Contrary to what an outsider might have expected, Jewish Socialism, in all its sectors, withstood the crusading onrush of the Left Wing. The Jewish Socialist Federation was not in the SP split of 1919, nor did incipient Communism make a noticeable dent in the unions or the Workmen's Circle.

To be sure, the ranks of the federation, the unions and the WC could not altogether escape the powerful emotional appeal of the Bolshevik Revolution. The Left was able to snatch away many youthful members, but the active cadres successfully resisted Communist penetration.

This is not to imply that the number of Jews in the Left Wing was small and their role inconsiderable. An appreciable number of Jews, including American-born, belonged to the CP. There were also Jews in the Russian and Hungarian federations.

To gain a perspective of the trends prevailing in Jewish labor in that period, one must review the enormous part radical ideas had in molding its thinking. And the roots of this phenomenon must be traced to the old country.

As described in the third chapter, the handful of intellectuals in the first mass immigration were all under the influence of Russian radical ideas—there were no neutrals among them. Spreading of rudimentary secular education was interlaced by them with a tempting vision of a classless society free from poverty and injustice. A small but lively movement was thus created.

As the Eastern European community began to settle down, many 53

55

careers. The personal column in the early Socialist press announcing the new professionals, doctors, dentists and lawyers grew longer as the years went by. Among the non-intellectuals, the settling down meant going into business or acquiring property—becoming landlords. Ordinarily, people moving into a higher economic bracket also acquired its values. But the peculiarity of Jewish society—its wage-earner economic base, lack of an entrenched middle class and the radiance emanating from a militant and culturally alive labor movement—worked for a continuation of the old attachment for most of them. Some even retained their old standing, lowering the buoyancy of the movement.\*

The complacent voice of the new alrightnicks jarred and disturbed the purists among the radicals. The impulsive veteran, Michail Zametkin—watchdog of the Socialist conscience—as early as 1906, wrote a sarcastic piece about the genossen "burdened with a couple of tenementlach," and the unhealthy air generated by

them.\*48

## THE ADAPTABLES AND THE PURISTS

The radical-minded segment was immeasurably greater in the second mass immigration. They carried through the Great Upheaval industrially and generated the political and cultural upsurge. They also raised fresh problems.

This segment was composed of two elements. A majority took a liking to the new country, and lost no time in sinking their roots in it. They utilized its freedom for strengthening and extending the industrial and cultural institutions that they found here. A minority, more romantic, found American reality short of their dreams.

The hard, callous phases of the American scene only spurred the majority to further social action. Through trial and error in their daily experience, they gradually shed their early unreal approach. They became Americanized, striving only for tangible results. From their midst came the second layer and the top leadership of Jewish labor. Baruch Charney-Vladek, David Dubinsky and Sidney Hillman were good examples of this majority.

The minority, mostly men and women under 20 on arriving here,

carried with them the thrilling excitement of the underground movement in Russia, with its glorified sacrifices. Nothing they encountered in America fitted these nostalgic memories. These youngsters came, for the most part, from middle-class parents, had attended the gymnasia, and were driven to emigrate not by sheer poverty but by a pall of discrimination hanging over their heads. Here most of them went to work in the garment and allied trades. The degrading experiences in the pre-union shop threw them into the front lines of the great industrial battles.

Their enthusiasm and courage were unexcelled. On the picket lines they felt the hot breath of the class struggle. But the compromise settlements, however fair, and the daily routine of a union, however inescapable, were boring to them. The young radicals were impatient with the "clumsy" arbitration machinery built into every collective agreement, considering it a wasteful brake on the initiative of the workers.

Particularly disgruntled were the girls. They were groping for a loftier goal than the union offered. Settling of prices and dickering with the boss for a cent more on a garment was "business unionism." And they were in the union not merely for "business," but for the soul as well.

Disappointment was not limited to the unions. America appeared to them completely dominated by the capitalists, and hard and cruel to the working people. Such "institutions" as the corporations' private armies, special deputies and court injunctions were shocking. The AFL, small, craft-minded, with a narrow outlook, some of its affiliates ruled by unscrupulous men, was disgusting. Even organized Socialism, toward which many of them looked hopefully, was by far unlike the one in the old country. The Socialist Party seemed flabby, the leadership smug and complacent, victims of the movement's new prosperity.

The vague longing for a collective "soul" would, in all probability, have been dispelled with the years. Time is an effective healer—or killer—of youthful restlessness. And the inexorable process of Americanization would inevitably have caught up with them, as it did with the rest of the immigration. These young people were good timber for any social cause, and from them would have emerged the top ranks. But the hot winds from the World War and Bolshevik Revolution blew them into Lenin's camp.

<sup>\*</sup> See Melech Epstein, op. cit., 1882-1914, Ch. 20.

## THE GROWING FRICTION

Relations between the higher echelons of the older generation and the active newcomers who adjusted themselves to America were not peaceful either, though they worked side by side. The former, stormbeaten veterans, had labored unremittingly for a quarter of a century, under the most trying conditions, until they reached the period of 1910–1915, when they could look around them and see solid organizations where before had been nothing but chaos. They now preferred caution and entrenchment. They were inclined to relax.

With still less equanimity did the new active people view the situation in the Socialist movement. They found a widespread Socialist sentiment, but a weak manifestation of it. In 1915, the Naye Welt (New World), organ of the Jewish Socialist Federation, openly complained of the decline of the SP and the inaction of all its units. 49

The prime source of the unhappy disproportion and inaction lay, as they saw it, in the "failure of Socialist nerve." Mostly members of the Bund, they had been schooled in a cohesive and aggressive labor and Socialist body, and the "complacent and timid conservatism" of the old-timers irritated them. They repeatedly complained of the lack of political vitality in the party. The Forward was accused—and with reason—of diluting its Socialist content with large doses of "human interest" stories, sensational headlines and a simplified, almost crude, form of Socialist propaganda.

Indeed, it was these features, introduced by the stubborn insistence of Ab. Cahan, that lifted the *Forward* from a small Socialist organ to a large popular paper. It might be added that its Socialist critics never made it clear whether they were ready to sacrifice the mass audience to the higher Socialist and journalistic standard. One could suspect that they thought they could have both.

The former Bundists resented the fact that the Forward was run by the Forward Publishing Association, an independent body that stood above the party. They also complained that the Forward was "dictating to the Jewish unions through its labor department." As the institution which had stood with Jewish labor through all its many travails and bore an honorable place in its achievements, the Forward was drawn into the internal politics of the unions, and usually supported the official leadership. The faith that the people

had in their paper made the position of the labor editor powerful indeed. Without a favorable mention in the *Forward* labor columns, a union official could hardly stay in office for very long.

Toward the end of the "Great Revolt," the number of organized Jewish workers may have reached as high as 400,000, while the Jewish ranks in the SP remained practically static. As late as 1913, S. P. Kramer, a Socialist writer and tuer of the Forward staff, gloomily commented on the ephemeral Socialist spirit in the Jewish unions: "The outside world assumes that the Jewish unions are Socialist, but a closer look will show that this is far from the truth. The union member listens to a Socialist speech, reads a Socialist article, is imbued with the Socialist spirit, but what is Socialism he doesn't know. And the first reform breeze carries him away from us. . . ." \*50

Kramer had deeper misgivings regarding the Socialist top of these unions: "... and because of that the leadership of the unions remains in the hands of a few people, among whom there are men who have one thing in mind, their own jobs. We have a central body, the United Hebrew Trades, but, just like the unions, it is ruled by a couple of people."

Dissatisfaction with the *Forward* did not originate with, nor was it confined to the intellectuals who came here at the end of the first decade. The *Forward*'s birth as an opposition to the official party had been a source of lingering ill will on the part of those who remained with the SLP. Veterans like Jacob Milch, Joseph Schlossberg and others had never forgotten nor forgiven the *Forward*.

Some of the older radicals were irked by the Forward's lack of a positive Jewish attitude. The Kishineff pogrom in 1903 had shaken much of their internationalism. As the semi-official historian Hertz Burgin gloomily put it, "This (the new mood) was a genuine nationalistic epidemic. . . . The radicalism of the quartal has almost melted away in the nationalistic wave." \*51 However, the Forward had stuck to its quasi-assimilationist policy.

Cahan's domineering personality and high-handed methods in dealing with people he disliked were not conducive to maintaining good relations either.

The old guard, in and out of the Forward Association, the WC and the UHT, tried to write off the criticism of the newcomers as

59 The New Concept

the grumbling of malcontents who viewed America through their Eastern European lenses. They suspected that the real intention of their critics was to take over leadership.

## FOR AN ACTIVE JEWISH POLICY

The do-nothing policy in the community, which stemmed from the superficial internationalism of the older generation, was another source of friction. Their very name, not Jewish but Yiddish-speaking Socialists, attested to their negative nationalism. <sup>+17</sup> With the exception of Morris Winchefsky, Abraham Liessin, A. Litwin, Dr. Frank Rosenblatt, Dr. Ab. Kaspe and a few others, the old-timers preached a total absorption of the Jewish identity into the American nation. As a result, the Jewish Socialists and radicals generally had no Jewish policy at all, and meekly followed the lead of the wealthy of the American Jewish Committee (formed in 1906) in all Jewish affairs.

"Americanization" was the ideological reasoning behind their resistance to a Jewish group in the Socialist Party. Jews had to join the party merely as individuals. For their own political expression, the old guard reserved the Forward Publishing Association. Their spokesmen were such diverse personalities as Ab. Cahan, Meyer London, Benjamin Schlesinger, Benjamin Feigenbaum, Philip Krantz, M. Zametkin, Max Pine and Meyer Gillis.

To the former Bundists, a Jewish federation within the SP was the only way to correct the disparity between sentiment and organization, end Socialist isolation, and make it an important factor in the community. The Jewish Bureau of Agitation, that the old guard had consented to form in September 1905 as a concession to the newcomers, proved entirely inadequate.

(A Jewish Socialist Workers Federation, consisting of the Jewish branches of the SLP, had been organized in 1906; David Schub, secretary. But the SLP was generally on the decline. The Bundist writers who, on their arrival, chose for their platform the SLP weekly, *Der Arbeiter* [The Worker], edited by Joseph Schlossberg and David Pinski, were soon repelled by the dogmatism and intransigence of De Leonism.)

The controversy between the old generation and the young was becoming livelier. (It was not solely a matter of age; a small number of Bundists and other young radicals, typified by Reuben Guskin, Harry Lang and Rudolph Block, sided with the old-timers; and quite a few of the earlier immigration allied themselves with the young oppositionists.) Meanwhile, more immigrants were landing daily, augmenting radical ranks. Caught in the process of spreading out from the big cities, a process that greatly increased the small communities in all parts of the country, the radicals had to set up their own tents in the new places. (An immediate cause of this migration was the mass unemployment resulting from the depression of 1907, that impelled many to seek a new livelihood in a smaller town.)

For the majority of radicals this change of place meant a change in economic status, but not in belief. To join either the Reformed Temple or the Orthodox Synagogue was unthinkable. The branches of the Workmen's Circle that they founded could not fully satisfy the more politically advanced. They clamored for direct contact with a Jewish Socialist movement similar to the Bund in the old home.

#### PARTY ADMITS A JEWISH LANGUAGE GROUP

The mounting pressure for a Jewish setup in the SP won out. Ignoring the opposition of the old guard, the party authorized a Jewish language federation in 1912. It was formed at a gathering in Paterson, New Jersey, August of the same year. J. B. Salutsky (Hardman) was elected secretary. About 2,000 joined in the first year, and at the first national convention in 1913, in New Haven, Connecticut, the membership rose to 2,500. It kept growing in the following years.

Der Yiddisher Socialist, a monthly published by the federation in August 1913, later became a bi-weekly, and, in August 1915, was replaced by the weekly Naye Welt; Salutsky, Goldfarb and Shachno Epstein, the board of editors. At the same time, a group of federation Socialists in Chicago issued a regional weekly, Yiddisher Arbeiter Welt (Jewish Labor World).

An idea of the federation's composition can be gleaned from a breakdown of the membership in 20 branches, involving about 1,100 people: citizens, 27 per cent; union members, 29 per cent; women, nine per cent; those who could speak English, about 50 per cent.\*52

At its second convention, in Philadelphia, May 28, 1915, the aver-

To shake off the unpardonable charge of Jewish nationalism leveled at it by the old-timers, the declaration of the first convention stated:

stream of American Socialism. It will adjust itself to his notions and habits, to his psychology and living conditions. It will explain to him and the right-thinking Jewish citizens the conditions in America, which is destined to be the second home of the Jewish people. It will aim to make them ripe to fight jointly with the American workers and right-thinking citizens for the liberation of mankind, . . .\*58

This vagueness in phrasing a Jewish policy also mirrored the differences at the federation top. Liessin, Winchefsky, A. Litwak, Zivyon, Dr. Frank Rosenblatt, Dr. Carl Fornberg, A. S. Sachs and Moishe Terman felt a positive concern for Jewish values; while others, headed by J. B. Salutsky, the prime mover of the federation, Max Goldfarb, B. Charney-Vladek and M. Olgin, were first of all Socialists. As to the rank and file, they were more Jewish, at least intuitively, than the leadership—as the rank and file always were.

Nevertheless, in an obituary resolution on the death of I. L. Peretz, the federation expressed deep sorrow over the "heavy loss suffered by the *entire Jewish people*, Jewish labor and Jewish literature." (italics M.E.) \*54

The forceful sequence of events soon threw the federation into the thick of Jewish affairs. It participated actively in the huge task of aiding the war victims overseas and in post-war rehabilitation. It took the initiative in forming the National Workers Committee, for the defense of Jewish rights here and abroad.\*

Dr. Max Goldfarb, writing in the Yiddisher Socialist, June 1, 1915, went even further. He suggested the formation of a world alliance of Jewish labor groups, "to deal with the painful Jewish problem."

More about this committee, see Melech Epstein, op. cit., 1914-1952, pp. 61-63.

#### REVISING ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR

From the very beginning of the war, the federation took a less tolerant view of the German Social Democracy than did Hillquit and the Forward. At the same time, it tried to dispel the defeatist mood of the Socialist rank and file.

As the hostilities continued, the federation moved to disassociate its antiwar stand from the pro-German sympathies of sections of the community, subtly voiced by the Forward. A conference called by the federation, March 11, 1917, and endorsed by the WC, the UHT and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, stated implicitly, "We are against war not because we side with this or the other camp of the belligerent countries. We are against war generally. We are not pro-German or pro-Ally. We are pro-proletarian." This was followed by a lengthy explanation of why Jews, perennial victims of rampant chauvinism, had to be against war.\*55

America's entrance into the war, the bloody battles on French soil and the march of the German Army deeper into Russia, February 1918, brought home the unmistakable danger of German militarism and gave rise to a clamor within the SP for a revision of the St. Louis antiwar platform. Most of the Jewish unions had never approved that platform. And the UHT and the ACWA, the former led by Max Pine and the latter by Sidney Hillman, adopted resolutions early in 1918 in support of President Wilson's war aims, the ACWA explaining that "the workers are interested in defeating German militarism." The Forward and the WC, who approved of St. Louis in 1917, were turning away from its antiwar platform and moving closer to the Allies in 1918.

In April 1918, the federation urged the parent body to revise the St. Louis stand. Its communication was quite explicit: "It is absolutely necessary for the Socialist Party to make . . . clear for the world its views . . . over the essence of the life-and-death struggle that is now raging between the horrible forces of German military imperialist despotism on one side and the united democratic countries on the other. . . . The situation demands that the party should come out with a positive stand . . . of the aims of the war or the terms of peace, which are one and the same." \*56

## THE FEDERATION GAINING GROUND

The federation was making headway. In 1915, it reached a membership of 8,000 (though the sale of dues stamps was never above 6,000), with nearly 100 branches in all important cities. Contrary to the general run of the SP units, who bestirred themselves three months before election campaigns and remained half-dead for nine months afterward, the federation branches, for the most part, were active the year round, cultural and Jewish affairs occupying most of their time.

The immigrant youth on the fringe of radicalism was not neglected either. The young immigrants could not step over the barriers, linguistic and background, that stood between them and their native-born cousins. To avoid getting lost in the new environment, they concentrated in "self-educational" clubs, also largely landsmanshaften. The most sensitive among them veered either toward Socialism or Zionism. The federation went to these clubs for recruits. And, in 1916, its youth branches held their first convention, forming the Socialist Youth Alliance. Its second convention was held June 8–9, 1918. In that year the Alliance had 16 branches with approximately 1,000 members. For a time the Alliance published its own organ, Freie Yugend (Free Youth). A report from Pittsburgh speaks of the spiritual transformation of the youth:

Four years ago, some of those who are now among the most loyal and active Socialists were standing on the street corners, spending their time chewing and spitting. . . . And some of the girls who are now the finest and most beautiful dreamers and fighters for freedom at that time wasted their best hours on cheap ragtime dances, kissing games and parties with nonentities. . . .

The report added that these same youth were now interested in serious problems, and were steady readers of Yiddish literature.\*57

The cessation of immigration during the war and the loss of the greater part of the youth to the Left Wing three years later finished the Alliance.

The Naye Welt, edited by Salutsky, was broader in scope than its usual Socialist counterpart. Its subtitle, "A Social, Political and Literary Weekly," denoted its contents. The magazine sought to acquaint its readers with basic American problems. It also tried to

develop among them a taste for better reading. The works of modern American and European authors were translated and commented upon. Yiddish poetry and literary and theater reviews were permanent features of the magazine. The reverence for literature was so deepseated that the steady theater column was conducted by an anti-Marxist, the noted poet, Zisha Landau. (One may add that the weekly publications of the large Jewish trade unions, too, were far from being mere house organs. They also carried material of a general educational character, and short stories, poems and literary reviews were printed regularly.)

The periphery of the federation was much wider than its numbers would indicate. Its lecture tours and publications reached far beyond its ranks. The federation encouraged free inquiry within the frame of Marxist thought. And, perhaps even more significant, it steadfastly kept its face toward America, thus striving for genuine Americanization of its members without adversely affecting their Jewish identity.

The notion that Jewish Socialism or radicalism remained attached to things Russian is entirely unfounded. On the contrary, the emphasis was on the new home. The issues of the Naye Welt for 1915 and 1916 are amazingly free from articles on Russia. A vast preponderance of the material is on political, social and labor affairs in America. This emphasis on things American was rooted in Socialist activities even before the federation. A new Yiddish Socialist quarterly, also called the Naye Welt, that appeared in October 1909, edited by Jacob Milch, had this to say editorially:

These two words, Naye Welt, express the program of the new magazine. . . . We will study the Naye Welt—America, its history, traditions, institutions and policies, its literature and poetry, its population and industries. In a word, everything that comprises the new world. . . .

Why only America? Columbus discovered a country destined to become the home of millions of Jews, destined to become in time the center of Judaism of the entire world. . . . America is the future country of the Jews. . . . snobs of Jewish Russia may turn up their noses at the mention of things American, but it won't be long before the Jews of America will be for the Jews of the entire world that which the Jews of Babylon and Alexandria were for the rest of the Jews of their time. . . .

The editorial concluded, "America has given the Jews everything, equality and opportunity. . . . Meanwhile, it is a shame to admit how little we know of America. . . ."

# JEWISH ANTAGONISM TO BOLSHEVIKS

Jewish public opinion was sharply antagonistic to the Bolshevik seizure of power. And this antagonism was understandable. Pogroms had always followed in the wake of revolutions. Moreover, the Bolshevik regime soon began expropriating small businesses and closing houses of worship.

Of the four daily papers in New York, the Orthodox Tageblatt and Morning Journal could obviously be counted among the severe critics of the Soviets. The third paper, the liberal The Day, went still further, becoming the mouthpiece of the extreme anti-Bolsheviks supporting foreign military intervention. The two other dailies, one in Philadelphia and one in Chicago, were also strong opponents of Bolshevism.

As to the Forward, it steered a neutral course, giving wide latitude to both anti-Bolshevik and pro-Bolshevik opinion. But there was only one open pro-Bolshevik on the staff, Hertz Burgin—and he belonged to the Russian Federation. The majority of the staff were unequivocally anti-Bolshevik. Editor Cahan was reluctant to attack the Bolsheviks because of his determined opposition to the "imperialist" war. The Forward, like the Hillquit-Berger leadership of the SP, was against continuing the war. The SP and the Forward even arranged a celebration of the Brest-Litovsk treaty in Madison Square Garden.

Most vehement against the Bolsheviks was Moissay Olgin. A week after the November Revolution, he sneered at Lenin:

Lenin's program sounds fine . . . , but is there any substance to it? . . . Even under the rule of the Romanoff's Lenin's shots were wide of the mark. Now he has forgotten that there are no more Romanoff's and there is no one at home to shoot at. . . . Lenin is a master at issuing signals to the backward masses, to the mob.\*58

The old-timers on the *Forward*, especially Philip Krantz, a former disciple of Daniel De Leon, and M. Baranoff, kept hacking away at the Bolsheviks. Another valued contributor, Dr. Iser Ginsburg, a

medical doctor and a Jewish scholar, ventured, in the Forward, to warn against the enthusiasm for the new Russia. He was sarcastic at the Jewish "internationalists" suddenly turned Russian Soviet patriots. Still, the general tone of the discussions—except for Baranoff—was restrained and lacking in polemical fireworks, amazing for radical writers. Even the debate running in the Forward during the summer of 1918 between John Reed and Henry L. Slobodin, a Socialist lawyer of the old school, was carried on without name calling. The chief reason for this politeness lay in the apparent remoteness of the problem. In the early months, the high command of Jewish labor considered Bolshevism a purely Russian domestic issue, not suspecting that it would soon creep into their own backyard.

The Naye Welt continued to publish highly critical material on Communism, reprinting articles of Russian Bundists hostile to the Soviet government, and a piece by Isaac Don Levine.

Hardly more friendly was Zivyon's column (feuilleton), "Risky Thoughts on Russia." Zivyon treated the Bolshevik upheaval lightly and humorously. He anticipated that Lenin-Trotsky would soon disappear and that Milukov-Gutschkov would reappear, "exchanging places in the cells of the Petropavlovsky fortress." \*59

Ironically, the first break in the Naye Welt's hostility toward Bolshevism was the series of articles by Karl Kautsky. The most authoritative Marxist was, for a short time, friendly to the Bolsheviks, undoubtedly swayed by their determination to end the war. However, by 1919, he became anathema to the Kremlin. Kautsky's piece was followed by a translation of Colonel William B. Thompson's article in the Evening Post and by articles of the English journalist, H. B. Brailsford, of the Labour Party, in the New Republic, all favorable to the Lenin-Trotsky regime.

Slowly and cautiously, the Naye Welt began to find a kind word for the Soviets, while continuing to print the anti-Communist views of the Bundists abroad. This groping for a new approach to Soviet Russia grew out of the general restlessness and the civil war in Russia.

Internal order and relative peace in Soviet Russia was shortlived. Civil war broke out early in 1918, and, repeating the tragic pattern, was accompanied by mass slaughter of Jews in the Ukraine and Southern Russia, committed by troops of the White Armies and, particularly, by Petlura's bands. Their soldiers killed, raped and looted wherever they entered. About 75,000 people were killed, 500,000 plundered, over 2,000 pogroms were registered. The mass murder and devastation of Ukrainian Jewry during the Soviet civil war, 1918–1920, was second only to the Chmelnitsky massacre in the 17th century.

The atrocities committed against the Jewish population prompted the Soviet government to issue a decree, signed by Lenin, for "uprooting the anti-Semitic movement." The decree also declared, "... the Jewish bourgeoisie are our enemies not as Jews, but as bourgeoise. The Jewish worker is our brother. Any kind of hatred against any nation is inadmissible and shameful. ..." \*60

The decree instructed all local Soviets to apply stern measures to

stop the outrages against the Jewish population.

In the same summer, an appeal by Lenin against hatred of the Jews, addressed primarily to the peasants, was made into a record to be played at village meetings and in Red Army barracks. Lenin spoke in simple language; the record itself was technically poor.\*61

The Jewish press was filled with horrifying reports of pogroms. A banner headline in the *Forward* of September 7, 1919 ran, UKRAINE FLOODED WITH JEWISH BLOOD. The dispatch told of "heaps of Jewish dead strewn over the streets of Uman. Old Jews put on *takhrikhim* and wait for death." In the same month, the paper printed a nightmare description of a pogrom in Zhitomir.

Worry over the fate of Russian Jewry was both general and personal. And no one could have overlooked the glaring fact that wherever the Red Army entered, the pillage of Jews had disappeared.<sup>+18</sup> + <sup>19</sup>