

# DAILY PEOPLE

VOL. 5, NO. 136.

NEW YORK, SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1904.

TWO CENTS.

ARTICLE

## FLASH-LIGHTS OF THE AMSTERDAM CONGRESS.

By DANIEL DE LEON

### VIII.

#### THE DRESDEN-AMSTERDAM RESOLUTION.

**T**HE Munich *Fliegende Blaetter* once had a cartoon representing a scene in the office of a parish priest in Southern Germany. The priest, rotund and benevolent-looking, sat in his arm-chair sympathetically facing a female parishioner, a peasant woman standing before him. The woman bore the marks of recent severe handling. Her head was bandaged; so were both her arms; and under her short skirt a bandaged leg was to be seen. She must have been complaining to the Father that her husband had given her a beating. The Father must have addressed to her some words of consolation, and admonition to patience. The cartoon bore only one sentence; it was the woman's answer: "Die Frau soll und muss gepruegelt werden, aber der verdammte Kerl uebertreibt es!" (The wife should and must be beaten, but the devil of a fellow carries the thing too far!) That woman's frame of mind on the subject of conjugal relations portrays exactly the frame of mind of the German Social Democracy towards Jauresism,—they do not object to the idea, only the devil of a fellow carries the thing too far.

#### THE LAY OF THE LAND IN EUROPE.

More than once in the course of this serial, and very much in full in the "Review of the Dresden Congress,"<sup>1</sup> I have pointed out the special socio-political condition that the bulk of the European continent finds itself in—indeed, the whole of the

---

<sup>1</sup> [See *Daily People*, January 3, 1904.]

continent, France conspicuously excepted. Suffice it here to repeat that, with the bulk of the continent, although portions of the capitalist body are everywhere seen evolved, nowhere is the evolution complete; in some places the evolution is further advanced, in others backward: in all capitalist society is still more or less enveloped in the warp of the feudal cocoon. Thus one and all present the phenomenon of two ruling classes, hence also political systems, simultaneously in existence: the older, the feudal, still dominant, thanks to the "vis inertiae" of precedence; the younger, the capitalist, pressingly assertive, thanks to its latent power of ultimate ascendancy. In countries so circumstanced the "co-operation of classes," as the term now runs, is not excluded. Its tactful application may even be a source of positive solace for the proletariat. The classic instance of Great Britain, so oft cited, need but be referred to. One time the feudal lord, as an offensive measure in his struggle with the capitalist, another time the oncoming capitalist, as an offensive measure against feudality, backed up the interests of the bottom class, the proletariat. For the "co-operation of classes," which means the co-operation of a ruling class with the proletariat, the social phenomenon is requisite of the simultaneous existence of two ruling classes, systems, of distinct type and successive eras. It is obviously a transitional period, offering transitional opportunities. The instant the elder of the two systems is supplanted by the younger, the transitional opportunities are at end. Germany, although the most advanced, capitalistically, of all the continental nations that are found in that transitional stage, but being the most powerful of all, typifies the rest. It goes without saying that, at least theoretically, Jauresism, that is, the "co-operation of classes," can not choose but be sympathetic to Germany, together with the rest of the continental nations of whom Germany is the type, and of whose sentiments Germany gives fullest expression. Nor is the theory unsupported by practice and positive evidence. It is a fact not to be overlooked or underrated that at the Paris Congress of 1900, the Kautsky Resolution being under discussion, Auer, the spokesman of the German delegation, supported the Resolution saying: "True enough, a Millerand case has not yet arisen among us (in Germany); we are not yet so far; but I hope we may reach the point at the earliest day possible." And the words of Auer were applauded to the echo without a dissenting voice from the German delegation, or the rest of the continental nations

that have Germany as their fogleman. Ministerialism, the “co-operation of classes,” Jauresism, in short, was sympathized with by all; it was admired and looked forward to as a desideratum.

For reasons that are exactly the reverse of the medal of which the German position is the obverse, the French Socialist elements that are now organized in the “Parti Socialiste de France” (Socialist Party of France) had and have neither approval nor admiration for Jauresism. For it they justly have unqualified condemnation only. The very socio-political reasons that justify the “co-operation of classes” in countries circumstanced as Germany, reject it in countries circumstanced as France. In France—as in America, together with the rest of the English-speaking world in general—the transitional phenomenon of the simultaneous existence of two ruling classes of distinct type and successive eras is absent. In France—as in America, together with the rest of the English-speaking world in general—Feudality has been wiped out, or remains only as a vanishing “trace”: Capitalism thrones with undisputed sway. The elements now constituting the Socialist Party of France resisted with might and main the proposed Kautsky Resolution. Yet were they overwhelmingly snowed under. The only organization of importance that stood by them was the Socialist Labor Party of America. Even the delegation from more advanced Great Britain joined in full the procession of the less advanced continental States. The Revolutionary Socialists of France came beaten out of the Paris Congress of 1900. Jauresism came out with flying colors.

#### SENTIMENT AS A FORCE.

So far I have pursued the inquiry only along the strictly social and political line. Another line of inquiry must now be taken up. Movements are made up of men, and man is “flesh and blood, and apprehensive.” To expect of him that he rise wholly above the foibles of his nature is to expect of him not the impossible merely; it is to expect of him what he may not be. Well may he say he “dares do all that may become a man, who dares do more is none.” The German Social Democracy, meaning thereby its managing powers, is a human agency. As such it is of the earth, not of the New Jerusalem. TO THE GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY THE

SOCIALIST PARTY OF FRANCE IS UNSYMPATHETIC. Free as America's happy location makes us, I need not write under the diplomatic restraint that the closely dove-tailing geography of the European nations forces upon the Socialists of the several European nationalities. The lukewarmness in the affection for the Socialist Party of France entertained by the German Social Democracy is a psychologic phenomenon of vastly deeper bearing than merely philosophic curiosity. It also has its bearing upon us in America, and, along with us, upon the English-speaking world at large. While the phenomenon flows from, it supplements the difference in the status between France, on the one side, and the rest of the continental States, on the other. Jointly the two forces illumine the field in a manner that neither could alone.

While undoubtedly prizing, the genius of the German Social Democracy feels rebuked by the Socialist Party of France. Although vastly surpassing the latter in point of membership, in point of the extent of press facilities, in point of financial resources and, last not least, in point of the public-eye-filling vote, the latter's clear-as-a-pike, soundly poised, brilliantly unbending and unterrifiable Marxist posture disturbs the equanimity of its German cousin. The phenomenon can be explained only upon the general principle that man usually feels sore at others when he is sore at himself. That the distinguished leaders of the German Social Democracy should feel sore at themselves is, paradoxical though the opinion may sound, as inevitable a fact as it is groundless. Why should they? Truth is that which fits all the facts in the case. The German Social Democracy is true. Its conduct fits the facts that surround it. It is doing, not merely the best that it is able to do, but the very best that the circumstances allow. That best, however, is not up to the standard of the Socialist Party of France. No blame can attach to the German Social Democracy on that score, any more than praise for superior inherent virtue can be the meed of the Socialist Party of France. It is no inherent quality in the river that flows through the chain of our great lakes that it displays the superb panorama of the cascade of Niagara; nor is it an inherent defect in the waters that pour down the eastern slopes of the Rockies that their course is accompanied by the humbler river swamps of the Missouri and Mississippi valleys. Rivers, true enough geology teaches, shape their own beds. But that is only a finality. At the start, their course

and aspect are predetermined by the solid mass that happens around them. The stream of the German Social Democracy is, indeed, making its bed, that tributary bed to the eventual international network of river beds through which the floods of an emancipated proletariat, the emancipated human race, will rush their fruition-full billows. Until then, however, the course and aspect of the German Social Democratic stream is pre-determined by the set of existing solid facts, none of which it can be held responsible for, and through which it is forced to wear its way—identically as are pre-determined the course and aspect of the stream of the Socialist Party of France by the more favorable circumstances that it, in turn, is as little to be credited for. Groundless, accordingly, is the secret sense of soreness at themselves on the part of the German Social Democratic leaders.

Yet the soreness is inevitable. The circumstance that the founder of Socialist Science—the author of Socialist theory, *Capital*, and of Socialist tactics, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*—was born in Germany and wrote in German has exercised so preponderating an influence upon the general, the public mind, that the opinion one time was, and is not yet worn out, that Socialism is essentially a German product, indigenous in and applicable only to Germany. The well-known and droll anecdote related about Zola in this connection will naturally suggest itself to all.<sup>2</sup> The important circumstances, that the founder of Socialist science had his wit whetted in France, and that it was in still a third country, England, that he gathered his facts and from whose shores he launched his two great works, easily go unperceived. Inestimable as was Marx's early German training, it was not all-sufficient; far from it. In fact, since Aristotle's, Marx's is the only universal mind the human race has yet produced. The science reared by such a genius is, of course, universal. For all that, it would be "doing more than may become a man" were the foremost elements of Germany, now gathered in the German Social Democracy, not to feel a special pride in Marx, aye, to claim him as their own, the gift of the German nation to the world. If to this the further circumstance is coupled that it was in Germany that the teachings of Marx first

---

<sup>2</sup> The story is told that Zola, seeing a German friend with a copy of Marx's *Capital*, said: "I couldn't read such a book. The gothic type is an abomination to my eyes." The friend thereupon opened the book and held it up to the startled gaze of Zola. *Capital* having been printed in England is not in gothic but in Latin type.

took the crystallized form of a Movement, of a political party, then the inevitableness of the present sense of soreness at themselves on the part of the German Social Democratic leaders becomes as obvious as it was shown to be groundless. It is a sentiment that cannot choose but spring up in men whose own Movement, starting with as clear-as-a-pike Marxist posture as to-day distinguishes the Socialist Party of France on the continent, was, nevertheless, constrained by the *force majeure* of imperative circumstances temporarily to deflect its pristine course, and pursue the river bed that the surrounding boulders of still lingering feudalism pre-determined for it.

A sentiment so natural, however deplorable, is, with men of knowledge and character, such as the leaders of the German Social Democracy, kept under the self-imposed control that character and knowledge equip a man withal. With men lacking both character and knowledge the sentiment runs riot. It is in its manifestation of riot-running that the German phenomenon under consideration has its bearing upon us in America, as also in Australia and Great Britain—the English-speaking world at large, and that it injuriously reacts back upon the German fatherland of the riot-runners abroad. The German Socialist of intelligence and character in Great Britain, Australia or America finds the grief of his expatriation soothed by the thought that, at least, his lot has cast him into a country whose social and political institutions are so much further advanced that they afford opportunities for the untrammelled development of Marxism. The German Socialist, on the contrary, of neither intelligence nor character, in the English-speaking world, grieves all the more thereat. The former is found enthusiastically active in the Socialist Labor Parties of these countries; the latter entertain for these parties envious, vindictive malice. Whatever energy he displays is to keep the Socialist Movement back, lest—oh, horror!—it outclass the Movement in Germany. It is no idle digression to pursue this aspect of the subject a little more in detail.

At Amsterdam Bebel told of a conversation he had with Marx and Engels in London. Having expressed to them his astonishment at the backwardness of the Movement in Great Britain, despite the country's advantages and their own unquestioned influence upon their surroundings, he was answered: "Indeed, things

would be different here, were not the British capitalists so peskily shrewd: they deaden the Labor Movement by corrupting its leaders!" Marx and Engels, as Bebel pointed out, placed their finger on the baneful influence of the "co-operation of classes" in Great Britain. This notwithstanding, Edward Bernstein—the revisionist—when he was in England, and M. Beer—the anti-revisionist poser—who is still in England, have been and ever are seen in full sympathy with every move in Great Britain that has the "co-operation of classes" as its silent or avowed guiding principle. The fact of "Labor" members of Parliament being elected on Tory and Liberal tickets won their admiration; and the more recent, more extensive and more brazen application of the "co-operation of classes," as manifested by the "Labor Representation Committee" movement, has received their unstinted applause. Nor did and do these gentlemen omit to emphasize their posture by co-ordinate conduct. While praiseful in their correspondence to the German Social Democratic press of all manifestations of the "co-operation of classes" in Great Britain, they had and have disapproval only for all opposite manifestations. These they either slur, or seek to smother with silence. Whatever luminous interval the otherwise muddle-headed British Social Democratic Federation has experienced they decried; and that most significant event of modern days in the history of the British Movement, the birth and rise of the British Socialist Labor Party, in final revolt and declared war against the infamy of the but too long continued "co-operation of classes" in Great Britain, is as if it were not—for all that the contributions of the Bernsteins and Beers from London to the German Social Democratic press contains on the subject.

If anything, still more pronounced is the phenomenon in Australia. In that island-continent is a "Labor Party" corner-stoned on the "Brotherhood of Capital and Labor," in other words, guided by the principle of the "co-operation of classes." The party elects several of its candidates to the Australian Parliament. Recently the bourgeois ministry fell, due to a conflict between the free trade and the protection wings of capital. The country's Executive and direct representative of the British Crown thereupon picked out a member of the Labor Party contingent in the parliament, bestowed upon him the premiership, and invited him to form a new ministry. The gift was accepted; the request was granted; and a "Labor Ministry," composed of laborites and bourgeois was empanelled—by the grace of a bourgeois

overlord. The performance was an exhibition of the “co-operation of classes” upon a stage more conspicuous and a scale more vast than any hitherto tried. Connected with the Australian Labor Party is a loosely shaped body that rejoices in the name of “Social Democratic Federation,” and which, of course, draws to itself the class of expatriated Germans under consideration. Through these the press of the German Social Democracy—from the Berlin *Vorwaerts* and *Neue Zeit* down—forthwith began to teem with exuberant articles on the Australian occurrence. One of these articles even flourished the jubilant headline of, “The Dictatorship of the Proletariat.” While thus rejoicing, the articles either wholly ignored the existence in Australia of a sound, uncompromising, militant Socialist Labor Party which was polling its full 25,000 votes, or made only casual allusions to it, suppressing its electoral strength, even mutilating its name. Thus the spectacle was presented of Bebel storming at Dresden and carrying the convention with impassioned assaults upon the THEORY of the “co-operation of classes,” while simultaneously the German Social Democratic press was misled by its German agents abroad into singing pæans for the PRACTICE of the “co-operation of classes”! Thus the bizarre spectacle was seen of denunciations for one Millerand in France to the orchestration of praises for a whole batch of Millerands in Australia!

Finally, in America, the same phenomenon manifests itself in downright repulsive form. The noisy victories of Japan on the battlefields of Manchuria have so taken the world by surprise that we are all apt to forget that much of that which we wonder at in Japan America presents upon a manifold larger scale. America’s development within the short span of its barely 130 years of independent life is unmatched. Coupled, moreover, with the circumstance of the veritably boundless area over which the development crept and leaped, the social growth of America presents aspects that could be presented under no other circumstances, hence are nowhere else to be seen. Important as these aspects are to a general study of sociology, to the proper understanding of the country, and to the subject in hand, I shall not here take them up. They were set forth in the Socialist Labor Party’s report to the Amsterdam Congress.<sup>3</sup> Suffice it here to point to a certain summary.

---

<sup>3</sup> [[http://slp.org/pdf/slphist/amsterdam\\_1904.pdf](http://slp.org/pdf/slphist/amsterdam_1904.pdf)]

While in small, thickly settled and old France, Jauresism is a Utopian vision of the future, in young, broad-acred and hardly explored America Jauresism is a recollection of the past—a past that, in point of distance of development, lies far in the rear, but that, in point of time, lies close behind, with a tradition still warm with the glow of inspiration, and that the country's youth still steadily revives. The theory of the "co-operation of classes" is, in America, a fatal delusion that the course of American development most naturally raises before the popular mind. It is the Marxist's duty as firmly to set his face against and expose it. The unintelligent and dishonorable German Socialist in America promotes the illusion here as his compeers do in Great Britain and Australia. Moreover, here, more so than elsewhere, his deportment is marked with unconcealed dislike, even hatred, for the land and its people, arrogantly demanding acquiescence with his views as the proconsul in America of an imaginary Socialist hierarchy in Germany. Adolf Hepner, the fellow-prisoner of Liebknecht, said to me in his editorial room of the St. Louis *Tageblatt* on the afternoon (of) Monday, the 27th of April, 1891: "The difficulty I notice here in America is that the Germans who are loudest in their claims of Socialist knowledge are the ones most ignorant on the subject. The German workingman who has come over with some knowledge of the subject goes about unassumingly. But a set of Germans, who, if they were to find themselves in Germany, would not dare to make even their existence known in the councils of the party, are here the most loud-mouthed and pretentious. They know even less of the country than they know of Socialism. They do not understand what they see or hear. They get everything mixed up. Vain-gloriously seeking to exhibit themselves in the plumage of Socialism, they encourage by joining positive absurdities (Albernheiten). Thus we have seen them join hands with the Greenbackers. They hurt the prospects of Socialism here, they throw disrepute upon the German Movement, and they mislead public opinion in Germany. As anxious as they are to cut a figure here, they are still more anxious to be thought at home to be cutting a figure in America. They push themselves forward as correspondents from America. Of course they are corrupt. A despicable crew (Elendiges Gesindel)." In saying this, Hepner was speaking of his experience in New York mainly, and was illustrating his points with the New Yorker Volkszeitung Corporation in general, its Herman

Schlueters and Alexander Jonases in particular—the identical head-center that presumptuously declares: “We Germans speak from above down” (Wir Deutschen sprechen von oben herab); that is seen to-day seconding the “co-operation of classes,” as manifested by American Jauresism, yclept “American Federation of Labor,” or “Socialist,” “Social Democratic,” “Public Ownership” party; that but recently, as in the instance of the brewery workers, and as so often before, in other instances was convicted of “co-operating with the classes” to the point of selling out the workers for advertisements; and, finally, that, like its confreres in England and Australia, furnishes its own country with false information only. They all imagine they are upholding their country’s policy; in fact they but caricature the same. When the sentiments and thoughts of superior men fall into the hands of little folks a mess is the inevitable result.

#### CONVERGENCE OF MOVING SPRINGS.

The social, political and psychological moving springs of the Social Democracy in Germany that lead to such riot-running excesses abroad are, however well under the control of superior men at home, not wholly without their regrettable manifestations even there. For instance:

I was at the International Congress of Zurich, held in 1893. France was represented only by the wildcat Allemanists, with Allemane himself as the leading figure. I met in Zurich not one of the leading men in the Socialist Movement of France. None attended. They did not because they could not. And they could not because their own national electoral campaign coincided with the date of the Congress, and, as was known in Zurich, the German contingent had declined to postpone or advance the date of the Congress in accommodation of the French. Nevertheless, when eleven years later the date of the International Congress to be held at Amsterdam in 1903 collided with the national electoral campaign of Germany, the date of that year’s Congress was, upon motion of Singer, unceremoniously postponed a full twelve months.

Again, and of still deeper meaning: Within four days of the opening of the Amsterdam Congress; at the very season when the Socialist Party of France was

holding its own national convention at Lille; when the party was furnishing Europe proof positive of the solidity and growth of its organization;—at that season the Berlin *Vorwaerts* published a correspondence from France belittling the body, while claiming to befriend it. The correspondence laid emphasis upon the “influential press” of the Jauresists, suppressing the fact that that press’s “influence” was wholly due to the support it received from the Combes ministry; the correspondence exaggerated the power of attraction exercised by the Jauresists upon the liberal-inclined workmen; the correspondence summed up in dark colors the prospects of the Socialist Party of France. Nor has this spirit of latent animosity ceased since the Amsterdam Congress. Since then I notice that Guesde has felt constrained to correct in the Berlin *Vorwaerts* more recent false statements that have since then appeared in the *Vorwaerts* against him and the tendencies of the Socialist Party of France, and that proceeded from the paper’s correspondent in Paris.

It goes without saying that the attitude of the German Social Democracy finds ready imitators on the continent in the quarters that Germany typifies. So ready was the imitation in the instance of the pre-Amsterdam Congress correspondence from Paris to the Berlin *Vorwaerts*, that two days before the opening of the Congress—on Friday, August 12—, while the city was filling up with the delegates from all parts of the world, *Het Volk*, the Socialist daily of Amsterdam, quoted the *Vorwaerts* correspondence, and, catching its spirit, improved upon it with lengthy comments to the effect that “sad is the plight of the Socialist Party of France”; that “the French workingmen in overwhelming majority are lining up with Jaures”; that “the mass of the Socialist workers are siding, not with Guesde, but with Jaures”; that “the Guesde party is losing ground”; etc.; etc.;—all the exact reverse of the facts. The article of *Het Volk*—a paper published in the very city where the International Congress was within two days of being held, a paper issued by the very organization that had charge of the Congress—was in the nature of an opening address. It was an official manifesto.

#### FRENCH SOCIALISTS’ TACTICS.

The wound inflicted upon the vanguard of the International Socialist Movement

at the Paris Congress of 1900 was deep. It was felt even in the United States. Here, however, thanks to the country's advantage of location, the evil effect of the Kautsky Resolution could and was readily resisted and overcome by the Socialist Labor Party. Otherwise in France. Her continental location and compulsorily intimate interrelation with nations politically less advanced than herself, unavoidably render her deeply sensitive to their conduct. The problem presented to the revolutionary Socialists of France at the close of the Paris Congress of 1900 was of prime magnitude, and thorny was the path before them. The mere overthrow at home of Jauresism would have been a Pyrrhic victory. Such is the lay of the land in Europe that the rest of the continental nations are main-body to the army of which France is the head of the column. As such, no more than the head of a column on the military field of battle, could France afford—either for her own safety or for the safety of the main body—to march too far ahead, perchance disconnected from the rest of the European Socialist army. Accordingly, two things were simultaneously essential to success—the overthrow of Jauresism at home, and also the disgusting of the rest of the European continent, Germany especially, with their ugly pet: the shaming them into withdrawing their support from the abortion. Indeed, the two things resolved themselves into one, the former being predicated upon the latter. The revolutionary French Socialists now reorganized in the Socialist Party of France, rose at the crisis equal to the occasion, and they pursued their policy with a tactfulness and strategy, that, even had it proved unsuccessful, would have deserved admiration and emulation. Crowned as it was with final success at Amsterdam, it constitutes a brilliant page in the annals of triumphant Socialist genius.

The same instinct that moved, and thought that guided, the Socialist Labor Party of America in its tactics against the variously named Jauresistic eruption{s} in this country, presided over the councils of the Socialist Party of France in the campaign that it conducted against essentially the self-same article at home. There are evils, like diseases, that may not be checked: they must be allowed to run their course. To check them is to scotch, not kill the snake. They must rather be poulticed into ripening to a head. It is the tactics known in the field of mathematics or of logic by the name of the “*reductio ad absurdum*”—the demonstration of error by pointing

to the absurd conclusion that it leads to. On the field of society the error, or absurdity, must be helped along; lashed, if possible, to the point of its own unveiling. When in this country the counterpart of the French Jauresist Movement—here assuming the various and successive names of “Social Democracy Colonization,” or “Socialist,” “Public Ownership,” “Social Democratic” party—put in its appearance, the Socialist Labor Party’s steadily pursued and triumphant tactics was {were?} to lash the error into its own logically absurd results. Thus, one year, it was lashed to exhibit whither one aspect of its policy—currying favor for Socialism by acting as candle-holder for the “labor lieutenants” of the Capitalist Class—logically led to, by driving it to vote for a Gompers at New Orleans, and the next year forcing it to exhibit the futility of the same policy by driving it to set up its own candidate against Gompers at Boston, and thereby itself uncover, through its trifling poll, the hollowness of the “Socialist” support striven for by such methods. Thus, at other times, it was lashed to exhibit whither another aspect of its policy—fusing on economics with the middle class—inevitably led to, by driving it to fuse with middle class and other capitalist candidates on politics also. Thus, again, it was lashed to exhibit still another aspect of its policy—fraternization with Gompers Unionism—by driving it to approve of the guild methods of such organizations, and forthwith driving it to turn a somersault back, and seek to wash its hands of the smut that stuck to them, the moment the practical results were held up of the base betrayal of the dearest principle of Labor, SOLIDARITY, that guild practices rend in shreds. Another time it was lashed to exhibit what that other aspect of its policy—laxity of organization—comes to, by driving it, on the one hand, to exhibit the sight of a discordant mob, holding different views in different latitudes and longitudes, and on the other, to submit abjectly to the yoke of a privately owned “party press.” And so forth, and so on. Thus the Socialist Labor Party in America against Jauresism here. The identical tactics—pursued, however, upon the vastly more difficult, because more slippery, field of parliamentarism, and having, moreover, a vastly wider aim, being intended to mature the necessary fruit beyond the borders of France herself, in the unsympathetic sister states of the Continent—did the Socialist Party of France take up against Jauresism at home.

Jaures, more than once at Amsterdam, twitted the Socialist Party of France

with being in a state of “cataleptic rigidity.” The reproach must have had a bad taste on Jaures’ own lips. Jaures is too keen a man to have failed to realize—at least from the tone of his secret sympathizers and now unwilling opponents from other parts of Europe—that it was to that very “cataleptic rigidity” of his adversaries at home that he owed his impending downfall at the International Congress. What Jaures termed the “cataleptic rigidity” of the Socialist Party of France was a posture of such uncompromising soundness that it had upon him all the effect of a goad. Levity never becomes more frivolous than when confronted with gravity. Utopianism, being unbalanced, is mercurial. Its own inherent law of being drives it to act obedient to the maxim that the wise Ulysses set up for the empty-pated Achilles—“things that move do sooner catch the eye than what not moves.” Of itself condemned to eye-catching pyrotechnics, the “cataleptic rigidity” of the soundly poised Socialist Party of France drove Jauresism adown the inclined plane at the bottom of which it was to dash itself: pricked it from cover, where it might be misunderstood, into the open, where it would stand exposed. From being at first only silently passive at the idea of a Millerand, a reputed Socialist, in close ministerial intercourse with a Gallifet, the butcher of the Commune; from subsequently seeking to ignore the responsibility of Millerand for the ministerial acts of the slaughter of the Chalon and the Martinique workingmen on strike;—from such seemingly slight beginnings, Jauresism presently rushed headlong down its course. It extenuated Millerand’s actions; boisterously upheld them; earned the praises, even a decoration, from the Muscovite Autocrat, that monstrosity of our days that combines the reckless blood-thirstiness of the barbarian with the vices and hypocritical pretences of civilization. It went further. It accepted for Jaures himself, at the hands of bourgeois deputies, a vice-presidency in the Chambers. It went still further. It merged into a bourgeois ministerial “bloc”; turned its press into semi-official mouthpieces of a subsequent wholly bourgeois ministry; and, finally, it capped the climax by voting the ministerial budget, the appropriations for the Army and Navy included!—“The devil of a fellow” had, decidedly, “carried the thing too far”; yet not an inch further than his premises fatedly led to, or that the safety of the Socialist Movement needed. The “cataleptic rigidity” of the Socialist Party of France had goaded Jauresism to exhibiting in the

noontide glare the logical consequences of the “co-operation of classes” in countries wholly freed from feudal trammels, countries where the only classes extant are the capitalists plundered and the plundered workingman.

The Socialist Party of France had accomplished the principal point in its program. It had driven Jaures to where his supporters outside of France could not choose but be ashamed of his political company. At Amsterdam, as narrated in the flashlight “Jules Guesde,” Guesde declared his party disclaimed any purpose of “seeking international aid for itself in the internal strifes of the Movement at home.” The declaration must not be looked into too closely. It is hard accurately to determine the point where the “seeking of international aid in internal strifes at home” ends, and the laming of outside support to a home foe begins. The Socialist Party of France lamed the support that Jaures had so far openly enjoyed from beyond the French frontier. How effectively the laming was done transpired at the Dresden national convention of the German Social Democracy, held in 1903. What now remained to do was to clinch the advantage. That was done at the French national convention of Rheims. At the Paris International Congress of three years before, the revolutionary French Socialists voted emphatically against the Kautsky Resolution. At Rheims they stooped to conquer. It mattered not that the resolution adopted at the immediately preceding Dresden convention embodied the Kautsky Resolution, let it in by a back door. The important fact, the one fact that the Socialist Party of France kept its eyes fixed upon was the language, the tone of the language to the tune of which the Dresden Resolution was adopted. That tone denied the Kautsky Resolution—the international, official prop of Jauresism. The Rheims convention adopted the Dresden Resolution with only such verbal changes as were obviously necessary, and forthwith forwarded it to the International Bureau at Brussels as the motion on international tactics that the Socialist Party of France would offer at the next year’s Amsterdam Congress. The move was like the tying of a knot to a string of beads. There was no chance allowed for backsliding. The support of Germany could not slip; and, with Germany, the continental states that follow in her train were considered secured. After that there remained nothing to do but to glean at Amsterdam the fruit of the intellectual alertness that could plan, pursue and execute such brilliant tactics, such masterly strategy.

## AT AMSTERDAM.

The posture, mental—I would almost say physical, also—of the peasant woman in the story that I opened this flash-light with, was the posture at Amsterdam of all the continental nations whose social and political backwardness renders Jauresism palatable. The distressed peasant woman of the story can well be imagined in a paroxysm of rage towards the fellow who had so severely handled her, and yet be full of love and affection, aye, even veneration for him. Such conflicting sentiments necessarily react on each other. On the one hand, her love, affection and veneration could not choose but dull the edge of her resentment. On the other hand, in equal measure with her love, affection and veneration, her rage would be sharpened at the abuse of a right before which she bowed in reverence. Such was the psychology at Amsterdam. It explains how not one of the European delegates dared uphold Jaures. It explains how none—excepting, of course, the representatives of the Socialist Party of France—dared condemn him as unqualifiedly as he deserved. It explains how all—Rosa Luxemburg and Plechanoff joined to the European exception—had some good word for him, some even bouquets to mitigate the smart of their tongue-lashings. It explains the weakness of Bebel's speech. Finally, it explains the adoption of the Dresden-Amsterdam Resolution and the essence of the resolution itself.

The Resolution adopted at Amsterdam, and which I have all along designated as the Dresden-Amsterdam Resolution, was the resolution submitted to the Congress by the Socialist Party of France, with but one alteration. It substitutes the word "repudiate" for "condemn"—the Congress "repudiates," it does not "condemn," whatever the difference may mean. The genesis of the Dresden-Amsterdam Resolution sufficiently explains its essence and purpose. These were further accentuated by the speeches made in its support. Finally, the vote of the Congress completes the picture.

At the Paris Congress of 1900, it was not merely the substance of the Kautsky Resolution that characterized the thing. It was the speeches made in its support that preened its feathers. Similarly at Amsterdam. In and of itself, the Dresden-

Amsterdam Resolution could have been voted for by Jaures himself. He did not: he fought it. He spoke passionately against it; he satirized its supporters; he ridiculed its contents. What he really fought, opposed, satirized, and ridiculed was the rhetorical orchestration against himself, and which gave the Resolution point. That, jointly with the genesis of the Resolution, was what forced Jaures' hand, and thereby earned for the otherwise faulty Resolution the support that it received from the Socialist Labor Party of America, as the least bad and only feasible forward step under the circumstances.

The Dresden-Amsterdam Resolution preserves the earmarks of the defective attitude of these International Congresses. The Kautsky Resolution was a bed of Procrustes: it met the fate of all such Procrustean attempts: each one interpreted it to suit himself, to the extent that it earned the witty nick-name of the Kaoutchouc (india rubber) Resolution. The Dresden-Amsterdam Resolution pulls, or affects to pull, some of the claws of the Kautsky Resolution, but it essentially preserves the Procrustean defects of its original, defects that, as the Kautsky Resolution experienced, will inevitably lead to sophistical arguments intended to escape the effect of its defective construction. That this forecast is not likely to be imaginary may be judged by the vote of the Congress—the large number of abstentions.

The success of the tactics and strategy of the Socialist Party of France had a narrow escape. The calculation that the continental states, which habitually follow in the train of Germany, would be secured by securing Germany, did not prove wholly correct. Victory was snatched by the skin of the teeth. In the first place—as was pointed out in the flash-light “Victor Adler”—the Adler-Vandervelde proposed resolution, intended to afford the Jaures sympathizers a half-way roost or asylum, was defeated only by a tie vote.<sup>4</sup> In the second place, when the final vote was taken on the Dresden-Amsterdam Resolution, six nationalities abstained from voting. With the exception of Argentina, who considered her own Movement too small to take sides in such an issue, all the other abstainers felt too strongly the Jauresistic

---

<sup>4</sup> The vote by nationalities stood:

Aye:—Australia, 2; Argentina, 2; Austria, 2; Belgium, 2; Denmark, 2; England, 2; France (Jaures), 1; Holland, 2; Norway, 1; Poland, 1; Sweden, 2; Switzerland, 2. Total 21.

Nay:—America, 2; Bohemia, 2; Bulgaria, 2; France (Guesde), 1; Germany, 2; Hungary, 2; Italy, 2; Japan, 2; Norway, 1; Poland, 1; Russia, 2; Spain, 2. Total, 21.

requirements of their own country fully to follow the lead of their otherwise leader, Germany. They could not go so far as to vote for the resolution; they dared not vote against it, and thus rank themselves on the side of Jaures; they halted half way.<sup>5</sup> They all will find arguments in the defective construction of the resolution that was adopted to follow the even tenor of their way, as dictated by their home conditions.

The Dresden-Amsterdam Resolution put the quietus on Jauresism in France. For that much it deserves praise. For the rest, the Resolution has all the weaknesses inherent in legislation that, special in its purpose, affects to be general in scope.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.

Uploaded August 2007

[slpns@slp.org](mailto:slpns@slp.org)

---

<sup>5</sup> The vote by nationalities stood:

Aye:—America, 2; Austria, 2; Bulgaria, 2; England, 1; Germany, 2; Holland, 2; Hungary, 2; Italy, 2; Japan, 2; Norway, 1; Poland, 2; Spain, 2; Switzerland, 1; Russia, 2. Total, 25.

Nay:—Australia, 2; England, 1; France (Jaures), 1; Norway, 1. Total, 5.

The abstentions were:—Argentina, 2; Belgium, 2; Denmark, 2; Holland, 2; Switzerland, 2; Sweden, 2. Total, 6 nationalities, 12 votes.