

Chapter 1 : Socialist Newspapers

The Decline of Socialism in America has 10 ratings and 3 reviews. Rocko52 said: Pretty good history of how the early US Socialist movement went from a un.

The Columbia Encyclopedia, 6th ed. Copyright The Columbia University Press Socialist parties in European history, political organizations formed in European countries to achieve the goals of socialism. General History In the late 19th cent. Most were directly influenced by the teachings of Karl Marx. In the s and 80s, Socialist parties appeared in most European states; in they joined to form the Second International. Despite similarities, the varying economic, social, and political conditions within countries gave distinctive national characters to the different socialist organizations. In France the political defeats experienced by socialists and other worker groups of the February Revolution and the Commune of Paris encouraged syndicalism and the revolutionary doctrine of Louis Auguste Blanqui. In Germany the state socialism of Ferdinand Lassalle gained wide acceptance. For more detailed historical sketches of the Socialist parties in France and Germany, see below. In Russia agrarian socialist ideas evolved indigenously as did anarchism , finding expression in the Populist movement see narodniki and in the works of Aleksandr Herzen , Mikhail Bakunin , and others. Georgi Plekhanov introduced Marxism to Russia. For the subsequent history of political socialism in Russia, see Socialist Revolutionary party ; Bolshevism and Menshevism ; communism. Socialism in Great Britain developed in close association with the trade union movement and obtained its ideological direction from the evolutionary socialists of the Fabian Society rather than from Marxism see Labour party. The Socialist parties in the Scandinavian countries were also generally moderate, and in the 20th cent. All European Socialist parties were marked by schisms; the main issue dividing them was whether party members should cooperate with bourgeois-dominated governments to work for gradual reforms or should organize extralegally to hasten what Marxists viewed as inevitable, proletarian revolution. Of those opposing the war, the most notable were the Russian Bolsheviks, who in won control of their country in the Russian Revolution. After the war left-wing socialists, hoping for an extension of the Russian Revolution to other European countries, split off from the more moderate majority to form Communist parties. In the interwar years most of the Socialist parties discarded their revolutionary ideology. Many participated in coalition governments with bourgeois parties, and in Great Britain , Norway, Sweden, and Denmark they formed their own governments. However, since they formed either coalition or minority governments they were prevented from achieving structural socialist changes, although some social reforms were enacted. Socialists were not able to counter the rise of fascism , and in Italy, Germany, and Spain they were suppressed. During World War II , socialists were prominent in the resistance movement in the countries occupied by Germany. In the postwar period the cold war widened the gulf between the Socialist and Communist parties, and most Socialist parties moved even further away from Marxism. Substantial periods of power have, however, enabled some to promote their goals of a planned economy and a welfare state in many European countries; their position has been especially strong in the Scandinavian countries. In the s a number of Socialist parties moderated their commit to a planned economy and the welfare state, most especially the British Labour party , which went so far as to abandon formally its traditional Socialist positions. Landauer, European Socialism ; G. Kramer, Socialism in Western Europe ; A. Despite repressive laws the SPD grew rapidly and by was the largest single party in the Reichstag. Ideological debate shook the party throughout the s. Bernstein led the revisionists in urging the SPD to weaken its commitment to Marxist theories of inevitable revolution and class struggle and to form alliances with middle-class parties. Karl Kautsky was the leading supporter of Marxist orthodoxy, and his position was formally upheld by the party, but in practice revisionism prevailed. Late in a group opposed to the continuation of the war broke off from the Majority Socialists and took the name Independent Socialists. They were led by Hugo Haase. Another, more radical group also broke away; the Spartacus party led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. With the German revolution of Nov. Under the Weimar Republic the Social Democrats joined coalitions with other parties and succeeded in improving the condition of the working classes but were unable to counter extremist resurgence, and with the rise of Adolf Hitler the SPD was

destroyed. In 1930, Brandt resigned as the result of a spy scandal and was succeeded by Helmut Schmidt. The SPD maintained a majority coalition, winning reelection in 1933, but went into opposition when the Free Democrats switched to the CDU in 1933. The SPD was a member of the East German transitional government in 1990, but lost again in the first all-German elections that year. Bibliography See studies by C. Morgan, G. Braunthal, and V. In the party supported French participation in World War I, accepting ministerial posts. By the 1930s, Communists held a majority in the party, and a split was unavoidable. In 1936, faced by economic depression, government corruption, and the rise of French fascism, the Socialists, allied with Communists and Radical Socialists, won election as the Popular Front; Blum was premier. But, flanked by Communists on the left and conservative parties on the right, it gradually lost strength, although it frequently was the leading party in governing coalitions. Split over support for the Fifth Republic in 1958, the party made a succession of alliances, unsuccessfully opposing the ruling Gaullists. It was reorganized in 1969 as the Parti Socialiste. The Socialists governed, with Pierre Mauroy and then Laurent Fabius as premier, until 1981, increasing social benefits, nationalizing industrial and financial enterprises later reprivatized by the successor government, and promoting devolution to local governments. However, its austerity policies cost it an assembly majority; a center-right coalition "cohabited" with President Mitterrand until 1986, when Mitterrand was reelected, and the party regained a majority. Michel Rocard became premier and established a minimum guaranteed income, but deficit-driven public-sector wage cuts cost him support. By the end of 1988, the party was divided in the face of a united conservative opposition, which triumphed in the assembly elections of 1988. The Socialists also lost the presidency in 1995, but they returned to power in the assembly in 1997, and Lionel Jospin became premier. In 2002, Jospin failed to win the presidency, placing third, and the party subsequently lost control of the assembly. They subsequently also won control of the assembly, with Jean-Marc Ayrault became premier. Criddle, *The French Socialist Party* 2d ed. Cite this article Pick a style below, and copy the text for your bibliography.

Chapter 2 : The Decline of Socialism in America J Weinstein: theinnatdunvilla.com: Books

The decline of socialism in America, 4 editions. By James Weinstein. Go to the editions section to read or download ebooks.

Why Did the Socialist Party Decline? Some historians have been less than conscientious about tracing this record and more concerned with writing their own preconceived notions into the party history. Both groups are incorrect. There was no serious decline after ; the Party grew in strength and popularity during the war. In fact, his description constitutes an attempt to rewrite history, an attempt to blur its healthy images and its class content, to blunt the edge of the principles involved and conceal its real significance. No effort is spared to make these high priests and their entourage appear in the best possible light while slyly demeaning and denigrating the opponents, those who had no other course open to them but to split away and launch the Communist Party. Obviously the intention is to have the former stand out more nobly by comparison. It is significant, however, that the role of the left wing and the new Communist Parties played so directly into the hands of the enemies of the socialist movement. But the period under discussion is one of the most crucial periods of revolutionary development in the United States. It included the irrevocable decline of the Socialist Party and the rise of the Communist Party. An analysis of these events, as they actually did occur, is important, for in the lessons of the real history there is much food for thought. This is especially so for those of the younger generation who consider themselves a part of the New Left and mistakenly dismiss, or even deprecate, revolutionary leadership through a vanguard Marxist-Leninist party. During the early part of , Weinstein wrote to me concerning certain information pertinent to his study. On the question of support of the Soviet Union, as on the war, the Left and Right differed little, if at all, until three or four years after the split " or so it seems from the dead evidence. Apparently that would be just too bad for history or " so it seems from the completed study. The completed study has remained faithful to this thesis. The central theme is the denial of any differences between the groups within the Socialist Party, even on questions of fundamental principles. Neither logical deduction nor the facts of history support the contention of no real differences. Since facts must be the basis of any serious evaluation, let us start with some facts. It begins with the notorious anti-sabotage provision. This brought to a head the longstanding and often turbulent struggle between the left-wing advocates of class struggle policy and industrial unionism, and the right-wing promoters of the more respectable parliamentary social reform program. However, authentic leadership of the party central apparatus was in the hands of Morris Hillquit, whose ability to balance Victor Berger on the right against Eugene V. Debs on the left always served him well. But on all decisive issues of internal conflict, the proletarian left wing faced a Hillquit-Berger combination. Hillquit usually proved capable of modifying somewhat, or polishing up a bit, the crudely expressed position of Berger and thus made it more palatable. At the party convention, the conservative leaders were determined to put an end to both class struggle policy and industrial union agitation. The Hillquit-Berger combination pushed through the following amendment to the constitution: Political action shall be construed to mean participation in elections for public office and practical legislative and administrative work along the lines of the Socialist Party platform. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling class tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workers of the world, unite! The facts of history attest the opposite. By this constitutional provision the right wing committed the party to bourgeois law and order and ruled out the advocacy of any method of working class action which might interfere with it. The convention action was followed by the recall of Bill Haywood from the National Executive Committee; and it brought the exodus of several thousand revolutionary workers from the party. What was the role of Debs in the internal party struggle? Together with Haywood he had been one of the founders of the IWW. In his own public agitation Debs never deviated from the class struggle line. He always remained a steadfast champion of industrial unionism; he never compromised that issue as the official party leadership did. Debs lived by the socialist ideals; his actions corresponded to his words. Wherever there was working class action, he would most likely

turn up in the thick of it. Though by far the most popular and influential member of the party, Debs nevertheless drew back in dismay from any active participation in internal party disputes. This was one kind of fight he always evaded. His abstention played into the hands of the professional opportunists. It removed one important restraint upon their ruthless factional manipulations, and their opportunist proclivities. To that extent, Debs shared responsibility for the decline of the Socialist Party. His abstention from internal party struggle was not inspired by pacifism. The reason for it must be sought rather in his mistaken theory of the party. This turned out to be a costly mistake indeed. It contributed a great deal to the disgraceful failure of the Socialist Party. Although deeply committed to the concept of social revolution, Debs did not recognize the prime prerequisite for its triumph — a revolutionary party with a Marxist leadership. Much less did he see the need for internal struggle to develop such a party. Debs seemed quite satisfied with the idea of an all-inclusive party; he felt that all such tendencies, from the revolutionary to the out-and-out reformist, could cooperate without expulsions or splits. But the all-inclusive party had become a contradictory phenomenon. At the point of its greatest external success, in terms of membership, influence and electoral gains, the issue of the class struggle began to tear apart the internal fabric. While the left wing fought for a proletarian program, the right wing promoted and nurtured bourgeois influences in the party. This negates the thesis of no difference between the conflicting political groupings. The contention that all groups were equally revolutionary in their ultimate commitment to thoroughgoing social transformation is blown sky high. Impact of War and Bolshevik Revolution Yet, judging by surface manifestations, the American party leaders made better efforts to uphold socialist antiwar principles than their European counterparts. This was only what appeared on the surface. The real test showed opportunist corruption rampant, particularly in the top leadership. As the United States moved swiftly toward active participation in the war, the Socialist Party National Executive Committee called an emergency convention at St. Louis in April to formulate a wartime program. On the outcome Weinstein comments in his history: Ruthenberg, symbolized the new unity of Left and Center that had been developing since As we shall see, the war drove Berger steadily leftward, and he remained a consistent advocate of immediate peace and total non-support of the war in his public utterances. He so testified in hearings before a Congressional committee. Louis manifesto had symbolized this unity, and the emergence of Hillquit and Victor Berger as the most widely known Socialist opponents of the war reinforced it. But surely it is not sufficient to observe and examine the official declarations of social opportunists; it is necessary to watch their fingers. Liberty Bonds were issued by the government to help finance the war, and as a means to enlist the citizens in political and material support of the war. It should have been called by its right name: Rank and file members were more dedicated and resolute in their defense of socialist principles. By referendum vote of 11, to the membership adopted a constitutional amendment making mandatory the expulsion of any elected socialist who voted either for war or for war credits. But Berger was not expelled. When left wing elements rose to voice their objection and to criticize these flagrant violations of both socialist principles and party rules, the violators were defended by the right wing leaders in control of the party organization. To the young members of my generation, who came under the draft law, the whole question appeared far more acute than merely waiting to vote socialist at the next election. Some of us did not hesitate to say so during question and discussion periods at public party meetings. Needless to say, this always brought a clash with the right wing. The actual fact is that among party leaders only Debs and Ruthenberg stood up against the war, and both went to prison for their conviction. Yet Weinstein seems blissfully unaware as he pursues his central theme. But it was not true. Reality shows the opposite to be the case. More than any other events, the war and the Bolshevik revolution widened the division and intensified the antagonisms between left and right in the Socialist Party. Prior to the appearance of these issues, the left wing had been a rather rudimentary, loosely knit formation; it was an inexperienced, somewhat heterogeneous, theoretically immature, and politically uncertain minority. Now the theoretical formulation of these issues by the Russian Bolsheviks provided the basis for a reconstructed left wing program. From Lenin we learned that the struggle against war is inseparable from the struggle to overthrow the capitalist system. To turn the imperialist war into civil war is the only correct proletarian slogan, said Lenin. All class struggle in time of war, consistently and earnestly conducted, must inevitably lead to this result. Thus formulated and elucidated, the slogan corresponded to the indispensable

socialist tasks. The dialectical relation between the struggle against imperialist war and the struggle for the proletarian revolution was clearly established; theory was integrated with practice. The Bolshevik revolution shook the Socialist Party to its foundation and brought new lessons and new inspiration to the left wing. The Marxist prediction of proletarian revolution, which we had formerly visualized only dimly, was now brilliantly confirmed. Here was demonstrated in the concrete the conquest of power by the proletariat. We saw the Soviets in action. Though originally created as instruments of the revolution, they became the organs of state power. Similarly we witnessed the translation of the dictatorship of the proletariat from theory into practice. For the left wing in the American Socialist Party the great privilege of partaking in the lessons of these developments became extraordinarily exciting; it was exhilarating; it galvanized and enkindled; all our previous efforts were now redoubled. The great ideas of the Bolsheviks provided a new foundation for the left wing.

This shopping feature will continue to load items. In order to navigate out of this carousel please use your heading shortcut key to navigate to the next or previous heading.

War time hysteria made labour groups and socialists, who were largely against the war, a target of vigilante attacks and political repression. To make matters worse, amid the political suppression internal divisions of the socialist movement spilled into the open. Encouraged by the revolutionary success in Russia, the radical left wing of socialism defected to the Communists. Wartime Hysteria The socialists were generally against the war, which they saw as the rich profiting off making the working class kill each other. Although many moderated their stances once the United States declared war in , the Socialist Party held on to its principles and maintained an official opposition to the war. Thus socialists and labour groups became a target for patriotic vitriol, as wartime fervour and nativist prejudice formed a volatile mix that seized the nation. The general public, which heretofore had tolerated the Socialists, now unleashed a wave of hatred for these nonconformists Throughout the country Socialist headquarters were raided by mobs and sacked by soldiers, while individual Socialists were treated shamefully. A Study in National Hysteria, University of Minnesota Press, Vigilantes prevented Socialists from using meeting halls; night riders tarred and feathered Socialist speakers Behr, and Edward H. Third parties in America: Citizen Response to Major Party Failure. Princeton University Press, Labour groups attracted vigilantes and popular condemnation for a different reason. Since much industrial and mining concerns were now considered critical components of the war effort, industrial action became represented as treasonous pro-German plots. Such accusations attracted the hateful attention of the populace easily. An illustrative example is the infamous deportation of striking miners in Bisbee, Arizona. Convinced that the strikers were foreigners engaging in a seditious German plot, a massive posse and summarily arrested over a thousand mine workers at gun point. They were then forcibly deported to New Mexico by rail, where they were dumped without food or water. As it turns out a majority were in fact American citizens, with most of the rest being British, Russian or Serbian. Many had purchased Liberty Bonds or were registered for the draft. Such actions, both from the civil population and later with the assistance of government forces, severely demoralised workers, who were the natural support base of socialism. Socialists would subsequently discover that they were more successful in cities that had not yet experienced the bitter failures of industrial action Unionism of either variety failed to survive the experiences of History of Labour in the United States Government Crackdown Beyond vigilante actions, the national hysteria also inspired government suppression. This was enabled by the passage of the Espionage and Sedition Acts, which gave the government legal grounds to prosecute anti-war dissidents. However, the hardest hit was perhaps organised labour; affected businesses created heavy political pressure on the government to strike against the Industrial Workers of the World , a prominent self-described radical organisation that found itself public enemy number one. The national leadership was put on trial for "conspiracy to overthrow the government", and rapidly convicted and sentenced to harsh terms by extremist judge Kenesaw Landis 33 to ten years and 15 to 20 years. This was followed by prosecutions of local officials, effectively killing the IWW as a relevant force. After less than an hour of deliberations the jury found each defendant guilty on all counts The resultant federal prosecution transformed the IWW from a militant labor movement to an organization preoccupied with its own defense, as legal expenses depleted its limited resources. A Comprehensive Reference Guide. Greenwood Publishing Group, Political Repression The Socialists were not quite as hard hit as the IWW, but the machinery of government came down harshly on the party as well. At the direction of Postmaster General Albert Bursleson , Socialist newspapers and magazines such as the New York Call or The Masses were deprived of their second-class mailing privileges , their editors charged with conspiracy to incite mutiny and various such crimes under the Espionage Act. Rather than provide protection from vigilantes, the police instead harassed the Socialists. Police in South Daktoa, for instance, broke up the state party convention and forced some delegates out of town. The Socialists would pay a heavy price for their opposition to the war, which was regarded as treasonous by the establishment from President Woodrow Wilson downwards. Some

[Indictments] were designed to hamper party organization and activity Others seemed aimed simply at terrifying and intimidating individuals. The Decline of Socialism in America The martyr to the Socialist cause was Eugene V. In he was charged under the Espionage Act over a speech in which he praised some allies Charles Baker, Alfred Wagenknecht , Charles Ruthenberg who had already been imprisoned under the Espionage Act. Another notable case was German-American moderate Victor Berger , the first Socialist representative elected to Congress. Having already been elected to the House of Representatives, Berger was thus blocked from his seat for having "engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the [United States], or given aid or comfort to the enemies. More blatant suppression of the Socialist Party followed in In a dramatic breach of the democratic principle, the New York State Assembly voted overwhelmingly to expel five duly elected members over their Socialist affiliation. All five were subsequently re-elected, and once again expelled. The Assembly then passed a law banning the Socialist Party altogether, though the Governor vetoed it. Many were socialist at home, and brought their ideological allegiance with them to the United States. Immigrant nationalities established their own language federations within the Socialist Party, with the Finns being a particularly successful example. In a climate of nativism and anti-foreign discrimination however, the immigrant base of the party were poorly regarded. In fact, war time hysteria did not abate with the armistice , but instead morphed into the First Red Scare and xenophobia. Fueled by news of the October Revolution in Russia, the American public became gripped by paranoia over leftist radicalism. It is in this context that Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer launched his grossly heavy handed debacle. In a series of illegal searches, seizures, and nearly indiscriminate arrests, federal and local police seized thousands of supposedly foreign "radicals" for deportation. Again, in the present raids we appear to be attempting to repress a political party. It has a platform, most of which Is highly objectionable to you and me. So much I grant you, but it at least calls itself a political party and holds open meetings and discussions. Attorney Francis Fisher Kane, resigning in protest to the raids. The vast majority of these arrests were later overturned by Assistant Secretary of Labor, Louis Freeland Post , and only a few hundred foreigners were ultimately deported. In response Congress opened impeachment proceedings against him, though he conducted himself so well that no action was ultimately taken. Nonetheless, the mass arrests cowed much of the American Left. In addition, American immigration was reformed in , introducing the quota system. This would henceforth limit immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe. Factional Disputes The Socialists had always experienced internal divisions. The October Revolution in Russia, however, galvanised the factional disputes into outright splits. Never before or since would Communists been so buoyed with confidence on the prospects of a successful world revolution. American Socialists, having spent the past years being trodden on by the general public and government, were inspired into emulation. The result was the formation of the Left Wing of the Socialist Party. And they were awed. Not all of the party agreed with the Bolshevik method. The ultimate result was the fracturing of the party into the broken remnant of the Socialist Party, the Communist Party , and the Communist Labor Party. By the time the last of the revolutionary elements defected the Finnish Language Federation left in when it became clear the Socialist Party would not affiliate with the Third International , the Socialist Party had dwindled to less than 14, members. The Communist offsprings of the Socialists did not fare much better. Although the two Communist parties merged after , a protracted fight ensued following the death of Lenin. Factions in the American Party aligned themselves to ideological developments within the Soviet Union, with several leadership changes and expulsions throughout the rest of the decade. Therefore, faced with repression from without, and division within, Socialism in America fractured into disarray by the start of the s.

*The Decline of Socialism in America, [James Weinstein] on theinnatdunvilla.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

The Socialist Party of America: A Historiographical View P. There was, however, a brief period of limited success for American socialists at the beginning of the twentieth century. In Eugene V. Debs, Socialist Party presidential candidate, received six percent of the national vote. In the same year socialists held public offices, sent one member of their party to congress, and had an impressive roster of , dues paying members. This challenging and persistent question has garnered a wide array of responses from historians who, from the s to the present, have made it the subject of book length monographs, essays, and journal articles. These authors, while sharing a common focal point, have approached this question employing historical frameworks reflective of the age in which they were interpreting and writing history. An analysis written in the s on the decline of the Socialist Party, for example, will not be the same as one written in the s by virtue of the fact that the historical profession itself has expanded its repertoire and developed new theoretical "lenses" through which to interpret the past- a reality that becomes evident through the primarily chronological format I have used in this non-exhaustive historiographical essay. As socialists in the 21st century begin to reassess electoral and movement strategy, exposure to this work might serve to allow socialists, even in some small measure, to better analyze and contextualize the current and future state of the socialist movement in the United States In Iris Kipnis presented the first book length monograph on the socialist movement in the United States, *The American Socialist Movement*, Kipnis dealt with the origins and rise of socialist movements from , but focused primarily on the decline of the Socialist Party of America. This paucity of research on the socialist movement, Kipnis believed, was attributable to the notion adopted by historians that the socialist movement was something of an historical aberration in US history, making it unworthy of extensive research and study. Kipnis rejected this point of view, positing that an understanding of the Socialist Party of America was an essential component in understanding other developments connected to the Progressive Movement of the early 20th century. Kipnis examined the Socialist Party as both a political party and a social movement, focusing on the internal developments and discord within the Socialist Party itself. Conceptually, he relied heavily on the "Rankian model" of history with its focus on politics, diplomacy, and political parties as the prime agents of historical change. Socialist Party newsletters and newspapers, proceedings from Socialist Party conventions, and official party statements made up the bulk of his research material. Kipnis focused on leaders of different factions within the party, as well as the factions as entities within themselves, and how they respond to external political forces, and to each other. In discussing his view of agency in history Kipnis wrote, "Surely the activities of the Socialists themselves had something to do with the nature of the results they achieved. If not, history must be merely the record of the movements of human puppets pulled by invisible strings. Kipnis built a case for a growing factionalism within the Socialist Party that led to its demise following the height of its success- the presidential election of when Socialist Party candidate Eugene V. Debs earned roughly six percent of the national vote. In choosing as an end date in his study, Kipnis made it clear that to him this date marked the end of the Socialist Party as a viable force against the two party system- an assertion that will be challenged fifteen years later by James Weinstein, whose work will be discussed below. Kipnis argued that leading up to the elections of two factions had emerged within the party- both a left and right wing. Kipnis argued that the right saw socialism evolving gradually in America by influencing American political and economic structures. As elections were won across the nation, the center elements within the party began to move to the right, seeing electoral success as a more expedient path to change. As the Socialist Party veered right, the left faction became increasingly disillusioned and left the party, leaving the Socialist Party to represent a kind of extreme form of American reformism, but not a revolutionary party. Trained as a sociologist, Bell took a self-described Weberian approach to interpreting history and contended that the decline of the American left, of which the Socialist Party was an integral part, could be attributed to its being "in the world but not of the world". Living in "another world" made the party irrelevant to most people. In addition to Weber, Bell stood apart in citing the theoretical considerations of Socialist Party leader and

historian Morris Hillquit whose occasional Marxist orthodoxy, Bell argued, led the party to accept ideological principles divorced from pragmatic politics. In addition to his theoretical considerations, Bell examined more tangible, tactical errors of the Socialist Party as well as external constraints. While Kipnis saw a "left" and "right" vying for control of the party up until , Bell saw between and "a complete shift of the entire socialist movement to a frame of reference completely outside the structure of American life" [10] which led to the death of the Socialist Party. This "frame of reference" was connected to an ethical rigidity that served to further remove the party from mainstream discourse. Along with official Socialist Party convention minutes, essays in socialist journals, and official party pronouncements, Shannon made more frequent use of personal correspondence between party leaders as well as materials from the Columbia University Oral History Project. Shannon also made use of the official records of the Socialist Party housed at Duke University and criticized Kipnis for overlooking such a valuable pool of source materials. Like Kipnis, Shannon examined disagreements within the party as resulting from conflict between factions, but also focused on conflict between the personalities of leaders within the party as well as their decisions and motives. Instead of seeing the Socialist Party from the "ground up" as later historians would, Shannon interpreted the party in terms of the moves of its great leaders as well as within the context of an American culture that held to traditions that socialists could do nothing to change. It was not, as Kipnis argued, the post election fallout and move to more mainstream politics that destroyed the Socialist Party, but the radicalization of the party that took place in the latter half of the s and into the s. In almost direct contrast to Kipnis, Shannon argued that the Socialist Party failed because it aimed its propaganda at a non-existent American proletariat. America, he believed, was not nearly class conscious enough to accept socialism as presented by the Socialist Party. As a result, the party lost its appeal. Other historians, of course, would disagree. James Weinstein was the first to argue that the socialist movement did not decline before and during World War One, but in fact "grew in size and prestige during the war" [15] , despite government repression during this period. The height of American socialism, he argued in *The Decline of Socialism in America* , was not the election of when Eugene V. Debs won the largest number of votes a socialist candidate would ever receive. Instead, Weinstein showed growth in the party and electoral success in the years during and immediately following World War One, with the Socialist Party finally falling away as a real force around . In his refutation of Kipnis, Weinstein focused on the continued inclusiveness of the party from . He showed a broad membership base and a party that served as a kind of umbrella organization for members of the Industrial Workers of the World IWW , Christian Socialists, atheists, those involved in mainstream politics, as well as those apathetic to electoral success. The party did not, as Kipnis suggested, become too right-leaning in its orientation and thereby irrelevant in an age of more viable progressive political parties. As the only political party in America that did not support the war, some of this new membership came from fellow war resisters. Even more significant were those immigrants who joined the party following the Russian Revolution- many of whom were of Slavic descent and supported the Russian Revolution. The percentage of foreign-born party members jumped from 20 percent before the war to 52 percent following it. With the supporters of Wilson and the war gone from the Socialist Party, a more revolutionary element had entered through this new membership. It is in examining the local, as opposed to the national character of the Socialist Party, that Weinstein was able to arrive at his conclusions. Despite a poor showing in the presidential election as compared to , the Socialist Party grew in and at the local level through election to local, less prominent offices. Likewise, the oversight of Kipnis and Shannon regarding the obvious importance of the foreign-born membership in revitalizing the party during and immediately after the war is mysterious. Being aware of the increase in party membership from foreign-born rank and file members while still declaring the party dead in makes one wonder if their theses were not informed by an element of xenophobia. Weinstein, on the other hand, saw growth as growth, even if the Socialist Party ceased to be primarily a party of native-born Americans. In fact, it was the foreign-born who had the greatest impact on the party in the post-war years. So what did destroy the Socialist Party? Following the Russian Revolution the Bolsheviks preached the necessity and inevitability of world revolution. The foreign-born members of the Socialist Party, many of whom were of Slavic origin, accepted the Bolshevik call and began a struggle for control of the party. By the "old guard" of the party, recognizing the impossibility of immediate revolution in America, fought for unity and

re-organization while the new left of the party pushed for insurrection. Battles for supremacy of vision ensued and in little time those calling for revolution, primarily the foreign-born, left the party for one of the new Communist organizations. This split marked the death of the Socialist Party. As the fifth work in a historiography concerned with the inability of the Socialist Party to survive in the American political landscape, Miller also worked from and refutes the findings of the authors above. Instead, Miller highlighted the ability of Berger and the center-right faction of the party to retain socialist belief in the midst of American political realities. Whereas Bell saw the maintenance of socialist ethics as an impossibility in the American political arena, Miller saw the real application of these ethics through the person of Berger and his followers. In choosing this focus, Miller was therefore greatly concerned with the agency of individuals in the workings of history. Even though Berger had achieved a measure of success in integrating socialist idealism with politics, internal and external obstacles, as well as personal failings, prevented the growth of the Socialist Party. She agreed with Shannon that the Bolshevik Revolution galvanized the leftist elements in the party, spurring them to preach an imminent socialism divorced from American realities that relied on appeals to a non-existent class-consciousness. Miller, however, did not place all of the blame on the left. At a time when the old left merged into a new one, cemented by stimuli that produced its greatest momentum, the right wing found itself fatally crippled and incapable of meeting vigorously the severest internal challenge. However, in opposing the war, Berger and the Socialist Party had become too far removed from the sentiments of most Americans. Berger could have united the center-right, Miller argued, were it not for his unsavory personality. The party found itself without a strong reformist component while the left was about to leave the party in favor of a more revolutionary position. This combination of "external events and internal errors combined to destroy the dream". Citizen and Socialist, examined the life of Eugene V. Debs, perennial presidential candidate for the Socialist Party in the early part of the twentieth century. Salvatore set out to correct what he perceived to be misrepresentations of Debs promulgated by preceding histories of the man and the period. Salvatore wrote that, "Too often Debs became a larger-than-life hero, a born radical eternally at odds with the culture that nurtured him. Salvatore wrote that, "the book is a piece of social history that assumes individuals do not stand outside the culture and society they grew in and from. Instead, it is the culture of the masses of rank and file workers [23] , as well as pre-industrial American cultural values, channeled through Debs within a socialist context that most interested Salvatore. His work was also something of a psychohistory, in that it ascribes psychological characteristics to Debs that were acquired through his childhood and upbringing. Additionally, manhood and dignity, within the context of the family, were central values to the working class climate from which Debs came. The value of manhood, "demanded that [a man] secure a living wage; establish through industry and proper habits his own self-respect; and in this manner secure the respect of other men- goals defined primarily from the work experience. Debs was successful, Salvatore argued, not because of who he was, but because of what he represented. In this vein, Debs was not the kind of historical anomaly that preceding biographies or textbooks have interpreted him to be, and the socialism Debs represented was not a foreign import of a strictly theoretical Marxist bent. And, although writing fifteen years before Brian Lloyd discussed below , refuted his thesis that the party was not Marxist-Leninist enough in orientation and failed because of its refusal to accept doctrinaire Marxism. Instead, Salvatore argued something quite different. Salvatore appears to accept an element of the "American Exceptionalism" thesis when he writes of the working class that, "the task of affirming a collective identity in a culture that boasted of its individualistic mores was difficult indeed. In this context, Salvatore said that preceding historians formed a badly posed question in asking why the Socialist Party failed. He wrote that, "Failure assumes the possibility for success, but that was never a serious prospect for the Debsian movement. It was a doomed project from the start. However, Salvatore remained somewhat optimistic about the meaning of the Socialist Party for American society, seeing the principles and program of the Socialist Party as an example to those in the future committed to issues of social and economic justice. Municipal Politics and the Grass Roots of American Socialism, focused on grassroots efforts to make socialism a reality in the United States. Suggesting that each point of view possessed shortcomings, he wrote, "taken singularly, each explanation appears too comprehensive; the overarching presumptions of each analysis ignore the complexity

of the whole. In light of the plausible alternatives, none of the explanations-external or internal-seems to yield definitive answers. Along with Salvatore, Judd was a product of the s theory explosion within the field, naturally responding to and utilizing the diversity of theoretical and historical frameworks that emerged in those and subsequent years. He relied on material not employed by the previous historians such as contemporary scholarly articles on local socialist activity in the Midwest, an unpublished dissertation on socialist municipal administration of the same era, and newspaper and journal articles focusing on local socialist administration written in the early twentieth century.

Chapter 5 : James Weinstein - Profile - In These Times

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Socialism is a closely intertwined set of liberating ideas and social movements that emerged in the aftermath of the French Revolution. No single definition encompasses the many socialist variants that took root in Europe and America, but socialism enfolds certain key ideas. As products of the Enlightenment, socialists believe in the power of rational thought, in the malleability of economic institutions and social mores, and in a humanistic solidarity that transcends the nation-state. In such a socialist world, the major instruments of production, distribution, and exchange are owned and administered for the welfare of all. Socialism entails the common ownership of the means of production, either through the state or some other mechanism of collective rule, and it seeks a broad and equitable distribution of the wealth generated by capital, especially in so far as early-nineteenth-century industrialism demonstrated a capacity to generate both great wealth and extreme social inequality. Protestant perfectionism, sometimes in tandem with the romantic currents of the early nineteenth century, animated many of the utopian communities and cultural experiments that sought to put into practice an egalitarian, anti-capitalist idealism. Such utopias, imagined and experimental, represented an important counterweight to the ideological and legal hegemony of laissez-faire capitalism. Like so many Christian utopians, Bellamy initially envisioned a socialist future characterized by order, hierarchy, a genteel culture, and an absence of social conflict. Indeed, Bellamy came to adopt a much more democratic, feminist, working-class outlook in the s. Socialism at Its Peak The socialist movement reached its height during the first two decades of the twentieth century, when the values inherent in Protestant utopianism were linked to the more "scientific" brand of socialism that had arrived on American shores in the wake of the failed European revolutions of German "48ers" made Americans aware of the early work of Karl Marx , whose ideas forever transformed the way in which both conservatives and radicals would think about capitalism, social class, and the nature of historical causation. Marx saw capitalism as the progressive, dialectical product of the social and economic forces that had ruptured the feudal world and destroyed the power of the landed aristocracy. But capitalism, he contended, was not a stable system: Meanwhile, industrial capitalism, with its factories, mines, railroads, and urban landscape, generated a strategically powerful proletariat whose own liberation required the socialization of industry and the political and economic liquidation of the bourgeoisie. The massive coal, rail, and steel strikes of the late nineteenth century and the state violence that suppressed them provided fertile soil for socialist agitation and organization. Led in the s by Daniel De Leon , the SLP became increasingly sectarian and hostile to the multifaceted political reformism of the era and to the more cautious unions of the American Federation of Labor AFL , presided over by the ex-socialist Samuel Gompers. Its leading personality was Eugene V. A Protestant railroad unionist from Terre Haute , Indiana, Debs moved into the socialist orbit after the courts and the army crushed the Pullman strike and sent him to jail. After a brief flirtation with a socialist colonization scheme in the West, Debs helped merge existing socialist organizations into the Socialist Party, founded in By this time he had already conducted the first of his five rousing campaigns for president of the United States , during which hundreds of thousands heard a message of socialist transcendence delivered in an idiom that resonated well with those Americans, both native-born and immigrant, who were seeking a twentieth-century version of the republican-producer values that had anchored American democracy and citizenship in earlier decades. At its apogee in , when Debs won more than , votes for president, or 6 percent of the entire presidential vote, the party enrolled about , members. Socialist ideas and organizations were rooted in three distinct communities. The first was that of the native-born lower-middle class, many of whom were Protestant veterans of Populist, Prohibition, and other rural insurgencies. The second community was intensely urban, immigrant, and activist. German, Croatian, Hungarian, and Jewish Russian immigrants became an increasingly important mass base for the Socialist Party, even as these populations used the party as a way station to their own Americanization. And finally, the

SP attracted numerous adherents from the lively world of pre-World War I reform, members of the social gospel, Progressive, and feminist movements. These intellectuals and social movement leaders put the ideas and values of Debsian socialism in fruitful dialogue with other liberal currents and reform institutions. Aside from Debs, hundreds of socialists campaigned for state and local offices during these years and scores were elected to municipal posts, notably in Milwaukee, Reading, Pennsylvania, Berkeley, California, Butte, Montana, and Flint, Michigan; in various small towns in the upper Midwest; and in states of intense post-Populist conflict such as Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas. With more than three hundred periodicals, mostly weeklies, the party press was even more varied and influential. The Yiddish-language Jewish Daily Forward had a circulation of 100,000, while the Kansas-based weekly, the Appeal to Reason, peaked at three-quarters of a million subscribers. Scores of immigrant newspapers, like the Slovakian Rovnost Ludu, the Slovenian Proletarec, and the three Finnish papers—Tyomies, Raivaaja, and Toveri—sustained the socialist idea within that large portion of the American working class whose native tongue was not English.

Internal Divisions and External Repression This sprawling, multi-ethnic movement was ideologically fractious. No machine ran the party, although in Milwaukee, Victor Berger and other German trade unionists established an organization of considerable durability. In New York City, the Jewish-socialist garment unions were a powerful bloc. This pluralism put the party very much within the American political vein, but as with all third parties in American history, the frustrations endemic to perpetual opposition generated a set of ideological divisions that fractured the party in the second decade of the twentieth century. Two fissures were particularly important because they layered ideological dispute on top of social and ethnic division. In all socialist parties, tensions arose over trade union strategy and its relationship to political action. This became particularly acute in the United States with the growth of a working-class syndicalism that challenged the increasingly conservative AFL leadership in the years after 1905, when the radical Industrial Workers of the World was founded. Hostile to both electoral action and business unionism, it attracted the allegiance of many socialists, among them William Haywood, who led insurrectionary mass strikes among western metal miners and eastern textile workers. This wing of the party wanted to function within existing unions and cooperate with the AFL on key issues, including support for immigration restriction and the routinization of a stable, collective bargaining regime. This divide in the party ranks turned into a rupture after the Bolshevik Revolution and U. American socialists were far more antiwar than those in the mass European parties who supported their respective fatherlands. Louis Brandeis and by an overwhelming majority denounced American entry as an imperialistic "crime against the people. Such principled antiwar radicalism had a dichotomous consequence. On the one hand the party enhanced its strength among all those hostile to the war. These included radical Progressives such as Randolph Bourne and John Reed; pacifists like the young Presbyterian minister, Norman Thomas; an emerging group of Harlem blacks grouped around A. C. Redwood. Despite government repression and patriotic fervor, a burst of socialist electoral enthusiasm gave party campaigners up to one-third of the vote in many industrial districts. In the Midwest and Northeast, several socialists were elected to state legislatures and to municipal office. First, government repression and patriotic vigilantism proved debilitating. The militantly antiwar Industrial Workers of the World was practically destroyed when, in September 1919, Justice Department agents raided its offices across the nation and arrested virtually the entire leadership. The SP did not suffer such an onslaught, but numerous leaders, including Eugene Debs, spent years in court or in jail because of their vocal opposition to the war. Divisions within the party, however, were far more debilitating than government repression. Although most socialists were antiwar, many intellectuals, especially those who sought to link the socialist idea to Progressive-Era state building, abandoned the party and supported the Wilsonian war effort. These included both the radical novelist Upton Sinclair and the "revisionist" theoretician William English Walling. A more numerous and consequential defection came on the left after the Bolshevik Revolution split the world socialist movement into those who defended and those who denounced the power of the Soviets. In the United States the socialist Right, oriented toward trade unionism and municipal reform, denounced Bolshevik autocracy and fought to maintain control of the party against a revolutionary Left, whose mass base lay with those eastern European socialists who looked to Moscow for inspiration and guidance. Although the right-leaning functionaries retained control of the party apparatus in 1920 and 1924, their victory was a Pyrrhic one, for a rival set of

communist splinter parties emerged out of the factionalism of the SP Left even as tens of thousands of militants drifted from Socialist Party life. In the 1920s and early 1930s the SP remained larger than even a unified Communist Party, but its membership was older, less active, and concentrated in but a few regions, notably southeast Wisconsin and New York City. In the early 1930s the Great Depression made anti-capitalist ideologies attractive to millions, and in Norman Thomas, the SP acquired a most inspiring spokesman who gained 1,300,000 votes in 1932. But the party could never translate its ethical appeal and economic critique into organizational strength during the depression decade. There were two reasons for this. First, as Thomas would later put it, "Roosevelt stole our program. But few socialists were revolutionaries in the 1930s; since the Progressive Era, they had advanced a social democratic program designed to ameliorate and restructure capitalism. New Deal reforms that regulated business, encouraged trade unionism, and framed a welfare state fulfilled enough of that agenda to rob socialism of its working-class base and union leadership cadre. In most union socialists, led by a powerful old guard from the garment trades, supported FDR as a Democrat, or in New York state as the candidate of the American Labor Party, which was designed to channel left-wing votes to New Deal candidates. Equally important, the Socialist Party of the depression decade and afterward never developed an electoral strategy or an ideological posture that avoided a debilitating sectarianism. For a time the American communists did much better. Their ideological and electoral opportunism during the era of the Popular Front did not split the Communist Party because all domestic issues were tangential to the overriding commitment of defending the Soviet Union and adhering to its "line. But the socialists had no foreign lodestar, so the lure of participation in mainstream politics generated division after division within party ranks. Unlike the Communists, however, they never formed a coherent bloc and most left the SP before the end of the 1930s. Meanwhile, the most active and intellectually resourceful SP youth were periodically recruited away, often by the Trotskyists, whose rigorous critique of both capitalism and Stalinism proved highly attractive. The American Socialist Party abandoned most electoral politics after 1936, and instead sought a realignment of the two-party system so as to more effectively influence labor and the Democrats. Although many leaders of the Students for a Democratic Society had been nurtured within a world of socialist institutions and ideas, socialists in the 1960s distanced themselves from the politics and culture of the New Left. Likewise, SP loyalists were at best equivocal about the U.S. By the end of this had engendered yet another party fission, with Harrington leading a left-liberal breakaway faction, the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee which in 1954 became the Democratic Socialists of America. Assessments of American Socialism The ostensible failure of the U.S. He answered, "On the reefs of roast beef and apple pie socialist Utopias of every sort are sent to their doom. This argument for an American exceptionalism has been a hardy perennial, with Louis Hartz and Seymour Martin Lipset among the most important late-twentieth-century proponents of this thesis. Hartz argued that the absence of a feudal past meant that America was, in effect, born bourgeois. Other "exceptionalist" features of the U.S. Another influential answer to the "why no socialism" question was advanced by Daniel Bell, who asserted in *Marxian Socialism in the United States* that the socialist impulse was an essentially religious, chiliastic one. Whatever their rhetoric or program, socialists were "trapped by the unhappy problem of living in but not of the world, so they could only act, and then inadequately, as a moral, but not a political force in an immoral society. But he ignored the experience of the western European social democratic parties, which were often members of governing coalitions that built the modern welfare state. Furthermore, his argument for an inherent socialist sectarianism also failed to recognize the incremental, reformist character of socialist and communist strategy during the entire second half of the twentieth century. First, its values, aspirations, and analysis have always been far more influential than its party organizations. Ex-socialists did not flee a God that failed, but instead sought a more efficacious venue to put their ideals into practice. This has often generated a creatively ambiguous line between socialists and reformers, especially during the Progressive Era and the New Deal and in unions, among many feminists, and in movements for peace and civil rights. In practice, if not theory, liberalism and socialism have been joined at the hip. The second key legacy of American socialism was a highly influential critique of Stalinism and other forms of authoritarian collectivism. From the mid-1950s, most socialists have argued that the Soviet model should be fought, at home and abroad, because of the communist failure to embody core socialist values: Remarkably, this was the critique

adopted by the more sophisticated proponents of the U. Marxian Socialism in the United States. Cornell University Press, Women and American Socialism, 1912 University of Illinois Press, Encyclopedia of the American Left. Marxism in the United States: Remapping the History of the American Left. San Diego , Calif.:

Chapter 6 : List of elected socialist mayors in the United States - Wikipedia

*Most historians, though, agree that the year was the Socialist Party's peak year in terms of membership as well as electoral votes obtained; it never reached that peak again. But one latecomer, James Weinstein, the author of *The Decline of Socialism in America*, (Monthly Review Press,), disagrees with this estimate.*

As a result, the 66th Congress will consist of two socialists and four hundred and thirty-three representatives of other persuasions. Socialists in Congress are a rare but not unknown phenomenon in American political history although never until now Congresswomen. Two served in the years leading up to the First World War, an era which saw over a thousand members of the Socialist Party elected to local and state offices. In 1912, two years before socialist presidential candidate Eugene Debs attracted over a million votes 6 percent of the total cast in the presidential race, Victor Berger, an immigrant from Austria-Hungary and founding member of the Socialist Party, was elected to Congress from Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Democratic norms counted for little in the hysteria of wartime and the post-war Red Scare, and the House of Representatives twice refused to seat him, even when he won a special election in for the same seat. Finally, in 1919, after his Espionage Act conviction was overturned by the U. Supreme Court, Berger was once again elected to Congress and allowed to take his seat. He was re-elected twice more before retiring. The other socialist Congressman in the Debs era, Meyer London, an immigrant from Lithuania and another founding member of the Socialist Party, was elected to Congress from a district on the Lower East Side of Manhattan in 1912, re-elected in 1914, but defeated in 1916. He ran a successful re-election campaign in 1918, serving a final term. It would be another half century before avowed socialists were again elevated to the halls of Congress. Democratic socialist Ron Dellums represented the Bay Area from 1972 through 1992, and Major Owens represented Brooklyn voters from 1978 through 1992. Bernie Sanders was elected to represent Vermont as an Independent in the House in 1980, where he served for 16 years. In 2007, he was elected to the U. Senate where he continues to serve today. Sanders is likely the most high-profile openly socialist elected official in the United States, and greatly helped raise the profile of democratic socialism through his Democratic presidential run in 2016. Sanders is not a member of DSA, though he has spoken at events for the organization during his political career. Voters who cast their ballots for Berger and London in the early 20th century knew exactly who and what they were voting for—the Socialist Party, the causes it embraced, and the ultimate goal of creating a socialist society. For Dellums and Owens, both of whom had held political office long before joining DSA, their democratic socialist allegiance was more of an incidental aspect of their appeal to the average voter. Each publicly acknowledged their membership in DSA, and the organization proudly advertised their membership. A half-century earlier, Berger and London had much stronger organizational ties to the socialist movement. But even then, they charted their own course, based on political conviction—and political expediency. Berger spoke out against WWI and wound up facing heavy jail time as a result, as well as the denial of his rightful seat in Congress. London opposed American entry into the war, but once war was declared he reluctantly decided to support it. There was grumbling from the socialist ranks about his apostasy, but no official condemnation or sanctions. Socialist Party politics in the Debs era were complicated. What then can we expect of the likely post-election relationship between the two new socialist Congresswomen and DSA? Tlaib already had made her mark in Michigan state politics before joining DSA. Nonetheless, as in the earlier case of Dellums and Owens, the democratic socialist label was likely of little importance to most of those who voted for either candidate in the general election, since they both ran as Democrats in heavily Democratic districts. And now that they are in Congress, both Tlaib and Ocasio-Cortez will almost certainly develop broadened political bases largely independent of DSA. Organized labor and liberal advocacy groups will be in their camp now. The Congresswomen may, out of conviction or good will, continue to pay DSA dues, and show up for rallies, fundraisers or other socialist gatherings, as Dellums and Owens did. If they are going to do their jobs right, serve their constituents—and get re-elected—they are going to be very busy and in a much bigger arena. Volunteer power from DSA, however, did help both Tlaib and, perhaps more so, Ocasio-Cortez, win their contested primaries. After all, as elected representatives, Tlaib and Ocasio-Cortez are accountable to a number of different groups that helped elect them, and first and foremost—and rightly so in

a democratic systemâ€™to the voters of the districts they represent. The Life of Michael Harrington if you like this, check out:

Chapter 7 : Why Did the Socialist Party Decline?

The decline of socialism in America, James Weinstein Snippet view - The decline of socialism in America, James Weinstein Snippet view -

Chapter 8 : James Weinstein (author) - Wikipedia

The Decline Of Socialism In America Socialism in america u s historycom, roots of socialism in america the roots of socialism in america can be traced to the arrival of german immigrants in the s.

Chapter 9 : The decline of socialism in America, | Open Library

Jack Ross, The Socialist Party of America: A Complete History. Lincoln, NE: Potomac Books, ; pp. James Weinstein, The Decline of Socialism in America