND PARLIAMENTARISM

In characteristic utopian fashion the syndicalists forget that the social revolution must in part grow “within the capitalist shell.” They forget that the state, the engine of oppression employed by the capitalist class, must be destroyed through capture by the working class.

In equally characteristic utopian fashion, the “moderate socialist,” with his pure and simple parliamentarism, forgets that **“because of its destructive object and because of its structure, which is arbitrary and determined by geographical lines, the political arm of labor cannot be used as a means of taking away from the capitalists and holding for the working men the means of production.”**

Thus the utopian syndicalist fails to utilize the political weapon; and the 20th Century utopian socialist misuses the political weapon and fails altogether to utilize the industrial weapon.

A combination of these two methods is necessary to the revolutionary socialist movement, and this combination the Left Wing intends to effect.

The New York and the Ohio versions of the Left Wing Manifesto conclude similarly:

PROGRAM

1. We stand for a uniform declaration of principles in all party platforms, both local and national, and the abolition of all social reform planks now contained in them.

2. The party must teach, propagate, and agitate exclusively for the overthrow of capitalism, and the establishment of socialism through a proletarian dictatorship.

3. The Socialist candidates elected to office shall adhere strictly to the above provisions.

4. Realizing that a political party cannot reorganize and reconstruct the industrial organizations of the working class and that that is the task of the economic organizations themselves, we demand that the party assist this process or reorganization by a propaganda for revolutionary and industrial unionism as part of its general activities. We believe it is the mission of the socialist movement to encourage and assist the proletariat to adopt newer and more effective forms of organization and to stir it into newer and more revolutionary modes of action.

5. We demand that the official party press be party-owned and controlled.

6. We demand that officially recognized educational institutions be party-owned and controlled.

7. We demand that the party discard its obsolete literature and publish new literature in keeping with the politics and tactics above mentioned.

IMMEDIATE DEMANDS

[8:] 1. We demand that the National Executive Committee call an immediate emergency national convention for the purpose of [formulating] reorganizing party policies and tactics to meet the present crisis.

[9:] 2. We demand that the *American Socialist Party* [repudiate the Berne Congress or any other conference] shall not participate in the proposed *Lauzanne conference* engineered by “moderate Socialists” and social patriots.

[10:] 3. We demand that the Socialist Party [shall elect delegates to the International Congress proposed by the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviki); that our party shall participate only in a new international with which are affiliated the Communist Party of Rus-

sia (Bolsheviki), the Communist Labor Party of Germany (Spartacus), and all other Left Wing parties and groups] of America issue a call for an international congress of those groups of the Socialist movement that participated both in the Zimmerwald Conference in September, 1915, and the Kienthal Conference of 1916, and those groups that are in agreement with them today.

4. We demand the unequivocal endorsement of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

5. We demand the unequivocal endorsement of the Spartacus Group of Germany.

6. We demand the unequivocal endorsement of the Left Wing movements of Europe.

Edited by Tim Davenport.

© 1000 Flowers Publishing, Corvallis, OR, 2004. • Free reproduction permitted.