

# THE UNITY QUESTION

and

A Brief History of the Socialist Labor Party

## REPORT OF DEBATE

BETWEEN

E. E. JUDD & A. S. REARDON

(S.L.P.)

(A.S.P.)

PUBLISHED BY

**The Socialist Labor Party of Australia**

NOVEMBER, 1917

*The People's Print., 16 George Street West, Sydney*

# EVERY WORKER SHOULD READ

## The Following Pamphlets :

- What Means This Strike (DeLeon)** 2d  
A concise statement explaining the cause of strikes.
- Address on Industrial Union Preamble** 2d  
An instructive pamphlet on the W.I.L.U. Preamble, and is a complete analysis of the economic position of the working class under the profit form of production.
- Socialism v. Anarchy (DeLeon)** 2d  
A masterly address on the difference.
- The Seven Questions (DeLeon)** 3d  
This is a Gem. The Answers given to the Questions sweep aside all the old stock objections to Socialism.
- Socialism and Churchianity** 1d  
A Reply to Archbishop Redwood on Socialism.
- The Cause of the War** 2d  
A statement made by E. E. Judd before the Sydney Labor Council. Both topical and informative.
- The Unity Question**  
Report of a Debate between E. E. Judd (S.L.P.) and A. S. Reardon (A.S.P.), containing a brief History of the Socialist Labor Party.

Obtainable at S.L.P. Headquarters :

**Rawson Chambers, Rawson Place, Sydney**

# THE UNITY QUESTION

## REPORT of DEBATE

between

**E. E. JUDD, (S.L.P.) & A. S. REARDON (A.S.P.)**

### INTRODUCTION.

The following is a report of the debate between representatives of the Socialist Labor Party of Australia and the Australian Socialist Party, at the A.S.P. Hall, Pitt St., Sydney, on October 8, 1917.

Comrade J. O. Moroney, General Secretary S.L.P., who was Chairman, said that the debate had been originally fixed for 13th August, but it had been postponed on account of the great industrial convulsion. The A.S.P. Executive had accused the S.L.P. of "failing to show a spirit of unity." The S.L.P. replied that the statement was false, and challenged the A.S.P. to appoint a representative to prove its statement before the members and supporters of both parties. The A.S.P. accepted the challenge to prove its statement that the S.L.P. had "failed to show a spirit of unity." That statement is the subject of debate.

Comrades in charge of the case will give all the details and it is only my duty to open the question for debate, to maintain order and to keep the speakers to the time limit of their addresses. Mr. Judd is to open the subject in a thirty minutes lead, that limit of time having been arranged; and if he takes up more than that limit the time so taken up will be deducted from the time given for his reply. After that Mr. Reardon

is to reply. One quarter of an hour will be allowed for relevant questions to which the speakers will reply. I would enjoin the audience to be patient, restrain any excitement and assist me in conducting the proceedings to a fair and definite conclusion.

## S.L.P. Statement

Com. E. E. Judd, S.L.P.: Mr. Chairman and Comrades: Goethe made Wilhelm Meister speak of how highly we should value those who endeavour, with great sacrifices, to forward the good among their fellows. Members of both the S.L.P. and the A.S.P. have made great sacrifices—in some cases devoting their lives—to “forward the good”—the grandest cause of all—“among their fellows.” Whilst we justly reverence Marx, De Leon, Liebnicht, and others whom we have never seen, we often overlook the worth and nobleness of the comrades we see daily. It is only just to appreciate and value the worth and nobleness of all comrades—irrespective of party lines.

We are living in the most impressive epoch that man has seen. When the statesmen placarded their declarations of war in 1914, they had no more idea of what they were starting than Luther had when he nailed his 95 theses on the church door at Wittenberg on the 31st October, 1517. Human affairs in capitalist countries can never return to their pre-war condition. The Socialists of the world are confronted with the most subtle and brutal ruling class the world has known; so subtle that it has chloroformed millions of its wage-slaves to such an extent that they are prepared to die in defence of its interests; so brutal that it is prepared to make any possible sacrifice—of our class—in its interests. In such an epoch and with such an enemy, scientific socialist unity is vitally necessary. Such an imperative necessity should find us big enough to unite and fight more effectively for the big things of life.

As the Chairman told you, the subject of debate is “The S.L.P. has failed to show a spirit of unity.” Although according to the rules of debate the person who takes the affirmative

has to speak first, Com. Reardon's seconds have insisted that I speak first.

I hope that unity of all Socialists who believe in S.L.P. principles will result from this debate. We should aim at becoming a very powerful section of the new International. That can only be achieved by organising on scientific Socialist principles.

Divorce cases prove that two parties often come together under a single name and fail to achieve unity and harmony. Two factions under a single name is not unity. I want to see unity in name, unity in structure, and harmony in action. We should aim at securing the compactness of a cannon ball. As parties coming together without understanding each other, and knowing each other's past, often leads to estrangement, I will proceed to explain the past of both parties, and the cause of the unity deadlock.

### EPITOME OF THE HISTORY OF THE S.L.P.

The Australian Socialist League—now the Socialist Labor Party of Australia—was established in 1887.

Up to the year 1897, the A.S.L. was practically the advance wing of the Political-Labor Movement, its members being the most active and aggressive within the Political Labour League, giving support to the Labour Party on the political field. Socialism, as then understood, was propagated by the A.S.L., and a rule of the League's Constitution (which was not enforced) prohibited its members from supporting any other political party.

In the year mentioned (1897), after the Federal Convention election, the Labour Movement was a most lifeless thing, both politically and industrially; whilst the A.S.L. was a mere handful. Finding themselves outvoted by the vote-catching politicians and their supporters on all questions of Socialist principles, the most advanced members of the A.S.L. working within the P.L.L. found it imperative to pull out. With the final severance of the A.S.L. from the P.L.L., the Sydney membership decided to reshape the movement and place the League on a more scientific foundation.

As a first provision, the latent rule prohibiting members of the A.S.L. from giving support to any other political party or organisation was enforced. As a conference held Easter, 1898, a new Constitution was drawn up, a manifesto prepared, and a palliative programme of "Socialist Demands" formulated. Later, a monthly organ, called "The Collectivist," was published, which, after being in existence for four months, amalgamated with "The Northern People"—a privately owned paper published at Newcastle, advocating similar views—and finally evolving into "The People," and Party controlled.

About the year 1899, when preparation was being made to elect the first Federal Parliament, the A.S.L. determined to enter the political field in N.S.W., with a full ticket of six for the Senate. The succeeding N.S.W. State Elections were also contested with the same palliative programme and manifesto. This was the last occasion on which the Elections were contested with such a palliative platform and manifesto, the 1901 Conference abolishing these, substituting in their place one demand only—Collective Ownership of the Land and Socially Operated Means of Production, and Production for Use.

At the Annual Conference, held Easter, 1907, a resolution was carried to change the name of the Party from Australian Socialist League to the Socialist Labor Party of Australia. This resolution was duly ratified by the membership, and from that time the organisation has carried on its activities under the name S.L.P.

In 1907 the S.L.P. of Australia, like the S.L.P. of America and Great Britain, realised the absolute futility of expecting Socialism to be accomplished by political means alone, that the ballot must be backed up by the organised economic might of the working-class, as set forth in the Preamble (1905) of the Industrial Workers of the World. The Party, after considerable deliberation, endorsed the I.W.W. Preamble of 1905, prepared a manifesto, issued it to the workers, and assisted in launching the Sydney I.W.W. Club, October, 1907.

Since 1901, the S.L.P. has not only contested N.S.W. State Elections, but—with the exception of the 1914 Election

—every Federal Senate Election on a Revolutionary platform. At each Senate Election (1914 excepted) it has nominated the full ticket of three and paid the penalty of £75 on each occasion for the right of political expression at the ballot box, in addition to the expenses of the campaign.

Though small in numbers, the A.S.L.-S.L.P. had carried on continuous propaganda since 1897, by means of its platform and Press, through the medium of its N.S.W. and Victorian Branches. The S.L.P.—as the pioneer organisation and the most scientific expression of Socialist thought—holds the most prominent place in the history of the Socialist movement in this country.

#### **FORMATION OF THE S.D.F.—I.S.G.—S.F.A.—A.S.P.**

About the early part of 1907, J. J. Morrish (ex-member of the A.S.L.), H. E. Holland (ex-member of the A.S.L. and one time joint editor of its official organ, "The People") and others formed the Social Democratic Party—which H. E. Holland afterwards reorganised into the International Socialist Group which is now the Sydney Branch of the Australian Socialist Party.

#### **S.F.A. FORMED.**

In 1907, Tom Mann, of the Socialist Party of Victoria, called a Conference of all bodies in Australia claiming to stand for Socialism. The Conference met in Melbourne, 1907. The S.L.P. Delegates (J. O. Moroney and T. Batho) placed the S.L.P. position before the Conference. As the S.L.P. was the most scientific organisation represented, and the only organisation that had recognised that Socialism could not be achieved by political means alone, and the only organisation that advocated the economic organisation of the working-class on the 1905 Preamble of the I.W.W., its Delegates insisted that the only scientific basis of unity was for the other Socialist bodies to accept the Revolutionary principles, methods, and tactics of the S.L.P. The Conference refused to agree to that as a basis of unity, only the S.L.P. Delegates voting for it.

As such organisations as the Social Democratic Vanguard (Queensland), the Social Democratic Federation (Sydney), and a similar body in West Australia—all adjuncts of the Labor Party—were represented on the Conference, the defeat of the S.L.P. basis of unity is easily understood. After the S.L.P. Delegates withdrew from the Conference, the Socialist Federation of Australia—now the Australian Socialist Party—was formed by the other organisations represented at the Conference.

### **S.F.A. AND PALLIATIVES.**

Notwithstanding that the S.F.A. endorsed the 1905 Preamble of the I.W.W. at its inception, at the following Conference, held in Sydney in 1908, a resolution was passed to rescind the Federation's endorsement of the said Preamble. This was repudiated by the Federated organisations. A year later, however, the Preamble was rejected, and palliative proposals were endorsed.

### **S.L.P. AND ECONOMIC ORGANISATION.**

Since the mission of class-conscious, revolutionary, industrial Unionism in the approaching Social Revolution has been understood, the S.L.P. has consistently proclaimed the principle enunciated by Daniel De Leon in his address on the Preamble to the Constitution of the I.W.W., namely:—"Without political organisation the Labor movement cannot triumph, without economic organisation the day of its political triumph would be the day of its defeat."

### **A.S.P. AND THE ANTI-POLITICAL I.W.W.**

Despite the fact that the A.S.P. is a political organisation, it lent its support to the anti-political I.W.W.; although the inconsistency and absurdity of such a position must have been quite obvious. By printing announcements of the "Bummery" meetings, and occasionally reports of same, and having its label a standing feature in the official organ of the A.S.P. ("International Socialist") for some considerable time, the

A.S.P. proclaimed its partisanship with the "Bummery" in contra distinction to the bona fide I.W.W.

### **UNITY CONFERENCE, 1912.**

If further proof of this partisanship of the A.S.P. towards the "Bummery" is needed, we can quote from incidents of the Unity Conference between the A.S.P. and the S.L.P., May, June, 1912. The S.L.P. recognised that the existence of two political parties claiming to be Socialist (although it was in no way responsible for the second party) could not but have disastrous effects in retarding the Socialist movement. Therefore, with a desire to end this disunity, the S.L.P. appointed three delegates (Coms. R. Dade, A. Edwards, and H. Ostler) to confer with three delegates from the A.S.P. to see if some basis of unity could be arrived at. The Delegates met and conferred, but without the desired result. A deadlock was reached at the outset on the question of Industrial Unionism. The S.L.P. Delegates insisted that one of the principles to form a basis for unity of the two parties must be a recognition and endorsement of the original Preamble of the I.W.W. This the A.S.P. Delegates were not prepared to accept, although two of them were disposed to be indifferent as to which I.W.W. was endorsed. H. E. Holland opposed the endorsement, mendaciously termed it "the De Leon I.W.W.," and came forth with devious suggestions. Of course, the S.L.P. Delegates would not recede from their position on the I.W.W. Preamble, which stands for both political and industrial action, recognising that if there was to be any unity of the Socialist forces there must be a certain degree of homogeneity among the elements composing the united Party; and with the A.S.P. Delegates leaning towards the "Bummery," there was nothing for the S.L.P. Delegates to do but withdraw.

### **1913-14 UNITY NEGOTIATIONS.**

As a result of the A.S.P. inviting the S.L.P. to confer with it on the question of unity, a conference of delegates from both parties was held at the Queen's Hall, Sydney, on 10th November, 1913.

Comrade Roche (A.S.P.) stated that at a previous conference (1912) the question of supporting the Detroit I.W.W. (1905 Preamble) had been a stumbling block, but this had since been got over by the A.S.P. referring the question of endorsing the Detroit I.W.W. to its branches, with the result that a majority of branches agreed to the endorsement of the Detroit I.W.W. He also stated that they (A.S.P.) realised that the actions of the S.L.P. had been right, and its principles and tactics correct. His co-delegates, Coms. Winspear and Jones, acquiesced in his statements.

At this Conference the principles upon which the proposed united party was to be based were agreed to. At the third meeting of the Unity Conference, held on March 19th, 1914, at the Queen's Hall, it was resolved, "That a Committee of five members from each Party's Executive meet together at a date to be arranged to discuss details of Press."

This meeting, though arranged, never took place, only an informal one being held in the A.S.P. room, in Goulburn Street, owing to the absence of Com. Jones, of A.S.P., through illness, and of Com. Roche, who was absent in Queensland, and nothing more was done in the matter, the S.L.P. receiving no further communications from the A.S.P. re any further meetings. Subsequently, the Central Branch of the Socialist Labor Party recommended to its General Executive that negotiations be opened again with the A.S.P. in the matter, and the General Secretary of the S.L.P. again communicated with the A.S.P. making arrangements for a meeting in the "People" Office on July 9th, 1914, and at this meeting a proposal regarding the S.L.P. printing plant was submitted by the S.L.P. Delegates. The A.S.P. Delegates agreed to put the proposal before their Executive Council, which would meet the following week, when they would immediately forward us its decision. From that date, July 9th, until November 9th—four months—we received no communication from the A.S.P. On November 9th we received from them a contrary proposal regarding our printing plant. As the S.L.P. believed that a Revolutionary Socialist Party should own its Press and plant, and as the A.S.P. proposals involved the hiring and substitution of—and dependence

upon—a printing plant owned by an outside organisation for the Party-owned plant, our Executive rejected the proposal—and the Executive's action was endorsed by the Party. Thus ended the 1913-14 Unity negotiations.

### DEMOCRATIC PROPOSAL OF THE S.L.P.

The next attempt to achieve Unity was initiated by the Annual Conference of the S.L.P., held at Easter, 1915. That Conference was of the opinion that as the S.L.P. and A.S.P. Executives had failed to achieve Unity, that the fairest and most democratic method—and the quickest way to achieve Unity—would be to place all the vital facts in connection with both organisations before the members of both parties. With that object in view the following proposal was adopted:—

"In order that the membership of the S.L.P. and A.S.P. shall clearly grasp all the vital facts in connection with both organisations—including the cause of the deadlock of the unity negotiations—that the Executives of the above-mentioned parties agree to prepare and publish a statement on behalf of their respective organisations in 'The People' and 'International Socialist' respectively

"In the event of the proposition being accepted by the A.S.P., the S.L.P. to open the discussion, which, in order to prevent the party statements being obscured, to be limited to official statements until its conclusion."

Also that when one Party published its official statement, the other Party was to republish it the following week, then publish the reply, which was to be republished by the first Party the following week, and so on until the official statements concluded. After the S.L.P. Conference decisions were ratified by its membership, the proposal was forwarded to the A.S.P. This proposal should have enabled the membership of both Parties not only to have understood the cause of disunity, but to have achieved Unity. Could we have made a fairer offer? The A.S.P. agreed to the proposal. On September 9th we published our statement and sent copies of it to the A.S.P. office. Instead of publishing our statement the following week—as they had agreed—the A.S.P. officials did not publish even

a part of it until October 2, 1915. On that date less than half of the S.L.P. statement was published in the "International Socialist," and the rest of the statement was suppressed. And what do you think, comrades, the A.S.P. officials said in an introductory paragraph to the published portion of our statement? What do you think honest men would have said? They would have said: "This is a part of the S.L.P.'s statement. What did the A.S.P. officials say? Here is their paper! They said, "**This** is the S.L.P. statement." As you see, it is less than half of the S.L.P. statement. Therefore their statement is a lie. Are not integrity and the honoring of agreements between sections of Socialists vitally necessary factors in the Socialist movement? What a calamity to our class it would be if the Socialists of different countries agreed to take concerted action in the event of a crisis, and, when the crisis eventuated, failed to honour their agreements! Don't we Socialists regard the suppression and lying practised by the Capitalist Press as a crime against humanity? Is it any less a crime when Socialists commit the same offence? If it is not, what are we to think of the A.S.P. officials who not only dishonoured their agreement and suppressed part of our statement, but lied about the part they did publish?

Notwithstanding the manner in which the A.S.P. officials treated our statement, when their reply was published in the "International Socialist" of December 11th, 1915—and although it contained untrue statements—we published every word of it on the front page of the following issue of "The People." Here are both papers! Anyone in the audience can examine them! In the same issue (January, 1916) of our paper you will find our reply entitled "A Rejoinder to the A.S.P.," which concludes with the following:—

"NOTE.—Will the A.S.P. Executive now publish the suppressed portion of the former S.L.P. statement? Also the above statement IN FULL, and reply to the same?

"(Signed) J. O. Moroney,  
"Gen. Sec."

That request was never complied with. The whole of our second statement was suppressed. On different occasions, prior to the suppression of our official statements, the A.S.P. had attacked members of the S.L.P. through the columns of the "International Socialist" and suppressed their replies. Was that fair?

In the case of our official statements, the A.S.P. officials dishonoured their agreement, suppressed more than half our first statement on Unity and lied about it, and suppressed the whole of our second statement. The S.L.P. honoured the agreement, published every word of the A.S.P. statement, and did all in its power to place all the important facts before the members of both parties in order to achieve Unity. Is there a Comrade in the audience—I know Comrade Reardon would not—who would describe the suppression, lying, and dishonouring of the agreement by the A.S.P. officials as a manifestation of the "spirit of Unity"?

### S.L.P. AND UNITY ON THE INDUSTRIAL FIELD.

In 1907, the S.L.P. realised the vital necessity of the class-conscious, Revolutionary, economic organisation of the working-class. It realised, as the late Daniel De Leon of our Party in America said in his address entitled "Unity," that the economic arm is indispensable to the Revolutionary act of taking and holding the plants of production, and is the frame of the Government of the Co-operative Commonwealth. Since then (April, 1907) the S.L.P. has done all in its power to establish and build up a sound economic organisation on the industrial field. It caused the I.W.W. (1905 Preamble) Club to be launched on the 22nd October, 1907. Since that date the S.L.P. members assisted to form Clubs in Melbourne, West Wallsend, Cessnock, and Lithgow. For over ten years the S.L.P. has advocated the organisation of the working-class on the original Preamble of the I.W.W. giving the I.W.W.—now Workers' International Industrial Union—Club free space in "The People," and assisting it to secure literature.

### S.F.A.-A.S.P. AND UNITY ON THE INDUSTRIAL FIELD.

In 1912, when the anti-political I.W.W. was launched in this city, members of the A.S.P. formed part of its membership. And the A.S.P.—as an organisation—assisted to build up the anti-political I.W.W. against the industrial and political I.W.W. Even after the A.S.P. decided to endorse the Detroit I.W.W. on November 10th, 1913, not one member of it (except perhaps Com. Roche) joined the organisation (I.W.W. Club) propagating the principles which the A.S.P. professed to endorse.

When the A.S.P. wanted to fight against Conscription in the early part of 1915 what organisation did it join forces with? The anarchistic I.W.W. When the S.L.P. wished to secure united action to oppose the introduction of Conscription in the following August, who did it approach? The A.S.P. Which action was the better manifestation of the "spirit of Socialist unity?"

### FORMATION NEWTOWN W.I.I.U.

On August 28th, 1916, R. Everitt, an Executive member of the A.S.P., wrote to the General Secretary of the Workers' International Industrial Union in America, and induced him—partly by false statements—to grant a charter to Everitt and others to form an Australian administration of the W.I.I.U. Everitt had—as a member of the A.S.P.—assisted to build up the anti-political I.W.W. He knew what a long and bitter struggle the I.W.W. Club had experienced. He knew that for years it had been—and was still—advocating W.I.I.U. principles. After the A.S.P. ceased to support the anti-political I.W.W., and had decided to endorse the Detroit I.W.W., Everitt and his supporters played the part of wait-awhile flowers for two years and nine months, until they were seized with an overwhelming desire to achieve unity on the industrial field by writing to America for a Charter and "authority" to establish a rival W.I.I.U. organisation. Every member of the Executive of the W.I.I.U. that was formed at Newtown was a member of the A.S.P.

The I.W.W. (now W.I.I.U.) Club was, and is, based upon correct principles, and its Constitution provides for the launching of the Detroit—now W.I.I. Union. In publishing many thousands of pamphlets, holding propaganda meetings, etc., the Club was doing propaganda and recruiting work vitally essential for the correct economic organisation of the working-class. The W.I.I.U. at Newtown can do no more.

No scientific Socialist, or scientific Socialist organisation, has ever contended that before people in any country can organise on correct lines they must get a "Charter" and "authority" from an organisation in another country. Had the people who formed the I.W.W. in Chicago in 1905 thought so, they would never have formed the I.W.W., because there was not in any country an organisation that could give them a "Charter" or "authority." Yet the chief pretext or justification advanced by Everitt and other members of the A.S.P. for forming a rival W.I.I.U. organisation here was that the existing organisation had not got "authority" and a "Charter" from America. They said, in effect, that they had got a piece of paper from America that the existing organisation (I.W.W.—W.I.I.U. Club) had not. Therefore, they contended, they were justified in forming a rival organisation.

When a scientific Socialist is living in a country in which there exists an organisation based upon the principles in which he believes, should he join that organisation or organise a rival organisation? If he wished to act in the best interests of our class, he would join the existing organisation. If he wished to act in the best interests of the capitalist class—by confusing the workers—he would organise a rival organisation.

Someone has said that Com. Everitt's action in stabbing the Club from behind—by getting, partly by false statements, a "Charter" from America and launching a rival W.I.I.U. organisation—was clever. Perhaps it was! But was it honest? Was his action worthy of an earnest Revolutionary fighting for the unity of his class, or was it worthy of a W. M. Hughes? And yet Everitt is one of an Executive that accuses the S.L.P. of "failing to show a spirit of unity." If my opponent knows



of an act more calculated to create or perpetuate disunity than that action of Everitt and other A.S.P. members, I ask him to tell you of it.

You may ask, what has the forming of the rival W.I.I.U. organisation to do with the A.S.P.? I wish to be just. I understand that many members of the A.S.P. did not agree with Everitt's action—some of them told me that they did not, and I believe them. But Everitt was then, and is now, a member of the A.S.P. Executive, those who composed the Executive of the W.I.I.U. at Newtown were members of the A.S.P., and the A.S.P.—as an organisation—acquiesced in the formation of this rival organisation by some of its members. Was the formation of the rival W.I.I.U. organisation a manifestation of "the spirit of unity"?

If instead of supporting the anti-political I.W.W., etc., the A.S.P. had acted as the S.L.P. has done, there may not have been so many of the good fighters of our class in gaol to-day, and we would have had a strong W.I.I. Union now. The A.S.P. is chiefly responsible for the non-existence of a strong W.I.I.U. in Australia.

### 1917 UNITY NEGOTIATIONS.

The blow the "NO" voters struck against Conscription and for freedom on the 28th October last reverberated throughout the capitalist world. It raised the hopes of the fighters for freedom and the oppressed everywhere. And the greatest and grandest thrill of hope and joy that the Socialists of the world ever experienced was when the cables flashed the news that the Russian Revolutionaries had struck their great blow for freedom. Although they were on the other side of the world, and we had never seen them and did not even understand their language, their action inspired us to greater effort, and our sympathies were with them. Any consolidation or strengthening or forward move of Socialist forces in any country sets an example to the Socialists of all countries. The S.L.P. recognises the truth of what I have just stated. Therefore, when the A.S.P. invitation for another Unity Conference was placed

before our Annual Conference last Good Friday (April 6th), and we saw the possibility of effecting a unity that would strengthen our forces here and serve as an example for Socialists in other States and other lands, we acted with alacrity. Despite all that the A.S.P. had done, and the fact that we were in the midst of a strenuous Federal Senate election fight, we appointed delegates, and asked the A.S.P. delegates to meet us on the Easter Monday. This they willingly agreed to. On Easter Monday (April 9th) the following delegation met at the S.L.P. Room:—A.S.P.: Coms. Neilson, Reardon, and Everitt; S.L.P.: Coms. Moroney, Klausen, and Judd. In the discussion that ensued the A.S.P. delegates said they had no objection to the S.L.P. as the name of the proposed united party. Com. Reardon said: "If we accept the Socialist Labor Party as the name for the unity party, there is no reason why our party should not come over to the S.L.P." I replied that I knew of no good reason why his party should not, and asked him if he knew of any good reason why his party should not. He replied: "No, I do not." I then suggested that we recommend to our respective Executives that three delegates be appointed from each Executive to meet and draft a basis of unity—including such matters as the name of the party and paper—and submit such proposals to the Executives for endorsement. In the event of such proposals being endorsed by both Executives, they be submitted to the general membership of both parties for ratification. I also proposed that the delegates meet the following Sunday (15th April). To these proposals the A.S.P. delegates willingly agreed. Our Executive not only appointed Coms. Klausen, Ostler, and myself to meet the A.S.P. delegates, but gave us a free hand. On Sunday morning, 15th April, we met Coms. Reardon, Thomas, and Everitt. I moved, as a basis of unity: "That we unite on the principles of Marxian scientific Socialism, and in the recognition and endorsement of the Preamble of the W.I.I.U. as adopted by the Chicago Conference in 1905, and amended by the General Conference in September, 1915." That was readily agreed to by the A.S.P. delegates. I then moved: "That the name of the united party be 'The Socialist Labor Party of Australia.'"

This was also agreed to. I then said: "The name of a Socialist paper should convey the clearest possible idea of the general nature of the paper's subject matter, and the aim of the party that owns it. The name of 'The People' only gives a vague idea of the paper's subject matter, and the aim of the party that owns it. The 'International Socialist' has been used for building up the non-political I.W.W., etc. For those reasons, I think we had best drop the names of both papers, and have a new name. Although the S.L.P. has published its ideas for over eighteen years, under the name of 'The People,' I am prepared to advise my party to accept a new name for the official organ of the united party." Therefore, I moved: "That the new name be 'The Revolutionary Socialist.'" I also explained that the word "Revolutionary" would not only give an idea of our aim, but it would also tend to prevent our paper being confused with the organs of alleged Socialist parties. Further, that the proposed change only involved the substitution of the word "Revolutionary" in place of the word "International" in the name of the A.S.P. paper, whereas it involved the abolition of the name "The People." Also I said that if anyone could suggest a better name than the "Revolutionary Socialist" I would accept it. Could I have made a fairer offer? The A.S.P. delegates found no fault with the name, but one of them—I think it was Com. Reardon—said that their Executive had instructed them to move that the name of the new paper be the "International Socialist." This he moved as an amendment to my motion. Finally, both names were submitted to the Executive for their decision. The A.S.P. Executive insisted that the name of the paper be the "International Socialist," and the S.L.P. Executive did not agree to that name, but was willing to recommend to its membership that the name "The People," be given up, and a new name adopted.

At the next meeting of the Unity Conference—which was held to try to overcome the deadlock regarding the name of the paper—Com. Reardon said that as the A.S.P. had agreed to the S.L.P. as the name of the united party, the S.L.P. should agree to the "International Socialist" as the name of the new

paper. I contended, in reply, that he and his co-delegates claimed that whatever the A.S.P.'s past had been, it was now come to the same position as to principles, policy, and tactics as the S.L.P. has held to all along the line. If that is so, honesty compels the public admission and recognition of that fact by the adoption of the name S.L.P. as the name of the united party. Further, that as the S.L.P. has a clean record, and the A.S.P. has not, the A.S.P. is not giving away anything, but is achieving a gain in adopting the name S.L.P. Com. Reardon then said he thought the S.L.P. should give way "for the sake of unity."

I replied that the creation and perpetuation of the A.S.P. and its support of the anti-political I.W.W. were crimes against the working-class. The A.S.P. delegates admitted that that was true. They also admitted that the S.L.P. had been right all through. I then said, "You admit that the S.L.P. has been right and the A.S.P. has been wrong, yet you ask that which you admit to have been right to give way to that which you admit to have been wrong! Why should right give way to wrong?" Before we adjourned that evening Coms. Reardon, Everitt, and McDonald agreed to recommend to their Executive that it accept the name "Revolutionary Socialist." As we were adjourning Com. McDonald said to his co-delegates: "The Executive is here! We are the Executive! We may as well accept the name now!" Com. Reardon said, "Our proxy delegates are not here."

When the A.S.P. delegates informed us at the next Unity Conference meeting that their Executive still insisted upon the name of "International Socialist," I said that I was prepared to go before their Executive and give reasons why the name "Revolutionary Socialist" should be adopted. At the following meeting of our Executive (Friday, May 11th) I was appointed to attend the A.S.P. Executive meeting next day. During the discussion at the A.S.P. Executive meeting I was surprised to find Coms. Reardon and Everitt opposing the name which—at the Unity Conference—they had agreed to recommend their Executive to accept. As Com. Klausen said at the Unity Conference, we placed all our cards upon the table and

played an open game. But the action of Coms. Reardon and Everitt in opposing at the Executive what they had agreed to recommend at the Unity Conference, suggested that they were playing a secret game.

I told the A.S.P. Executive that if they could suggest a better name than the "Revolutionary Socialist" I would advocate it. I explained to them how unity could be achieved before the end of that month, but they would not accept my proposal. No new arguments were advanced against the proposed name.

Com. Reardon afterwards informed Com. Moroney that the A.S.P. Executive had decided to insist upon the name "International Socialist," or, as an alternative, that the name of the paper be left until after unity had taken place. The S.L.P. Executive rejected the A.S.P. proposal, and proposed that "in the event of unity, both names, 'International Socialist' and 'The People,' be dropped and a new name adopted for the official organ of the party." The A.S.P. Executive then carried the following motion: "That the Secretary be instructed to inform the S.L.P. that as it had failed to show a spirit of unity, it is futile to proceed with the negotiations." Thus, after all the most important matters had been agreed to—and whilst the A.S.P. Executive had before it a proposal from us regarding the name of the paper—the A.S.P. Executive broke off unity negotiations. Was that a manifestation of "the spirit of unity"?

Com. Moroney was instructed to reply to Com. Reardon as follows: "We regret that the A.S.P. Executive treated our proposal re the name of the official organ of the proposed united party so unjustly. The statements contained in your communication that 'the S.L.P. has failed to show a spirit of unity' is false.' Therefore, we challenge your Executive to appoint a representative to meet a representative of the S.L.P. before a combined meeting of the members and supporters of both parties, to prove your statement that the S.L.P. has 'failed to show a spirit of unity.'"

## CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, I will briefly summarise some of the most important facts. As the S.L.P. was in existence, the forming of the A.S.P. as a rival Socialist organisation was against the principles of Socialist unity. Its perpetuation as a rival Socialist organisation has been, and is, against the principle of Socialist unity. The A.S.P. support of the anti-political I.W.W. against the original I.W.W. was a crime against the working-class, and was against the principle of scientific Socialist unity. The suppression of the S.L.P. unity statements and the dishonouring of an agreement and the lying by the A.S.P. officials was not a manifestation of the "spirit of unity." The launching of a rival W.I.I.U. organisation at Newtown last December by members of the A.S.P. was not a manifestation of "the spirit of unity." A.S.P. representatives admit that the S.L.P. has been right and that the A.S.P. has been wrong. Yet the A.S.P. Executive demands that the S.L.P. shall give way to it on the name of the paper.

One of the greatest Socialist demands is that wrong should give way to right. Acting in accord with that demand, members of the A.S.P. go to Newtown Bridge and other places and tell the people that things that are wrong, such as the P.L.L. and capitalism, should give way to things that are right, such as the Socialist movement and Socialism. One would naturally expect that when the A.S.P. is in the wrong it would be prepared to do what it demands of others when they are in the wrong. But its Executive demands in the case of the S.L.P. that the great Socialist demand must be reversed, and that which it admits to be right, give way to that which it admits to be wrong. If the A.S.P. was in the right, and the S.L.P. in the wrong, would the A.S.P. give way? No! Then the A.S.P. asks the S.L.P. to do that which—were it in the S.L.P. position—it would refuse to do.

The A.S.P. Executive admitted that it could not suggest a better name than the "Revolutionary Socialist." Although the S.L.P. offered to drop the name "The People," under which it had published its ideas for nineteen years, and sug-

gested that the name of the new paper be the "Revolutionary Socialist" or some other new name, the A.S.P. replied that the S.L.P. had "failed to show a spirit of unity," and broke off unity negotiations. Was breaking off unity negotiations a manifestation of the "spirit of unity?" The formation of the A.S.P. as a rival organisation was in conflict with the principle of Socialist unity. The existence of the A.S.P. is in conflict with the principle of Socialist unity. The A.S.P. is responsible for disunity, and is chiefly responsible for the non-existence of a powerful Socialist organisation in Australia.

The S.L.P. is not responsible for the existence of rival Socialist organisations. It has responded to every request for Unity Conferences. When the Executives failed to achieve unity in 1914-15, the S.L.P. tried to place all the important facts before the members of both organisations, but was prevented doing so by A.S.P. officials. The S.L.P. has always desired and worked for the effective unity of the working-class. That unity is a basic principle, and but for the felt need for it the S.L.P. would never have been founded and its long and arduous years of propaganda would never have been undertaken. The S.L.P. has always afforded opportunities for unity on scientific Socialist principles and just conditions. The S.L.P. was the first and is the only Socialist Party in Australia that has consistently advocated both the political and economic organisation and effective unity of the working-class. Since 1887 the S.L.P. has been the most scientific organised expression of Socialist thought in Australia. With patience and indomitable perseverance it has cleared the way through forests of ignorance, and held fast to scientific Socialist principles, whilst other parties have confused and misled the workers. The scientific knowledge and steadfast spirit of the S.L.P. has enabled it to maintain an impregnable front against all the shams and parties of Capitalism. In spite of all the calumny and intrigue of its enemies, and the Te Deums they have sung whenever they thought it had received a death-blow, the implacable S.L.P. is not only undaunted and unbowed, but is forging ahead. The S.L.P. is the only organisation in Australia that has consistently advocated, and been prepared to

accept, the effective unity of Socialists on scientific Socialist principles and just conditions.

Com. Reardon has undertaken to prove that the S.L.P. has "failed to show a spirit of unity." Although he is a clever speaker, and skilled in the art of debate, and will probably make a plausible statement, I do not envy him his task. (Applause.)

---

## The Other Side

**A. S. REARDON FOR THE A.S.P.**

Comrade Chairman, Comrade Judd, Comrades, and friends.

Before commencing I must really thank Mr. Judd for what he said about my being a clever speaker and debater. If it be so, 'tis the first time I have ever heard of it. I have been deeply interested in this question of Unity. No man can be a Scientific Socialist unless he believes in the unification of the forces that are making for the emancipation of the working-class. (Hear, hear.) It is now twelve months since I resigned from the Socialist Labor Party, and as it may be of interest during this discussion on Unity, I will take the opportunity of reading my resignation:—

15th October, 1916.

Mr. J. Eather,  
Sec., Sydney Branch, S.L.P.  
Dear Comrade,

Being opposed to the S.L.P.'s attitude re Unity, and fully endorsing the action of Melbourne Comrades in seceding, being in fact partly responsible for said action, insofar as that I moved the amendment in Melbourne

Branch insisting on the Party again attempting to bring about Unity, I herewith beg to tender my resignation from the S.L.P. The ultra-conservative stand adopted by the Party, together with the refusal to publish correspondence on Unity, which is tantamount to a stifling of discussion on the subject renders the efforts of individuals in this essential direction futile, and a waste of time; hence, Comrades—"Ave atque vale!!"

Yours for a United working-class,

A. SILVEY-REARDON.

And so I became a member of the Australian Socialist Party. I was not acquainted with much of its history at the time, and I thank Mr. Judd for acquainting me with it. This I am acquainted with, however, that the A.S.P. has the true-going revolutionary spirit, and I challenge any member of the S.L.P. to show me one point in connection with it where it fails to come up to the requisite standard of a straight-out Revolutionary Socialist organisation. I refer you to the paper of the Party, and I challenge any man to show me an organ higher in tone than the "International Socialist," or one of a higher educational value, in the world of Socialist periodicals. When I listened to Com. Judd I was interested in what he had to tell us of our past history; I was particularly struck with one peculiar idea. If I am correct, Mr. Judd was originally brought up in the Christian faith, has been deeply inured in that faith, for I am told that devoted Christians entertain a belief in a certain affair they call God, who kept a sort of zoological garden out Jerusalem way, and placed therein an Adam and an Eve, who somehow committed a sin, and through all generations since then He practically accuses all people born on this earth of being guilty and responsible for the original, just as Comrade Judd blames the present members of the A.S.P. for the past history of the organisation.

No one regrets more than I do that there should be two Parties calling themselves Socialist in Australia, but the fact remains that there are two parties, in spite of everything which must have transpired in the past. The A.S.P. is now

a concrete movement of young and virile workers, carrying out the propaganda of the Party. It is a larger body than the S.L.P., and I claim its membership has more vigour and enthusiasm.

In March of this year the Party did me the honor of electing me to be General Secretary, and I decided, now that I was in the A.S.P., that I would do my best as an individual, at all times and in all places, to bring about the Unity which is so much to be desired. On the 31st March of this year I wrote, under instructions from my Executive, to the S.L.P. in these terms:—

31st March, 1917.

Mr. J. O. Moroney, Gen. Sec., S.L.P.

Dear Comrade,

In accord with a resolution carried at our recent Conference, I have been instructed to approach you with a view to once again opening Unity negotiations. You will I think agree that Unity of the Revolutionary forces of Australia has never been so essential as at the present time. You will, therefore, I trust, bring this matter before your Executive and acquaint me with its decision.

On behalf of the Central Executive, A.S.P.,

A. S. REARDON,

Gen. Sec.

To this I received a reply assuring me that the S.L.P. were prepared to consider the question of Unity, and suggested making arrangements for a date on which the matter could be gone into. There is no need to read that letter. (A voice: "Yes, yes.") It is not necessary to read it now. I may do so later on. Now, there are two points I want to touch upon. The first is the letter I read just now and the second is the following letter:—

A.S.P. Central Executive,

11th June, 1917.

Mr. J. O. Moroney, Gen. Sec., S.L.P.

Dear Comrade,

Your letter of the 29/5/17 was considered at the last meeting of the above, and the following motion was

carried:—"That the Secretary be instructed to inform the S.L.P. that as they have failed to show a spirit of Unity, it is futile to proceed with negotiations.

Yours fraternally,

A. S. REARDON, Gen. Sec.

Now, if Com. Judd had done what I would have liked him to have done, he would have dealt with the history of the organisation at this stage. I intend to confine myself to the story of the matter between these two points. We have been accused by Com. Judd of some awful misdeeds in the past, but surely when the S.L.P. agreed to meet us in order to discuss the matter of Unity it was tantamount to admitting that we were proper and reputable people to deal with, and, if not, his statement of the S.L.P. that they were desirous of Unity was all cant and humbug. (Hear, hear.)

Well, this conference was arranged, and we went along to the S.L.P. There had been trouble over the name of the United Party at previous conferences, and they had agreed to change the name. We came to the conclusion, that as unity was necessary and desirable amongst Socialists, that we would do everything to facilitate the business, and straightway offered to accept without question the name S.L.P. We met in an honorable way, and said we were prepared absolutely to drop the name of A.S.P. which you must admit was no trivial offer; for although there is perhaps nothing in a name, there are people who might perhaps see some little sentimental value in it. When we got that settled, with the concurrence of the S.L.P., certain minor difficulties arose. Questions as to the name of the paper and so on. Com. Judd will bear witness to the fact that I put the position this way:—"If you will agree to unite upon the basis of revolutionary Socialism, and we are prepared to accept the name of S.L.P., then in a spirit of unity, will you not accept the name of International Socialist for the paper of the United Party?" It was a far greater thing for us to drop the name of our party than for the S.L.P. to change the name of their paper, and we asked them in the same spirit of compromise and fair play. The position

I put is this; and you will see the sweet reasonableness of it. I said: "We speak as individual members of the A.S.P.; we have members in all our Branches. We are prepared to unite on any basis, but we must consider our membership. We are not here to make unity absolutely, but to devise a basis upon which such unity can be effected. This basis will have to be submitted to a referendum vote of the whole of the membership. It is therefore essential that we should submit to them, in the interest of a speedy unity, proposals that they are most likely to endorse. What proposition could be fairer than the one we submitted? We are already giving up the name of the Party, and you desire us to ask our members to give up everything. If you will meet us in a spirit of unity and we can submit a give and take proposal, if you will accept the title of our paper, all will be well. The S.L.P. demurred and objected. Did that show a "spirit of unity" for a start? Other meetings were held after that and eventually the S.L.P. asked us to receive a delegate in order that he might state their case against retaining the name of the paper. We immediately said we would, and Com. Judd came along at a later date and lectured us on our awful past. After more deliberation the following proposal was put forward:—

"That we accept the name S.L.P., provided the name of the paper be the 'International Socialist.' As an alternative, we suggest that the name of the paper be decided by a vote of the membership after Unity has been accomplished."

(Com. McDonald, member of the A.S.P. Executive, delegate to unity conference: "How did the vote go?") It has not been submitted to the ballot but that was the proposition. We would unite first as the S.L.P. and let united party decide the name of the paper. Was that a fair offer to come from the A.S.P.? (Yes and No). We waived aside every objection, and we got this letter in reply:—

29th May, 1917.

Mr. A. S. Reardon, Gen. Sec. A.S.P.,

Dear Comrade,—

Yours of the 18th inst., forwarding decision of your Executive on the Unity question—"That the name of the paper be the 'International Socialist,' and in the event of Unity being brought about, the matter be submitted to the whole of the membership"—was considered by the General Executive of the above party, when the following resolution was adopted, and which I was instructed to forward to you—"That this Executive disagrees with the proposal of the A.S.P., and proposes that in the event of Unity, both the names of the 'International Socialist' and 'The People' be dropped, and a new name submitted for the official organ of the party."

Yours fraternally,

J. O. MORONEY, Gen. Sec.

We offered to unite with the S.L.P. but they deliberately refused to unite, on essential and vital principles, and made minor details the stumbling block. After all is said and done we are only human. We went into the question with the S.L.P. with the idea of endeavouring to the utmost to bring about one solid organisation, but were met with opposition and indifference. On the 11th of June I was instructed to write to the S.L.P., and this is the letter:—

A.S.P. Central Executive,  
11th June, 1917.

Mr. J. O. Moroney,  
Gen. Sec. S.L.P.

Dear Comrade,—

Your letter of the 29/5/17 was considered at last meeting of the above, and the following motion was carried, "That the Secretary be instructed to inform the

S.L.P. that as they have failed to shew a spirit of unity it is futile to proceed with negotiations."

Yours fraternally,

A. S. REARDON, Gen. Sec.

Was our statement in accord with the facts (a voice, No.) I have yet to learn where we went astray, and Mr. Judd has failed throughout his speech in shewing us. We did everything that was possible, but they failed to meet us in the same spirit, and on them must rest the onus of the organisation not being united.

Let us answer Mr. Judd's arguments, especially in regard to the W.I.I.U., the Original I.W.W. Club, existed purely as a propagandist club. Year in and year out it carried on its operations. Former members inside the A.S.P. got together—I was not amongst them—I have enough criminal records against me without that, if it be criminal. They got together and decided that if ever there was a time for One Big Industrial organisation, it was ripe. Doing the right thing, they sent to American headquarters of the W.I.I.U. for a charter, and the fact that headquarters responded to their application, is proof positive that they had taken up the right position. The members of the Newtown Branch of the A.S.P. got into that organisation. All the more credit to the A.S.P. for having developed men with the intellect to realise its industrial position and possibilities, and to build up an organisation where it had not existed before. With regard to Com. Ray Everitt getting the Charter from America by means of false representation, that has yet to be proven. Com. Judd asked me if I know of any worse action than that of Com. Everitt and others. Yes, the refusal of the S.L.P. to unite.

As to no one suggesting a better name for the paper than "Revolutionary Socialist," we suggested a better name for the paper, the name that makes its objects clear to everyone, we suggested the "International Socialist," but they did not accept it.

Reverting to the history of the doings of members in the past, it might have been bad, but the party to-day has out-

grown all that and we bear favorable comparison with any Socialist party in the world. I think we have cleared it of late, and I am of opinion that the S.L.P. completely failed to meet us in a spirit of unity, and that the negotiations were utterly futile. In conclusion I may say that I am out for action, and have one object, my own emancipation. I cannot get that until the working class get theirs, and they cannot get theirs until there is one sound solid organisation, having for its purpose the overthrow of the capitalist system, and the creation of "the Commonwealth of Labor." I am up against anything that stands between that and myself, and henceforth, any individual or any party that stands in the way of the closer organisation of the working class is one to which I am opposed.

Emancipation for the working class I repeat, and to hell with those who stand in the way of it.

---

## QUESTIONS

Chairman: A rather peculiar position has arisen. Mr. Judd having exceeded the time allowed for his opening statement; he has left himself no time for reply, and as we have to keep strictly within the limits laid down I have no option but to throw the matter open now to the audience for questions. One quarter of an hour will be allowed for this, and the questions consequently must be relevant to the statements made by the speakers.

Com. McDonald: Is it in order to ask, is there any truth in the statement made by Mr. Judd that the A.S.P. delegates at the Unity Conference, agreed to recommend to their Executive that it agree to the Revolutionary Socialist as the name of the United Party paper?

Com. Reardon: Let me explain. The position was this. At the Unity meeting in question, there were six of us present; their names are immaterial, but we were prepared to recom-

mend that our respective Parties unite on the principles of Socialism, and to take the recommendations of the conference back to our Executives for decision. But no motion was put at that Unity meeting in favour of the name Revolutionary Socialist.

Com. Mrs. Reardon: If the people who formed the W.I.I.U. at Newtown were in the wrong, why did the Melbourne section of the I.W.W. Club endorse their action and link-up with them?

Com. Judd: The Melbourne section linked up with them partly because they did not know all the facts, and partly because they were misled.

Com. Everitt: How is it that the Melbourne influence caused Comrade Klausen to back down over the lying statement about myself?

Com. Judd: It is not true that the Melbourne section forced him to back down.

Com. F. Hancock: Is it a fact that a lying statement contained in the March issue of the "People" was challenged and when the Melbourne section forced him to repudiate it, Klausen apologised?

Com. Judd: Melbourne section did not force Klausen to repudiate anything. Comrade Everitt wrote a reply to Comrade Klausen's statement in the "People" and drew attention to Comrade Klausen's error regarding members of the W.I.I.U. at Newtown and Craft Unions. — When Klausen's attention was drawn to Everitt's letter he apologised for his error in the next issue of the "People." Could a man have acted more honourably?

Com. McDonald: Is it a fact that the A.S.P. Executive was incomplete at the time of the Conference?

Com. Reardon: I would like to make an explanation. When I was first elected as Secretary, I found things were neglected as regards the administration of the Party, in fact they were in a decidedly "crook" condition. Immediately I came into office I set about establishing some sort of order. Branches outside of Sydney were circularised asking them to elect proxy



delegates as provided by our rules, and at the time of the Unity Conference returns were expected to come in at any time in order to make the Executive complete. If, therefore, there is any insinuation of dirty work, I can only ask you to disabuse your mind of the idea.

Com. McDonald: Were not the whole of our Executive present at the Unity meeting at which I said "The Executive is here," and you replied "No! The Proxy delegates are not here?"

Com. Reardon: If you had said "part of the Executive" I would be prepared to say, correct; but in some cases the Proxies had not been returned.

Com. McDonald: Were not the whole of the Executive there?

Com. Reardon: No! They could not possibly have been there, because they were not all elected.

Com. Judd: Is it a fact that after the adjournment of the meeting, Comrade Everitt said to Comrade McDonald "You should not have said we were the Executive," and Comrade McDonald asked "Why should I not?" and Comrade Everitt replied, "You should have used more tact, and McDonald said "I'm not going to mess about with words. I want unity. They (the S.L.P. delegates) appeared to be honest with us, and I think we ought to be honest with them?"

Com. Reardon: You have stated the facts of the conversation exactly as they occurred. In fact, if you had been a phonograph you could not have been more exact. We were influenced by the Executive not being complete, and if Comrade McDonald was reprimanded by his fellow-members for giving away Executive matters, they had a perfect right to do so. There was an Executive, but not a full one.

Comrade Everitt: Is it not a fact that Comrade Judd, after he addressed the A.S.P. Executive, when asked by me if he would recommend to his Executive, that the two parties unite on principles, and leave the name to a separate vote of the whole membership, refused to do so?

Comrade Judd: Yes. I would not trust the A.S.P. officials to take a vote.

Com. Miss O'Neill: Why did you refuse to recommend the name of "International Socialist?"

Com. Judd: I refused to recommend the name "International Socialist" to our Executive because it would be against the best interest of the United Party to retain the name of a paper that had supported and assisted the anti-political I.W.W. I objected to the proposed United Party having for the name of it's official organ the name of

a paper that had been responsible for leading honest workers to associate themselves with the anti-political I.W.W. against the Detroit I.W.W. Also because the word International did not draw a clear line of demarkation between the alleged Socialist Parties who, whilst they might be International, are by no means Revolutionary, and the Revolutionary Socialist Parties, who are both Revolutionary and International. The A.S.P. officials did not put forward a better name than the Revolutionary Socialist, nor did they put forward any statement why it should not be adopted. In accepting the name S.L.P. they were doing an honest act, and were taking the name of a Party with a clean record, while, with regard to the paper, I was prepared, as I told their Executive, to accept the best name that could be suggested.

Com. Mrs. Reardon: If the A.S.P. is as bad as you have stated, why are you prepared to consider unity with it?

Com. Judd: I did not say that the A.S.P. is bad. I do not condemn the rank and file of an organisation for the actions of its officials, except in so far as it acquiesces in their actions. The rank and file of an organisation is often superior to its officials. As for being prepared to consider unity with the A.S.P., I recognise, as I said in my introductory remarks, that there are noble men and women who have made and are making great sacrifices. And I believe that the S.L.P. and the A.S.P.

would have united long ago if the past officials of the A.S.P. had been honest.

The foregoing report of our speeches and the relevant questions is correct.

(Signed) A. S. REARDON.  
E. E. JUDD.



## Extracts from Socialist Labor Party's Manifesto

In modern capitalist class States the Government are but Committee for managing the common affairs of the capitalist class.

The solution of the industrial question cannot be achieved by sending politicians into Parliament to administer the affairs of the Capitalist class.

The solution of the industrial question lies in the overthrow, by political and industrial action, of the Capitalist class state, and the institution in the place of the political government, of an administrative body made up of the representatives of the organised industries of the nation; the wiping out of the "State" lines, and the substitution, in place of the "State," of lines of industries; thus instead of the State of New South Wales, we would have "The Industry of Railroads," "The Industry of Mines," "The Industry of Food Production," and so forth.

All the representatives of those industries, representing the people working in those industries would constitute the Government.

Its administrative functions would consist, mainly, of the management of production, supervision of transportation, commerce and exchange, and control of all the socially operated means of production and distribution that civilisation needs.

Such a Government would be the directing authority.

### ONE BIG UNION.

As industrial organisation is vitally necessary to overthrow the Capitalist class State and establish an Industrial Co-operative Commonwealth. UNDER THE SHIELD OF POLITICAL AGITATION the Socialist Labor Party aims at organising the wage-workers into one great class-conscious, revolutionary Union, powerful enough to reflect its own political party. The S.L.P. advocates the organisation of the workers on the lines set forth in the Preamble of the "Workers International Industrial Union." Bringing the workers together on such a basis—under one constitution, and with as many departments as there are industries—not only strengthens the working class in its encounters with the exploiting class, in the struggle for reduction of hours, raising of wages, and the adjustment of conditions, but provides the framework for the Industrial Co-operative Commonwealth.

**FOR SOUND INFORMATION**

on

**Economics, Politics & Industrialism**

**SUBSCRIBE TO**

**“ THE PEOPLE ”**

---

Official Organ of the S.L.P.

Per Year, 2s 6d; Half-Year, 1s 3d. Post Free

Address—Rawson Chambers, Rawson Place,

SYDNEY

---

**DO YOU WANT**

Knowledge of the International Movement?

**IF SO, THEN READ**

**“ The Weekly People ”**

---

Official Organ of the S.L.P. of America

6s 6d per Year; 3s 6d Half-year; 2s per Quarter

Rawson Chambers, Rawson Place, Sydney