

POLITICAL POWER—
“Shield” or “Dictatorship”

Judd—Reardon
Debate

S.L.P.

v.

A.S.P.



Published by—
THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIALIST PARTY
AT THE
Marxian Printing Works, 115 Goulburn-Street, Sydney.

P
320.994
J88P

19 MAR 1981

STATE LIBRARY
OF VICTORIA
SOURCE *RAW*

Anon
CALL No.

P
320.994

J88P

FOREWORD

The following is a stenographic report of a debate between E. E. Judd, of the Socialist Labour Party, and A. S. Reardon, of the Australian Socialist Party. The debate was held in Islington Park, Newcastle, on Sunday, February 15th, 1920 ; Mr. C. H. Anlezark occupied the chair.

We had hoped to get Mr. Judd's signature to the report, in accordance with clause 8 of the "Conditions of the Debate," but owing to the fact that Mr. Judd failed to carry out his obligation, we are now publishing it as signed by the reporter (who has no connection with the A.S.P.) as being correct. As stated in "The International Socialist," we expected Mr. Judd would wriggle out of signing it—Why ? This question will be easily answered by those who read the debate.

A couple of examples of the confusionist tactics used by Mr. Judd in the debate will not be out of place here. Firstly: When Reardon mentioned the "six-bob-a-day-murderers" statement as not being socialist propaganda, Judd endeavoured to confuse the minds of those present by referring to the case of W. Jeffery which happened about June, 1918, and at the same time he knew full well that Reardon was referring to Judd's own case just prior to the Senate Election. December, 1919—18 months after Jeffrey's case. Secondly: While the sentimental mush about Tom Batho in no way proves Judd's case as being correct, it may interest readers to know that Tom Batho was an opponent of Unity, but he was in no way an hypocrite in the matter, and we have reason to believe that he, Tom Batho, will realise, more so than anyone else the blatant hypocrisy of Judd's sentimental whine. Some little time back a Testimonial was got up for Batho, and the action of the two parties in connection with

the committee conducting same speaks for itself. This committee had (practically) to wring support from the S.L.P. and were finally rewarded with a little financial support and the publication of a wrong name and address for the Secretary in the S.L.P. official organ. On the other hand the A.S.P. gave the Committee as much assistance as possible, doing its printing matter free of charge and giving the testimonial full publicity in our official organ. We are pleased to be able to say our printing office received from Comrade Batho a token of appreciation of our assistance.

As to the vote, it is of no concern to us, for we realise that the securing of the vote by popularist tactics in no way counter balances the printed statement. This fact is evidently realised by Judd, and it fully explains his failure to correct the proofs of this debate, likewise those of the Baritz-Judd debate.

Unfortunately, however much one desires to keep strictly to the point at issue, the tactics used by the other side determine that you deal with points raised altho you realise that they have no connection with the subject under discussion. There is a true saying that "a fool can ask more questions than a wise man can answer in a life time"; it is also that an individual without a case can make insinuations, charges and unsupported statements that, if taken seriously, would be more than could be answered in a lifetime.

There is no need for us to deal here with the insinuations, etc., put forward as a 'case' by Mr. Judd, for the reader, when he sees that Mr. Judd makes no attempt to meet Reardon on the question of Principles, will realise their true value. In short, our attitude is well summed up by Marx in a letter to Engels when writing of the attacks of "half baked" socialists:—"Our position as representatives of the proletarian party we owe to our efforts, and what establishes it is the general hate that all the groups in the old world and in the old parties have for us."

Judd-Reardon Debate

E. E. JUDD, Socialist Labour Party
A. S. REARDON, Australian Socialist Party
Mr. ANLAZARK, Chairman

RESOLVED:—That the Socialist Labor Party is the only Scientific Revolutionary Socialist Party in Australia with a clean record.

The Chairman: The conditions of the debate are:—

- (1) That the chairman open the debate at 2.30.
- (2) That each speaker be allowed thirty, fifteen and five minutes.
- (3) That a vote of the audience be taken at the conclusion of the debate.
- (4) That the chairman confine himself strictly to putting the question.
- (5) That the vote be taken before 4.30.
- (6) That Mr. Anlezark be chairman, if available.
- (7) That the debate take place in Islington Park.
- (8) No report of the debate to appear in the "I.S." or "R.S." before the stenographic report, which is to be signed as correct by the two principles.

E. E. Judd, Opening :

E. E. Judd will affirm the proposition that the Socialist Labor Party is the only scientific revolutionary socialist party in Australia with a clean record. He will open in a speech of thirty minutes' duration, and Reardon will reply for thirty minutes. Each will then occupy fifteen and five minutes alternately. A vote will be taken at the conclusion. When each speaker has taken 25 minutes I will knock on the box, which will indicate that he has five minutes to go. Mr. Judd.

Judd: I want to consider the question without heat. (Hear, hear). I understand that some of our friends expect that Judd will throw mud at Reardon, until Reardon looks like a black angel, and that Reardon will throw mud at Judd until Judd appears likewise. I understand that some who expected that have come here on that account. Well, as far as I am concerned they can go away, as I have not come here to throw mud at Reardon or anybody else. My mission this afternoon is to place certain facts before you in as true a light as possible.

Let us just look in imagination across the sea and think of the water at this moment washing the shores of Newcastle and of the waters—the same waters—that are lapping the shores of some other country. Remember that the Pacific Ocean washes also the shores of Soviet Russia—from Moscow right round the coastline, almost to Japan. And in every country the flag of Socialism is flying. The spirit of freedom is alive everywhere.

No doubt some of our comrades are wondering why we here should participate in an attack upon each other. But in the interests of the working class it is time the position was made clear. At least, that is my intention.

We have to fight a common enemy, and in view of that a debate such as this might seem unnecessary; in fact, the Newcastle branch of the A.S.P. carried a resolution that in its opinion the debate should not take place, as it was calculated to injure the movement instead of forwarding it. The branch, therefore, decided to take no part in the proceedings. Very naturally, the branch took a somewhat superficial view of the matter. However, to get down to the subject matter of the debate, it is well in the first place that I should explain how it arose.

When I and the other S.L.P. candidates were in the midst of the Senate campaign, when we were up against Laborites, Nationalists and all the rest of them, the official paper of the A.S.P.—the "International Socialist"—came out with an editorial containing a covert attack upon us. It certainly seems sinister that a party claiming to be socialistic should attack us at a time when we were being bitterly assailed by Nationalists, Laborites and Farmers. The article was signed by Ray Everitt, the editor of

the "I.S.," who claimed that they of the A.S.P. constituted the only scientific revolutionary socialist party in Australia; and members of the A.S.P. were advised to write the words "Revolutionary Socialism" across their ballot papers, instead of voting for any of the candidates.

Those who know anything about the history of the socialist movement in Australia know that for 20 years or more the S.L.P. has been the vanguard of the socialist movement of Australia.

I read the article referred to in the Trades Hall at Newcastle, and added that no man knew better than Ray Everitt—assuming that Everitt wrote the article—that the statements it contained were false. But in the perpetuation of that falsehood Everitt was, and still is, backed up by others of the party. It is bad enough when one man makes a statement calculated to mislead, and thus injure the working class, but when three or four or more endorse it, it becomes a crime against the working class. How much more criminal is it when the thing is repeatedly asserted?

One of the A.S.P. officials in Newcastle objected to my reference to the matter at the time, and the incident led to this debate. Before going further it is well to look back a bit. Some of our friends might object to that, because people with "records" do not care to have the past placed before the public gaze. Before I am finished they will have even greater regrets. In this instance the past of the A.S.P. contains violations of revolutionary socialist principles. In 1887 the present S.L.P. was established as the Australian Socialist League. The League carried on until 1900, when the name was altered to that of the Socialist Labor Party. About 1907 Harry Holland, who had been out of Sydney for some time previously, cut loose from the S.L.P. and started a new party, a rival organisation. That new party is known to-day as the Australian Socialist Party.

I ask you this: When a scientific revolutionary socialist party is already in existence—and has been in existence for some years—what justification can there possibly be for the formation of a new party which sets itself up in direct opposition and antagonism to the original? In order

that the working class should understand the true socialist position, it is essential that in each country there should be only one scientific revolutionary socialist party, just as there is but one proletariat. The S.L.P. was already in existence, formed in accord with true socialist principles, and in harmony with the teachings of Marx and Engels. I ask you what justification can there be for a second organisation in the political field when one founded on correct principles already exists?

I suppose some of our friends will object to this, but there is nothing like getting at the facts. What those who founded the organisation, which to-day is known as the Australian Socialist Party did, is much the same as starting a union on a field where a union is already established on sound principles. What would you call such a union? (Voices: "Bogus"). Decidedly. What would you call a man who attempted to start a bogus union? Would you not consider that to form a second organisation was to create confusion in the minds of the workers, and that that confusion would divide them instead of consolidating them as a class? By those means the way is made clearer for the natural enemies of the working class to rule the workers. If that holds good in respect to industry is it not equally wrong to form a rival organisation on the political field? The struggle against our enemies is thus made more difficult. Our class should never be led on to the wrong track.

Remember, the S.L.P. was in no way responsible for the formation of the new party. One member of the S.L.P. simply broke away and went ahead with the formation of the new party. No attempt has ever been made to justify the existence of the second party; even Comrade Reardon has never yet attempted to justify the existence of the A.S.P.

Some men are moved to form rival organisations on account of personal convictions, but in this instance no class reason has been adduced. The existence of two parties having the same aim has made the struggle far harder for each. It was hard enough before, but now we are paying two lots of rents to two different landlords, we had to procure and have to maintain two printing

presses, whereas one could easily do the work; in fact, the work all round is made doubly hard.

The struggle was so hard that you know what happened. Tom Batho—you all know him as a worker in the interests of our class for the last 30 years—due to the strain put upon him, is to-day practically blind. Due to lack of nourishment, Batho's wife suffered with him; she has experienced the pangs of hunger and was deprived of many things which every woman is justly entitled to receive. And many good workers in the interests of our class have been led quite innocently to transfer their activities to the wrong quarter.

The man who helped to form the S.L.P. had to struggle hard to keep going; his wife died, and he is now almost blind. (A Voice: "Cut out the sentimental stuff.") Some people wonder why I am bitter, but I ask any of you to place yourselves in the position of Tom Batho. What would happen if you were similarly treated. What if any of you were sent to a premature grave or were afflicted in the struggle to advance the interests of your class?

To commit a wrong against our class is a serious thing. To foster a second party, when one would serve, is a wrong against our class and is a serious thing—it is a crime against the working class of this country. If such a crime has been committed, what is the next worst thing; the perpetrators of that crime can do. It is to perpetuate the wrong. That is exactly what Reardon and the others are doing. It is a distinct violation of socialist principles and against the interests of the working class.

There should be only one socialist party in Australia, yet we find there are two. Both cannot be right. It is a very serious situation. The confusion which has resulted can be plainly seen by our comrades in the S.L.P. You know how our branch was working at Newcastle. It had a hall, and was active in the distribution of literature. After a long time came the A.S.P. and established a branch here. Since then they have tended to confuse the workers of Newcastle and district, all of which is due to the fact that there are two parties here. The same applies to Sydney.

This is worth remembering: the S.L.P. has been established for perhaps 20 years, having branches over the

Newcastle coal fields. It had a big measure of success. The A.S.P. realised that, and its officials said: "Here is our chance; we will get in there." All the pioneering work had been done. They did the same thing in Sydney. The A.S.P. came along just as the boss does and reaped the benefit of another's work. There is no distinction between the action of either.

Reardon was an ex-member of the S.L.P., having joined in Melbourne; he came to Sydney and was a member of the Sydney branch, but left and went over to the A.S.P. when something that he and others did not like happened in the S.L.P. Since then he has assisted to keep alive the A.S.P. It could not be that Reardon did not know that the objective of the S.L.P. was the correct objective. The S.L.P. sets forth:

"The abolition of Capitalism (the class ownership of industry, either privately, or through Nationalisation), and the establishment in place thereof, of a Co-operative Commonwealth founded upon the collective ownership by the whole community of the land, and socially operated means of production, with the establishment of a system of production for USE instead of for PROFIT."

Reardon and the A.S.P. delegates have consistently evaded unity proceedings, though at the unity conference the A.S.P. delegates agreed to accept our objective, with the alteration of only one word, and they also agreed to accept our constitution, which shows that our principles are in harmony with the teachings of Marx.

I have to show this afternoon that the Socialist Labor Party is the only scientific revolutionary party in Australia with a clean record.

In the first place, we must recognise that there can be only one socialist party in each country. When we say "workers of the world, unite," we do not mean "unite in five, ten, fifteen or twenty different organisations," or even in two separate organisations. Our aim—which was also the aim of Marx—is to bring the workers of the world together as a class in one organisation, espousing a common cause. Yet in Australia we find a section breaking away from the established party and forming another on the same lines to the tune of "Solidarity For Ever." As there can be only one scientific revolutionary socialist

party in Australia we claim that the true party is the S.L.P., whose principles are soundly Marxian.

Those people who stand for a second party are not true socialists, because their action is a violation of socialistic principles. Their adherence to a second party constitutes a crime against the working class. All the untrue statements that have been made against Judd and the S.L.P. have been due to the existence of two organisations. You see that even members of the Newcastle branch of the A.S.P. are opposed to the holding of this debate this afternoon; had the two parties not been in the field it would not have been necessary. But this debate is only one of the effects of a cause that should never have existed.

See how illogical our A.S.P. friends in Newcastle are; they ridicule, and rightly so, the idea of this debate, but do not get at the cause, in order that we may be united and thus be better prepared for the struggle against capital. Why not apply criticism all round and endeavor to get at the cause instead of the effect—the present disunity between the A.S.P. and S.L.P.

If the executives of both bodies were to come to a common understanding the movement would be greatly strengthened. Let the rank and file of either party know both sides of the case; then give the rank and file an opportunity of deciding upon what course of action shall be followed in the future. The executive of the A.S.P. at an earlier stage agreed to do that. It was decided that the case for the A.S.P. and S.L.P. should be printed in the "Revolutionary Socialist" and "International Socialist" respectively, but in the "International Socialist" only half our statement was printed, the other half being suppressed. Long after the time in which the A.S.P. executive agreed to that arrangement they published only half of our statement, though it was made to appear that it represented the whole case for the S.L.P. Could there be anything more unfair than that? Our full case has not been published to this day. Could any suppression of the capitalist press be worse? We hear constant complaints that the capitalist press suppresses the reply of some Labor man.

Suppression is dishonest and unfair; but is it any less dishonest and unfair for a Socialist paper to suppress a

reply from a socialist party? (Cries of "No"). Comrade Emmett or our party published some articles in the "Revolutionary Socialist," to which Moses Baritz had a reply in the A.S.P. paper; Baritz attacked Emmett for the stand he had taken; Everitt also attacked Emmett. Emmett sent a reply for publication to the executive of the A.S.P.—and Reardon is one of the officials of the party—but that reply has not yet been published, though many months have elapsed. Could you have anything more cowardly than that? Even in the police and criminal courts of capitalism an accused person is given an opportunity to defend himself, but it seems that the A.S.P. has not yet reached that ethical plane.

There also appeared a statement that Emmett had insulted the Jewish section of the working class, and although Emmett sent along a refutation nothing concerning it has yet appeared. Why? The S. L. P. has never yet insulted any section of the working class.

Before closing, let me tell you what happened to the report of the recent Baritz-Judd debate in the "International Socialist." It purported to be a verbatim report, but Baritz' final speech of five minutes covered 9½ inches, whereas the space occupied by my speech of 5 minutes was only about 4½ inches. That's honest, is it not? Several most important statements were suppressed altogether and several things that I did not say were attributed to me. The report had been "cooked."

Let me conclude by asking Reardon to tell you frankly whether the A.S.P. Executive and himself are out to fight the S.L.P., or whether they are prepared to unite with us in our common fight against the forces of oppression? (Applause).

A. S. Reardon in Reply

Reardon:

Regarded superficially, I do not suppose there has ever been a more childish question debated from any platform than that set down for discussion here to-day—"That the Socialist Labor Party is the only scientific revolutionary socialist party in Australia with a clean record." Yet in reality it is not childish; although on the face of it it would seem so.

Here are two men, both presumably intelligent, coming all the way from Sydney, wasting their time and yours, to thrash out such a proposition that appears to be of no vital concern to the workers as a class. So much depends upon the interpretation, the correct interpretation, of the Marxian position, that it is for me to show that the stand taken by the S.L.P. does not square with the teaching of Karl Marx, and that, therefore, the S.L.P. is not a scientific revolutionary socialist party.

This debate arose out of a controversy during the last Senate campaign, and Judd challenged a representative of the A.S.P. to debate. Consequently, the party to which I have the honor to belong, and of which I have the still greater honor of being general secretary, instructed me to come here. In ordinary circumstances the subject is one that could be disposed of in five minutes. Judd, however, has laid down premises which are in no wise correct. He has made the very wide, but unsubstantiated, assertion that the Socialist Labor Party is a scientific revolutionary socialist party. Because that contention is entirely wrong and ungrounded I take the platform here this afternoon.

If the S.L.P. is not a scientific Socialist Party, the claim that it has a clean record must go by the board. Let us see why. What is meant by the term, "scientific revolutionary socialism?" You may not agree with the mission of scientific revolutionary socialism, but you cannot disagree with this: that scientific revolutionary socialism bases its principles, its methods and its tactics upon the foundation laid by Marx and Engels, as set forth in the Communist Manifesto, published in 1848.

The Bolsheviks have accepted the principles enunciated in the Manifesto as the basis of their organization in Soviet Russia, and what is good enough for the Bolsheviks is sure good enough for me. You will, I am sure, agree with me that the Marxian proposition has been the means of emancipating the Russian workers. (Hear, hear). Therefore, it is with the position as laid down by Marx and Engels that I will deal.

Nearly twelve months ago the A.S.P. issued a challenge to the S.L.P. to debate this question of principle. Satur-

day, April 19, 1919, to be precise. In the "International Socialist" of that date we stated: "As to Marxian principles, the A.S.P. have never succeeded in forcing the S.L.P. down to a discussion of principles. We have never got farther than their "great sacrifice," and by the way, we desire to congratulate them on making the great hypocritical sacrifice by dropping the name of their paper without unity, as they have done. But while there is life there is hope, and we sincerely hope that the S.L.P. will appoint a representative to negative the following question:—

"RESOLVED—That the S.L.P. does NOT stand true to Marxian principles. We will appoint one to affirm, and we will meet all expenses if necessary."

The A.S.P. relied upon the Marxian basis, and was prepared to prove (as I shall do later on) that the S.L.P. did not stand upon the solid Marxian foundation. But that challenge was not accepted, and we have not met until now.

We who are travelling towards the goal of working class emancipation must of necessity be careful as to how we act, because so much depends upon the issue. In Germany a section of the working class calling themselves "socialists" proved traitorous when the test was applied, and that same section was responsible for the shooting of Karl Leibknecht and Rosa Luxemburg at a time when the workers of Germany were forced to take revolutionary action. Many workers fell as a result of that traitorous act. Even in Russia the Bolsheviks were menaced by a similar foe, and they were compelled for long to measure arms with the Mensheviks, who also called themselves "socialists." The Mensheviks were responsible for the shooting of Nicholas Lenin, though, fortunately, he escaped with his life.

Right through history, the socialist movement has been handicapped by those who, while claiming to be socialists, never based their principles upon the position as stated in the Communist Manifesto. That is why we have to be so careful before we can accept certain people at their own valuation. To end any possible confusion it is vitally

necessary that principles, policy and action should be square. (Hear, hear).

In the Communist Manifesto it is clearly laid down by Marx and Engels that the first requisite is, that the workers come together as a class, "and consequently," says Marx, "into a political party." Listen to this from Marx:

" . . . This organisation of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political party. . . ."

The workers being thus organised, Marx proceeds:

"The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties; formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat."

The working class is advised to take political action—revolutionary political action. Marx adds:

"We have seen above that the first steps in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy."

Marx saw the necessity for the working class securing control of political power first. That is the position endorsed by scientific revolutionary socialists of all countries. It is regarded as absolutely necessary that the workers should first obtain political power to enable them to exercise control over the forces the State now has at its back.

Let us get down to recent times—to the conference of the Third International at Moscow. This is taken from the Manifesto of the Moscow (Communist) International:

"The proletariat must reply to this colossal conspiracy (League of Nations) of the capitalist class by the conquest of the political power, direct that power against its class enemies, and set it in motion as a lever for the economic revolution."

This is followed by a lengthy clause dealing with the necessity of the conquest of political power.

Upon that point the A.S.P. stands four square with the Third International. We stand for the organisation of the workers as a class for the purpose of gaining control of

the political State and for the abolition of the "right" of private ownership. Where does the S.L.P. stand in this regard?

Upon this question the S.L.P. position is entirely confusing, and its apologists have displayed utter ignorance of the teachings of Marx. They do not understand the Marxian position; that is perfectly clear. A little while ago the Socialist Labor Party of England, which has slavishly followed Daniel De Leon for 15 years, has now adopted what is practically the A.S.P. position generally. I sincerely hope that the S.L.P. of Australia will follow. The S.L.P. of Australia has already declared for industrial and political action, but in its Senate campaign manifesto, published in the "Revolutionary Socialist" of November 7 last, it is stated that the medium by which the workers will secure their ultimate emancipation will be the One Big Union. Here are the exact words:—

"As industrial organisation is vitally necessary to overthrow the capitalist class state and establish an industrial co-operative commonwealth, the Socialist Labor Party, under the shield of political agitation, aims at organising the wage-workers into one great class-conscious, revolutionary union—powerful enough to reflect its own political party."

Note the term, "political 'agitation'."

What the S.L.P. exists for, I am sure I do not know, unless it is going to act as the political fig leaf of the O.B.U. The Manifesto goes on to contend that the bringing of the workers together under one constitution, with as many departments as there are industries,

... "Not only strengthens the working class in its every-day encounters with the exploiting class and creates the necessary instrument for the revolutionary act of taking and holding the socially operated means of production, but provides the framework of the Industrial Co-operative Commonwealth."

That is in direct contradiction to the revolutionary position which Marx laid down, namely, that political action must precede industrial action, so that the workers will thereby be enabled to gain control of the coercive forces of the State, which would otherwise be used against

them. Yet this "scientific revolutionary socialist" party known as the Socialist Labor Party actually proposes to "take and hold" the socially operated means of production, "thus attempting to lock the boss out and run the industries in the interests of the workers while the boss is left in possession of all the implements of destruction.

Is that "scientific" or "revolutionary"?" (Laughter).

Did anyone ever see the boss in the industries, anyhow? The boss takes jolly fine care not to make himself too conspicuous about the workshop. (Laughter.) It is not a question of "taking and holding." It is a question of abolishing the private ownership of the master class. (Hear, hear.) And private ownership is a political right. Take away the control of the political State from the master class and let the working class turn the forces of the State to their own account—the army, the navy, the police and the rest—and the right of private ownership collapses and the workers will come into their own.

Before the right of private ownership can be abolished the political State as now constituted must go. The S.L.P. does not yet understand that. It's high time the party got a grasp of first principles. I contend that the method of organisation and the line of action advocated by the S.L.P. is in direct contradiction to the doctrine of Marx; further, that it is a menace and a danger to the working class.

The S.L.P. advises the workers to "organise to take and hold the industries." Yet only last week we were given another demonstration of the power wielded by the political state. What of Hughes' proclamation in respect to the striking engineers? Does that not show you what is the absolute limit to action on the industrial field? If it does not, it ought; it certainly contains a striking lesson.

Do you not realise that in this instance Hughes wields the political baton? Before we can get much further than the engineers on the industrial field we will have to take action against the political state of the master class. The Marxian doctrine has been accepted by true Socialists throughout the world; and in Australia the A.S.P. is the only party which adheres strictly to that doctrine. Without revolutionary political action the workers cannot

achieve their emancipation. After revolutionary political action has succeeded the industrial unions will begin to operate, not before.

By the term "revolutionary political action" do we mean the sort of "political action" for which the S.L.P. stands? Not at all. Let me quote Judd in his collection called "The Case for the O.B.U." This is what Judd understands by "revolutionary political action":—

"As De Leon says: "Political action is the purely technical expression. It means the peaceful trial of strength in social issues. As such the term is generous. It embraces a number of things, that is, all the things necessary for its realisation. It embraces meetings, conventions, or any other established method for the nomination of candidates—for election to existing parliaments—campaigning, that is, agitation in favor of the principles, and, of course, the candidates of the party voting; finally, as a consequence, 'parliamentary activity'."

"A peaceful trial of strength," eh! Was it a "peaceful trial of strength" in Russia? By hell, no. The Bolsheviks took political control—assisted by the soldiers. There was no peaceful solution of the Russian problem; not on your life. So by "political action" Judd and Co. mean 'peaceful' action—an impossible dream, anyhow.

In the opinion of Judd and other De Leonites the working class is to be emancipated by "peaceful political action"—by the holding of meetings, conventions, and, presumably, by passing resolutions. And these are the "scientific revolutionary socialists" — these S.L.P. people. (Laughter.)

What the A.S.P. understands by revolutionary political action is "any action by the working class whether per medium of the ballot box or by armed insurrection that has for its objective the capture of the power of the political state. (Hear, hear). The immediate objective of the working class should be to capture the political forces of the State.

Under capitalism the right to control the armed forces of the State is vested in the master class, who administer the state in its own interests. Scientific revolution-

ary socialism has before it the task of capturing the political forces of the State; when that control is consummated the army, the navy, the police, and the rest will be put in action on behalf of the working class and against the ruling class of to-day.

The workers can accomplish nothing tangible by industrial action alone. Even if they secured control of industry to-morrow—in pursuance of the policy of "taking and holding—they would be driven out within a very short period, unless the coercive forces of the State were used to establish their right of possession. Were they minus that support, a host of aviators, gunmen and police would bomb and shoot them to hell out of it. (Laughter).

The A.S.P. amply justifies its existence as a scientific revolutionary socialist party, whose foundation is thoroughly Marxian. On the other hand, there is no justification for the existence of the S.L.P., much less its claim to be regarded as a scientific revolutionary socialist party. Judd compared the formation of the A.S.P. to the starting of another union in the same industry. Well, at the present time Judd himself is engaged in an endeavor to form a new union in industries already organised along craft lines. The A.W.U., for instance, is an established concern, yet Judd comes along with a One Big Union proposition, which, if successful, will replace the A.W.U. (Laughter.) The S.L.P. means to leave the boss in control of all the forces of the State while it attempts "to take and hold" the industries.

The thing is ridiculous on the face of it.

Unless the workers are in control of the forces of the State, the boss will have nothing to fear.

To point out this fallacy and weakness was my main reason for coming to Newcastle to-day. The S.L.P. is not, and never has been, a scientific revolutionary socialist party, though it calls itself one. If it is "scientific" and "revolutionary" it is in name only. Seeing that my opponent's premises are incorrect, it follows that his conclusions are incorrect also, besides being unsound. Judd and the S.L.P. have always broken away from the Marxian position, and have simply re-echoed De Leonist platitudes. The S.L.P. believes in political action, Judd will tell you,

but what he and the S.L.P. understand by political action is not revolutionary political action at all. It is certainly not scientific revolutionary political action as known to the true socialist movement, and according to the correct interpretation of Marx.

De Leon says that "political action embraces many things, including meetings and conventions." There is nothing in De Leon's statement (quoted previously in full) about political action in the sense of the Marxian interpretation. When Judd speaks of political action he means, with De Leon, as a "shield for industrial action." Says Judd in "The Case for the O.B.U.":—

" . . . The chief functions of the political arm will be to act as a shield whilst the union is organising its forces."

So that the brand of political action for which the S.L.P. stands is merely a sort of "blind," and will be confined to the holding of meetings, conventions and the running of candidates for seats in Parliament. Under that "shield" they are going to organise the workers on the industrial field, depending solely upon the industrial wing to secure for the working class its emancipation. That alone shows a profound ignorance of the Marxian stand. I hope they will learn speedily just what the Marxian doctrine is.

An insult to the Jewish section of the working class was contained in an article published in the "Revolutionary Socialist," and written by W. H. Emmett. It was in relation to Moses Batritz, who, being of Jewish parentage, naturally took up the implied challenge. The S.L.P., by virtue of its failure to repudiate the sentiments, and the fact that it gave them publicity, endorsed that slur.

Judd had claimed that the S.L.P. had never insulted any section of the working class. Hasn't it? Judd himself had referred to returned soldiers from the S.L.P. platform as "six-bob-a-day-murderers."

Judd: That is a lie. (Hear, hear).

Reardon: You admitted having said it in the presence of Mrs. Hungerford, M' Mahon and Ted Sinclair at the Central Hotel, Newcastle. (Aside): Is that not so, Sinclair?

Comrade E. A. Sinclair: That is so.

Judd: It is not so. Never mind. I will reply to that lie. Voices: Cut out personalities.

Reardon: I don't give a damn whether you like it or not. I am here for the truth. I am putting the working class position. If the working class is to emancipate itself it will have to learn the lesson from Russia. There, when the Bolsheviks gained political control the soldiers took sides with the working class and made possible the complete revolution.

If the workers of this or any other country are to be emancipated they will want the assistance of the soldiers. Make no mistake about that. And anyone who insults the soldiers is guilty of an action that is detrimental to the interests of the working class. (Applause). If the soldiers are not with us they will be up against us. Not having made any protest against the utterance of that statement the S.L.P. endorsed the insult to a large section of the working class. There are certain other things I must deal with, but as my time has almost expired I will leave it till the next round.

I will then reply relative to the question of unity, as I do not intend to evade any phase of the question that I can deal with in the brief period at my disposal. (Applause).

E. E. Judd—Second Speech

Judd: First of all, as to the "six-bob-a-day-murderers" lie; I made no such statement. (Hear, hear). A little while ago Comrade Jeffries, a member of the S.L.P., was assisting to maintain order at one of our meetings on the Sydney Domain. While thus engaged the police grabbed him and took him off to the lock-up. The charge which the police had intended to prefer was not one that came under the heading of War Precautions Act offences. With the police there went to the station a brother of a returned soldier.

The police asserted that I had said certain things, but that I had referred to returned soldiers as "six-bob-a-day-murderers" was not one of them. This brother of a returned soldier said that he had heard me say it. . . . This

Jeffries denied, and apparently none of the police heard it. However, the fellow held out, and I was subsequently charged. I applied to Judge Pring for permission to prosecute the returned soldier's brother for perjury, but was denied that right. (Voices: "Of course" and "Naturally"). And that in spite of the fact that the police had not heard me say it.

I was accused on a perjured statement. Reardon knows that; I did not think that he would descend to such tactics when he knows the facts. Reardon knows that Jeffries was convicted and that I was never charged. It is playing the game pretty low. Granting that I had made the statement, which, of course, I did not, and if from it it can be said that I and the S.L.P. insulted a large section of the working class, Ted Sinclair and the A.S.P. are open to a similar charge, as Sinclair has made a like statement. And, as Reardon has appeared on the same platform as Sinclair, he too must have insulted a large section of the working class.

What I did say at the meeting in question, and what I told the judge I said, in reply to a soldier who called out "You are a bloody mongrel," was that I was not in favor of making a soldier of myself in the interests of the ruling class, and that I did not go away to commit murder. This is the second time that the alleged statement has been attributed to me in debate. I did not want to go away as a soldier, any more than Reardon, who did not go.

Now, follow me closely. Reardon says that when I challenged an A.S.P. representative to debate during the last Senate campaign the A.S.P. replied. What I said at the Trades Hall here was in reply to the editor of the "International Socialist." Here is the paper. Ask Reardon to show you one word wherein it indicates that the article is in reply to us. I ask him to read the article and see if he can find a single reference to the fact that it is in reply to us.

Reardon: I have not time to go through the article, but I do not think it specifically mentions that it is in reply to you or the S.L.P.

Judd: Everitt, the editor of the "I.S.," says that the

A.S.P. is the only revolutionary socialist party in Australia, and he advises members to write the words, "Revolutionary Socialism" across their ballot papers. What I said in your Trades Hall was in reply to that, and yet no opportunity was afforded me in the quarter in which the attack was launched to reply. Is that honest? (Cries of "No".) Is Reardon such a fool as not to understand the facts of the case? (Voices: "No").

Reardon is no mug—you can tell that by the way he has spoken this afternoon. He did not tell you that we replied to the covert attack in the "International Socialist" and that our reply was suppressed. That is their practice. They tell only half the story—if the story does not happen to suit them.

After the last debate between Reardon and I, we were accused of having published false statements as to what transpired. We offered to rectify any errors, but so far no corrections have been sent along.

If the S.L.P. was never Marxian in principle why was Reardon ever a member of the party? And why did the A.S.P. executive about two months ago agree to our principles? Reardon has endeavored to belittle the De Leon doctrine, but De Leon will be remembered long after Reardon is dead and forgotten. The S.L.P. agrees that both political and industrial action are vitally necessary—the political wing is destructive and the industrial wing constructive. The workers will have to take and hold the industries and to that end there must be a political arm to the industrial body. The O.B.U. scheme provides for that political arm. But it is only by organisation in industry that the workers can take and hold the socially operated means, production and distribution.

Lenin points out that great difficulty the Bolsheviks had to contend against when the constructive period came after the capture of the political power in Russia by the Bolsheviks was the disorganisation they were confronted with on the industrial field.

Comrade Reardon's wife, in a leading article in the "International Socialist," admits that, and says that the great difficulty with which the Bolsheviks were faced was, that they had no economic organisation at first.

Which statement will you accept? That of Mrs. Reardon, who pointed to the menace to Bolshevism through lack of effective economic organisation after the capture of political power, or that of Mr. Reardon, who says that industrial (or economic) organisation is secondary to the exercise of political power? Both cannot be right.

De Leon discovered the first germ of the Soviet State in his statement of the I.W.W. Preamble.

Reardon implies that the A.W.U. should not be disturbed in its present strangle-hold upon the workers in certain industries, and that I, in helping to replace it by the O.B.U., am acting the part of one who attempts to do something detrimental to unionism. But he knows as well as I that the A.W.U. does not stand for the same principles as the O.B.U.—that the craft form of organisation has out-lived its usefulness. He knows that the new form of organisation is intended to re-model the whole system of industrial organisation, and that there can be nothing detrimental to unionism or dishonest in that.

If there is, it was detrimental and dishonest on the part of the executive of the A.S.P. and of Reardon as its secretary, to accept an alteration in the constitution of his party; also to form a new scientific revolutionary socialist party when one was already in existence. Reardon knows the difference right enough. Is there a man or woman here who thinks he does not? (Cries of "No").

If there is a difference why was he dishonest enough to try to put one over on you? Reardon and other A.S.P. delegates to the Unity Conference only recently endorsed the statement of De Leon about locking the boss out of industry, thereby to secure to the workers the control of the means of life. The term, "political action" means any action in the interests of the working class; that was the I.W.W. objective, which the A.S.P. used to support. So why object to the I.W.W. position? If you believe in armed revolt you believe in political action!!

A. S. Reardon in Reply

Reardon: It would seem that since I was last on the box the question has become: "Is Reardon dishonest?"

instead of: "That the S.L.P. is the only scientific revolutionary socialist party in Australia with a clean record." To my opponent I can well leave personalities.

Judd: Your reference to the six-bob-a-day-murderers was pretty personal.

Reardon: Well, that statement, I repeat, was made in the presence of Mrs. M'Mahon and Ted Sinclair. But the question to-day is whether or not the line of action advocated by the S.L.P. is in the interest of the working class or not.

Judd says that De Leon will be remembered when I am dead and forgotten. Sure—for his attempt to side-track the working class on a position he did not understand. Yes. De Leon will be remembered when I am forgotten—so will Charlie Peace, and he was the greatest criminal England has ever known. (Laughter).

So when Judd's party can send a majority of its members into Parliament the workers will be in a position to "take and hold" the industries! Will it? Yet De Leon says that "the 'reason' for a political movement obviously unfits it to 'take and hold' the machinery of production," and he adds: "What the political movement 'moves into' is not the shops, but the Robber Burg of Capitalism—for the purpose of dismantling it."

As to the A.S.P. having at one time supported the I.W.W. position, I am surprised that a man who has gained so much notoriety at the expense of the I.W.W. men's misfortune in much the same way as the parsons do out of the crucifixion of Christ, should bring the I.W.W. into the arguments at present. I am making these statements in the interests of the working class, and I do not care whether you like it or not. I am no limelight seeker, and do not want the plaudits of the crowd.

As for relying upon political agitation and the ballot. Listen to these words of warning, given by Lenin in his book entitled "The Collapse of the Second International," a book published and endorsed by the English S.L.P., and which is right in opposition to the position of the S.L.P. in Australia:—

"If no revolutionary situation is in existence to-day, or conditions which breed discontent among the masses

and increase their activity; if to-day you are handed a voting paper, take it and organise so that you can beat your enemy, but do not use it for the purpose of sending men to parliament for the sake of soft jobs, at which they clutch, for fear they may be sent to prison. If on the morrow they take away your voting paper and hand you a rifle, a magnificent quick-firing gun, built in accordance with the latest requirements of death and destruction, don't listen to sentimental whimperers who fear war. In this world there still remain many things that must be destroyed by fire and iron before the working class may be free."

And what does Lenin will do me any old time. (Hear, hear).

As to De Leon having formulated the industrial programme, Jean Jacques Pindy laid down the same principles at the last meeting of the First International at Basle in 1870—the identical proposals which the S.L.P. now claims as having emanated from De Leon.

Judd has not proved—he did not attempt to prove—that the S.L.P. is a scientific revolutionary party. He mentioned that Lenin had referred to the lack of economic organisation in Russia at the time of the capture of the political state, and that my wife also drew attention to it in a leading article in the "I.S."

Sure. Mrs. Reardon understands the Marxian position. Lenin states that the Bolsheviks were handicapped in Russia by the absence of economic organisation, but after they gained control of the political state and thus emancipated themselves they were able to go right on with industrial organisation, which is now being successfully pursued. But the S.L.P. wants to perfect industrial organisation now—it puts the cart before the horse.

Lenin points out that they did not need industrial organisation in Russia until the old regime had been overthrown.

With regard to Emmett and the alleged suppression: Emmett, who has always been regarded by the S.L.P. as an authority upon Marx—the best in Australia, in fact. Well, Emmett wrote an article dealing with the Inventor, which was published in the "Revolutionary Socialist," concerning which article Moses Baritz wrote a criticism

in the "International Socialist." Baritz pointed to a number of glaring errors in Emmett's article. Emmett wrote a lengthy reply for publication in the "Revolutionary Socialist," to which Everitt replied in the "International Socialist." Emmett forwarded a further reply to the "International Socialist."

The editor of our paper inserted a paragraph in the "I.S." in which he pointed out that the discussion had been previously carried on through the two papers, and intimated that though Emmett had forwarded his latest reply for publication in the "I.S." it would be preferable that it appear in the official organ of his own party, adding:

"We are sorry if the S.L.P. refuses to publish it, although we cannot help congratulating them on their decision, as they may consider, as we do, that three columns is a large space to waste on such matter. However, if at any future time they consider it necessary to publish Mr. Emmett's reply, we shall be very glad to deal with it, as there is certainly much that requires criticism and correction."

It was a very long article, mostly "tripe." (Laughter.) That reply was published in the "I.S." of October 4, 1919, yet on October 6, 1919, the "Revolutionary Socialist" came out with an article headed "A.S.P. suppression." Candidly, could the action of the editor of our paper be called "suppression?" Surely no one in his senses would contend that it was.

Then came the unity proceedings. There had been and is still much talk of unity. It is unity that the A.S.P. wants. But the S.L.P. has stood still. It is true that I was once a member of the S.L.P. Also, once upon a time, I wore short trousers and played marbles. But an intelligent person progresses. "With age comes wisdom." To-day the S.L.P. is standing in the way of unity.

Attempts have been made during my short period in Australia to unite the opposing sections, but the A.S.P. has always stood solidly to the basic principles enunciated by Marx. There can be no unity until the S.L.P. comes down to the A.S.P. principles and policy. These their delegates said they were prepared to accept at the last Unity Con-

ference. Three delegates were appointed from the S.L.P. and three from the A.S.P., and these drew up a basis of unity, concerning which they were to report back to their respective organisations. If endorsed by the two executives a vote of the membership was to be taken. The executive of the A.S.P. endorsed the proposals, and I, as general secretary, was instructed to write the S.L.P. asking the executive if they were yet prepared to take a vote of their membership on the question, and stating that when they were ready we would do same immediately. The only reply was that the A.S.P. would be notified when the information was available. A similar reply was received to a second letter. No other word concerning the taking of a ballot have we received from the S.L.P. from then till now.

So the unity proceedings got no further than that. Eventually we informed the S.L.P. that unless informed by a certain date as to its intentions regarding the ballot we would declare unity proceedings off. In the meantime Judd wrote the various branches of the S.L.P. advising them to turn the unity proposals down.

Judd: That is not correct.

Reardon: I understand it is correct. Anyhow, I have no reason to doubt it. The rank and file of the A.S.P. are the party; the executive is elected by rank and file, and the rank and file instruct the executive. I, as an official, have no vote. (Applause.)

E. E. Judd

Judd: I asked Reardon to peruse that copy of the "I.S." which I handed him, and to tell me if he could discover one word to indicate that it is a reply to me or the S.L.P. He looked at the paper, but did not say anything about it last time he was on the box. Why? Did he find that his first statement was incorrect? If so, he should have been man enough to admit it.

He now says that Emmett's reply was not suppressed, but in his attempt to smooth the matter over he let the cat out of the bag, indicating that the real writer of the article was Baritz, not Everitt. He went outside the dis-

ussion to accuse the S.L.P. of something that Emmett had done, by alleging that Emmett, and, therefore, the S.L.P., had insulted the Jews, a section of the working class. But he forgot to tell you that that reply was not published until weeks after the receipt of Emmett's article.

They have not published Emmett's reply to this day. Is that not suppression? The fact that a notice was inserted to the effect that the article would not be published does not alter the fact that it was suppressed. It is trickery, that's all. It is an insult to your intelligence. Ask Reardon to tell you what became of the unity vote. He has not explained that yet? The rank and file of the A.S.P. demand unity, but the A.S.P. officialdom says "No." Due to the tactics adopted by the executive the A.S.P. branch in Melbourne has gone to the dogs through official corruption. The branch in Adelaide has gone and the branch in Broken Hill is also dead.

Reardon: That is not correct.

Judd: Well, I have letters which show that the Barrier branch is defunct, but if my information is incorrect I will withdraw. The fact remains that the Melbourne and Adelaide branches at least have gone.

Throughout this debate Reardon has contended that the S.L.P. was not formed on true Marxian principles? Our constitution is decidedly Marxian. Reardon told you that we had accepted their position. He knew he was lying when he said that. The S.L.P. objective has been the same as to-day for a long while. The only alteration we assented to was the substitution of the word "social" for "collective." The existence of two parties, both claiming to be scientific revolutionary parties, has led to confusion in the minds of the workers, and, as a result, the capitalist class has been assisted.

You are all aware that there is a breakaway section of the A.L.P. As the officials of the A.S.P. have shown no desire to unite, some ex-members of the A.L.P. are uniting with the S.L.P. While there are men in the A.S.P. like Reardon and Everitt there will never be unity. These men are acting to the detriment of the movement, and

must be exposed. The S.L.P. is the only scientific revolutionary socialist party in Australia with a clean record. (Applause.)

A. S. Reardon in Reply

Reardon: I want to say that the reason I did not refer to the article in the "I.S." last time was because Judd occupied his quarter of an hour to the minute, and as it would take me nearly a quarter of an hour to read the article, I did not have a minute in which to do so. One cannot read, listen to a speaker and take notes at the same time. Judd did not want me to hear what he had to say so that I could not reply, but I am too old a bird to be caught with chaff. (Laughter.) It is an old trick in debate to get one's opponent to read something while being attacked. Judd asked me to tell whether we are out to fight each other or for unity? Speaking not for myself, or for the executive, but in the terms of the decision of our last conference, I say that the A.S.P. is out to oppose all other parties whether allegedly socialist or avowedly capitalist.

The A.S.P. claims that it is the only scientific revolutionary socialist party in Australia, and we are well able to substantiate that claim. We are prepared to unite with any kindred body who accepts the Marxian position, even with the S.L.P. when it is prepared to accept the Marxian doctrine.

The S.L.P. is now linked up with the I.S.L.P., says Mr. Judd. Is it contended that that organisation stands for Marxian principles? While negotiations for unity were proceeding between the S.L.P. and A.S.P. the S.L.P. were holding secret conferences with the I.S.L.P.

Judd: That is a lie.

Reardon: It is not. How comes it that Unity between those two bodies was arranged in the meantime. The membership of the S.L.P. has increased some in consequence, but numbers do not always make for soundness. The new organisation contains within itself the elements of its own disruption, and of its ultimate destruction. Men like McCrystal, who do not understand the socialist posi-

tion, talking from the socialist platform trying to excite sympathy on the strength of his being a returned soldier in order to catch votes! Where does the new party expect to get? (A voice: "We all have to learn.")

Relative to Judd's statement about the space allotted him in the "I.S.," for the last five minutes of his debate; it reminds me of the debate I once had with Judd: you will all agree that I am a faster speaker than Judd, who brought along a couple of stenographers, Judd's speech occupied about seven columns, but mine only run into about three columns. (Laughter.)

Judd: That is not true.

Reardon: It certainly is true. Look at the copy of the debate. However, what I want to impress upon you is that the A.S.P. stands by the principle of Marx as endorsed by the Third International and by revolutionary Socialist parties of all countries. With those principles the S.L.P. objective is not in accord. My opponent dealt with many things, but did not touch the main proposition. No, he evaded that altogether. As to Judd's statement that the article in the "I.S." was written by Moses Baritz and not by Ray Everitt, over whose signature it appeared, I can tell him that the article was written by Everitt at my house, at a time when Baritz was many miles away.

Judd has mentioned Everitt's name several times during this debate; I know Everitt, and can say unhesitatingly that he is one of the finest, noblest and truest comrades with whom it has ever been my pleasure to work in this cause. Of him I can say with Walt Whitman, "Tried, true and my loving comrade."

I repeat that the A.S.P. is the only scientific revolutionary Socialist Party in Australia. Those who do not fall into line with A.S.P. principles ignore the teachings of Marx, and are off the only path that can lead to the emancipation of the workers as a class. (Applause.)

A show of hands having been taken, the chairman declared that the hands showed a majority in favor of Judd's contention.

Marxian Printing Works, 115 Goulburn-Street, Sydney.

