SUPREME COURT REFORM
IS IT A WORKING CLASS ISSUE?

The recent proposal of President Roosevelt to extend the membership of the Supreme Court of the United States is the latest of a series of reforms that has caused much discussion. This additional effort to perform the miracle of abolishing poverty without abolishing capitalism has the advantage of being relatively simple to understand compared to some of the others. Its effects on the working class can, therefore, be more readily understood. The essential part of the plan is the granting of power to the President to appoint a younger justice to the Supreme Court bench whenever a justice reaches the age of 70 and refuses to retire voluntarily. The object of this scheme is to add a man with "younger," more liberal ideas to counter-balance each aged conservative-minded justice who remains on the bench.

Four years ago President Roosevelt took office in the midst of a depression with many bright promises on his lips. He and his party set about to abolish the sufferings of the working class. A whirlwind of activity commenced, a deluge of legislation poured forth. When four years later, after all this activity, the latest saviour of the working class could still see a "third of a nation, ill-clad, ill-housed and ill-nourished," he claimed it was not because he had promised the impossible but because of the reactionary forces ranked against him. In particular, the conservative majority in the Supreme Court which had over-ruled much New Deal legislation came in for a large share of the blame.

Before we can consider the merits of this or any similar proposal we must have clear in our minds one basic fact about modern society, its class nature. On the one hand is the capitalist class, a small minority which owns and controls the means of producing the things we all must have to live. On the other hand is the working class, the vast majority which owns nothing except its energy, its labor-power. The owners are in the position to compel the workers to sell them their energy for wages. These constitute only a portion of the wealth produced by the workers and are just enough on the average to keep the worker in working condition. The rest of the wealth is kept by the capitalist class.

It is easy to see how this condition produces an antagonism of interests between the two classes. The workers as sellers of labor power try to get as high a price as possible and the capitalists as buyers of the same commodity seek as low a price as possible. The existence of this struggle manifests itself through the strikes and lockouts that occur in industry.

Thus we see a master class and a slave class, the latter condemned to poverty by the system which enslaves it. All its sufferings and troubles arise from the wages system. It can be emancipated only by the abolition of the system. This act by the working class and this alone can solve its problem. The interests of the working class lie solely in the Socialist revolution.

Not so with the capitalists, however. Their interests are in a diametrically opposite direction. Their concern is to perpetuate the system that gives them possession of the bulk of the wealth without working. In keeping with this interest, they try to smooth over some of the rough spots of capitalism so that the system will run with a minimum of friction and so that the workers won’t be goaded into revolt. In short, they try to reform the capitalist system. This they do apparently in the interests of the workers but actually in their own interest for capitalists by its very nature can never be made to run for the benefit of the working class.

There are other motives behind reform activity by the capitalists, such as the relative cheapness of one activity when compared to another. For example, it is cheaper to give relief than to build hospitals, jails, insane asylums, etc., for the unemployed workers. One general thing can be said, however, about reforms and that is they are never in the interest of the working class, only in that of the capitalists.

If we consider the proposed Supreme Court reform in the light of these facts, its relation to the working class becomes very clear. The last depression produced widespread unemployment and crushing poverty. The capitalist system, financial and industrial, was deranged. The Democratic Party under the leadership of President Roosevelt set about the steps they considered necessary to restore the system and provide for the victims to the extent needed to maintain capitalism. They represented one section of the capitalist class interested in such reforms as the N.R.A., A.A.A., etc. Another section of the capitalist class opposed these reforms for various reasons such as increased taxation. The latter group was backed by the majority of the Supreme Court in most of the decisions in the New Deal legislation. However, the last election made it clear that President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party had the backing of the overwhelming majority of the country. With the mandate of society thus clearly expressed the President could confidently take whatever steps were necessary to overcome his
opposition. Hence his proposal to change the constitution of the Supreme Court.

What should interest workers, however, is whether his plan will benefit them if it is put into effect. The answer is quite clearly no. The interest of the workers is in the overthrow of capitalism and the purpose of the Supreme Court whether conservative as at present or liberalized by the proposed legislation is the maintenance of capitalism. This purpose was clearly in the minds of the framers of the Constitution. According to Charles A. Beard in his "An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States," these views of the Founding Fathers were:

"Unequal distribution of property is inevitable and from it contending factions will rise in the state. The government will reflect them, for they will have their separate principles and sentiments; but the supreme danger will arise from the fusion of certain interests into an overwhelming majority, which Madison foretold in another place would be the landless proletariat, an overwhelming majority which will make its rights paramount, and sacrifice the 'rights' of the minority. To secure the public good, he declares, 'and private rights against the danger of such a faction and at the same time preserve the spirit and form of popular government is the great object to which our inquiries are directed." (pp. 157-8).

President Roosevelt himself has openly declared on numerous occasions that his reforms were devoted to the continuation of capitalism and not to its abolition so that we cannot in the instance of the Supreme Court proposal, believe that he is endangering the system. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that a worker who supports one side or the other in this controversy is supporting not his own interests but those of one section or another of the capitalist class.

Workers, let your masters fight their own battles as best they may. They need your support in their political wars just as they do in their military wars. They appeal for that support the same way in both cases. Emotional phrases and empty promises, impossible of fulfillment are the bait. Don’t be misled by such hollow sham. Use your reasoning powers to discover the facts as they exist. Instead of backing Tweedledum against Tweedledee, join your fellow-workers in the only struggle worth your while, the fight for Socialism. When that battle is won, then and then only will equality prevail over privilege, freedom over slavery and satisfaction of needs over privation and want.

—R.S.S.

May Day and Working Class Unity

On May First, in various parts of the globe, tens of thousands of workers celebrated what has come to be known as “Labor’s Own Day.” Amidst flags and banners, and singing, workers march many abreast through the streets of the world’s largest towns and cities. Among those who march can be seen children in their teens, who for the nonce assume the airs of their elders, whilst their elders behave as children.

The historical background of May First and why it was chosen as the particular day of the year when Labor should celebrate does not concern us for the moment. It will suffice to point out that its original purpose, i.e., the struggle for the universal eight-hour day now belongs more or less to the limbo of history. What does concern us, however, are the more recent claims made by many of those who participate in this demonstration. For instance, there are those who see in the May First parade a symbol of “Labor’s Unity.” Others see in this demonstration an omen of “Revolution.” Albeit, whatever significance May Day may have in the minds of those who demonstrate, to the Socialist none of the above claims are merited by the facts.

Labor, that is the Working Class, is not united. The mere fact that thousands do parade together, whilst millions look on from the sidelines or ignore the event entirely, should be proof enough of the lack of working class unity. But is there even “Unity” among those who march together? The very fact that they represent a conglomeration of parties and organizations, ideas and aspirations mutually hostile, reveals anything but unity. These “United Fronters” having staged their one-day stand, were busy on May second, nursing their bunions as well as their well established hostilities. At best the marchers merely suspended their differences for a few hours. Following their May Day unity there continued the internecine warfare prevalent in what is known as the Working Class Movement. The illusion of unity gave way to the reality of factionalism, etc.

As for the claim that the May Day demonstrations have revolutionary significance, we need but witness (as we have so often in the past) the various pleas and demands of the marchers presented on their banners. These included every reform imaginable, none of which can alter the status quo of the Working Class. In these long lists of immediate demands one demand is generally conspicuous by its absence, that being the one thing really worth demonstrating for—the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. Even were this to be included, the very composition of the parades would nullify its value. What with Republicans and Democrats, Anarchists and Single Taxers, A.F. of L. carpet-baggers, I.W.W.s, Pacifists and Physical-Foists, ad nauseam, the ideological unity necessary for the intelligent act of establishing Socialism, does not exist.

We do not mock or sneer at the enthusiasm, the vigor and good feeling which can be displayed by our class, but rather deplore the fact that it must be diverted into such wasteful channels. Were this same energy and enthusiasm devoted to the task of working for Socialism, May Day would take on important significance. If this were the case every day would be a May Day.

—S.F.
Is There Need for a Labor Party?

During the past year, and especially during the Presidential campaign of 1936, considerable publicity has been given to the formation and development of a "Labor Party" in the United States. In the main, however, this movement has been concentrated in the State of New York, where in September 1936, there was legally incorporated the American Labor Party. At the time of its incorporation the sponsors of this new political party claimed that they had some 400,000 members, nearly all of whom were drawn from the Trade Unions.

The history of the working class in this country is replete with similar organizations. From the first quarter of the 19th century onward, the path of working class political action has been strewn with the corpses of various political parties, most of which were short lived. Many on the other hand were abortive from the very start. Most were local in character, while a few took on a national aspect. All however, were interested primarily in obtaining political office for the purpose of introducing reform legislation. The reader interested in the details of this history may be referred to the special study of this aspect of American history, written by Mr. Nathan Fine, entitled, "Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States. 1828-1928."

The American Labor Party is another attempt on the part of a section of the working class to improve its economic conditions by political action. There is, however, an important distinction between this new party and most of the parties which preceded it. While it would seem that this party is separate and apart from all other political parties, (having given itself a name and independent legal standing), the fact remains that those who were responsible for its organization were really interested in something other than independent political action. They were interested in the formation of this party for the immediate purpose of rounding up the "labor vote" for the re-election of Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Presidency. This was openly stated in the "Labor Party Herald," the campaign organ of the American Labor Party, with the bold headline, "Vote for Roosevelt." Furthermore, Mr. Roosevelt himself acknowledged this support with a long letter, to the "Labor Non-Partisans League" (a national body with which the American Labor Party was affiliated).

While it is true that Mr. Roosevelt has played the already overdone role of the "friend of labor," a role ever important to the politician who seeks to be successful, the fact still remains that he represents a party which in turn represents the interests of a section of the capitalist class of America, i.e., the Democratic Party. The history of this party is one of anything but "friendliness" to the working class. Yet do we see the "movement of labor" actually the movement for Roosevelt and his party. For that part of the Democratic Party's platform which deals with "labor" bears a close resemblance to the American Labor Party's program.

Among the sponsors and supporters of the American Labor Party are some who allege that they are Socialists. Among these is the group which split off the Socialist Party of America recently, calling itself "The People's Party." In the official organ of this group, "The New Leader" (one-time official organ of the Socialist Party), a writer points out that his party has no reason to apologize for its action in supporting the American Labor Party, (since then these erstwhile pseudo-Socialists have officially joined the American Labor Party), and went to some length to explain his party's action. To accomplish this, he dug diligently into the "Communist Manifesto," quoting that Socialists "had no interests aside from the working class ..." and that Socialists "do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties." May we enquire in passing, since when has the Democratic Party been a working class party?

There is a close resemblance between the tactics of this newly formed party and its pseudo-Socialists and Communist supporters, and those of the British Labor Party in the past. They too, on numerous occasions supported the avowedly capitalist Liberal Party, swapping political horses at election time. Compare the stand taken by the Labor Party (then the Labor Representation Committee) at its inaugural meeting, when the following motion was carried:

"That this Conference is in favour of establishing a distinct Labour Group in Parliament, who shall have their own whips and agree upon their policy, which must embrace a readiness to co-operate with any party which, for the time being, may be engaged in promoting legislation in the direct interest of labour, and be equally ready to associate themselves with any party in opposing measures having an opposite tendency, and further, members of the Labour Group shall not oppose any candidate whose candidature is being promoted in terms of Resolution I." (See Report of Conference on Labour Representation, February 27th, 1900).

There was a form of political racketeering—agreeing not to muscle in on each other's territory. A case in point is that of Mr. J. R. MacDonald, (one time idol of the American pseudo-Socialists), who as early as the year 1906, obtained his seat in Parliament by a deal with the Liberal Party. The excuse for such action then was similar to that now offered by the American reformers, "Reaction must be kept out of office." In Great Britain "reaction" was synonymous with the Conservative Party, just as in the United States today, reaction is synonymous with the Republican Party. But behold the course of history! The David of Labor now lies down with the Goliath of Capitalism. J. R. MacDonald has become (for a while at least) the fair-haired boy of the Conservative Party.

But after the Labor Party had succeeded in getting political power by use of these opportunistic catch-cries, (Continued on Page 7)
The Futility of Reform

An examination of present day society reveals that it is composed chiefly of two classes. One group, the capitalist class, is a very small minority of society; the other, the working class, consists of the vast majority of the population. Just as there is difference in the size of these two classes, so is there difference in the ways they make their living. The capitalists own the means of wealth production, that is, the mines, the factories, the railroads, etc. The working class owns nothing but its energy, its ability to work. The owners, therefore, are in a position to compel the workers to sell them their labor-power in return for wages. These wages are on the average just enough to keep the worker in a fit condition to produce wealth for the capitalists. Thus is seen the condition in society, that a small minority which does no work, lives in ease and affluence, while the great majority who perform the productive work live in poverty and economic insecurity.

These conditions have produced in turn certain problems usually known as “The Social Problems.” In the same way that society is divided into two classes, so too are the problems in society. Each social group has its own particular problems, which, however, differ fundamentally as to kind and degree. Close examination will disclose the fact that most of the so-called “Social Problems” are really working class problems, and, as we are here concerned with the working class, we can disregard any of the problems of our masters, the capitalists. The solution of the capitalists’ problems would in no way solve those of the workers. The latter’s problems would continue to exist, often keener than ever, under the headings of poverty and insecurity.

It should be noted that the general conditions discussed above are neither new nor recent. They are as old as capitalism itself. Early observers such as Robert Owen in England, St. Simon and Fourier in France and others in this country, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries already noticed these conditions. This fact in turn makes it apparent that these conditions are not confined to any particular locality or nationality, but that they are as international as capitalism itself. It is true, however, that the degree or intensity of these conditions varies from place to place throughout the world in accordance with the degree of capitalist development.

Rise of Labor Unions

In the early stages of modern capitalism, it was but natural that the conditions of the working class should reflect themselves in its ideas and activities. This reflex found its theoretical and practical expression principally in the form of the early labor union movement. Here the workers found a method by which they hoped to improve their conditions, or at least prevent them from becoming worse. The basic function of the labor union, then as now, was to struggle with the employers over the questions of wages, hours and working conditions. Such activity was limited to those workers in the unions, who were then, even as at present, a small minority of the working class. There were other questions over which the unions agitated. In this country, in the early days of capitalism, when the modern factory system was still struggling in competition with earlier methods of production (based on handicraft in its later stages), when free land and other factors made scarce the supply of wage labor, the labor unions were able for a time to place some limits on the exploitation of their members. This condition lasted but temporarily. As the methods of production advanced, the more complex and costly machinery which was used, not only displaced the hand tool and the once proud “independent craftsman” but at an equal pace deprived the workers forever of whatever control they had of the means of production. Following this process, came large waves of immigrants, bringing workers from all over the world. The result was an overcrowding of the labor market. Unionism was receiving a serious blow.

With the development of capitalism arose the modern corporation. Their large centralized industries and plants, brought still more efficient methods of exploiting the workers. The result was that the antagonism of interests between workers and employers became ever keener.

Just as the workers had their weapon in the class struggle in the form of the unions, the capitalists had theirs, too. Their weapon was the state. Not only did the successful use of the unions by the workers mean that they could get a larger share of the wealth which they produced—leaving a smaller share for the capitalists—but the very nature of the unions’ weapon, the strike, was a nuisance to the employers, even when used unsuccessfully. The strike of necessity interfered with the smooth running of production. The use of the state hindered the workers in their efforts to improve their condition through their economic organizations.

The Workers Look to Politics

From their experiences as they struggled against their employers who were using the state machinery, the workers could form only one conclusion. If the state could serve as an instrument for the masters to attain their ends, why could it not be such an instrument for the workers? It had become apparent to some that the old political parties were only instruments of the employers, that no matter which capitalist party was in power, the government was used to crush the workers’ struggles. Thus arose the idea of new political parties, composed of workers, which would represent the interests of workers. By the interests of workers was meant legislation that would have as its object, the improvement of their conditions. From that time onward, the issue of “Reform” be-
Publication Resumed

In making its reappearance after a lapse of seven years, “THE SOCIALIST” once again fills an urgent need. This need is a two-fold one, in that it provides the Workers Socialist Party of the United States with an added medium for spreading its message of Socialism, as well as placing within the reach of the working class of America a journal devoted to the scientific treatment of the various problems and questions continually confronting our class. That there is a need for such a publication cannot be denied, especially when an examination of the various periodicals in the so-called working class movement reveals that they are anything but scientific.

Since the time, seven years ago, when “THE SOCIALIST” was compelled to suspend publication, not only has “much water flowed over the dam,” but what is far more important, capitalism in its development during this seven years, has witnessed many important happenings. Nearly all of these have affected the working class in one way or another. Outstanding of these events in its effect upon the working class, has been the world-wide “crisis” or “depression.” This phase of the normal development of capitalist society, differing only from similar “crises” in the past by its enormity, has had its repercussions upon our class—large scale unemployment afflicting millions of workers; large scale destitution extending the misery already so common to sections of the working class. It is but natural that these conditions should also reflect themselves in the thinking processes of the working class. Such conditions provide a “happy hunting ground” for the many and varied social quacks who vend their dubious wares. The working class provides an “open season” for these hunters of place and pelf on the political field.

It is indeed unfortunate that during this time there has been no publication in the field to place before the working class a scientific criticism of these various social quacks. However, the working class is still beset by numerous individuals and groups claiming that they have the cure—al for the troubles of the workers. It is an important part of “THE SOCIALIST’S” job to expose these cure—are; to point out their limitations, to show that, at best, they may serve to palliate— but never cure.

“THE SOCIALIST” will not only serve as a medium for the message of Socialism by the application of the scientific principles upon which the case for Socialism is based, to the various problems and questions facing the working class, but will also be a forum where those who disagree with us will be able to state their case. Just as our public platform is always open to serious opponents, so too, do we invite these opponents to state their objections in the correspondence columns of “THE SOCIALIST.” Likewise, to those of our class who, whilst not opponents, are yet doubtful, we extend the same invitation. It is only by the mutual exchange of facts that clarity can be achieved. On the other hand, to those members of the working class who read “THE SOCIALIST” and agree with the position of the Workers Socialist Party, we invite them to join our ranks, so that:

“... a speedy termination may be wroth to the systems which deprives them of the fruits of their labor, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.”

How You Can Help Us—And Yourself, Too

Mere agreement with the contents of “The Socialist” is not enough. More than this is needed. Not only do we need your active sympathy as a member, we need also the sinews with which our paper can carry on. Even if you cannot see your way clear to joining our ranks, there are other ways in which you can do your “mite” for Socialism. You can help us put “The Socialist” into the hands of the working class, by either assisting in the sale of it; or, by sending the addresses of interested workers (we will do the rest) and by putting us in touch with news-agents and bookstores willing to place “The Socialist” on sale. Equally important as the above will be your assistance in helping us finance the publication. Your donations, small or they may be, will be welcome. Help us build up our Publication Fund.

PARTY ACTIVITIES

Local New York
Regular Business Meetings—1st & 3rd Thursdays of Each Month.

Local Boston
Sunday—Open-Air Meetings, Boston Common. Every Sunday from 3 P. M. to 6 P. M.—Forum at Local Headquarters, 12 Hayward Place, every Sunday at 8 P. M.
Monday—Open-Air Meetings. Talbot & Blue Hill Avenues, Dorchester. Every Monday from 8 P.M. to 11 P.M.
Tuesday—Marxian Study Class. “The Communist Manifesto.” 1163 Blue Hill Avenue, Dorchester. Every Tuesday at 8 P.M.
Thursday—Class. Text-book used, “The Theoretical System of Karl Marx” by Louis Bondin. Every Thursday at 8 P.M.
Saturday—On June 19 and August 21, Museum of Fine Arts Tours. “History of Social Customs.” Meet at main entrance at 1:30 P.M.

Local Los Angeles
Information regarding activities can be obtained from the Local Secretary.

All the above activities are free and all those who wish to attend are always welcome.
FROM THE PRESS

Bayonets, Brass Buttons and Butter

We are continually being reminded that our modern world is one in which the "quest for beauty" rapidly gives way to "the belly urge"; where men no longer seek the finer things of life, and where "duty" shirts before the universal cry of "How much?" We are reminded too, that our modern slaves are ceasing to "love their work"—that is if they have any. These, indeed, be troublesome times, especially so when we find such ideas seeping into those places where they should not. For instance, the armed forces—those bulwarks of Law and Order—are having their troubles. Soliciting as a career is losing its allure for the common man. Military life is not what it is cracked up to be—and there goes its appeal to youth. Somebody has been carrying on a "whispering campaign" that Napoleon was all wet, and that the knapsack no longer carries a marshall's baton, but rather the Regulation load. Can this be exaggeration, or is it really so?

In recent months considerable publicity has been given to the fact that the ruling class in Great Britain is having some difficulty in alluring men and boys into its army. It seems upon the surface, that the years of patriotic teaching crammed into these workers has been wasted. "God, King, and Country," "England, Home and Beauty," somehow have lost their appeal. Our masters, therefore, are compelled to do something about this. After considerable investigation they have discovered what they already know—that army life "ain't what it's cracked up to be."—and some of the reasons why. The boys do not seem to be sold on the idea so easily now. But more than this—and here we hang our heads in shame—there are definite material and economic reasons.

For one thing, military glory has a slight tarnish. The sword has been sheathed to give a free hand to the scrubbing brush. Thus we read in the New York Times, of March 17, 1937, that:

"War Minister Alfred Duff Cooper aroused laughter and cheers in the House of Commons . . . when he gave further details of his scheme for attracting army recruits — 'kidding kids into the army,' as some say. He told how domestic help would be employed at a cost of $40,000 to relieve Tommies of the irksome task of scrubbing out canteens.'"

Maybe we are out of order in asking "What about the irksomeness of life for the domestics?" No doubt some other minister will apply his superior wisdom to this problem.

Having removed the drabness out of our Tommy's life something must now be given him as compensation. "The Devil," we are told, "finds works for idle hands." But War Minister Duff Cooper has taken care of this too, for Tommy Atkins can now eat himself to death. Instead of having a mere three square meals a day—something his fellow workers outside are less certain of—he is to have four. To top off this lavishness on his masters part—one ounce of REAL BUTTER for each man is to be served on the messroom tables, instead of the one ounce of margarine formerly served, and one-half ounce of margarine "into the bargain." What a bargain!!! Yes, what a bargain. For a little more pay, an extra ounce of butter, and relief from the irksome task of scrubbing floors, and a few other incidentals, men and boys must give their lives for things opposed to their own interests. They must do their masters' dirty work. The irksomeness of floor scrubbing will no doubt be compensated by the romance and glamor of life in the trenches at some time in the near future. The boys are to be elevated from the mental tasks of women to the more heroic task of learning new tricks in the legalized murder of war.

Thus does an Empire rest upon such small things as a scrubbing brush and a little butter. —S.F.

The Bonds of Ownership

An Associated Press dispatch of April 2, 1937, which appeared in the New York Sun quotes Jan Bata of Czechoslovakia, owner of one of the largest shoe factories in the world, as saying that as the result of observations made in a tour of the United States:

"... the American worker is independent but the American industrialist is a slave."

This statement calls forth an alarming picture. We visualize at once the capitalist tied down to his golf clubs, his social functions, his world cruises and his vacations in Palm Beach or Southampton. Whose heart could be so hard as not to melt with pity at the sight of large numbers of capitalists driven into silk knee-breeches to attend the Coronation ceremonies in London? Weep for a system of society that compels men to hire secretaries to clip coupons for them. Fie on a world that forces on a man an existence in which he eats the best of food, wears the best of clothes and enjoys all the good things of life.

This is not the worst, however. Side by side with this slave class lives the class of independent workers free of all these things that enunciate the capitalist slaves. Happy the existence in which men are free to wear themselves out tramping around looking for a job or working at one. Who so base and down-trodden as not to yearn for a life in which worrying how to make ends meet does not play a large part? Who would not strive for an old age of independence, living on a pension insufficient to provide the necessities of life or in some fine poor-house?

When these two modes of living of the two classes are compared we might confidently expect a rush of capitalists to form an organization to emancipate them from their present bondage. Perhaps that is why the Liberty League was formed.
Socialists, however, do not take such nonsense at its face value. They know as well as Mr. Bata that “slaves” do not take tours of the United States while “independent” men stay home to work in their factories. When the workers understand these facts they can soon put an end to the difference in the ways of living of the two classes. They can end the existence of the capitalist “slave class” that lives in luxury and idleness and the “independent” working class, which lives in poverty and economic insecurity. —R. S. S.

**Capitalism - Fugitive From Justice**

Capitalist “justice” once again triumphed when the three justices of the Court of Special Sessions in Brooklyn, New York, unanimously declared the seventeen strikers at the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital guilty on four counts, one of which was “endangering property and life.” But as in all capitalist law courts, the real defendant was absent. The real criminal—capitalism—was not prosecuted. Nobody produced evidence in the course of the trial to show that it was the conditions of employment in the Brooklyn Hospital—the long hours and low pay that caused the sixteen employees and their union president to go out on strike. No, for that would be against the interests of justice—capitalist justice.

But the members of the working class have a court of their own which is held every four years—the polls. There, we of the Workers Socialist Party render a verdict of guilty by voting to abolish capitalism and establish Socialism, a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community. Study our indictment of capitalism contained in our Declaration of Principles and join our jury of Socialists.

---

**Is There Need for a Labor Party?**

(Continued from Page 5)

what were they able to accomplish for their working class supporters? The answer is, nothing. Ever anxious the Labor Party’s most important concern is public office. To expect them to put forward ideas that are not in conformity with the desires of the electorate (and these are non-Socialist desires) is to expect miracles. Being “practical” politicians they conform and therefore aid in maintaining this ideology. Yet they would have us believe that they are the vanguard of the working class, when in reality they follow the workers in their non-Socialist activities.

This form of activity may be good tactics on the part of politicians who are unable to find or make a place for themselves in the existing parties. They have by these methods succeeded in getting themselves well-paid jobs. But what are the results of this activity on the working class?

After 30 years of the British Labor Party’s activity, the following is the answer:

Moreover, the 1935 election was a curious and menacing experience. Through the campaign one had the most uncomfortable feeling that the people no longer believed in politics. There was no great enthusiasm for the government, but there was no enthusiasm for the labor alternative either. Even in the erstwhile labor strongholds there was none of the feeling and confidence of 1929. There was a strong haunting feeling of disillusionment and the feeling of ‘we may as well vote, but does it really matter very much anyhow.’ That is very significant. It resembles what happened in Italy and Germany on the eve of Fascism.” (Plebs Magazine, December 1936, p.284).

Yet in spite of the experiences of the working class in Great Britain as well as elsewhere, the American workers are being propagandaized by politicians who claim advantages will accrue to them by giving their support to a Labor Party. And one which besides having all the weaknesses of its British counterpart, starts off by giving its support to avowed representatives of capitalism. Yet we have seen considerable legislation of a similar nature to that advocated by the American Labor Party in operation in other capitalist countries and it has left the workers of those countries in the same position as before. That the conditions and position of the workers has been unchanged there can be no question. Even a cursory examination proves this. But what is not so clear to most workers is the non-Socialist and anti-working class character of these various Labor Parties.

We of the Workers Socialist Party must oppose all such parties like the American Labor Party, that are willing to join the coalition of capital. Such parties may be practical for the political job seekers, but of no use whatsoever to those who seek emancipations from the system which keeps them in subjection.

—E. B.

---

**The Futility of Reform**

(Continued from Page 4)

came paramount in the political life of America. The problems of the working class had in a sense become the problems of its masters. To ignore the workers and their problems meant to encourage the movement of the workers away from the old capitalist parties and perhaps in time, the loss of political power. It is vital to the capitalist class that they control this power as the primary function of the government or state machinery, national, state and municipal, is the protection of property privilege and the continuation of capitalism.

The present social system cannot be perpetuated when the sufferings it causes to the majority in the community produces in their minds a desire for social change. This is a compelling reason (we will temporarily ignore the others) why the capitalist class must give reforms or suffer the consequences of its blindness. But the capitalist class and its representatives are not entirely blind to the condition of the working class. They see in the ever-increasing number of hungry, destitute wage slaves, an ever growing threat to their supremacy and their social system. The factual basis of this statement may be judged from the following:
Mr. Edward F. Hutton, business man and broker, put business methods to work in raising funds for the gigantic Radio Show to be staged at Madison Square Garden tomorrow night for the benefit of the Salvation Army, and today revealed that a few hours spent on the telephone netted $45,000 from 65 wealthy persons who bid $1,000 each for a box at the show.

Mr. Hutton, originally named as honorary chairman of the committee in charge of the charity entertainment, returned from a Florida vacation two weeks ago to discover contributions were lagging. He promptly got on the telephone.

"To aid this fund is good sound business, not charity," he said. "What would you do if you were starving? Multiply that one case by 1,000,000. What then? In my opinion, the Salvation Army is the most effective of all welfare organizations. It is standing between you and these starving families. There is a potential danger in the masses of uncared for and hungry men and women." (N. Y. World-Telegram, 5-25-31).

The following statement even more directly supports the above contention:

"If unemployment insurance and old-age pensions were to cost ten or fifty times what their opponents charge they will cost, even then they would be a cheap investment for the manufacturers and taxpayers of the State, because it is only through them and many similar measures that the continuation of our present social and economic order can be maintained." (Editorial from the Bridgeport Herald, 3-26-31).

Even William E. Borah, the Republican Senator from Idaho, who can by no stretch of the imagination be called a "radical," sees the importance of reforms to capitalism. In an address before the National Press Club, a couple of years ago, he stated among other things:

"...he believed charity is all that prevents the unemployed and hungry from turning against the government and wrecking the present economic system."

Under the compulsion of such ideas do we find the avowedly capitalist political parties trimming their political sails with various reforms. In order to catch working class votes and with them, political power, the Republican and Democratic parties present a long list of reforms on their election programs.

In spite of the economic rivalries which exist among groups of capitalists and which manifest themselves in the various capitalist parties; in spite of the fact that these parties contain individual capitalists or groups of capitalists whose ignorance of the society in which they live gives them conservative and reactionary ideas, the capitalist class in general is familiar with its class interests. It, too, feels the effect of the social forces at work in society.

(To be continued)

The Socialist Party of Great Britain publishes the following pamphlets. They should be read by all workers.

Socialism
A clear explanation of the subject in simple language. 48 Pages .......................... 10 Cents

Questions of The Day
Fascism, Russia, War, Trade Unions, Social Reforms and other subjects examined from a Socialist viewpoint. 80 Pages .......................... 10 Cents

The Workers Socialist Party
Its Object and Declaration of Principles
OBJECT: The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles
The Workers Socialist Party holds:

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railroads, etc.) by the capitalist or master class; and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labor alone all wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organize consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation for the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE WORKERS SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labor or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the workers of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought upon the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labor, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those who agree with the above principles and who desire membership in the Party, should apply to the Secretary of the nearest Local.

Party Directory
National Office and Local New York, 5 Sylvan Place, New York, N. Y.
Boston Local, E. Rahinson, See'y, 12 Hayward Place, (off 190 Washington Street) Boston, Mass.
Los Angeles Local, H. Dyer, See'y, 300 W. Covina Blvd, Baldwin Park, Calif.

Indispensable!
THE SOCIALIST STANDARD
Published Monthly by
The Socialist Party of Great Britain
Obtainable at 5 cents a copy from all our Locals