# THE ISSUES OF UNITY

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

### OPINIONS OF MEMBERS AND OTHERS

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

Shall the S. D. P. and the S. L. P. unite upon the basis agreed to and recommended by the majority of the New property o

ommended by the majority of the New

York conference?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now I admit that the name in itself

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

To what extent did this conflict of party spirit actually dominate the con-

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

Without going further it is perfectly

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

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

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

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

from any sense of self-sacrifice, but because I endorse, if not the specific grounds, the action, and am prepared

to answer for my share of it.

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

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

Diametrically opposite to this is the spirit of the S. D. P. It has from the beginning been tolerant and hospitable. It pursued the even tenor of its way

through showers of abuse. Its dignified policy, its spirit of toleration appealed to the people, while its comrades loved and trusted each other and worked with inexpressible zeal for its success.

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

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

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

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

the fact to any one.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fourth, elect a national campaign committee.

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

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

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

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

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

### Benham's Venom

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

The manifesto is biased, illogical and untrue; it bears evidence in almost every line that all information that was furnished as its base came not from the majority of the S. D. P. committee, or from any one who wished to make known facts, but from a minority, who went to the conference with cut-anddried plans (perhaps instructions) to practically absorb the S. L. P. or to do what has been attempted by this manifesto-to tear down the reputation of all who were foremost or active in the movement for unity. As I have been included (paragraph 4) in the list of those who broke their pledges I send this to you for publication. It will probably be published in an obscure part of the paper. Almost the entire front page was used by your committee in an attempt to blacken the character of all concerned in the conference. It is evi-dent that the four signers had rather place any obstacle in the way of the Socialist movement than to see local power and interests made smaller, as the Socialist movement grew larger by the unification of the political organizations.

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

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

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

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

No. 2. That Benham broke any

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

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

No. 5. That Harriman has ever agreed to support the name S. D. P. vithout reservation, is untrue. When Harriman and Hillquit (with so much mystery) were charged by Heath in the conference committee, the matter was shown to be so absurd that no one except Heath showed any signs of believ-ing a word of it, and Heath put in his time explaining how he had been misled into the belief, etc. Stedman and Margaret Haile afterwards insisted on Hillquit being a candidate for provisional committee, and both said he was the best man New York could furnish, all S. D. P. delegates concurring, except Heath, who sulked.

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

No. 7. That Harriman and Hillquit ever obligated themselves in any manner to support the name S. D. P. in the conference, except with the proviso that such course was necessary to enable Berger to "use his influence for two hours." Berger did not even see Debs before the latter's acceptance was made public; therefore, there could not possibly be any continuance of a contingent pledge, as the contingency was absent. No. 8. That Max Hayes ever by

word or act in New York or elsewhere, either attacked or declined to support the name S. D. P.

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

Sunday, March 25.
No. 10. That the committee on conference voted for or proposed to sub-mit two names until the S. D. P. delegation, through Chase, made the proposition on Monday morning.

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

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

the joint committee.

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

### Social Democratic Berald

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY BY THE

SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF AMERICA

Executive Board

ESSE COX. . . . . . . . . Chairman

EYMOUR STEDMAN, . . . Secretary

EUGENE V. DEBS VICTOR L. BERGER

FREDERIC HEATH

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

Entered at Chicago postoffice as second class matter

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

94 is the number of this paper. If the number on your wrapper is 95 your subscription expires with the next weeks' paper. Please reasw premptly.

OHICAGO, SATURDAY, APR. 21, 1900.



#### NOTICE

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

#### THE SITUATION CLEARED UP

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

very outset, were prohibitive of union.

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

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

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

## JESSE COX RESIGNS

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

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

my resignation.

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

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

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

A movement like this was necessarily confined to narrow limits, and could never reach the proportions of a tri-

umphant political party.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

eighteen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fragernally yours,

re. Fraternally yours,
Jesse Cox.
Chicago, April 11, 1900.

### Benham's Thousand and One Reason

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

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

Paul J. Bauerberg.

#### All Due to "Self-Conceit"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

dory of the N. E. B. by making D. P. (thus erecting a grand liv-onument to the N. E. B.'s prowess acv). This was clearly shown rattitude at the time of the S. L. ation, when, instead of meeting w Socialists as equals, they teleed a condescending invitation to hester convention to join the Sonocratic party. Furthermore, ald did not publish a complete Furthermore. of the Rochester resolutions until ed to do so. These are only comrades, but such straws are significant when you suspect men senood. Berger's editorials against in the Wahrheit, until within a ne before the Indianapolis conm, were exceedingly bitter and un-Jesse Cox was unreserved claring against the union at Indians, in private conversation. He said about it on the floor of the conand that accounts for the fact my members are not aware of his In the meeting of the commitof fourteen at Indianapolis, the ob-of Berger, Heath and Cox, aided by or three others, seemed to be not to ct a union but to so arrange the conns, etc., (diplomatize if you please) as to cast the odium of preventing the mion on the S. L. I. This they apparently hoped to do by instructing the committee of nine to "stand" for the e, evidently thinking that either the P. would reject these terms, in h case it would incur the blame, or, the terms were accepted, it would be a natic stroke well calculated to flater the self-conceit of the national excentive. In this scheme they were de-leated by the adoption of the minority report, after a discussion of three hours. The Herald ignores this incident in its port of the convention.) manifesto just issued is imbued

with this same spirit. It fits in well with the other parts of the story and is a thrilling climax, but it is the end of the hapter. It will have no serious effect. The comrades will read it, grow indignt and then laugh and say to our S. L. P. friends: "Our DeLeons are more ng than was yours."

Understand, I do not charge these four men with being corrupt. I am not o charitable. The whole affair is attributable to their overwhelming selfconceit alone. (Self-conceit has worked more harm in this world than all cortion combined.)

It is our duty, comrades, to act romptly. Vote for union solidly. Show promptly. Vote for union solidly. Show our S. L. P. friends that we respect them and are sincere. Strike hard, talk plain and we soon will have passed over this bit of rough road. E. Val. Putnam, St. Louis, Mo., April 7, 1900.

### Stedman's Reply

Comrades: It is difficult to address you and present facts and circumstances which lead to conclusions against your hopes. We are all apt to warp and distort everything we see and hear to fit our desire, even though ruin and discord are seen to be the inevitable result.

The problem you are to solve should e as free as possible from sentiment and lecided upon conceded and known facts. First, are the statements made in the sto true and that which they in-

cond, if true, is union desirable? Without recurring to the statements in he manifesto, but to prove its correct-I will consider with you the Harriman-Hillquit letter. Therein the charge of petty schemes and jealousies and inual ambitions" are made. Let us The S. L. P. at Rochester nominated candidates and elected a commitee of nine on conference which, at Inapolis under a threat to retire and ak off all negotiations, took out of he hands of the convention and the ere the privilege of instructing or limiting the powers of their spe-cial committee. The threat was made, and the committee was elected uninstructed; thereupon a date for a meeting was fixed at New York when Berger, in all probabilities, would be absent (Bercr received the highest vote of any elected on the committee). Harriman and Hillquit say the "treaty was adopted unanimously"; that is their conclusion.

I deny its correctness.
Fred Heath made charges of broken pledges (Stedman and Haile were not nt at peace conference in Indian-I stated that Harriman and Hayes had promised me to support the name S. D. P. at Indianapolis, Mr. Hariman replying said "that was so, but that with the promise he said with contral with the promise he said that I did ms," to which I replied that I did or remember the words "with conces-ions" being used by him. We rememthe circumstances and conversation ently; let it go at that.

to Springfield for headquarters. me tell you the facts. Chicago, veland, New York, Springfield, New wen and Boston were nominated. A nty of your committee proposed nitting all of them and the members ick their choice. The majority ruled tly and ordered a vote. Upon first vote Chicago received one, and dropped. After several ballots were can, the place (New York), nominated the S. L. P., received a majority vote was carried. Thereupon Harriman ching across the table) tapped Hillon the shoulder and said "don't you

see you are tricked," and asked for a separate meeting of each committee. Your committee then proposed three cities from which our members should make their selection. The S. L. P.'s told us to retire again and select either Springfield or New York. A majority your committee decided in favor of

Now, comrades, why was New York discarded after receiving a majority vote of the joint committee, and the responsibility thrown upon your committee of making a selection between Springfield and New York. I regret here to say a majority of your committee failed to see the point. Benham's section was op-posed to New York. Hoehn said New York would lose upon a referendum, so the next best thing for the S. L. P. was to place it in an obscure town, but within the grasp and control of the New York element of the S. L. P., as Stone (S. L. P.) said "we can more quickly destroy De Leon." Harriman, whose "petty scheme was this"? Why not give all the towns a show? Comrades, this move was to give the New York S. L. P. the leverage of the national executive.

It cannot be denied that in New York the S. L. P. are at war with each other, and in New York the S. D. P. is far from harmonious, if not in open war. You who were present at the convention will remember the clash between London and Phillips and each represents different factions in New York, and they are not at peace today. Considering these facts, would it not be suicidal to place your N. E. C. in a hot-bed of internal discord.

Rights of minority. On Sunday morning before opening the discussion there was a motion made by two of the S. L. P. that no minority report should be permitted except by consent of a majority of one of the two committees. I suggested that they seemed to anticipate trouble rather early. This motion was then lost; the next day remade by S. L. P. and carried. Thus a minority (usually Haile and Stedman) can only speak by permission of a majority. That's not gag-rule, comrades; that's Socialism—S. L. P. Socialism. The convention did not prescribe the unit rule. Where the majority secured such a right let them tell.

Harriman and Hillquit say that Haile and Stedman stated that "we would withdraw our minority report.' We made no such statement; on the contrary, we asked for five days to determine upon it and send the same to Butscher or Stone. It was sent and was rejected under the rule of the majority. Again, Sted.nan never proposed a national executive committee, and voted against the conference committee making the nominations, saying "the initiative should remain with the members." The majority decided otherwise, and Stedman then did make some nominations. I did not believe the principle was right then or now.

Harriman and Hillquit say they (S. L. P.) yielded the most important pointslocation, N. E. C., etc. Comrades, you have the shell (Springfield); they have the oyster (New York).

Harriman and Hillquit say they con-ceded to Stedman's plan of N. E. C. "solely in the interest of harmony." Error. Harriman and Hillquit, you mean the national committee, to be composed of one from each state, so those in New York might feel the pulse of those on the prairies and in the mines and grasp unitedly the diversified economic interests of the nation, and when adopted I believe the words "not less than" preceded the word "three" in section three (3), article two (2), majority

Again I contended for a national executive committee of nine or eleven, the quorum to transact the business and submit their proceedings to the non-resident members, then there could be members of the N. E. C. in the far west and east. This plan works successfully in the Brewery Workers' and International Woodworkers' unions. This plan was not acceptable to the majority; a western or middle western check was not desirable; the Atlantic coast alone should prevail.

As to the name. After discussing the name half a day, we, the S. D. P. committee, were advised to caucus, and as the entire S. L. P. committee, except Hayes, stood for U. S., we proposed submitting two names. The pledges made in the conference were unknown to Haile and Stedman. I did not then have possession of all the facts; will re-

cur to this later. Harriman and Hillquit say "we parted in full accord with each other." Oh! yes! On parting Comrade Haile said to Hillquit loud enough for all to hear: "We (S. D. P.) could not have surren-dered to a nobler foe." That peculiar "accord with each other" which existed between Grant and Lee when the latter, beaten to pieces, gave his sword to Grant, and the "accord" between surrendering Cronje and victorious Bobs.

As to broken pledges. According to Harriman and Hayes and Benham, the latter agreed not to oppose the S. D. P. name if Harriman and Hayes were nominated by us, but as they were not nominated he was at liberty to oppose it. In other words, if we would give up Eugene V. Debs as a candidate and take Harriman and Hayes, Benham would

not oppose our name. You may all personally dislike Debs; that is your business. But Benham solicited Eugene to accept the nomination and then because Debs did as requested Benham opposes the name. Benham, you were for or against the nomination of Debs; provided we would not nominate him you would withdraw opposition to the name to ask such as a concession, you must have been against his nomination.

In other words, if Debs went in the air the price would be paid for your supporting the name. Price too high, Ben?

As to Hayes, he failed to speak in

favor of the name at the New York conference. Harriman and Hillquit, according to their statement, promised to support the name if Berger could induce Eugene to accept, but as Debs had accepted before Berger saw him, they feel released of their promise. Harriman and Hillquit, what were you after, Berger's influence or Debs' acceptance? If the latter, you got what you wanted and should have kept honor intact. If you only wanted Berger's influence and if that is what you were bargaining for, I grant you stand acquitted; such an excuse discredits those who advance it.

I regret that the lingering spirit of DeLeonism in the New York S. L. P. comrades should have forced these gentlemen from a reputable attitude and that which honor dictated, and it reflects discredit upon the S. L. P. movement there. These men, Harriman and Hillquit, have broken their words, as a sacrifice to a portion of their party located in New York. To exact such a sacrifice was dishonorable, and it is against an element which would force a man to break his pledge against whom this contest is waged.

As to Berger's nomination of Harriman. If you, Harriman, did not wish the nomination, why did you not decline? The convention nominated you, and there was your opportunity to quit.

Harriman and Hillquit say "but between the interpretation of a situation and a pledge there is, you will admit, a world of difference." Yes? Harriman and Hillquit, I will admit; more, there never was a pledge, word or, promise that could not be broken, violated or excused upon the theory of "the inter-pretation of a situation." You could hypnotize the smoothest Jesuit that ever diplomatized upon that theory.

I can assure you that I do not fear the decision of our members. I hope, only, that their decision shall be based upon all the facts (which I did not possess at the conference).

You ask me to be frank, what is our object, etc. It is to prevent a disunion, to prevent the loss of the name S. D. P.; not the symbol, but the methods, tactics and policy that it represents. Nations do not war over sticks and cloth (flags), but over the institutions they represent, and further, we are against the destruction of the Social Democratic Herald.

You, Harriman and Hillquit, ask what influence has changed my attitude since I left the joint conference. This statement will disclose some of them; others will be stated by other comrades, and others in the interest of Socialism I hope may be forgotten.

I am now convinced that the nomina tion of E. V. Debs has possibly saved the S. D. P.; that his acceptance was not expected; that the name S. D. P. was to be conceded to us by the S. L. P., and we were to nominate Harriman and Hayes and New York was to assume control of the S. D. P. and dominate its policy, etc., and that this under-standing preceded the Indianapolis convention, but Eugene's acceptance dis-turbed the understanding.

I have favored union, proposed a joint mass-meeting in Chicago of the S. L. P. and the S. D. P. before the Rochester convention and after it, and after the Indianapolis convention the two first invitations were rejected by the S. L. P.; the last, no action. Last January we, the S. D. P., proposed to unite locally for spring election under the name Socialist party. It was rejected by the S. L. P. We supported their ticket and I favored that course and now find many of the S. L. P. candidates whom we supported are in hopes the national ticket will get a small vote—they want a slow growth. I want Socialism within a thousand years.

This spirit I believe too strongly per-meates the entire national S. L. P. organization.

Benham's article almost answers itself. According to him he commenced sell. According to him he commenced his criticism weeks ago in the Class Struggle. Feb. 3, after the Rochester convention, appeared the following: "Having (S. D. P.) first split the Socialist forces by starting a second party, and second, by declining for petty personal reason an honorable and highly important union we demand your support here. tant union, we demand your support because we are straight, scientific Socialists; because we are the first party in the field," etc. This followed, you should remember, the Rochester convention. His intimation that Debs, Berger and others deceived or tricked the S. L. P. and "that it was a hold-up behind closed doors," and that "they (the S. D. P.) will none of them be so tall that they cannot be brought to their knees" is characteristic of S. L. P. If a majority want it, perhaps we will come down on our knees. We may as well get used to it early, because in the S. L.

# **LOCAL BRANCHES**

CALIFORNIA

Liberty Branch, San Francisco, holds public meetings every Sunday and Wednesday evenings, commencing at 3. Admission free. Educational meetings (for members) every Tuesday evening. Sociology, Economics, Public Speaking, etc.

Educational
Tuesday evening. Sociology, Economics
Speaking, etc.
Business meetings (for members) every ThursBusiness meetings (for members) every ThursBusiness meetings (for members) every Thurs-Business meetings (for members) every Thursday evaning.

Membership, with advantage of Educational Course and Social Democratic Herald free to each member, 25 cents per month.

Apply to the secretary, John C. Wesley, 117 Tark street. Branch No. 1, Los Angeles, meets every Sun-day afternoon at 3 o'clock at Woodmen's Hall, 1251/2 Spring St. J. Franc, 700 Dayton Ave., Secretary.

COLORADO
Branch No. 1, Denver, meets every Sunday at 3:00 p. m.
t 1715 California Ave., Chas. M. Davis, Secretary, 1629 CONNECTICUT.

The Connecticut State Committee meets the last Sunday of each month at Turn Hall, Rockville. L. Schlaf, Secretary. Branch No. 3, New Haven, meets every Tuesday eve-ning, at 198 State St., at 8 p. m. Cornelius Mahoney. Secretary, 165 Frank St. Branch No. 4, Rockville, Conn., meets first and third Thursdays at Purn Hall meeting room, Village street. Secretary, Richard Niederwerfer, Box 760.

Meetings of Chicago Central Committee held regularly second and fourth Wednesdays of each month at Dr. J. H. Greer's office, 52 Dear-born St. orn St. Branch No. 1, Chicago, meets every Wednesday, yening. Thomas Kirwin, Secretary, 2504 Went-

Branch No. 1, Chicago, insets every vening. Thomas Kirwin, Secretary, 2504 Wentworth Ave.

Branch No. 2 (Bohemian), Chicago, meets second and fourth Sundays at 2 p. m. at Nagi's Hall, 535 Blue Island Ave. Vaciav Jelinek, Secretary, 866 Blue Island Ave.

Branch No. 3 (Bohemian), Chicago, meets second and fourth Mondays at 8 p.m. in Dunder's place, 1080 W. 18th place. Joseph Dunder, Secretary.

Branch No. 5, Chicago, meets second and fourth Sundays of each month at Andr. Muzik's, 40 String St. Paul Chiapecka, Secretary, 39% Robie St.

Branch No. 6 (German), Chicago, meets every first Saturday each month at 8 o'clock at Nagi's Hall, 535 Blue Island Ave, near 18th St. Albin Geisler, Secretary, 736 W. 20th St.

Branch No. 9, Chicago, meets at 1148 W. 63rd st., first and third Sundays at 3 p.m. S. L. Westine, Secretary, 6243 Center ave.

INDIANA.

Branch No. 6, Indianapolis, meets first Saturday evening and third Sunday afternoon of each month at Reichwein's Hall, corner Market and Noble Sts.

IOWA.

Branch No. 2, Hiteman, meets every fourth Friday in the month at opera house. S. B. Jamieson, chairma James Fisher, organizer; Joseph Schollacut. secretary. KENTUCKY

Branch No. 2, Covington, meets first and third Wednesday evenings and second and fourth Sunday afternoons of each month. All agitation meetings except third meeting in month. Good speakers. Secretary, F. C. Stumpf, 201 8th street.

MARYLAND.

Branch No. 1, Baltimore, meets every Sunday at 8 p. m. at Carpenter's Hall, 560 E. Baltimore St. Public invited. Branch No. 2, Baltimore, meets every Tuesday at 8 p. m. at Wenzel's Hotel, 328 W. Camden st. Good speeches. Public invited. Levin T. Jones, Secretary, 202 W. Barre st.

The Massachusetts State Committee meets the first Saturday of each month at 724 Washington St., Boston. All dues and moneys intended for the State Committee should be sent to the inancial secretary, A. McDonald, 104 W. Springfield St., Boston. All other correspondence should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Margaret Halle, 5 Glenwood St., Roxbury.

Branch No. 2, Holyoke, meets "second and fourth Mondays of each month at Springdale Tuner Hall. H. Schlichting, Organizer 587, Sumer St. Branch No. 5, Lynn, permanent headquarters, 17 Munroe St. Business meeting every Monday night at 781. Open house. Public invited. Harry Golimer. Branch No. 9, Brockton, meets the second and fourth Tuesdays of each moath at 8 p. m. for business at Socialist Hall, Clark's Block, corner Main and Center Sts. Every comrade is expected to attend one meeting a month. Frank S. Walsh, Secretary, 62 Crescent St. Branch No. 18, Newburyport, meets the second Monday of each month at Laster's Hall, 1 State St. T. H. Chisnell, Secretary, 16 Collins St. A. L. Binley, 238 Merrimac St.

Branch No. 31, Chelsea, permanent headquarters, Room 2, Postoffice Building. Open every

Branch No. 31. Chelses, permanent headquar-ters, Room 2, Postoffice Building. Open every evening. Business meetings every Thursday at 8 p. m. Public invited.

P. it is an essential requirement.

A union, if possible, with such I think unwise. Comrades, you may respond to the call of those who have attacked you for twenty months, and it may be pleasant to remember that when they were against you some few did the best they could for you and the Social Democratic party.

Yours for Socialism now and forever, \* Seymour Stedman.

# **NEW BRANCHES**

The new branches of the Social Democratic party organized since a Lamanda Park, Cal.

Ocala, Fla. Livingston, Mont. Harviell, Mo. Indianapolis, Ind. Prosser, Wash. Crookston, Minn. San Antonio, Tex.

### Michigan Socialists

All Social Democrats and all unattached Socialists residing in Michigan are requested to write at once to Henry Ramsey, 84 Railroad street, Battle Creek, Mich., and thus aid in placing a Social Democratic state ticket in the field this fall.

The following paragraph, received from Comrade Butscher after The Herald forms went to press last week, should have appeared at the end of the clause in the majority report setting a time for the vote:

"Only members in good standing who joined the party before April 1, 1900, shall be entitled to vote on these ques-

### To Texas Socialists

For purpose of State organization, the Bonham Social Democratic Branch requests that every Socialist in Texas who reads this notice, will please send name and address to the undersigned. Please attend to this at once. W. E. Farmer, Bonham, Texas.

All Socialist papers please publish.

St. Louis headquarters, Room 7, 22 N. Fourth St. Address all communications to E. Val Put-nam, Secretary. For information concerning ward branches, inquire at the above address. Branch No. 7, Kansas City, meets every Tuesday at 8 p. m. at 1200 Union Ave. G. J. Storz, Secretary, 1230 W. 9th St.

MONTANA. Branch No. 2 meets first and third Sundays of each nonth at G. W. Wood's home, Chico, Mont.

NEW JERSEY No. 1. Secretary, Michael W. Schor, 87 Liv-Branch No. 1. Secretary, Michael W. Schor, 87 Livingston at.
Branch No. 5, Camdon, N. J., meets every 3d Sunday of the month. For particulars address Paul Eberding, 1306 Kaighu's Avenue.
Branch No. 6 (German), Paterson, N. J., meets first and third Mondays at 8 p. m. at Helvetia Hall, 54-55 Van Houten St. Karl Linder, Secretary, 246 Edmund St.

mund 8t.

NEW YORE.

The City Central Agitation Committee of Greater New York and vicinity meets first and third Tuesdays of every month in Wilzig's Hail, 85 E. 4th 8t. Elizabeth H. Thomas, Secretary, East Side Branch, No. 1, New York, meets every first and third Thursday at 112 Clinton St. A. Guyer, Secretary, 18. Buffolk 8t.

Branch No. 2, 2th Assembly District, meets second and fourth Wednesdays of the month at 1059 Second Av., at the 'Central.' Henry Lang, Secretary, 23 E. 50th St.

Branch No. 4, West Side Branch, New York, meets second and fourth Tuesdays of every month at beadquarters, 18 W. 59th St. Elizabeth H. Thomas, Secretary, 18 Communicate with Secretary in the Secretary of the month at the rooms of the Wednesday of the month at the rooms of The Veice of Labor, 42 Grand St. Jacob Panken, Organizer, 18 Division St. Branch No. 12, Brooklyn, headquarters, 25 Rulledge St. Meets every find Thursday at 115 sharp. All persons interested are invited to attend these meetings and co-operate in organizing local branches in every district in the city. Wm. Butscher, Secretary, 251 Rulledge St.

Branch No. 20, regular meetings are held first and third Friday of the month, at Wester Hall, 160th St. and Third Ave. Borough of the Bronx, E. Spranger, Secretary, 317 E. 169th St. All persons interested in Socialism and the B. D. P. are invited to attend.

OHIO.

Branch No. 2, Cleveland meets in Oblescie.

Branch No. 2. Cleveland, meets in Ohlsen's Hall, 65 York St., second and fourth Sundays at 3 p. m. Lectures, discussions, business meetings, first and third Fridays at 8 p. m. Branch No. 3, Cleveland, meets first and third Sundays in each month at 8 p. m. in Ohlsen's Hall, 65 York St. Lectures and discussions. Branch No. 4, Cincinnati, meets at Richelieu Hall southeast corner 9th and Plum Sta., every Sanday at 2 p. m. Lectures and discussions. Public invited. Jos. Jasin, Secretary, 140 Central Avenue.

Branch No. 5, Dayton, Ohio, meets every 2d and 4th Friday evening, in Hall 27, Central Trades Council Block. Everyone interested in Socialism invited. J. C. Schawe, Chairman, W. Barninger, Secretary, P. O. Boz 294.

Branch No. 8, Cincinnati, meets every second and fourth Saturday in Workingmen's Hall, 1318 Walnut St. F. Hamel, Secretary, 1804 Frintz St.

Branch No. 11, German, Columbus. Ed Greiner, Secretary, 806 Mohawk St.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Branch No. 2, Eric, meets every Sunday, 3 p. m., at K. of L. Hall, 716 State St. Chairman, Joseph Stain, Secretary, J. E. Perry, 119 Sassafras St.
Branch No. 4, Pittsburg, meets every Thursday evening at 7:30 p. m. at Funk Hall, S. 3th and Josephine Sts. W. Bohn, President, 244 Addison St. J. H. Lewis, Secretary, 2315 Jane St. Branch No. 5 (Jewish), Philadelphia, meets every Friday at 423 S. Third St. at 7:30. Discussion from 8 to 9. I Gerson, Secretary.

WISCONSIN.

Milwaukee Central Committee meets on the first Monday of each month at 8 p. m. sharp at GIS E. Water St. Eugene H. Rooney, Secretary. John Doerfier, Treasurer.

Branch No. 1, Milwaukee, meets every second and fourth Tuesday evening of the month at the Ethical Society Building, 565 Jefferson St. Visitors always welcome. Howard Tuttle, Chairman. Eugene H. Rooney, Secretary.

Branch No. 2, Milwaukee, meets every second and fourth Friday in Gestke's Hall, corner Green Bay and Concordia Ave.

Branch No. 3, Sheboygan, meets every fourth Thursday of the meath as Custav Durgard's Hall on Pennsylvania Ave. R. Schoen, Secretary-Treasurer, S. 12th St.

Branch No. 4, Milwaukee, meets every first and third Friday each month at Meller's Hall, corner 22d and Brown Sts. George Moerschel, Secretary, Si 25th St.

Branch No. 9, Milwaukee, meets every fourth Friday of the month at R. Bigel's Hall, southeast corner Orchard St and 9th Ave. O. Wild, Secretary.

Branch No. 11, Milwaukee, meets the second

tary.

Branch No. 11, Milwaukee, meets the second Wednesday of each month at the office of the Wisconsin Vorwaerts, 614 State St.

Branch No. 12, Milwaukee, meets every first and third Thursday of each month at Krans Hall, 21 and Center St., at 8 p. m. Secretary, Rudolph Loeechman, 1126 23rd St.

### SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LIBRARY

Fabian Essays
Rogers—Six Centuries of Work and Wages
Paine—Rights of Man
Donnelly—Cassar's Column PAMPHLETS

F. G. R. Gordon—Hard Times: Cames and Cure... sonard D. Abbott—The Society of the Future... F. Lassalle—What Is Capital... H. M. Hyndman—Socialism and Slavery... F. Lassalle—The Workingman's Program... has. H. Vail—The Ladustrial Evolution... 

THEODORE DEBS, Secretary Treasurer, 126 Washington Street, Chicage.

The Social Democratic

PRICE: 15 CENTS

Sent postpaid on receipt of price Debs Publishing Co. TERRE HAUTE, IND.

NATIONAL CAMPAIGN FUND Previously acknowledged . . . . . . \$120.00 Robt. Clausen, Kalispell, Mont.... 5.00 Thos. P. Turner, Healdsburg, Cal.

PROPAGANDA FUND

### THE ISSUES OF UNITY

garding its membership. Information has never been asked for, except once, and that was in the conference committee, at New York. The S. L. P. national secretary replied, giving approximately the membership. This was evidently satisfactory. If it had not been, a request for inspection of the books would have cheerfully been complied

No. 14. That the S. L. P. does not know its membership. If the S. L. P. authorities do not know their membership, how could they "studiously evade' giving definite information (which they "do not" have)? You say they do not know, and then find fault with them for not telling you. They do know and have been and are now willing to give

any information on proper application.

There is no doubt in the mind of all who are acquainted with the facts regarding the Wednesday night conference in Indianapolis that Berger knew Debs was to accept. The fact that Berger insisted and argued and took up so much time in order to get a qualified pledge from some of the S. L. P. delegates, and that he at first refused to go and see Debs, unless Benham would also yield, shows, with the other circumstances, that it was a hold-up behind closed doors to make the S. L. P. delegates personally pledge themselves to the name S. D. P. Hayes was not there; they did not care for him. He was already openly pledged. Only for the impudence of one S. D. P. delegate, who had been talking with Debs, and let the matter out by mistake, the trick would have succeeded. There are several others implicated in the trick (undoubtedly Gordon) and others higher up the S. D. P. ladder. Their names it does not now seem to me necessary to an-

On Monday Berger pledged himself to Benham to "use his great personal influence with Debs' previous to the pre-sentation of Mr. Debs' name for nomination. At the conference Wednesday evening, after Debs had been nominated and had declined, Berger said he had not used his influence. If not, why not? The fact is not to be doubted that he had, and knew the result of the efforts in that direction. On Thursday mornng Berger promised Harriman and Hillquit that he would not present the name of Harriman for vice-president. Berger went directly from the hotel (where he left Harriman and Hillquit) to the convention and placed Harriman in nomination. Was that because he was so enthusiastic for Harriman? Was it because Berger loved him so? No. It was another trick with a double purpose. First, to get Harriman before

the people in a secondary, yet prominent position; second, to be able through his being in this position to more effectively knife Harriman's character, attempt to force him from the S. D. P. ticket, and thus prevent the continuance of the friendly basis upon which the relationship between the parties then existed.

In the conference committee when the S. L. P. brought in the list of four names for candidates from New York Hillquit's name was not there. Stedman and Haile immediately protested. Both insisted that he must be a candidate as he would be the most valuable man that New York could send. At the solicitation of Haile and Stedman, Hillquit was made a candidate. I entered protest then and there, knowing the characteristics and desires of the two who most strenuously insisted. It was my opinion then, since made an absolute fact, that Hillquit was set up as a candidate that he might be knifed in full public view, as he has been by those who insisted upon his candidacy for the provisional committee. When I made the protest every member of the joint committee pooh-poohed the idea of the charges ever being mentioned again. Hillquit's name was the only recommendation made from either party. Why?

As for the purpose of the manifesto, it is in keeping with the acts above stated.

I may yet be obliged to acknowledge that in my zeal for union and in the hope of its accomplishment, I have overestimated both the wisdom and sincerity of the Social Democratic party. If the membership can be driven from the plain duty to the Socialist movement by the cry of "stop thief" set up by the Chicago imitators of De Leon, then I shall be forced to the conclusion that there are yet men professing Socialism, but who still yearn for the hand of usurpation and the lash of party masters.

There are some other matters of interest in connection with the unity matter, and I shall in the future be pleased syncrasies and weaknesses of some of the "giants" of today the "giants" of today. They will none of them be so tall that they cannot be brought to their knees when their peculiarities are made known to the peo-

I see that Edwards and Gordon, conscious of how lightly their ordinary statements are regarded by their party membership, have sought to make im-pressive their statements in this case by ppearing before a notary and swearing. I still have an unconquerable desire

for a united Socialist movement in the United States. And union will come and soon, in spite of all interfering of-ficials and their "aggressive tactics" of personal vilification and wholesale repudiation.

While thoroughly cognizant of the unstable character and unsavory acts of some individuals in the S.;D. P., the delegates and members of the S. L. P. have no disposition to allow the misdeeds of a few individuals to stand in the way of unification of the Socialist forces in the United States. The necessities of uniting the Socialist organizations (representing the same great prin-ciples) are above the acts of individuals. or the personal desires for continued power of men in high places. To all acquainted with the facts in the matter, it is apparent that the charges made and reasons given in support of the manifesto are simply flimsy excuses to block the road to unification.

Jesse Cox, V. Berger, Seymour Sted-man and F. Heath by promulgating this manifesto have vilified those foremost in the work of unification in both parties; they have scandalously attacked Harriman, the unanimous choice of the Indianapolis convention for vice-president; they have disowned and repudiated the majority of the Social Democratic conference committee; they have refused to accept the work of the joint committee.

Will the membership of the S. D. P. allow a few individuals to overthrow or hamper the work of the Indianapolis convention, the work of its delegates to the conference, and the work of the conference committee?

In any event, the action of the four signers of the manifesto furnishes a sweet morsel for every enemy of Soeialism. All or any opposed to the So-cialist movement could afford to pay almost any price for such a service in the cause of capitalism.

C. B. Benham.

### Harriman-Hillquit Joint Letter

Comrades: The manifesto issued by the national executive board of your party was a most painful surprise to us, as it undoubtedly was to all earnest friends of union of the Socialist forces

After months of untiring work on the part of the best men in the ranks of both parties it seemed as if the greatest achievement of the the Socialist movement had been attained, the elements of discord, of petty schemes and jealousies and of individual ambitions were apparently banished forever from our ranks, and the foundation for a strong and harmonious Socialist movement seemed to have been laid.

The Rochester convention met, and in clear and manly language declared it-self for union with the S. D. P.

The Indianapolis convention met, and enthusiastically acclaimed union with

Both conventions elected large committees with instructions to prepare a basis for union. Each party elected men who have its utmost confidence and gave them full power to act in the mat-ter to the best of their abilities and understanding, the only limitation placed on their powers being the required ratification by the referendum.

The joint committee spent three full days in deliberations over the great task intrusted to them, and as a result sub-mitted a treaty which to every unbiased mind must appear fair, impartial and conducive to the best interests of the movement.

The treaty was adopted by the joint committee unanimously. No voice of protest or objection was heard on the part of the S. L. P. committee, although many of them had sacrificed some pet ideas in the interests of harmony, and no voice of protest was heard on the part of the S. D. P. committee. Victor Berger was absent. Frederick Heath made some charges against the S. L. P. subcommittee to Indianapolis, seemed to be quite satisfied with their explanation, as were all other members of the S. D. P. committee. He took no part in the work of the committee on the second day of its session, but reappeared and voted on one question on the last day.

Stedman and Mrs. Haile who had first expressed dissatisfaction with the choice of Springfield as the seat of the national executive committee and with the manner of electing the provisional committee, and who had announced that they would submit a minority report on those points, changed their position and declared they would withdraw their minority report when Stedman's plan of electing the permanent national executive committee was adopted, and a national campaign committee with headquarters in Chicago was created.

On the most important questions the S. L. P. committee yielded to the desires and sentiments of their S. D. P. comrades: when the choice of the seat of the N. E. C. had by a process of successive balloting narrowed down to Springfield, Mass., and New York city, the S. L. P. committee left the final decision with the S. D. P. committee, and when the latter by a majority vote adopted Springfield the S. L. P. committee indorsed the recommendation by vote of 8 to 1.

On the question of the composition

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

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

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

A subcommittee was appointed to prepare and submit the treaty and nothng but the general vote was wanted to formally accomplish union.

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

And on what grounds do they seek to justify this very extraordinary step? Two grounds are stated in the mani-

festo: I. That the S. L. P. committee to

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

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

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

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

We do not believe that this charge equires any reply, as Harriman and Hayes were not nominated by the Indianapolis convention.

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

Comrade Hayes has made that statement on condition that the minority report would be adopted; the minority report was adopted and Hayes has fully lived up to his promise; he has worked and agitated for the name S. D. P., and he voted for that name at the joint com-

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

might be agreed on."

Why do the writers of the manifesto fail to state that Comrade Hillquit added: "The S. L. P. has no prejudice against your name and will adopt it if you can show it to be better than any other name, but we also expect that the members of the S. D. P. are not fetish worshipers and will adopt any other name which they could be persuaded was the best"?

That changes it a little does it not, comrades? And still you could not fail to remember one part if you remem-bered the other so well. Why, then, this omission?

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

We do not remember and do not be-lieve that Comrade Stedman ever referred to an alleged promise of Com-rade Harriman on the floor of the convention in our presence, for had he done that we would surely have corrected him upon that point. Comrade Harriman has on a previous occasion explicitly denied that he had promised to support the name S. D. P. unconditionally. What he did say to Comrade Stedman was that he was not prejudiced against the name and would be willing to accept it, provided corresponding conces-

The keynote of all negotiations between the S. L. P. committee and the S. D. P. convention, in open and private discussion, was that the union should be effected on honorable terms, which could only mean that correspond-

ing mutual concessions were to be made.
This point, which will surely be remembered by all S. D. P. delegates, seems to bear out Harriman's version of his conversation with Stedman rather than that of the latter.

"That the S. L. P. committee had port the name S. D. P. if the full Rochster ticket (Harriman and Hayes) would be nominated by the Indianapolis convention."

This is true, but Harriman and Hayes were not nominated.

"That Harriman and Hillquit had also promised at that conference to support the name S. D. P. in the event that he ticket nominated would be Debs and Harriman:"

This is not true.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the Indianapolis conference.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moreover, your entire committee in cluding Stedman voted unanimously for

the proposition.

What, then, is the real objection to that question?

You cannot possibly You cannot possibly fear the decision of your own members!

Your insinuations that our party would return a fictitious or dishones: vote on the treaty is not worthy of a

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Job Harriman, Morris Hillquit.

### NATIONAL FUND

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

CONNECTICUT

MICHIGAN Kellber, S., Grand Re



### The Union Label

on everything you buy is a

Insist on having the