

REPORT

REVOLUTION TRIUMPHANT.

Conservatism at Stuttgart Gets Black Eye on Every Important Question.

International Socialist Congress Unanimously Adopts Anti-Militarist Resolution—American I.W.W.—S.L.P. Resolution on Politics and Economics Gets Support Which Amazes Conservatives—Swiss Delegate Sturdily Defends It—Majority of French Vote Is Cast for It—S.P. “Backward Races” Resolution again Introduced and again Defeated.

STUTTGART, Aug. 24.—The Congress is adjourned. Events crowded themselves into the last two or three days. Only then did things begin to happen. Up to then it was all preparatory.

The happenings were heralded in on the 22nd by the order of the Wurttemberg authorities to Harry Quelch, a British delegate, that he leave the Kingdom within 10 hours. In the course of a debate in the Congress Quelch had referred to the Hague Peace Conference as a gathering of “thieves and murderers”, or words very much to that effect. The action of the Wurttemberg authorities illustrates, true enough, the backward state in which free speech and civic rights are still left in Germany. Nevertheless it is no slight commentary on “men and things” that Quelch—a gentleman who has echoed in England the American Socialist party slander about S.L.P. “violence of speech”—should be the one ordered out of the Kingdom of Wurttemberg for the use of language that was unquestionably violent.

Politics and Economics.

Differently from Amsterdam, this Congress had fully three committees on important subjects—the Committee on party attitude toward Unions, the Committee on immigration and the Committee on anti-militarism. Safe to say, that

on all three subjects conservatism received a black eye. I shall begin with the Union question, the only one on which conservatism might seem to have held its own. The German representatives on the Committee had introduced a resolution. It was a collection of words so inoffensive that all might agree on them. Heslewood (I.W.W.) and myself, introduced another resolution—an up-to-date handling of the question. A debate of several days ensued. The German non-committal resolution received amendment after amendment—the Russians stuck in a sentence, the Italians another, and so forth. The thing grew more and more in length, and in a crazy quilt appearance. It became what we call in America an “Omnibus Bill”—out of which every one could take what he liked, and reject what did not suit him. An effort was then made to induce America to drop her resolution and join the “band wagon”. America resisted the blandishments. Heslewood and myself had spoken on our resolution—I on the principle of the thing, Heslewood, who came after “A.M. Simons, Editor”, flattening out the gentleman’s false accusations and documentarily turning the tables upon him. At the close of the debate four minutes were allowed, for “declarations”. I made the declaration for America. We declined to abandon our resolution on the ground that the Marxian principle, which highest developed capitalist America had proved correct—“only the economic organization can set on foot a true party of Socialism”—forbade us: the “Omnibus” resolution contained in that respect a theoretical error: it attributed EQUALITY of importance to the economic and to the political movement: useful, good, even necessary and indispensable as the political movement was, it was only secondary to the economic: the false perspective with which the “Omnibus” resolution threw the political and the economic movement was a position fatal to healthy Socialist development in America now, and prepared the ground for a like fatality in Europe. Of course the “Omnibus” resolution was carried; conservatism, nevertheless, was [amazed when it saw the American resolution receive, outside of Heslewood’s vote and mine, three others—1 from Switzerland, 1 from Italy, and 1 from France, 5 votes in all. How amazed conservatism was at this display soon appeared from the language held to us (America) by several of the Committeemen, Russia especially, who voted for the “Omnibus”; they admitted the thorough correctness of our position, and hungrily asked for literature. Moreover, how amazed conservatism was at the display also

appeared from the campaign that its leading men immediately initiated against our European supporters, especially the talented woman delegate from Switzerland, Mrs. Margaret Faas-Hardegger. Upon this episode I shall return in some later commentaries on the Congress. Suffice it here to say that the old Grenlich, who was recently in America and was stuffed by the *Volkszeitung* Niedermeyer corruptionists, tried to brow-beat Mrs. Faas-Hardegger with an avalanche of slanders against us, and sought to intimidate her with the aid of the rest of the Swiss delegation. But the intelligent and sturdy woman proved a match for them all. She held her ground, and turned the tables upon them. Finally, how justified conservatism was in being amazed at the outside support received by the American resolution in committee appeared from the increased outside support our resolution received yesterday in the Congress itself. There were cast against the "Omnibus" resolution (and thus for the American) 18½ votes—that is, besides the 4½ from America, 11 votes from France (that is a majority of the French vote); and 3 votes from Italy. That we had more votes than that may be judged from the circumstance that Mrs. Faas-Hardegger's vote was not counted for us, the Swiss delegation having adopted the unit rule which suppressed its minority. The progressive delegation, 12 strong, from America and other parts of the Congress, received its 18½ poll with a lusty applause, which quickly drowned the hissing attempted from the side of the A.F. of L. representation from America seated on the opposite side of our table.

The following is the American resolution:

"Whereas, the integrally organized industrial organization of the Working Class is the present embryo of the Commonwealth of Labor, or Socialist Republic, and foreshadows the organic form of that Commonwealth, as well as its administrative powers;

"Whereas, Craft Unionism, wherever capitalism has reached, untrammelled, full bloom, has approved itself what the plutocratic *Wall Street Journal* of New York hailed it, in hailing the Gompers-Mitchell American Federation of Labor, 'The bulwark of capitalist Society,' that bred the officialdom which the American capitalist Mark Hanna designated as his 'Labor-Lieutenantship'; therefore be it

"Resolved, 1. That 'Neutrality' towards Trades Unions, on the part of a political party of Socialism, is equivalent to 'neutrality toward the machinations of the capitalist class';

"2. That the bona fide, or revolutionary Socialist Movement needs the

political as well as the economic organization of Labor, the former for propaganda and warfare upon the civilized plane of the ballot; the latter as the only conceivable physical force with which to back up the ballot, without which force all ballot is moonshine, and which force is essential for the ultimate lock-out of the capitalist class;

“3. That, without the political organization, the Labor or Socialist Movement could not reach its triumph: without the economic, the day of its political 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; without the political organization, the movement would attract and breed the agent provocateur, who would assassinate the movement.”

Industrial Workers of the World.
Socialist Labor Party (America).

Immigration and Emigration.

On the other two subjects—immigration and militarism—the triumph of the progressive element was complete. Reserving again for future treatment the events that clustered around these two subjects, the following is a bird’s-eye view thereof.

On the immigration question the “backward races” resolution, hooted down in Amsterdam, made its reappearance in Stuttgart. This time it appeared under a thick coat of paint to conceal its identity, and it again turned up through the gate of the American S.P., backed up by Van Koll, a pure and simple political Socialist of Holland. Hilquit was its proposer. It deceived nobody. The S.L.P. on that committee drove the stoutest nail into the coffin of the Hilquit proposition. It was documentally proven to be, economically and politically, the echo of the scab-herding A.F. of L. It was roundly routed. In its lieu a sub-committee of the Committee on Immigration was appointed to draw up a special resolution. That resolution was adopted by the Congress.

Anti-Militarism.

Finally, on the subject of anti-militarism. On this subject I should by far prefer to say nothing until I could handle the subject in full, as I expect to do in a special series of articles on the Congress. A condensed statement is here necessary.

The Committee on Anti-Militarism drew the strongest attention. The larger portion of the European headlights were centered there—Herve, Jaures, Bebel,

Vollmar, etc. The Committee had it hot and heavy. The anti-militarists crowded the Germans heavily. Not that the Germans were pro-militarists. A passage from Bebel's speech defines their position best. "Were we," said Bebel, "to use in Germany such language as Herve does we would all be thrown into jail." Herve's speech was brilliant. *The People* will presently have it.¹ Yet it must be admitted that Bebel's answer covered the ground for Germany—a country that, civic-politically, is still so backward. Nevertheless, it goes without saying that the exceptionally backward state of Germany could not be allowed to set the pace for the International Movement. The German position was lashed. Finally a sub-committee was appointed to draft a resolution that should truthfully utter the international thought and yet be couched in such language as to enable the Germans to sign it without having to go to jail. Such a resolution was framed. I am told upon reliable authority it was first submitted to some German legal lights for the sake of safety, and it passed muster with them. Thus the anti-militarist resolution was signed by all the committeemen—German (Bebel and Vollmar) as well as French (Jaures and Herve). That resolution is as follows:

"The Congress confirms the resolutions passed by the former International Congresses against militarism and imperialism, and it again declares that the fight against militarism cannot be separated from the socialist struggle of classes as a whole.

"Wars between capitalistic states are as a rule the consequence of their competition in the world's market, for every state is eager not only to preserve its markets, but also to conquer new ones, principally by the subjugation of foreign nations and the confiscation of their lands. These wars are further engendered by the unceasing and ever increasing armaments of militarism, which is one of the principal instruments for maintaining the predominance of the bourgeois classes and for subjugating the working classes politically as well as economically.

"The breaking out of wars is further favored by the national prejudices systematically cultivated in the interest of the reigning classes, in order to turn off the masses of the proletariat from the duties of their class and of international solidarity.

"Wars are therefore essential to capitalism; they will not cease until the capitalistic system has been done away with, or until the sacrifices in men and money required by the technical development of the military system and the revolt against the armaments have become so great as to

¹ [To be appended at a future date.—R.B.]

compel the nations to give up this system.

“Especially the working classes from which the soldiers are chiefly recruited, and which have to bear the greater part of the financial burdens, are by nature opposed to war, because it is irreconcilable with their aim: the creation of a new economic system founded on a socialistic basis and realising the solidarity of the nations.

“The Congress therefore considers it to be the duty of the working classes, and especially of their parliamentary representatives, to fight with all their might against the military and naval armaments, not to grant any money for such purposes, pointing out at the same time the class character of bourgeois society and the real motives for keeping up the antagonisms between nations, and further to imbue the young people of the working classes with the socialist spirit of universal brotherhood and with class consciousness.

“The Congress considers that the democratic organization of national defence, by replacing the standing army by the armed people, will prove an effective means for making aggressive wars impossible, and for overcoming national antagonisms.

“The International cannot lay down rigid formulas for the action of the working classes against militarism, as this action must of necessity differ according to the time and the conditions of the various national parties. But it is its duty to intensify and to co-ordinate as much as possible the efforts of the working classes against militarism and against war.

“In fact, since the Brussels Congress, the proletariat in its untiring fight against militarism, by refusing to grant the expenses for military and naval armaments, by democratising the army, has had recourse with increasing vigor and success to the most varied methods of action in order to prevent the breaking out of wars, or to end them, or to make use of the agitation of the social body caused by a war for the emancipation of the working classes; as for instance the understanding arrived at between the English and the French trade unions after the Fachoda crisis, which served to assure peace and to re-establish friendly relations between England and France; the action of the socialist parties in the German and French parliaments during the Morocco crisis; the public demonstrations organized for the same purpose by the French and German socialists; the common action of the Austrian and Italian socialists who met at Trieste in order to ward off a conflict between the two states; further the vigorous intervention of the socialist workers of Sweden in order to prevent an attack against Norway; and lastly, the heroic sacrifices and fights of the masses of socialist workers and peasants of Russia and Poland rising against the war provoked by the government of the Czar, in order to put an end to it and to make use of the crisis for the emancipation of their country and of the working classes. All these efforts show the growing power of the proletariat and its increasing desire to maintain peace by its energetic intervention.

“The action of the working classes will be the more successful, the more the mind of the people has been prepared by an unceasing propaganda, and

the more the Labor parties of the different countries have been stimulated and drawn together by the International.

“The Congress further expresses its conviction that under the pressure exerted by the proletariat the practice of honest arbitration in all disputes will take the place of the futile attempts of the bourgeois governments, and that in this way the people will be assured the benefit of universal disarmament which will allow the enormous resources of energy and money wasted, by armaments and by wars, to be applied to the progress of civilization.

“In case of war being imminent, the working classes and their parliamentary representatives in the countries concerned shall be bound, with the assistance of the International Socialist Bureau, to do all they can to prevent the breaking out of the war, using for this purpose the means which appear to them the most efficacious, and which must naturally vary, according to the acuteness of the struggle of classes, and to the general political conditions.

“In case war should break out notwithstanding, they shall be bound to intervene for its being brought to a speedy end, and to employ all their forces for utilizing the economical and political crisis created by the war, in order to rouse the masses of the people and to hasten the downbreak of the predominance of the capitalist class.”

The above was adopted unanimously by the Congress amid uproarious applause, with Herve standing on a chair and voting with both hands up—to emphasize the fact that the Anti-Militarist forces had triumphed.

DANIEL DE LEON.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.
Uploaded October 2009

slpns@slp.org