

SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC HERALD

VOL. II. No. 44

CHICAGO, ILL., U. S. A., SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 1900.

Whole No. 94.

THE ISSUES OF UNITY

Eugene V. Debs Clearly States His Position. Exhaustive Enunciation of His Views

OPINIONS OF MEMBERS AND OTHERS

Comrades:—A crisis is upon us. The very life of our party is threatened. Shall it emerge from the ordeal in glory or perish in ignominy? If we be men, fit and worthy to have custody of a party to which the working class are turning with a last hope, the issue is not in doubt for a single instant.

Shall the S. D. P. and the S. L. P. unite upon the basis agreed to and recommended by the majority of the New York conference?

I have read the report of the conference, the manifesto of the executive board of the S. D. P., the replies thereto by Comrades Harriman, Hillquit, Hayes and Benham, the current issues of the press of both parties, as also a vast number of personal communications relative to the unity proceedings, and after a careful survey of the entire situation and the matured deliberation of which I am capable, I have arrived at a conclusion, and I now propose to meet the responsibilities that rest upon me in my triple capacity as member, official and candidate, by declaring my position in clear and unequivocal terms and facing without fear all its consequences, be they what they may.

As I write I see the blanched faces, the appealing eyes of the working class, to whom alone, and my own conscience, I am finally accountable for my acts. Rather than betray them and turn their hope into despair, I would destroy myself, and if in what I now have to say I write a word not dictated by my conscience and approved by my best judgment, I hope the hand that pens it may be palsied at its task.

Dismissing all personal prejudice and all partisan predilection and viewing the matter solely from the standpoint of a socialist to whom the cause is dearer far than his own life, I take my stand against union of the parties on the basis proposed by the New York conference, and until our party has been rescued from the maelstrom which threatens to engulf it, against union on any terms. I say this with the fullest realization of what it means to break with comrades loved and true, yet sustained by the conviction that duty demands it, that time will triumphantly vindicate the action and that the odium of to-day will be the honor of the future.

Let I be misunderstood let me write it in plain words. I am opposed to union because I favor unity. In the present strained situation there can be unity without union, but there can be none with it; and as certain as it is effected, if such should be the verdict of the ballot, the Social Democratic party will be disrupted and there will be no unity in the united party.

In arriving at my conclusions I have been guided largely by my intuitions, but I shall try to make the reasons which actuated me as clear as I can to my comrades of both parties.

It will be remembered that a short time previous to the convention I wrote an article for the Herald saying that in my opinion the time for union had not yet arrived, which article provoked considerable criticism. For months I had been doing all I consistently could to harmonize the two parties and to pave the way to unification. There were many obstacles in the way. For years the official organ of the S. L. P. had drilled it into their members that the S. D. P. consisted of a lot of freaks, frauds and fakirs without a redeeming feature. They were fairly saturated with the virus of hate and contempt. Hundreds of them, members of the anti-De Leon party, and I speak advisedly, still rankle with that feeling which, to even the superficial observer, is but illy concealed. It is this sort of training in the school of intolerance, fanaticism and hate which have given the party a spirit irreconcilably in conflict with that of the Social Democratic party which by its high-minded toleration has appealed so successfully to the American people in behalf of socialism that its complete supremacy as the socialist party was only a question of months, while at every step of its progress its members were derided as "half-baked socialists" by the very men who now, we are assured, insist upon union. The spirit is still there, whatever may be said to the contrary, and it is this that, in my opinion, prevented the S. L. P. representatives from even temporarily accepting our name, even though they had to change their own, even though some of them assured us it would be done and even though our identity be totally obliterated on the eve of a national campaign.

It is this spirit with which I have to deal and it is this that largely forms the basis of my opposition to union.

I shall not attempt to follow the unity proceedings through their tortuous windings. I care nothing about quibbles and hair-splitting technicalities. There are those who are schooled in artifice, in word jugglery, in the legerdemain of smooth and cunning phrase which can be made to mean anything or nothing, and they are proud of it. I am not an adept in such practice and have no desire to be.

When the representatives of the S. L. P. appeared at our convention and assured us that they wanted unity I unqualifiedly accepted their word and persuaded myself that my misgivings had been exaggerated; nor shall I now charge them with violating their pledges, although it seems clear to me in the light of subsequent proceedings that in their zeal to effect union they exceeded the scope of their authority and went counter to the wishes of their party.

Comrade Harriman will doubtless recall the conversation he and I had as we together walked to the convention hall to attend the closing session at which I accepted the nomination. Without any reservation whatever he assured me that the name Social Democratic party was entirely acceptable to him and that he was confident that his party felt as he did, and that there would be no opposition upon that point. He also added that on the eve of a campaign was no time to make a change, and that whatever change might seem desirable could be made after the national election by the united party.

Now I admit that the name in itself amounts to little and should not stand in the way of union one instant, but it is what the name stands for, the spirit, the morale, the party identity, that amounts to everything and (let us not be deceived) it is this that inspired the labored arguments in opposition to the name, so that while the name itself is of no consequence it covers the central, controlling issue between the two parties and in rejecting it, the S. L. P. representatives, inadvertently perhaps, struck the proposed union a fatal blow, and as I now view it, fortunately so for the cause of socialism.

To what extent did this conflict of party spirit actually dominate the conference?

Referring to the name, the attitude of the S. L. P. amounted to this: "We are going to change our name, but will not have yours." In the matter of headquarters each party said in effect: "I can't have it and therefore you shan't," and made a selection ridiculously unsuitable for a national party.

Without going further it is perfectly obvious that in all of this the S. L. P. shrewdly yielded little or nothing, while our party surrendered practically everything, and the adoption of the majority report would simply mean the swallowing up of the Social Democratic party and its domination by an element composed largely of men who had despised and ridiculed it and who would to-day scorn the suggestion of union did they not see the handwriting on the wall; and this perfectly plain and evident fact many of our own comrades who are clamoring for unconditional union seem utterly unable to see.

If unity was possible when the conference met, it was no longer possible when it closed. It is admitted that they had a complicated situation to deal with and if they did the best they could they were simply unequal to the task, and so far as failure is chargeable to the conference I have no more fault to find with the S. L. P. representatives than with our own. From first to last there was sparring for party advantage instead of an honest, controlling desire for unification, and this in itself, conspicuous in every important feature of the negotiations, proves beyond cavil the conflict of party spirit.

Some of our own comrades will deny this, for while they are members of the S. D. P. they have the spirit of the S. L. P., just as there are members of the latter who are in accord with the spirit of our party.

The National Executive Board has been severely censured for issuing its manifesto in advance of the majority report. My name is not attached to it, but I am equally responsible with my four associates for what it contains. If it is "criminal" and "malicious," as charged, I claim my full share of the odium, not

from any sense of self-sacrifice, but because I endorse, if not the specific grounds, the action, and am prepared to answer for my share of it.

The purport of the report had gone out. It had struck the party with the effect of a lightning stroke and revolt threatened instantaneously. Prompt action was required in the emergency and the board took it and will stand by it until time vindicates their fealty and turns denunciation into praise. Had they not acted as they did the party would ere this be deserted of hundreds of loyal comrades, the very ones who worked and sacrificed, and put up the money, too, to make the national party what it is to-day. I am not now discussing the justice of revolt. They do occur and unless the executive board had taken prompt action the S. D. P. would have been disrupted, and even though part of it had united with the S. L. P. we would no more have a united Socialist party than we had before.

I have said that the spirit of the two parties, as a whole, is totally dissimilar and it is this fact rather than the incidents to it, that is responsible for the failure of the union. The S. L. P. was trained in the bitter school of bigotry and intolerance. It must preserve an air frigidly scientific. Emotion and sentiment must be banished. Hard and stern are the party methods and it must be confined strictly to the working class. Tolerance is a crime. Members must suspicion each other and rows must occur at such intervals as to prevent the party from getting beyond the bounds of a mere faction. It has taken years to cultivate and intensify this spirit that has dwarfed socialism in America, and it cannot be overcome in a day nor by resolutions passed in a conference.

Diametrically opposite to this is the spirit of the S. D. P. It has from the beginning been tolerant and hospitable. It pursued the even tenor of its way through showers of abuse. Its dignified policy, its spirit of toleration appealed to the people, while its comrades loved and trusted each other and worked with inexpressible zeal for its success.

I cheerfully admit that in some places the spirit of the parties has so modified as to make union entirely feasible. But this is not true of the parties at large. Take Chicago, for example. We are told the S. L. P. have 600 comrades there. Not one of them all told have ever been at our headquarters, even since the unity negotiations have been in progress. At heart they have no use for our comrades and hold them in contempt, and it should also be said that our comrades have no use for them. This is the fact, and there is no use trying to conceal it. Taken as a whole, they will not work together, and all the resolutions that can be passed will not unite them in their present spirit toward each other. To put them into one party at this time means simply disruption and disaster. Better far to keep them in separate parties until the logic of events has ripened them for union.

In discussing the spirit of the S. L. P. I am struck by the exhibition of it which appears in Comrade Benham's letter, which I wish every one of our comrades to read with care, especially the paragraphs in which he charges our executive board, in innuendo so direct that specific averment could add nothing to its force, with being in the pay of capitalism. I confess to being greatly surprised in the source in which that spirit had found expression. Comrade Benham's letter must furnish its own comment so far as I am concerned. After reading what he has to say, and the manner in which he says it, I am satisfied that he and I are not ready to belong to the same socialist party.

It seems hardly possible that this is the same comrade who in the convention made the touching plea to me to accept the nomination for president, inviting me to his California home to have my health and vigor restored by the balmy breezes of the tropics; and yet was it not that same evening at the "peace conference" that he took the ground that if I were given the nomination he would insist upon our party giving up its name? Just why my nomination should be at the expense of my party's name I will leave others to explain.

It has been charged that Victor Berger knew that I would accept the nomination before he went into the "peace conference." This is not true. Up to the time the convention adjourned I had steadfastly refused the nomination. I left the hall with my brother alone, and after a long struggle with myself concluded to accept the nomination. I did not know a conference was held and did not see Berger until after it adjourned. He could not have known that I would accept the nomination for I had not at that time communicated the fact to any one.

For the reasons herein imperfectly stated I am opposed to union at this time, and I shall vote against it and also against the report of the majority and use my best efforts to defeat both.

I propose to stand by the Social Democratic party until conditions favor a united party; and my judgment is that this consummation will not be deferred long after the national election. In the meantime I stand ready to work in harmony with the S. L. P., and so far as I am concerned, we shall go into the national campaign with a united front.

I shall not resign the nomination at this time unless the party desires it. I did not want the nomination at the convention, but I shall not desert when the party needs me. Nor can I be neutral, as some of my best loved comrades insist, without feeling myself guilty of cowardice. The effect upon myself personally is of no consequence, and I am not concerned upon that point. It has been intimated that the reason I did not want the nomination this year was because I wished to nurse my chances till the party became strong enough to elect. All I have to say is that the presidency and all other offices are alike to me and I do not think there is a man living who has a stronger aversion than I to public office; and that I am a candidate at all is simply because of an overwhelming sense of party duty.

And now I respectfully propose the following line of action: First, let us decide against union at this time and reject the majority report.

Second, elect a national executive board of nine members by referendum vote. Upon this board women should be represented by their own sex.

Third, elect a national secretary and treasurer and editor of the official organ.

Fourth, elect a national campaign committee.

This program can be carried out in short order and then we will be ready to co-operate with the S. L. P. in moving on the enemy with a united front. If they are willing to unite on candidates, that can be readily arranged, and if not we will go into the campaign with our own. We will lose no time in attacking the common enemy. Wherever it is possible let the two parties unite on candidates and otherwise co-operate, and where this cannot be done there need at least be no friction. Separately organized, the parties can move forward on parallel lines and accomplish the substantial objects of unity; while these must certainly be defeated by an enforced union of elements that are fundamentally dissimilar and inharmonious.

Such co-operation as is herein indicated would be in the nature of a preparatory stage for final union and would inevitably lead to such a result.

And now a closing word to our comrades. How far you may agree or disagree with me I do not know. I have given you as accurately as I could a transcript of my head and heart. I have written without malice toward any one and with the cause of socialism the guiding influence in reaching my decisions. You are to decide this important question and I have no wish to control your action. Having faith in your judgment and your loyalty I have no fear of the verdict you will render.

I hope that each of you will carefully read all the testimony presented by both sides before you cast your vote. Read the N. Y. People, the Cleveland Citizen, and other S. L. P. papers as well as the Social Democratic Herald, and then vote as your conscience may dictate, and the party we love and which has been such a shining success will emerge from the fire unscathed, and tempered by the heat and passion of conflict will be better than ever fitted to enter upon the glorious future that awaits it.

Yours fraternally,
Eugene V. Debs.
Terre Haute, Ind., April 16, 1900.

Benham's Venom
Editor The Herald: Your paper of April 7 contains a "manifesto" in which four of the S. D. P. national executive committee arraign all the S. L. P. delegates (from the Rochester convention to the Indianapolis convention) as men who in the conference committee broke pledges made in Indianapolis. The manifesto also distinctly avows that the S. D. P. delegates to the conference were false to the interests of the S. D. P.

The manifesto is biased, illogical and untrue; it bears evidence in almost every line that all information that was furnished as its base came not from the majority of the S. D. P. committee, or from any one who wished to make known facts, but from a minority, who went to the conference with cut-and-dried plans (perhaps instructions) to practically absorb the S. L. P. or to do what has been attempted by this manifesto—to tear down the reputation of all who were foremost or active in the movement for unity. As I have been included (paragraph 4) in the list of those who broke their pledges I send this to you for publication. It will probably be published in an obscure part of the paper. Almost the entire front page was used by your committee in an

attempt to blacken the character of all concerned in the conference. It is evident that the four signers had rather place any obstacle in the way of the Socialist movement than to see local power and interests made smaller, as the Socialist movement grew larger by the unification of the political organizations.

Many weeks ago I pointed out in the Class Struggle that the opposition to unity would come only from these individuals holding high or salaried positions. The unexpected has not occurred. But that the method should be that of De Leon—ruthless and reckless character assassination—no one could well expect from those who profess the high principles of Socialism. Yet such is the case.

I shall not attempt (nor could I in twice the space occupied by the manifesto) to call attention to all the errors and untruths in the manifesto. It is one huge, black daub, hurled with but one intent, to besmirch the reputation of those who have served the Socialist cause honorably, faithfully and to the best of their ability. A great majority of the conference committee were for many years working and struggling to advance the Socialist movement when the signers of your manifesto were advertising the reactionary doctrines of the middle class reformers.

I shall here only partially refer to the absolute falsehoods of the manifesto. The accusation by intimation and attacks by innuendo; the blunders and contradictions cannot at all be attended to here.

The falsehoods in part are:
No. 1. That The Herald was open to discussion regarding unity. It was not "open." It was closed to many that I know of.

No. 2. That Benham broke any pledge.

No. 3. That Benham ever agreed to "aggressively" support the name S. D. P. I was known to be opposed to the name S. D. P., but said I would withdraw opposition if Harriman and Hayes were nominated. They were not nominated. I opposed the name in the conference but broke no pledge in so doing.

No. 4. That the Indianapolis convention was essentially a mass convention. It was nothing of the kind. It was a convention in which one-fourth of the delegates had a majority of the voting power in their pockets. Though dozens of questions were decided, the delegates voted but twice by recording the votes of the signers of their credentials.

No. 5. That Harriman has ever agreed to support the name S. D. P. without reservation, is untrue. When Harriman and Hillquit (with so much mystery) were charged by Heath in the conference committee, the matter was shown to be so absurd that no one except Heath showed any signs of believing a word of it, and Heath put in his time explaining how he had been misled to the belief, etc. Stedman and Margaret Haile afterwards insisted on Hillquit being a candidate for provisional committee, and both said he was the best man New York could furnish, all S. D. P. delegates concurring, except Heath, who sulked.

No. 6. That Benham ever used the word "acceptable" in connection with the words Social Democratic. No such word as acceptable was ever used, intimated or implied. I only bore with the name on the ground that the nomination of Harriman and Hayes would make its application to the united party possible.

No. 7. That Harriman and Hillquit ever obligated themselves in any manner to support the name S. D. P. in the conference, except with the proviso that such course was necessary to enable Berger to "use his influence for two hours." Berger did not even see Debs before the latter's acceptance was made public; therefore, there could not possibly be any continuance of a contingent pledge, as the contingency was absent.

No. 8. That Max Hayes ever by word or act in New York or elsewhere, either attacked or declined to support the name S. D. P.

No. 9. That the name was discussed for one whole day. It was discussed exactly four hours—from 2 to 6 p. m., Sunday, March 25.

No. 10. That the committee on conference voted for or proposed to submit two names until the S. D. P. delegation, through Chase, made the proposition on Monday morning.

No. 11. Stedman did not state at the conference that Harriman had no conditions upon his statement regarding name. Stedman said "he did not remember anything of that kind in that conversation on the street."

No. 12. It is false that the Indianapolis convention did (or could) "instruct" the joint committee. It might instruct the S. D. P. delegates; but not the joint committee.

No. 13. That the S. L. P. has studiously avoided giving information re-

(Continued on Fourth page)

Social Democratic Herald

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY BY THE
SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF AMERICA

Executive Board
JESSE COX, Chairman
REYMOUR STEDMAN, Secretary
EUGENE V. DEBS, **VICTOR L. BERGER**
FREDERIC HEATH

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—One year, 50 cents. Six months, 25 cents. No papers sent to any one on credit. If, without having subscribed, you receive it, then it has been subscribed for by a friend and no bill will follow. Foreign subscriptions \$1.00.

Entered at Chicago postoffice as second class matter.

A. S. EDWARDS, Editor
THEODORE DEBS, National Sec'y-Treas.
126 Washington St., Chicago.

94 is the number of this paper. If the number on your wrapper is 95 your subscription expires with the next week's paper. Please renew promptly.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APR. 21, 1900.

NOTICE

We wish the membership at large to understand that no communications addressed to The Herald on the subject before them will be suppressed, but that all the paper will hold up to the issue for May 5 will be published. Then, having passed over this bit of rough road, and the vote announced May 12, The Herald will return to its propaganda for Socialism and the Social Democratic party.

THE SITUATION CLEARED UP

It is now admitted by the S. L. P. delegates that if the ticket nominated had been Harriman and Hayes they would have supported the name Social Democrat. They say distinctly (see Harriman and Hillquit letter) it is true that they pledged themselves to the name if Harriman and Hayes should be nominated. So far the statements made by Gordon and Edwards are admittedly true. "But," say the authors of the joint letter, "Harriman and Hayes were not nominated," and since the Social Democratic convention chose to nominate as the head of the ticket Eugene V. Debs instead of Job Harriman, they now set up the paltry defense that they were absolved from the pledges given just as emphatically for the Debs-Harriman ticket. No genius is required to see clear through so thinly veiled an excuse. Benham says that he "only bore with the name on the ground that the nomination of Harriman and Hayes (which would have pleased him beyond measure) would make its application (acceptance) possible." There never was the slightest doubt as to where Benham stood on the question of name so long as the candidates talked of were Harriman and Hayes. They all agree that if Harriman and Hayes had been nominated they would have been satisfied and the name would have stood. In this they all agree that Edward and Gordon have stated the truth.

But the convention nominated Debs and Harriman and they are not satisfied, although the pledges of Hillquit and Harriman, in spite of their quibbling about Berger's position and what Berger said or did not say, were as clearly understood and as positive on the Debs-Harriman proposition as on the other. With Debs at the head of the ticket they deliberately chose to throw their pledges to the wind. Then by making the claim that there were other "conditions," they seek to prejudice the minds of Social Democrats against the executive board and those who are admitted to have told the truth in one particular and, as a matter of fact, have told it in all. Harriman and Hillquit say "it is not true" that they promised to support the name Social Democratic in the event that the ticket nominated would be Debs and Harriman; further along, after injecting the quibble about Berger, they say that in answer to Berger's question: "Will you permit me to say to him (Debs) that your position on the question of name would not be changed [changed from what?] if he accepted the nomination?" that this was what actually occurred; "To that question Benham answered in the negative and Harriman and Hillquit in the affirmative."

What does this mean except that Edwards' and Gordon's statements are confirmed as a whole and every attempt to discredit them only shows that the S. L. P. delegates and all in sympathy with them are trying to fortify themselves behind the paltry quibble that "when the pledges were given Debs had accepted without having been influenced by Berger." Therefore they were released and would jeopardize the whole question of union by declaring the conference, which at the time they regarded as important (especially as at first it promised to result in the nomination of Harriman and Hayes) as having "no significance."

Comrades, what a significance would now attach to that conference, in the estimation of the S. L. P. delegates, had the Social Democratic convention nominated both of their men!

It is contended that the conference of ten had no power or authority to arrange a program; that they could not legally pass upon questions which belonged solely to the convention. The

contention is unchallenged. Nobody argues that they could. But any ten men had the moral right in behalf of unity to consult together. This was done in other matters and the motives or character of the comrades who took part have not been assailed. It is not doubted that they were actuated purely by a desire to serve the cause. But as to those of the seven who have told the truth about the "peace conference" (while others who were present and know the truth has been told, either remain silent or put a false construction upon it), they are actuated solely by a desire to "rule or ruin."

Now, comrades, take another view of the affair. When Comrade Debs had declined the nomination and delegates left the hall, most of them did so thinking that Harriman and Hayes would be nominated next day. Of that there is no doubt. Suppose the "peace conference" had met, talked over the situation, agreed among themselves that the best thing to do for union would be to nominate Harriman and Hayes, and pledged themselves to that. Suppose then that some of their number had gone to the convention next day and opposed the nominations. Who would have questioned the moral right of those attending the conference to make such a compact in the interest of unity, and how many of the sixty-seven delegates would have failed to score the opposition for their "perfidy"? Imagine the indignation of Hillquit, Harriman, Hayes and Benham under such circumstances, especially if the opposition had succeeded!

Members of the Social Democratic party cannot be persuaded that the members of the executive board had any hidden motives in issuing the manifesto. They were actuated by one desire only; that was to conserve the interests of a movement for which they as individuals had done as much as any like number of members in the party, and a vast deal more than the "statesmen" who have conspired against them. To now charge them with being recreant to their trust is as paltry as it is untrue and dishonest. But it is quite in keeping with the methods that were adopted before the Indianapolis convention to discredit them, and it is in perfect accord with the methods of eselpeism. The latter is finely illustrated in the scurrilous screed by Benham printed in this paper. This ardent advocate of unity (if Harriman and Hayes were nominated) descends to delectable billingsgate and intimates that the manifesto was a service paid for in the interest of capitalism! Ordinarily such venom as Benham exudes would be excluded from this paper; but this is given as a fair, average sample of S. L. P. "argument."

Comrades of the Social Democratic Party: When the advocates of "union at any cost and under any condition" (!) urge that your executive board had no right to issue the "manifesto," there are four important points to be remembered:

First—That there was no other way in which the truth could have come into your possession; you never would have had it from S. L. P. sources for reasons that must be obvious to all.

Second—If you had been allowed to act upon the majority report in ignorance of the gross violation of pledges, no man will have the temerity to suggest that your executive board would not properly have been open to censure for permitting the consummation of union under circumstances which, at the very outset, were prohibitive of union.

Third—The compact made at Indianapolis having been violated, it is your clear and undoubted right to pass judgment upon that violation; for you, as members of the Social Democratic party, this question now takes precedence over all others. Do not be deceived by specious explanations. The facts are before you.

Fourth—The question for members of the organization to decide is not as to the merits or demerits of the executive board, but whether in the face of all the facts union is desirable. Under the constitution adopted at Indianapolis you will soon choose a new board of nine, and the present board is ready to relinquish its duties as soon as your decision is known.

Vote on the proposition of your executive board and against the majority report. Vote for the spirit and methods of the Social Democratic party and its preservation.

JESSE COX RESIGNS

To the National Board of the Social Democratic Party: Herewith I transmit my resignation as a member of your honorable board, and beg its immediate acceptance.

In presenting this resignation, I desire to make a few remarks as to the present condition of the Social Democratic party, as well as my reasons for my resignation.

The Social Democratic party was organized at a time when the Socialist Labor party had been in existence for many years. It was believed by the men who organized the S. D. P. that a new Socialist party was needed to occupy a field not reached by the S. L. P., and that an entirely different policy from that of the S. L. P. was necessary to occupy this field and make a successful Socialist party.

The trades unions had been antagonized by the S. L. P., and were, therefore, bitterly hostile to that party. The policy of the S. L. P. was narrow and intolerant. Men who for many years had been in the Socialist movement, and whose character and conduct should have entitled them to the highest respect from the party, were without cause charged with crimes against the party, put on trial, and expelled from the party often for the merest and most innocent trifles. Indeed, the men who had the management of the party, having little knowledge of men, and no experience in the affairs of life, seemed to think that they could treat men as children, and punish them as such. To criticize the management of the party was treason, to be punished by immediate expulsion. The employer of labor, though poorer than the men he employed; the professional man, though perhaps living merely from hand to mouth; every one indeed, but the manual laborer, was looked upon with suspicion when attempting to join the party. To attach oneself to the party, was to submit one's person and reputation to the jurisdiction of men, who had got possession of a few catch words, which they called scientific Socialism, but who were, in fact, persons of the most contracted views, and particularly ignorant of almost everything pertaining to the successful management of a great organization. There were exceptions, of course; but these were few, and scarcely to be found among the managers of the party.

The propaganda of the S. L. P. was largely a matter of vituperation, misrepresentation, and scurrilous abuse of all who dared to exercise the slightest independence of thought or action. It was the endeavor of the party to rouse the hatred of the working class against the individuals of the possessing class, rather than against the physical conditions that produced class distinctions.

A movement like this was necessarily confined to narrow limits, and could never reach the proportions of a triumphant political party.

In saying this, I do not wish to be understood as attacking the sincerity of the motives even of the managers of the party. I speak in all kindness. It is by their acts alone that they must be judged.

In the organization of the Social Democratic party, it was endeavored to avoid these mistakes of the S. L. P. A friendly attitude was adopted towards the trades unions. The platform and policy of the party was such as to attract all classes suffering from the evils of capitalism. The propaganda was directed to excite hatred of these evils, rather than of individuals of the class which had profited by the malorganization of society, for which it was not responsible. But abuse of power by the possessing class was not spared. The propaganda of the party was reasonable, dignified and convincing, and the result was a most rapid growth of the party. Influential newspapers which had been without reason antagonized by the S. L. P. became staunch supporters of the new movement. Although the party has been in existence but a little over a year and a half, it has branches in almost every state, and is favorably known everywhere.

The party organ passed by without notice, the malicious and scurrilous attacks incessantly made upon the party and its prominent members by the S. L. P. The party refused to be drawn into any controversy with the S. L. P.

A party having such injudicious management as had the S. L. P. could not long exist without internal dissensions; and finally these dissensions caused a division of the party. Each faction accused the other in choicest billingsgate, of being responsible for the causes of the party mismanagement, which they all now admitted had taken place.

But in truth it was impossible to locate the responsibility for these causes, since while they were acting, scarcely any of either faction raised a protest against the management. The factions fought each other with fist and club, litigated in the courts, and separated.

There is no evidence that the men of either faction of the S. L. P. have changed their character, or their tactics. There is no reason to believe that the policy of either faction can ever permanently change. Men cannot change their nature by a resolution of a convention.

In a caucus of the delegates to the Indianapolis convention I frankly opposed any step towards any organic union with the S. L. P. I believed that any such union at that time would result in injury to the Socialist movement. The two parties occupied different fields, were composed mostly of men of different characters and temperaments, and, as I believed, could not at that time, or in the near future, act in harmony. I thought the two parties might vote for the same national candidates under proper arrangements, but maintaining their own separate organizations, which could be friendly to each other. I thought that the convention should appoint no committee to confer with the committee of nine appointed by the Rochester convention of the S. L. P., except such committee as should report back to the convention itself while in

session. I advocated these views in caucus, and privately to the delegates. I pointed out that, in my judgment, any committee we might appoint to meet the S. L. P. committee of nine under the terms imposed by the S. L. P. convention would inevitably get the worst of the bargain, as our men were no match for the men of the S. L. P. in capacity for intrigue and unscrupulous trickery. Our delegates expressed themselves in caucus, and privately, as tenacious of the name and organization of the Social Democratic party, on account both of the record of the party, and the international character of the name. But the S. L. P. delegates who attended the Indianapolis convention, and were admitted to the privileges of the floor, abused the courtesy thus accorded them, and by misleading speeches, false promises, and threats of withdrawal if their own terms were not conceded, won over the well-meaning but inexperienced and too confiding delegates in the convention, to submit not only the name, but the organization, national organ, and very existence of the party to the tender mercies of the joint committee of eighteen.

The result is, that if the report of this committee be adopted, the name, policy, organization and national organ of the S. D. P. will be extinguished; the Socialist Labor party will survive alone, and the same old policy and tactics, which for so many years dwarfed the Socialist movement, will again have sway, making it impossible for self-respecting people to remain affiliated with the organization, and confining the movement to a little sect, whose influence must always be insignificant.

If any one has any doubt about the statement that the men of the faction of the S. L. P. which met at Rochester have not changed their character, let him read the letters now pouring into headquarters from these very men. These letters are filled with malicious abuse and misrepresentation, and indicate that the same vicious spirit that so many years characterized the S. L. P. is still existent in them. Association with such men as these would be intolerable.

Many of the members of the S. D. P. are inexperienced in the movement, and do not know or appreciate the nature and consequences of such a step as the adoption of the report of the committee of eighteen. Let us hope, however, that our members will reject that report, and every part of it.

I have been for a long time anxious to be relieved of my duties and responsibilities as a member of the national executive board. My private business presses me, and I have reached an age when I can no longer stand the additional work, care and anxiety which are necessarily imposed upon a member of the board. Had I been present at the convention when I was re-elected I should have declined re-election. While I am ready to aid the Socialist movement by every means in my power, I think younger men than I should be selected for committee work. I have done such work now in Socialist and semi-Socialist movements for about twenty years, and think I have earned the right to a rest.

I will thank your board, therefore, to promptly accept my resignation, and fill the vacancy thereby created.

In closing, let me express my high appreciation of the very friendly and harmonious relations which have always existed among the members of the present national executive board. Its meetings have always been meetings of warm friends engaged in a common cause, and I shall always recollect them with pleasure.

Fraternally yours,
Jesse Cox.

Chicago, April 11, 1900.

Benham's Thousand and One Reasons

Comrades: After carefully reading the manifesto of the N. E. B. and the "answer" of Comrades Harriman and Hillquit in New York Volkszeitung of April 9, I am thoroughly convinced that (1) If Harriman and Hayes had been nominated by the Indianapolis convention, the name S. D. P. would be a nice-fitting name for the new party, and Mr. Benham would feel himself bound to present one thousand and one arguments in favor of the name. But as only Debs and Harriman were nominated, Mr. Benham felt himself bound to present one thousand and one arguments against it; (2) If the nominees of the S. L. P. would be accepted, Harriman, Hillquit and Hayes would work and vote for the name S. D. P.; "this not being thus" they are now conscientiously opposed to that name for the one thousand and one reasons given by Mr. Benham; and (3) If our heads would locate themselves under somebody else's heels, all would be well; as it is now, the name of the S. D. P. is under no circumstances good enough for them. Comrades! Do not forget that up to now we have never fought one another for a difference of opinion, free discussion being our safety valve. Let us not hurry to condemn any one, be it the weakness of our conference representatives or the wrath of our executive board; be it the unnecessary excitability of one comrade or the indignation of another. Read carefully and listen to both sides, especially to the answer of Harriman and Hillquit, and if you do not care

to stand on the slippery ground of "formal truth," "formal promises," "formal nonsense," you will see what happened when you pitted nine honest-minded men, desirous of a union of forces without any back-thought, against nine men who were determined, reason or no reason, not to accept the name S. D. P. Remember that the official organs of the "other nine" are ALL THE TIME AGAINST OUR NAME, although affecting "I-don't-care" airs. Are they ashamed of our name, may I ask in plain language? If yes, they are surely ashamed of it not for its sound, but for the ideas, tactics and men who are associated with it. If they are not, why all this nonsense? Comrades! Think twice before you condemn anybody, but think seven times before you change your fair name for another one, ridiculous in addition to its absurdity. Above all look out for the tactics of the old S. L. P., look out for De-Leonism. Long live the S. D. P.!

Paul J. Bauerberg.

New York.

All Due to "Self-Conceit"

Comrades: The national executive's manifesto is a disgraceful blunder. We must fight it vigorously. Prompt and decisive action is necessary in order to insure the unification of the Socialist forces of America. Let us be plain. This is no time to smooth things over. Let us look at the facts in their proper order.

1. Union is desirable, even were the charges of the N. E. B. true. The fact that four members of the S. L. P. committee broke their promises would not be a good reason for refusing to unite. If the presence of four bad men could drive me out of a Socialist party my resignation from the S. D. P. would date from the time of reading the manifesto of Berger, Heath, Cox and Stedman.

2. The so-called "peace conference" referred to in the affidavits was nothing but a private meeting of seven Social Democrats and three members of the S. L. P. committee. It was not authorized by, nor was any report made to, the convention. It was a secret affair to which only seven delegates out of sixty-seven were invited. It was not recognized by the convention as having any binding force. In fact, the instructions to the committee of nine "to urge the selection of the name Social Democratic party" were adopted, and the motion to instruct the committee to "stand" for the name was defeated Thursday afternoon, and this private caucus was not held until Thursday night. Therefore the proceedings of the caucus could not possibly have influenced the convention in giving the committee its instructions, (and I suppose the N. E. B. will admit that the committee was bound by the instructions of the convention rather than by the agreements of the private caucus). The only possible influence the caucus could have had might have been on the nomination of Comrade Harriman for vice-president. But does anyone doubt that he would have been nominated if the caucus had never been held? Either he would have been chosen by the convention Friday morning or a nominal candidate would have been named, to be withdrawn by the joint committee, which would have substituted Harriman.

For the N. E. B. to base its manifesto on the fact that there was a private caucus (which it apparently considers a higher body than a national convention), is to insult the membership at large. Comrades, you should repudiate the manifesto by voting unanimously for union.

3. The manifesto accuses the S. D. P. committee of nine with violating the instructions of the convention when it agreed to submit a proposition to a referendum vote (a referendum, mind you), as follows:

"In case the party name voted for by you fails to obtain the concurrent majority of both parties, shall the name receiving the majority of the total vote of both parties be adopted?"

With what magnificent zeal our national executive rushes to the front to prevent the horrible catastrophe of having the members of the party decide for themselves whether they will yield the name or not in case a majority of the total vote should be the other way. What are you kicking about, my lords? Do you not see that if the majority of the members of the Social Democratic party vote to abide by a decision of a majority of the united Socialists of America your little say is then overruled? Why are you afraid to abide by the decision of the members? If they are unalterably opposed to surrendering the name, even to the extent of sacrificing the union, can they not vote "no" on the above proposition? Wherefore the necessity for your new-born "bugaboo"?

Comrades, the N. E. B.'s second assertion amounts simply to this: that the joint conference committee has submitted something to you to vote upon which the N. E. B. does not want you to have an opportunity to vote on.

4. Now I want to take up our worthy Big Four and call the attention of the comrades to the spirit animating these gentlemen. It has always appeared to me that these members of the national committee were opposed to union from the very beginning—except, perhaps, on conditions that would humble our friends of the S. L. P. and add to the un-

THE ISSUES OF UNITY

(Continued from First page)

garding its membership. Information has never been asked for, except once, and that was in the conference committee, at New York.

No. 14. That the S. L. P. does not know its membership. If the S. L. P. authorities do not know their membership, how could they "studiously evade" giving definite information (which they "do not" have)?

There is no doubt in the mind of all who are acquainted with the facts regarding the Wednesday night conference in Indianapolis that Berger knew Debs was to accept. The fact that Berger insisted and argued and took up so much time in order to get a qualified pledge from some of the S. L. P. delegates, and that he at first refused to go and see Debs, unless Benham would also yield, shows, with the other circumstances, that it was a hold-up behind closed doors to make the S. L. P. delegates personally pledge themselves to the name S. D. P. Hayes was not there; they did not care for him.

On Monday Berger pledged himself to Benham to "use his great personal influence with Debs" previous to the presentation of Mr. Debs' name for nomination. At the conference Wednesday evening, after Debs had been nominated and had declined, Berger said he had not used his influence. If not, why not? The fact is not to be doubted that he had, and knew the result of the efforts in that direction.

In the conference committee when the S. L. P. brought in the list of four names for candidates from New York, Hillquit's name was not there. Stedman and Haile immediately protested. Both insisted that he must be a candidate as he would be the most valuable man that New York could send.

As for the purpose of the manifesto, it is in keeping with the acts above stated. I may yet be obliged to acknowledge that in my zeal for union and in the hope of its accomplishment, I have overestimated both the wisdom and sincerity of the Social Democratic party.

There are some other matters of interest in connection with the unity matter, and I shall in the future be pleased to make some comments upon the idiosyncrasies and weaknesses of some of the "giants" of today.

I see that Edwards and Gordon, conscious of how lightly their ordinary statements are regarded by their party membership, have sought to make impressive their statements in this case by appearing before a notary and swearing.

of the N. E. C., Stedman's plan was adopted against the inclinations of the S. L. P. members and solely in the interests of harmony.

In the consideration of the party press the Social Democratic Herald was accorded special privileges which no S. L. P. paper received, and even on the question of name, the first motion to submit two names emanated officially from the S. D. P. committee.

Both Stedman and Mrs. Haile before parting fully and frankly expressed their appreciation of the courteous and liberal treatment of the subject by the S. L. P. committee. The joint committee parted in full accord with each other, each one, including Stedman, promising to go and work for the united party.

And after all that, just when the results of the good work commenced to show in an increased and enthusiastic activity all over the country, four members of the S. D. P. and members of the national executive board, overriding the will of their party as expressed by their national convention, ignoring the majority of their own committee on union elected by the same convention, appear with what they are pleased to term a manifesto, and openly agitate against union.

Two grounds are stated in the manifesto: I. That the S. L. P. committee to Indianapolis had pledged itself to the name S. D. P. and had broken its pledge. II. That it had been agreed that each party vote separately on the propositions submitted, and that the joint committee had violated this agreement by submitting the following question:

"In case the party name voted for by you fails to obtain the concurrent majority vote of both parties, shall the name receiving the majority of the total vote of both parties be adopted?"

Let us consider them in their order. The charge of broken pledges is contained in the following six different statements:

1. "G. B. Benham pledged himself to unequivocally and aggressively support the name Social Democratic on the condition that Harriman and Hayes are accepted by the S. D. P. as candidates."

2. "Max Hayes, on the floor of the convention on Thursday afternoon announced his personal choice of the name Social Democratic, and in solemn terms pledged himself and his paper to the name. * * * he did not vote for the name."

3. "Mr. Morris Hillquit in his first address to the convention on Wednesday, March 7, declared that the Rochester convention had purposely refrained from adopting a name in order that they might be free to adopt any name that might be agreed on."

4. "That Comrade Harriman had stated to Comrade Stedman that he would support the name S. D. P. and that Stedman announced on the floor of the convention that he changed his vote from the majority to the minority report because Harriman and Hayes had given him their promise to support the name."

5. "That the S. L. P. committee had pledged itself to the name S. D. P. and had broken its pledge. The charge of broken pledges is contained in the following six different statements:

1. "G. B. Benham pledged himself to unequivocally and aggressively support the name Social Democratic on the condition that Harriman and Hayes are accepted by the S. D. P. as candidates."

2. "Max Hayes, on the floor of the convention on Thursday afternoon announced his personal choice of the name Social Democratic, and in solemn terms pledged himself and his paper to the name. * * * he did not vote for the name."

3. "Mr. Morris Hillquit in his first address to the convention on Wednesday, March 7, declared that the Rochester convention had purposely refrained from adopting a name in order that they might be free to adopt any name that might be agreed on."

4. "That Comrade Harriman had stated to Comrade Stedman that he would support the name S. D. P. and that Stedman announced on the floor of the convention that he changed his vote from the majority to the minority report because Harriman and Hayes had given him their promise to support the name."

5. "That the S. L. P. committee had pledged itself to the name S. D. P. and had broken its pledge. The charge of broken pledges is contained in the following six different statements:

1. "G. B. Benham pledged himself to unequivocally and aggressively support the name Social Democratic on the condition that Harriman and Hayes are accepted by the S. D. P. as candidates."

2. "Max Hayes, on the floor of the convention on Thursday afternoon announced his personal choice of the name Social Democratic, and in solemn terms pledged himself and his paper to the name. * * * he did not vote for the name."

of the N. E. C., Stedman's plan was adopted against the inclinations of the S. L. P. members and solely in the interests of harmony.

In the consideration of the party press the Social Democratic Herald was accorded special privileges which no S. L. P. paper received, and even on the question of name, the first motion to submit two names emanated officially from the S. D. P. committee.

Both Stedman and Mrs. Haile before parting fully and frankly expressed their appreciation of the courteous and liberal treatment of the subject by the S. L. P. committee. The joint committee parted in full accord with each other, each one, including Stedman, promising to go and work for the united party.

And after all that, just when the results of the good work commenced to show in an increased and enthusiastic activity all over the country, four members of the S. D. P. and members of the national executive board, overriding the will of their party as expressed by their national convention, ignoring the majority of their own committee on union elected by the same convention, appear with what they are pleased to term a manifesto, and openly agitate against union.

Two grounds are stated in the manifesto: I. That the S. L. P. committee to Indianapolis had pledged itself to the name S. D. P. and had broken its pledge. II. That it had been agreed that each party vote separately on the propositions submitted, and that the joint committee had violated this agreement by submitting the following question:

"In case the party name voted for by you fails to obtain the concurrent majority vote of both parties, shall the name receiving the majority of the total vote of both parties be adopted?"

Let us consider them in their order. The charge of broken pledges is contained in the following six different statements:

1. "G. B. Benham pledged himself to unequivocally and aggressively support the name Social Democratic on the condition that Harriman and Hayes are accepted by the S. D. P. as candidates."

2. "Max Hayes, on the floor of the convention on Thursday afternoon announced his personal choice of the name Social Democratic, and in solemn terms pledged himself and his paper to the name. * * * he did not vote for the name."

3. "Mr. Morris Hillquit in his first address to the convention on Wednesday, March 7, declared that the Rochester convention had purposely refrained from adopting a name in order that they might be free to adopt any name that might be agreed on."

4. "That Comrade Harriman had stated to Comrade Stedman that he would support the name S. D. P. and that Stedman announced on the floor of the convention that he changed his vote from the majority to the minority report because Harriman and Hayes had given him their promise to support the name."

5. "That the S. L. P. committee had pledged itself to the name S. D. P. and had broken its pledge. The charge of broken pledges is contained in the following six different statements:

1. "G. B. Benham pledged himself to unequivocally and aggressively support the name Social Democratic on the condition that Harriman and Hayes are accepted by the S. D. P. as candidates."

2. "Max Hayes, on the floor of the convention on Thursday afternoon announced his personal choice of the name Social Democratic, and in solemn terms pledged himself and his paper to the name. * * * he did not vote for the name."

3. "Mr. Morris Hillquit in his first address to the convention on Wednesday, March 7, declared that the Rochester convention had purposely refrained from adopting a name in order that they might be free to adopt any name that might be agreed on."

4. "That Comrade Harriman had stated to Comrade Stedman that he would support the name S. D. P. and that Stedman announced on the floor of the convention that he changed his vote from the majority to the minority report because Harriman and Hayes had given him their promise to support the name."

5. "That the S. L. P. committee had pledged itself to the name S. D. P. and had broken its pledge. The charge of broken pledges is contained in the following six different statements:

1. "G. B. Benham pledged himself to unequivocally and aggressively support the name Social Democratic on the condition that Harriman and Hayes are accepted by the S. D. P. as candidates."

2. "Max Hayes, on the floor of the convention on Thursday afternoon announced his personal choice of the name Social Democratic, and in solemn terms pledged himself and his paper to the name. * * * he did not vote for the name."

3. "Mr. Morris Hillquit in his first address to the convention on Wednesday, March 7, declared that the Rochester convention had purposely refrained from adopting a name in order that they might be free to adopt any name that might be agreed on."

4. "That Comrade Harriman had stated to Comrade Stedman that he would support the name S. D. P. and that Stedman announced on the floor of the convention that he changed his vote from the majority to the minority report because Harriman and Hayes had given him their promise to support the name."

5. "That the S. L. P. committee had in informal conference promised to support the name S. D. P. if the full Rochester ticket (Harriman and Hayes) would be nominated by the Indianapolis convention."

This is true, but Harriman and Hayes were not nominated. 6. "That Harriman and Hillquit had also promised at that conference to support the name S. D. P. in the event that the ticket nominated would be Debs and Harriman."

What actually transpired at that conference was the following: Berger stated that he had not given up all hope of inducing Debs to accept the nomination, that he had great personal influence with Debs and would, with the permission of the conference, endeavor to persuade him. He then said in substance: "If I go to Debs telling him that your committee had pledged itself to the name S. D. P. if Harriman and Hayes were nominated, and that you would not support the name if Debs be nominated, that would be an argument against Debs' acceptance. Will you, therefore, permit me to say to him that your position on the question of name would not be changed, if he accepted the nomination?"

To that question Benham answered in the negative and Harriman and Hillquit in the affirmative in order that that obstacle in the way of Debs' acceptance be removed.

But at the time the question was asked, Debs had already definitely accepted the nomination without having been seen by Berger and without having been in any way influenced by the attitude of the S. L. P. delegates on the question of the name.

Whether or not Berger knew of that fact at the time he asked the question, we do not assume to say; but we may certainly state that when it became known that Debs had accepted the nomination while we were in conference, we as well as the S. D. P. delegates understood at the time that we had been talking on false assumptions and that the entire conference had no significance; and although we had parted with the express understanding that we would meet again in two hours, no one of the conference ever thought of re-assembling.

We are free to confess that our suspicions against Berger had been aroused at that time. We decided it would be best not to have Harriman nominated by the S. D. P. convention at that juncture, and requested Berger and a number of other prominent S. D. P. delegates to desist from nominating him. Berger promised to respect our desires and promptly nominated Harriman in the absence of the latter.

We may notice right here that Harriman's nomination for the second place on the ticket was by no means a concession to the S. L. P. as the authors of the manifesto seem to assume, but was distinctly a concession to the S. D. P.

In support of our statements we will quote from the stenographic report of the session of the joint committee a few remarks on the subject made by some members of the Social Democratic party, whose trustworthiness is above doubt.

CAREY: "I want to say right here that the attitude and action of those four members of the S. L. P. there, reflects credit on them, and I do not believe any one of them ever made pledges that he broke." Carey was present at the Indianapolis conference.

MRS. HAILE: "I want to say I thoroughly believe that the comrades of the S. L. P. have lived up to their pledges."

CHASE: "The proposition was made with these three gentlemen to work for the S. D. P. name, provided Harriman and Hayes were nominated. These promises were also to stand provided that Debs accepted the nomination through the influence of these pledges as presented by Comrade Berger. Comrade Berger had nothing whatever to do with his acceptance, and they were perfectly justifiable in feeling that there were no pledges."

That a number of delegates to the Indianapolis convention were convinced that the name S. D. P. had been practically decided upon we may well believe. But let us remind you how that came about.

In the first conference our committee insisted upon a joint vote being taken by both parties on all questions of union, while your committee and especially Comrade McCartney demanded that a concurrent vote of each party be taken. Considering the question between ourselves after the adjournment of the conference, we concluded that the position taken by the S. D. P. delegates on that question was the better of the two, and we frankly admitted it on the next day.

When the motion to take a concurrent vote was thereupon carried, the S. D. P. delegates reasoned that if each party would take a separate vote on the question of party name, their members would unanimously vote for the name S. D. P. and the members of the S. L. P. knowing the situation, would have no other alternative but to vote for the same name if they want union; and we are frank to admit that we at one time shared that impression and made no secret of it.

But between the interpretation of a situation, and a pledge, there is, you will admit, a world of difference.

Closing our remarks on the party name we desire to say that we regard the question of name as one of very subordinate importance in comparison with the great question before us. We insisted on a different name so as to avoid the appearance of a surrender to your party which would have created great depression in the ranks of the S. L. P. and resulted at best in a lukewarm, half-hearted union.

The choice being now with the members of both parties, it is absolutely indifferent to us which of the two names is adopted, and we will work for the united party to the best of our abilities whatever name it carries.

As to the alleged breach of the promise to have each party vote separately on the referendum, we absolutely deny that charge and are perfectly willing to leave the decision of the question to the intelligence of the comrades.

The proposition referred to reads as follows: "In case the party name voted for by you fails to obtain the concurrent majority of both parties, shall the name receiving the majority of the total vote of both parties, be adopted?"

This question will be submitted to the separate vote of each party. Your party is not bound by the decision of our party. You may vote it down, and if you do not, it is the voluntary decision of your party to submit to a joint count on the question of name.

Moreover, your entire committee including Stedman voted unanimously for the proposition.

What, then, is the real objection to that question? You cannot possibly fear the decision of your own members.

Your insinuations that our party would return a fictitious or dishonest vote on the treaty is not worthy of a reply.

Comrades Cox, Berger, Heath and Stedman, why not be frank about the subject? What is your real object in issuing this singular manifesto at this time?

It cannot possibly be the desire to preserve your name, for the way to do that would be to agitate among the members of your party to vote down the proposition above mentioned and not to attempt to break off all negotiations for union.

Comrade Stedman, what influence has changed your attitude since you left the joint committee?

Comrade Berger, if you were ever in favor of union, as you claimed to be, why did you systematically write against it in your organ, The "Wahrheit," going to the extent of distorting facts and indulging in personal abuse of the ugliest kind, for which we are ever ready to furnish the proof by translations from your paper?

Comrades Cox and Stedman, be frank. Is not your "manifesto" in singular accord with the tenor and spirit of that other singular document, the letter sent by you to the Rochester convention?

Comrades, we have by this time seen enough of the members of your party to have the utmost confidence that they as well as the members of our party are fully capable of deciding upon these questions if an opportunity is given to them.

We rest our case on the good sense and judgment of the membership of both parties.

Job Harriman, Morris Hillquit.

NATIONAL FUND

The following is a list of comrades who have agreed, in response to the appeal of the National Executive Board, to contribute monthly for one year to the national fund. Other names will be added as they are received.

Table listing names of comrades contributing to the National Fund, organized by state: CONNECTICUT, NEW YORK, ILLINOIS, INDIANA, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW JERSEY, OHIO, PENNSYLVANIA, TENNESSEE, TEXAS, WISCONSIN, MISSOURI, MARYLAND, NEW HAMPSHIRE, NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Union Label

on everything you buy is a guarantee that the producers thereof receive a fair rate of wages for its production. Insist on having the