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THE NEW SOCIALISM

Writing a decade since in one of our heavy academic quarterlies, Professor Thorstein Veblen, then of the University of Chicago, said: "The only Socialism that inspires hopes and fears today is of the school of Karl Marx." Today with almost equal truth one might paraphrase Veblen thus: The only Socialism that now inspires hopes and fears is of the school of Tom Mann and William D. Haywood.

For the purposes of this discussion we shall call the Marxian Socialism "the Old Socialism," and the Socialism of Mann and Haywood "the New Socialism."

The New Socialism has usually been known in America as Industrial Unionism, while in England and on the continent of Europe it is usually called Syndicalism. But, no matter what the name it bears or the country in which it appears, it is essentially the same everywhere. Everywhere it inspires fear and dread in the privileged classes, and everywhere it fills the breasts of all the workers, even the lowliest and most unskilled, with revivifying and unquenchable hope.

Whether it startles humanity by a strike of the railway workers in France, or of the dock workers in London, or of the coal miners in England and Wales, or of the heterogeneous and polyglot textile workers of Massachusetts, its outward phenomena and its inner spirit are the same.

Surely it behooves us all, no matter what our viewpoint, to understand this new portent.

What is this New Socialism? Is it a friend or a foe of the Old? Is it its child? And, if its child, is the child destined to devour its parent?

To answer these questions we must first make sure we know what were and are the salient features of the Old Socialism. Fortunately this is no difficult task, for the main characteristics of Marxian Socialism have remained practically unaltered since they were first publicly stated in the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels in 1847.

Briefly stated, the essential Marxian theses are that human thought, action and institutions are molded and determined by material and economic conditions; that this has caused a constant succession of class struggles to retain or obtain economic advantage; that the last and culminating class struggle
is the modern conflict between the class who work for wages and the class who subsist on rent, interest and profits; and that this struggle can only be ended by the decisive victory of the working class or proletariat, who, once in control of society, will abolish all classes by doing away with their foundation, private ownership of the means of production and distribution.

It will be seen that the most essential points are that it is the function and mission of the wage-working class to become the rulers of society and the abolishers of exploitation of man by man.

Lest it be thought that I have colored my outline of Marxism consciously or unconsciously to suit the purposes of this paper, I will quote here an epitome of Marxism from the pen of Gabriel Deville, formerly one of the leaders of Marxian Socialism in France. "History, Marx has shown," wrote Deville, "is nothing but the history of class conflicts. The division of society into classes, which made its appearance with the social life of man, rests on economic relations—maintained by force—which enable some to succeed in shifting on to the shoulders of others the natural necessity of labor.

"Material interests have always been the inciting motives of the incessant struggles of the privileged classes, either with each other, or against the inferior classes at whose expense they live. Man is dominated by the material conditions of life, and these conditions, and therefore the mode of production, have determined and will determine human customs, ethics and institutions—social, economic, political, juridical, etc.

"As soon as one part of society has monopolized the means of production, the other part, upon whom the burden of labor falls, is obliged to add to the labor-time necessary for its own support a certain surplus-labor-time for which it receives no equivalent—time that is devoted to supporting and enriching the possessors of the means of production. As an extractor of unpaid labor, which by means of the increasing surplus-value whose source it is, accumulates every day more and more in the hands of the proprietary class the instruments of its dominion, the capitalist regime surpasses in power all the antecedent regimes founded on compulsory labor.

"But today the economic conditions begotten by this regime, trammeled in their natural evolution by this very regime, inexorably tend to break the capitalist mould which
can no longer contain them, and these destroying principles are the elements of the new society.

"The historic mission of the class at present exploited—the proletariat—which is being organized and disciplined by the very mechanism of capitalist production, is to complete the work of destruction begun by the development of social antagonisms. It must, first of all, definitely wrest from its class adversaries the political power—the command of the force devoted by them to preserving intact their economic monopolies and privileges.

"Once in control of the political power it will be able, by proceeding to the socialization of the means of production through the expropriation of the usurpers of the fruits of others' toil, to suppress the present contradiction between collective production and private capitalist appropriation, and to realize the universalization of labor and the abolition of classes." (Foot-note. From Preface to "The People's Marx."

It will be noted that Deville states that the first act of the proletariat must be to wrest the political power from its class adversaries and then "proceed to the socialization of the means of production." He does not even state that the latter will be accomplished by the use of the political machinery of the state. It would be difficult to cite a quotation from Marx himself that would indorse the notion that the capture of the political power is a condition precedent to social reconstruction. It is true that the Communist Manifesto states in general terms that "every class struggle is a political struggle" and that historic document concludes with a tentative practical program largely political in character, but this is very far from stating that it is purely through politics that the working class are to work out their own salvation or that it is through the medium of parliamentary legislation that the means of life are to become the collective property of the people.

What Marx was ever clear upon was that the Revolution which he foresaw and foretold was to be a revolution from the bottom up, not from the top down; that society was to be saved, not by the privileged, but by the oppressed; that it was the stone which the builders rejected that was to become the head of the corner.

That the proletariat were destined to rule he never doubted. How the proletariat were to gain the dominant power he never ventured to predict in detail.
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In the Communist Manifesto he and Engels wrote, in 1847: "The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air." In 1864, drawing up the declaration of principles of the Workingmen's International, Marx wrote: "The emancipation of the working class must be accomplished by the workers themselves." This emphasis upon the proletariat as the dynamic agents of Social Revolution is just as marked in Ferdinand Lassalle, the practical founder of the German Socialist Party. In his famous Arbeiter-Programm, after asserting again and again that the workers are to become the rulers of society, he says: "But on all who belong to the working class the duty of taking up an entirely new attitude is imposed, if there is any truth in what I have said.

"Nothing is more calculated to impress upon a class a worthy and moral character than the consciousness that it is destined to become a ruling class, that it is called upon to raise the principle of its class to the principle of the entire age, to convert its idea into the leading idea of the whole of society and thus to form this society by impressing upon it its own character.

"The high and world-wide honor of this destiny must occupy all your thoughts. Neither the load of the oppressed, nor the idle dissipation of the thoughtless, nor even the harmless frivolity of the obscure, are henceforth becoming to you. You are the rock on which the Church of the present is to be built.

"It is the lofty moral earnestness of this thought which must, with devouring exclusiveness, possess your spirits, fill your minds, and shape your whole lives, so as to make them worthy of it, conformable to it, and always related to it. It is the moral earnestness of this thought which must never leave you, but must be present to your heart in your workshops during the hours of labor, in your leisure hours, during your walks, at your meetings, and even when you stretch your limbs to rest upon your hard couches it is this thought which must fill and occupy your minds till they lose themselves in dreams. The more exclusively you immerse yourselves in the moral earnestness of this thought, the more undividedly you give yourselves up to its glowing fervor, by so much the more, be assured, will you hasten the time within which our present
period of history will have to fulfill its task, so much the sooner will you bring about the accomplishment of this task."

I have chosen to dwell upon the fact that the founders of the Old Socialism always taught that the Social Revolution was to be achieved by the proletariat, was to be from the bottom up, because many apologists of the New Socialism, perhaps led astray by the love of rhetorical antithesis, persist in telling us that "Socialism is a movement from the top down, while Industrialism is a movement from the bottom up." I would not deny that the conduct of some of the "leaders" of American and English political Socialism do give a certain color of verisimilitude to this facile antithesis; but it is certain that the Socialism expounded by Marx and Engels and Lassalle was as truly as Industrial Unionism salvation from the bottom.

While it is indisputable that Marx believed in participation in politics by the revolutionary proletariat, it is equally undeniable that in his more scientific writings he was most careful to avoid any prediction as to how the proletariat would dispossess the holders of the means of production. In the famous chapter on the "Historical Tendency of Accumulation," in the first volume of "Das Kapital," published in 1867, he vouchsafes us no more than this:

"Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolize all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The expropriators are expropriated. * * * *

"The transformation of scattered private property, arising from individual labor, into capitalist private property is, naturally, a process, incomparably more protracted, violent and difficult, than the transformation of capitalistic private
property, already practically resting on socialized production, into socialized property. In the former case we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people.

There you have Marx's view in Marx's own words. If Marx believed that this expropriation was to be effected by the regular routine of parliamentary politics, it is passing strange he was so extremely careful to avoid saying so. In the light of what Marx actually did say, anyone who believes in organizing the proletariat, whether in labor unions or political parties, or both, for the purpose of expropriating the expropriators is justified in calling himself a Marxian Socialist.

In "Value, Price and Profit," a paper read before the Workingmen's International in the seventh decade of the last century, Marx said quite clearly that he recognized the possibility and desirability of the labor unions becoming agencies for social revolution. His exact words were: "Trade unions work well as centers of resistance against the encroachments of capital. They fail partially from an injudicious use of their power. They fail generally from limiting themselves to a guerrilla war against the effects of the existing system, instead of simultaneously trying to change it, instead of using their organized forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class, that is to say, the ultimate abolition of the wages system."

The New Socialism might well be defined as a systematic attempt of the labor unions to follow this advice from Karl Marx.

But it cannot be denied that the generally recognized spokesmen of present-day Marxian Socialism tend to lay more and more exclusive stress upon political action or rather parliamentary action; and that they look with no friendly eyes upon the growing power of the New Socialism. Thus, in England, Harry Quelch, the editor of "Justice" and the generally recognized defender of the pure Marxian faith in Great Britain, in the May issue of the "British Socialist," sneers at Syndicalism as "this latest phase of Anarchist anti-Socialism." And Quelch's _bête noire_, J. Ramsay Macdonald, M. P., leader of the British Labor Party on the floor of the House of Commons, recently contributed to the _Daily Chron-
icle (London) a series of articles analyzing and denouncing Syndicalism. It is no mean tribute to the power of the New Socialism that it has been able to make Quelch and Macdonald agree on one subject at least.

The beginnings of the tendency in the Socialist movement to lay paramount stress upon political action are readily to be traced to the writings of Friedrich Engels. And it is of interest to note that Engels derived his theory of the State from that great and still inadequately appreciated American scholar, the late Lewis H. Morgan, of Rochester, New York.

It is true that Marx and Engels were approaching a similar theory of the State independently before they had read Morgan's "Ancient Society," for in the Communist Manifesto they wrote: "Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another." And in his "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific," which appears to have been written before Engels had read Morgan's "Ancient Society," which appeared almost simultaneously, Engels elaborated this thesis more fully thus: "Whilst the capitalist mode of production more and more completely transforms the great majority of the population into proletarians, it creates the power which, under penalty of its own destruction, is forced to accomplish this revolution. Whilst it forces on more and more the transformation of the vast means of production, already socialized, into State property, it shows itself the way to accomplish this revolution. The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production into State property.

"But, in doing this, it abolishes itself as proletariat, abolishes all class distinctions and class antagonisms, abolishes also the State as State." Further on he says even more explicitly: "The first act by virtue of which the State really constitutes itself the representative of the whole of society—the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society—this is, at the same time, its last independent act as a State. State interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then dies out of itself; the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of processes of production. The State is not 'abolished.' It dies out."

This conception of the State as born to protect economic privilege, as being essentially a class instrumentality, has been
generally accepted by Socialists. Logically it simply proves that the overthrow of capitalism is impossible so long as the capitalist class retain complete control of the political power. From this the natural conclusion was drawn that the first objective of the Socialist parties must be the conquest of political power. It does not necessarily follow that this seizure of governmental powers must be effected by the ballot and the routine parliamentary methods. All that the Engels conception of the State implies is that Socialist reconstruction of society cannot be carried out unless the capitalist class are very considerably hampered in their use of political power.

But this conception of Engels remained an unproved hypothesis until Morgan demonstrated the existence of organized communities, possessing no coercive public power, among the North American Indians and the pre-Homeric Greeks and others. Engels was quick to see the tremendous importance of Morgan's discoveries. In 1884 he published his "Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," frankly basing his work upon that of Morgan.

While there are passages in "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific" that indicate that Engels regarded the State as the probable instrument of expropriation and social transformation, it is doubtful if he continued to hold that view. In the "Origin of the Family," written a decade later, he said: "Universal suffrage is the gauge of the maturity of the working class. It can and will never be anything else but that in the modern State. But that is sufficient. On the day when the thermometer of universal suffrage reaches its boiling point among the laborers, they as well as the capitalists will know what to do." And a decade later still, in writing a preface for a reprint in German of one of Marx's historical studies, he said that since the Paris Commune it was impossible for us longer to cherish the illusion that the proletariat could seize upon the machinery of the bourgeois state and use it unmodified for revolutionary purposes.

Certainly Marx's view that the State, like all other human institutions, is the creature of economic conditions, comports ill with the notion of many of the modern followers of Marx that the State can be used to alter fundamentally economic conditions.

The Marxian position would appear to be that the proletariat are destined to achieve the Social Revolution by abolis-
ing private ownership of the means of life; that they cannot
do this so long as political power remains wholly in the hands
of their opponents; and that the Labor Unions may and should
play an important role in effecting this social transformation.

The New Socialists, whether in France, England or
America, would all subscribe cheerfully to these doctrines,
though many of them would hasten to explain that the ballot
is not the only means by which political power may be won.

Why then is there so much friction between the accredited
leaders of Socialism and the New Socialism? Because there
have been in the course of years accretions to the Marxian doc-
trine. The Marxian doctrine that Socialists must hamper the
capitalists in their employment of the powers of government
has grown into the doctrine that the Social Revolution can be
effected solely by parliamentary methods. This growth has
been natural and largely unconscious on the part of those who
have been affected by it. It magnifies the importance and role
of the elected person and the Intellectual. To those who have
come very naturally to look upon themselves as the leaders of
the Socialist Movement, the new doctrine that politics are of
secondary importance, and that the great work of reconstruc-
tion is to be accomplished by the united strength of the labor
unions, seems little short of blasphemous heresy, and they have
not been slow to dub it a reversion to Anarchy. But if our
analysis of the essential nature of Marxian Socialism has been
correct, the New Socialism has as much right as the old to
the name of Marxian.

After all, the conflict between the leaders of the Socialist
parties and the exponents of the New Socialism are more ap-
parent than real. For in times of actual serious conflict with
Capitalism we find them fighting side by side. In France after
the railway strike of 1910 it was Jaurès, the leading advocate
of Parliamentary Socialism in France, who fought for the re-
instatement of the blacklisted railway workers. In England
it was George Lansbury, M. P., whose efforts in Parliament
obtained the release of Guy Bowman and the reduction of the
sentence of Tom Mann, who had both been imprisoned for
telling the British soldiers that murder was none the less mur-
der because the killer wore a uniform, a doctrine enunciated
by James Russell Lowell in the Bigelow Papers. When the
Lawrence strike culminated in the atrocities committed upon
women and children by the police and militia, it was Berger,
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the Parliamentarian, who aided Haywood, the New Socialist, in arousing the conscience of the nation. And in the municipal elections in Ohio, in 1911, which resulted in many Socialist victories, much of the most effective campaign work was done by Haywood, Frank Bohn and other New Socialists.

In order to understand the New Socialism it may be most convenient to study it chiefly in England, for there its most signal victories have been won. I refer to the London Dock Strike, the Seamen’s Strike and the Railway Strike of 1911 and the great Coal Miners Strike of 1912. These strikes, while they did not secure the strikers all they demanded, nevertheless showed dramatically both to the workers and to the general public the essential omnipotence of the workers when united, and their very formidable power when only partially united and very inadequately organized and prepared for combat. Moreover three of these strikes, like the French Railway Strike of 1910, and the Hungarian Suffrage Strike of 1912, had very perceptible political effects, thus demonstrating that the strike as well as the ballot can be used for the proletarian conquest of political power.

These strikes were all illustrations of the New Socialism in action. They by no means give us the measure of the power of the New Socialism. They were in fact mere hints of the mighty portents we may expect when the propaganda of the New Socialism shall have thoroughly permeated the working classes.

Whence sprang British Industrial Unionism? Primarily from the conditions of British trade, industry and politics. In the face of the highly centralized organization of British industry the old methods of craft or sectional trade unionism had shown themselves powerless. The Labor politics of the British Labor Party, a mixture of lobbying and trading with the Liberal Party, had destroyed the belief in the efficacy of political action along parliamentary lines—a belief that was very strong in England in the ninth decade of the last century. Hence, the workers were ripe for the doctrine that what they wanted they must take by their own power, and that they could only do this by the united action of all the workingmen and women in an industry, including the lowest paid and the most unskilled as well as the highly skilled craftsmen who had formerly formed the bulk of the organized labor movement.

These conditions would have given birth to the New So-
cialism sooner or later in any case, but the process of birth was facilitated and hastened by the timely arrival from Australia of Tom Mann, early in 1910. Mann at once began a vigorous propaganda for Industrial Unionism, though he was careful to antagonize the existing trade union movement as little as might be. His aim has been to induce the existing unions to open their doors to the unorganized and the unskilled, and to federate or amalgamate themselves into unions as broad as the industries in which they worked. He has never organized new unions save where the workers were unorganized, as among the waterside workers in Dublin; and he organized them, not into a new union, but into the already existing National Transport Workers' Federation. In this work he has been eminently successful. Indeed his success has been so astounding and so rapid that it can only be accounted for on the theory that the movement would have come a little later spontaneously without his very effective propaganda.

Where did Tom Mann get his knowledge of the New Socialism? From France? No; to French Syndicalism his debt is very small. He became an Industrial Unionist in Australia, and the Industrial Union Movement in Australia drew all its inspiration and literature from America.

This literature consisted chiefly of the Preamble to the Constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World, other pamphlets issued by that organization, and the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW (Chicago). That Mann had read this literature carefully and thoughtfully was shown me when he surprised me in London just before the Dock Strike of 1911 by quoting to me verbatim et literatim from an article of my own in the Review.

Mann had been thoroughly trained and grounded in the tenets of Marxian Socialism during the many years in which he had been a co-worker with H. M. Hyndman and Harry Quelch in the Social Democratic Federation. This is also true of Ben Tillet, the very able leader of the London riverside workers.

The most active and militant of the younger leaders of the South Wales coal miners, who had so large a part in bringing to pass the recent coal strike, had been trained in the Workingmen's College, formerly at Oxford but recently moved to London. And there they had studied, as a sort of
Labor Magna Charta, the Preamble to the Constitution of the American Industrial Workers of the World.

Since this document may fairly be regarded as the fundamental statement of the principles of the New Socialism it may be well to state that it was framed at the first convention of the I. W. W. in Chicago, in 1905. It has been slightly amended since, but the spirit has remained unchanged. The amendments have only served to make it more explicit. The first convention was largely the result of the conviction of many American trade unionists that in the face of the Trust and the centralization of manufacturing capital the old-time trade unionism based on craft divisions and the manual skill of the craftsmen was rapidly becoming impotent or worse. This conviction had manifested itself spontaneously and sporadically in all parts of the country. So that it is fair to say the Preamble sprang, not so much from theory as from the actual experience of the working class in its daily struggles for a decent livelihood. This Preamble reads, in its present form:

"The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of working people, and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life.

"Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production, and abolish the wage system.

"We find that the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands makes the trade unions unable to cope with the ever growing power of the employing class. The trade unions foster a state of affairs, which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping defeat one another in wage wars. Moreover, the trade unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers.

"These conditions can be changed and the interests of the working class upheld only by an organization formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries, if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or lock-out is on in any department thereof, thus making an injury to one an injury to all.
"Instead of the conservative motto, 'A fair day's wage for a fair day's work,' we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, 'Abolition of the wage system.'

"It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized, not only for the every day struggle with capitalists, but also to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old."

The differentiating ideas of the New Socialism appear to be that unionism should cease to be the organization of the aristocrats of labor and become truly all-embracing class organizations; that such unions will be strong enough, whether with or without the aid of political parties, to overthrow the rule of the employing class; and that when once this is done they will be prepared to carry on the work of social production and distribution, which will be in the main merely a continuation of the functions they will have been performing before their conquest of society.

In addition to this one always finds the idea that in the conduct of their daily conflicts the workers are training themselves intellectually and morally for their future responsibilities to humanity.

Thus, while the New Socialism is not in essentials in conflict with the Old, it easily answers two objections that always gave pause to the apologists of the Old. The first of these is implied in the common query: "How are you going to see to it that the world's work is done after your victory?" The Old Socialism, looking forward to a political victory, had no convincing answer. The New Socialism says the very organization that wins the victory will carry on society's work after the victory is won, and that without any interval of disorganization. Indeed it is impossible for the New Socialism to win until it is fully prepared morally and technically to shoulder the responsibilities to mankind the victory will impose upon it.

The second of these objections to Socialism is commonly stated: "You must change human nature to make Socialism practicable." The New Socialist answers, the process of obtaining Socialist victory will change human nature; our victory will only come after human nature has been sufficiently changed.
The New Socialism tends to assure a peaceful revolution. This the Old could never do. Curiously enough the idea has gained currency in America that Haywood, Mann and the New Socialists generally are advocates of force and violence, while the Old Socialists of the parliamentary type such as Berger, Hillquit and Spargo, love peace and eschew violence. This is almost the exact reverse of the truth. It was the parliamentarian, Berger, who in a signed article advised every Socialist to buy a rifle. It was the parliamentarian, Hillquit, who said that if the Socialists were not allowed to seat peacefully the officials they had elected they would, "if need be, fight like tigers on the barricades."

The New Socialists look on riots, barricades and street fighting as hopelessly obsolete with the capitalist class in full possession of all the machinery of war. The weapon upon which they rely is the power of the workers peacefully to fold their arms in such numbers as to paralyze industry and force the unconditional surrender of the capitalist class.

This means the General Strike; but the New Socialists are not foolish enough to believe that any strike will ever be absolutely universal. The absolutely universal strike is simply an ideal toward which to work, but which in the nature of things can never be reached. The New Socialist believes with Browning that "a man's reach should exceed his grasp."

Moreover, there is no necessity for an absolutely general strike. A strike falling far short of that would force society to capitulate unconditionally. One hundred thousand London riverside workers, in 1911, compelled the British Government to solicit their permission to move petrol enough to furnish power to move the mails across the City of London. Two million coal miners forced the British Parliament in 1912 to pass England's first Minimum Wage Law.

It is difficult to set limits to the possible effects of a strike of five million English workers sufficiently well organized to carry out a peaceful general strike of one week's duration.

M. Georges Sorel, who has been the leading writer among the apologists of French Syndicalism, calls the General Strike a social "myth" which will never be realized, but which inspires the French workers to great and heroic daily deeds. But to the struggling workers the General Strike is no "myth." They know well enough that a strike sufficiently general to
emancipate humanity is not only possible but as certain as any future event can be.

The notion of violence so generally associated with the New Socialism probably springs in part from the fact that many French syndicalists have perpetrated acts of violence. But this violence, as Dr. Louis Levine has pointed out in his just published scholarly work on "The Labor Movement in France," has been due, not to their revolutionary ideals, but to the numerical and financial weakness of the French Labor Unions. Weakness in labor unions everywhere begets violence without regard to the theoretical views of the union leaders. The MacNamaras were craft unionists, Democrats in politics and Catholics in religion. Yet there is no atrocity in the annals of French Syndicalism comparable in horror to the blowing up of the Los Angeles Times building.

English and American Industrial Unionists have been so slightly influenced by French Syndicalism that it is unnecessary to go with any fullness into the latter. Suffice it to say it only took form and actuality in 1895 and has only been powerful since 1902. Its achievements have been marvelous in view of its small numbers. The General Confederation of Labor has today less than half a million members; and owing to the extreme reluctance of the French workers to pay more than nominal dues it has never had large funds at its disposal.

Like English and American Industrial Unionism it was the creation of actual economic and political conditions, rather than of theorists. Indeed theorists like M. Sorel have never exercised much influence on the French Syndicalist movement. It is true that the leading ideas of French Syndicalism can be found in rudimentary form in the writings of Bakunin and his associates in the old International. But it is very doubtful whether these Bakuninite writings had any real influence in determining the course of the development of modern Syndicalism even in France.

It could be held very plausibly that Bakunin's distrust of the State and parliamentarism was more logically Marxian than the position of Marx and his friends in those bitter struggles in the old International. For Marx held that each stage of economic development begets the political institutions in harmony with it. The present parliamentary or representative State came into being to serve the will of the bourgeoisie, and fulfills that function admirably. But, for that very rea-
son, would not pure Marxism hold that it is impossible for it to be used by the proletariat for wholly different ends?

But, be that as it may, there can be but little doubt that Marx and his allies were right in holding that at that stage of industrial and historical development a powerful movement could only be built up along political lines. For the rest the divisions in the International were doubtless influenced more or less by racial and personal feelings. Marx was a German and a Jew. Bakunin was a Russian and an aristocrat. And it is quite certain that most of Bakunin's support came from those Latin races that then, as now, had little love for the Prussians.

What is the general attitude of the New Socialism toward ordinary political action, in short, toward participating in elections? This is well stated by the hero of the elder Rosny's very conscientious study of French Syndicalism, "La Vague Rouge." The hero, an agitator for the General Confederation of Labor, when asked by a workingman, "Is it no longer necessary to vote?" replies, "Vote if you want to—A so-called Socialist deputy is always better than a radical deputy, and a radical deputy is preferable to a reactionary deputy. But do not take your vote too seriously. Give your attention, all your attention and all your enthusiasm and all your courage, all your strength of arm and of head, to the struggles of your labor union."

It will have been noticed that there is nothing in the Preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World inconsistent with participation in politics. And the French General Confederation of Labor at the Congress of Lyons in 1901 expressly adopted a resolution "leaving to individuals the undeniable right to devote themselves to that kind of struggle which they prefer in the political field."

Tom Mann was a member of the Social Democratic Party when he began his crusade for Industrial Unionism in England. When the Social Democratic Party adopted a resolution in favor of "an adequate navy" for England he resigned. But he told me in conversation that he was not especially hostile to political action, but that his great desire was to unite the workers on the economic field, so that with that in view he felt political abstention was the best policy for him. His main idea being that religious or political differences must not be allowed to divide workers whose economic interests were identical. In
a recent letter he reminded me, "You know I am non-parlia-
mentary."

On the other hand, Ben Tillet, next to Mann the most
successful strike manager in England, is still an active mem-
er of the British Socialist Party, into which the Social Demo-
cratic Party has been merged.

In America, Haywood, the leading exponent of the New
Socialism in practice, is a member of the National Executive
Committee of the Socialist Party. Nor is Haywood alone.
In fact, most of the active workers for the New Socialism in
this country are dues-paying members of the Socialist Party.

It is well to remember that the New Socialism has never
yet become powerful in any country where there was not
already in existence a more or less potent Socialist political
party. And in all of its struggles it has been aided by So-
cialists in office. Here in America, as a matter of chronology
it was not until after Berger was elected to Congress that Hay-
wood led the Lawrence strikers to victory. And Berger helped
very materially in that fight. Without the active aid of the
Socialist Party the Lawrence strike would have failed.

Most New Socialists believe that the political machinery
of the present State is 'by its very nature unfitted to be used
for revolutionary social transformation. They believe the con-
structive work of the Social Revolution will be performed by
the labor unions. But they also believe that the State is a
powerful repressive engine in the hands of the capitalists, and
that the election of Socialists to office interferes with the cap-
talist employment of this machinery of repression, and so
gives the revolutionary unions a freer field in which to develop.

The New Socialists are not inclined to be narrow or dog-
matic. What can be gained by parliamentary action they are
willing and glad to take, though they believe that the direct
pressure of a strike will often secure political results more
quickly than votes alone. Hence, in America, at least, they
believe in using both methods. New Socialists in this country
fully realize that it costs a workingman nothing to vote, while
a strike often means suffering and privation, not only for him-
self but for his wife and little ones as well. Hence, they be-
lieve in supporting the Socialist Party, while building up with
all their energy insatiable revolutionary unions.

Indeed there are many New Socialists, including the
writer, who hold that a strong Socialist Political Party is a
condition precedent (in this country at least) for a strong industrial union movement.

Elector Socialists to office is usually called “indirect action,” in contrast to the “direct action” of the New Socialism. Curiously enough many people have come to believe that “direct action” means assassination and dynamite bombs. Dr. Louis Levine has rendered a valuable public service by blowing away the clouds of misunderstanding with which this subject has been enveloped. On page 122 of the work already referred to, he tells us: “‘Direct action’ may assume various forms, but the principal ones in the struggle against employers are: the strike, the boycott, the label, and sabotage.” The first three of these have always been employed by the most conservative craft unionists, while the latter under the name of “Go Canny” has long been used by the conservative unions of England. So that it appears there is nothing very new and dreadful about “direct action” after all.

“Sabotage,” according to Dr. Levine, “consists in obstructing in all possible ways the regular process of production, in order to obtain any demand. It may express itself in slow work, in bad work and even in the destruction of the machinery of production.” It should be noted that the Congress of Toulouse (1897) of the General Confederation of Labor recommended the boycott and sabotage “only in those cases in which strikes would not yield results.” Dr. Levine tells us the French Syndicalists “strongly condemn any act of sabotage which may result in the loss of life.”

Sabotage is only used as a last resort by men who are apparently beaten. The British thought John Paul Jones was beaten. But when they called on him to surrender, he replied: “We have only just begun our part of the fighting.” In the same spirit the French railway workers, after Briand called them to their military colors, and their strike was apparently lost, might have said: “We have only just begun our part of the fighting.” They worked, but freight that was destined for Lyons, mysteriously turned up weeks later at Lille, and packages shipped to Havre were hopelessly lost till they were reported from Marseilles. This disorganization of the service continued until the discharged strikers had all been reinstated. The Socialist deputies in Parliament helped very materially in bringing this result about.

The Socialists of the world are more and more coming
to see that they cannot neglect either direct or indirect action. It is quite safe, to predict that the American advocates of "direct action" will almost to a man help the Socialist Party in this year's campaign. And we may be quite as sure the parliamentary Socialists will loyally support every strike organized by the "direct actionists."

I think we are now in a position to say with considerable assurance that the New Socialism is the legitimate child of the Old, and that it will not devour its parent. On the contrary we are even now beginning to see a synthesis of the two which will retain all that is virile in either. But when this synthesis shall have been completed it is quite safe to say that those traits which have heretofore been the differentiating marks of the New Socialism will be the most salient characteristics of the Ultimate Socialism.

That this synthesis is well under way in America is shown significantly by the following resolution adopted unanimously by this year's National Convention of the Socialist Party at Indianapolis:

"In the face of the tremendous powers of the American capitalists and their close industrial and political union the workers of this country can win their battles only by a strong class consciousness and closely united organizations on the economic field, a powerful and militant party on the political field, and by joint attack of both on the common enemy."

Here the political party has definitely recognized that it is the mission of labor unions not only to protect the workers against the encroachments of capitalism, but also aggressively to attack capitalism; and that is the fundamental doctrine of the New Socialism.

When this synthesis shall have been completed, the knell of capitalism will have been rung.

The two great contributions of the New Socialism are: First, its ability to guarantee a peaceful transition from Today to Tomorrow, from Capitalism to Socialism; and second, its emphatic insistence upon the inevitability and the absolute necessity of the psychological and moral regeneration of the working classes.

When the Old Socialism was asked what would happen if the ruling classes did not surrender when Socialist parties should register majorities at the ballot box, its only possible answer was the threat of Hillquit to "fight like tigers."
New Socialism serenely replied: "If they do not surrender, the workers will peacefully fold their arms until they do."

Socialist writers from Ferdinand Lassalle to Miss Vida Scudder have always insisted upon the spiritual re-birth effected by a vivid sense of class consciousness and class responsibility. But the Old Socialism, which made its powerful appeals to class emotions only at infrequently recurring elections, could not make this spiritual awakening of the toiling masses an actuality. The New Socialism, with its call to the workers to fight the Class War daily in the shops, is day by day effecting the moral re-birth of the workers.

What the New Socialism will lose, in the course of its metamorphosis into the Ultimate Socialism, is its more or less marked reluctance to participate in electoral politics. This is the one respect in which English and American Industrial Unionism have been strongly influenced by French Syndicalism. And the labor union prejudice against politics in France is largely due to local causes. Formerly French political Socialism was divided into five warring factions or camps. And each faction sought unceasingly to capture the labor union movement. The latter became the football of factional politics, and its growth was retarded until at length in desperation the unions deliberately excluded politics from the unions. Having suffered so much from politics, it is small wonder that the organized French workers are still reluctant to take an active share in the political struggle. But in England and America, where in their very first struggles the revolutionary unions have been so materially assisted by such political Socialists as George Lansbury, M. P., and Victor Berger, M. C., it is probable the very slight hostility to politics that has manifested itself sporadically will soon wholly disappear. It has never seriously affected the masses of the British and American workers who are practical enough to wish to use every weapon at their disposal.

The political propaganda and agitation of the Old Socialism must remain the chief means by which the Ultimate Socialism will educate the general public as to its goal and methods, and by which it will teach them the true significance of the constantly recurring struggles on the industrial field. But it is probable that the activities of Socialist representatives in legislative bodies will in the future be largely limited to seconding the efforts of the revolutionary unions on the industrial
field, and to giving permanence and universality to their victories by giving them statutory registration.

The palliative measures which have often been introduced in the past by Socialist representatives will probably, as time goes on, be left more and more to Progressives such as Winston Churchill and Lloyd George in England, and LaFollette and Bryan in America; for Capitalism to prolong its lease of life must, willingly or unwillingly, become progressive.

The New Socialism has come to stay. Its power will steadily increase. It is a World Force that must be understood and reckoned with by friend and foe.

YOU AND YOUR VOTE

International Socialist Review, August, 1912

This month I want to talk to the millions of men and women who have votes. It is true that there are hundreds of thousands of working men and millions of working women who have no votes. But millions of you do have votes. Figures just published by the government (the government, not your government) tell us that there are 26,999,151 men of voting age in the United States. While millions of Negroes and thousands of migratory and casual workers are disfranchised there are many states in which the women vote, so that we probably have not far from 25,000,000 men and women who have votes. At least thirteen million of these are working men and women. It is to you, who make up these thirteen million, I want to talk.

You have votes. What are you going to do with them? You are surely going to vote; are you not? To vote costs you nothing. To strike usually means to pinch your stomach, while you can vote without having a scrap the less in the larder. If your vote can help you at all it is folly not to use your vote.

Can it help you? That depends on how you use it. Any party that is elected this fall will carry through into law some reforms that will benefit the workers more or less. The Industrial Revolution is moving so fast that no party any longer ignores it. No party is in favor of standing stockstill. Back in the last century a great English statesman (Harcourt) said, “We are all Socialists now.” Today in America any politician can truly say, “We are all progressives now.”
No matter whether the Republicans or the Democrats win we shall get more and more Workingmen’s Compensation Acts, more and more restrictions upon child labor, more and more regulation of the labor of women in industry. No matter whether Republicans or Democrats are in power more and more states will grant women the franchise, and more and more serious attempts will be made to reduce the awful economic waste of unemployment and the human degeneracy it causes. No matter whether the Republicans or the Democrats win the movement to lessen the strain upon organized charity by Old Age Pensions will grow in force, volume and velocity.

If you want nothing more than reforms such as these it matters very little whether you vote or not. It is true you can hurry them up a little by voting the Socialist ticket, but these reforms are coming anyhow, no matter how or whether you vote. Why? Because labor power is the capitalist’s goose that lays the golden egg. The efficiency of your labor power depends absolutely upon your health and material well being. If the capitalist does not see to it that you are well stabled and fed, he is killing the goose that lays him the golden egg of profit.

Formerly the capitalist could afford to neglect or ignore this. When your body rotted in the slums till the charity mongers labeled you “unemployable” (which means no longer pregnant with profits) the capitalists could draw upon the villages and fields of the country for fresh supplies of robust and vigorous humanity.

Labor Power Becoming Scarce

In England the supply of healthy rural labor was long since exhausted, so that there the degeneration or physical shrinking of the bodies of the workers has been going on apace. In the fifty years between the Crimean War and the Boer War the medical records of the British army show that the candidates for the army had decreased three inches in height and thirty pounds in weight. English labor power has been rotting at the core, and consequently England has been outstripped in the mad race of international commercial competition by Germany, Japan and the United States.

Here in America up to this century the farming country
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has been an ample reservoir from which to draw almost inexhaustible supplies of fresh, healthy labor power. But now the reservoir is drying up. The census of 1910 shows that scores of rural counties in Ohio and Pennsylvania have less people in them than they had in 1900.

The capitalists could ignore this so long as they could draw on southern and southeastern Europe and the Orient for fresh stores of healthy humanity whose vitality had not been sapped by the modern factory system. But the recent strikes at Lawrence, McKees Rocks, Paterson, Jersey City and Middletown have shown them that the "scum o' the earth" have an even greater capacity for organized solidarity and resistance than the native-born Americans.

Reforms Will Pay the Capitalists

The capitalists are intelligent enough to see the significance of these things. They are learning the lesson very rapidly. They have no desire to slay the goose that lays the golden egg. Very soon there will cease to be any real opposition to reforms that aim at preserving your health and efficiency. The capitalists are good enough business men and bookkeepers to see that old age pensions and insurance against sickness, accident and unemployment are cheaper, are better business than jails, poor houses, asylums, hospitals, Ward's and Blackwell's islands to care for the unemployable. They are daily coming to see that it is better business to prevent men and women from becoming unemployable than it is to care for them after they are down and out. They are even learning that too wide-spread joblessness and a wage too far below a decent subsistence level leads to agitations that threaten the whole fabric of capitalism.

In the near future any party that hopes to retain power, that hopes to keep the good will of the capitalist class, must carry out reforms that will materially benefit the workers.

But the Republican and Democratic parties will never knowingly enact a reform in the interest of the workers that will not benefit the capitalist class more than it does the working class. This does not mean they are moved by brute selfishness alone. They are not. They are kindly when they can afford it just as you are. As Kipling said:

"The Colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady
Are sisters under their skin."
The workers have no monopoly of the elementary social virtues. The upper class, cream or scum, knows more about the lower strata of society today than it ever did before. It knows those upon whom it rides better, far better than any other ruling class in history ever knew the burden-bearers. And this increased knowledge begets increased sympathy. The rich, altogether apart from self-interest, want to help the poor. And this kindly desire is a factor in all modern social legislation. But the rich are so placed that they can afford to help the poor only when by so doing they help themselves still more.

Please think closely about this. Unless you do think and think hard, you cannot understand the new politics, the politics of 1912.

OLD PARTY REFORMS INCREASE PROFITS FASTER THAN WAGES.

Every party in the field honestly wants to do something to help you. Any party that wins will. But any party except the party of the workers, the Socialist party, will, while it is helping you, help your employers and their class still more. This means the changes that they will make will make no change. They are trying to change the system without changing the system. Their reforms will not narrow by a hair's breadth the gulf between the workers and the shirkers.

Let us try to see just how this is. Let us take a very simple example. Suppose you work for a boss; that the total of wages and profits is ten dollars a day; that you get two dollars and he gets eight dollars. Then, the gap between you and him will be six dollars, will it not? Now, suppose he introduces a reform that increases your wages to four dollars a day. You will now be able to buy better food, you will see your wife and children better fed, housed and garbed, you will find you are saving something and life will begin to be cheered by hope for the future. You will be a better and more efficient slave. The boss can now put in better machinery and speed you up more scientifically by the Taylor system, so that the total of wages and profits can now rise to sixteen dollars. You, getting four in wages, leave the boss twelve dollars for his profits. The gap between you and the boss is now eight dollars, is it not? Before it was six. The reform has improved your condition absolutely, but relatively you are worse off than ever. You have more comfort, but the gulf between your condition and the master's condition has actually been broadened!
Do you see now, what a reform is? A reform is a change that improves your condition as an envelope containing labor power, while it at the same time broadens the gulf that separates you from a true human existence, and thus makes your position more deplorable and hopeless than ever. That is true of any reform that is possible or practicable while the capitalist parties, the Republican, Democratic or Progressive parties, control political power. Such reforms we may call reformist reforms.

But if you and your fellows united in your own party, the Socialist party, held control of the political power, another kind of reform would be possible and practicable. This second species of reforms we may call revolutionary reform. What is a revolutionary reform?

A revolutionary reform is a change that, while it may, and very often in the early days of your power will, help the boss, will always help you more than it helps the boss, and thus make narrower and narrower the gulf that yawns between your condition and his.

Let us go back to our old example. Suppose you are working for an employer; that your wages are two dollars, and his profits eight. There you have the gap of six between you. A revolutionary reform in raising your wages to four dollars might increase the total of wages and profits to only thirteen dollars. The profits would now be nine instead of eight. The employer would be making more money. But the gap between you and him would now be five instead of six. The chasm would have been partly closed.

There we have our definition—a reform is revolutionary whether it increases profits or not, if it narrows the economic gulf yawning between the workers and the shirkers.

Most revolutionary reforms would reduce profits instead of raising them. But even those revolutionary legislative reforms that would leave profits undiminished or even raise them slightly are absolutely impossible until the workers have complete control of the powers of government.

Because revolutionary reforms are today impossible, the man who holds that they are the only reforms worth fighting for is correctly called an Impossibilist. Does this mean that you and I ought to oppose the reformist reforms that may help you and me even a trifle? Not at all. To use the slang of the day, we simply “Let George do it!” The Progressives,
whether Democrats or Republicans, are more expert reformist reformers than we are or can be. Reformist reform is their historic mission, just as the achievement of the Social Revolution is ours. The Socialist in a legislative body will always vote for a reformist reform, but if he does his duty he will not fail to shout upon the house-tops that the "reform" widens instead of bridging the chasm between the classes.

EVERY LOGICAL SOCIALIST IS AN IMPOSSIBILIST

Those who want to end instead of mending the present system of the martyrdom of man cannot afford to waste their energy clamoring for reformist reforms. That is the business of the Progressives. Your business and mine is to be insistent Impossibilists, ever demanding revolutionary reforms that we know will not be passed, for the louder and more attention-compelling our demand becomes, the faster will the reformist reforms multiply upon our statute books, and not only will they increase in number, but their quality will improve in direct ratio with the growth of the Impossibilist vote. By Impossibilist I mean Socialist, for every logical Socialist is an Impossibilist.

Now, we begin to see where we stand. You have a vote. To what party will you give it? The Republican party offers you many and real reforms. The Democratic party offers you many and real reforms. The Progressive party offers you many and real reforms. Do these reforms look good to you? No doubt; they ought to. They will do you some good. You ought to want them. But to get them there is no need for you to vote for the Republican, Democratic or Progressive parties. The Republican, Democratic and Progressive parties are going to give the people "progressive" reforms in any case. But the velocity, number, magnitude and quality of these reforms depends absolutely upon the growth of the Socialist vote.

If you want possible reforms now the way to get them is for you to become a Socialist and demand impossible reforms tomorrow.

It is these "progressive" reforms that you are going to hear the most about during this campaign, so that the most important thing for you politically is to learn to think clearly about these things.

But you need something more than reformist reforms. If you had all the reformist reforms ever dreamt of you would
THE NEW SOCIALISM.

still be a wage-slave with an ever-growing chasm separating you from the life to which human beings should aspire at this stage of industrial development. For, the greater grows our mastery over Nature the greater should become our demands upon Life.

What you need is to increase your share of the social product faster than the employers' share increases. This is a difficult proposition, but nothing less than this will bring you a single step nearer the life of Free Fellowship. Your ballot can help you in this. It can help you now. The larger the Socialist vote grows, the better will become the quality of the progressive reforms. What do I mean by quality? Why, just this. A progressive reform always gives the boss more than it gives the slave, than it gives you. To improve the quality of the reform is simply to reduce the employer's share and increase your share of the benefits of the reform. This process of improving the quality of the reform can never under the capitalist parties go far enough to turn the reform into a revolutionary reform. But it can go far enough to keep the worker's share of the benefit from being a mere empty pretense, and the only way to make it go that far is to pile ever higher and higher the Socialist vote.

SOCIALISTS IN OFFICE MAKE CLASS UNIONS POSSIBLE.

But your ballot alone will never enable you to narrow the gap between your condition and the condition of the master class. To do that you need your Socialist ballot, the political organization of the working class, and together with your ballot you need the ever-growing labor union of your class, the economic organization of the working class.

It is upon the latter that you must rely to increase your share of the total social product, but you can never organize your unions effectively while you leave the capitalists in full and unimpeded control of the police, judiciary and all the powers of political government. To give your labor unions an atmosphere in which they can develop a healthy and vigorous life, you must put just as many Socialists as possible in political office. You must have your Seidels and your Duncans in the mayor's offices to use the power of the police on the side of the workers in time of strike and conflict. You must have your Charlie Morrills and your Herbert Merrills and your Jim Maurers in the State legislatures to fight the growth of
the state police and constabulary. You must have your Victor Bergers in Washington to rivet the gaze of the Nation upon the atrocities perpetrated by the puppets of the capitalist class in such Titanic struggles as the memorable Lawrence strike. Only thus can you hope to develop a vigorous and effective labor unionism.

Your unions have done so little for you that doubtless you were surprised and incredulous when I told you it was upon your unions you must rely to increase your relative share of the social product. Your incredulity is justified. Your unions have done very little for you of late years. During the 25 years from 1881 to 1905 the total time that the employers lost by strikes was two-thirds of one per cent of normal working time. This troubled them so little that when it was demonstrated to the National Association of Manufacturers that Strike Insurance could be written for less than 1 per cent per annum, the members would have none of it, saying that strikes hurt them so little it was not worth even one per cent to insure themselves against loss of profits and waste of fixed charges during idleness caused by strikes. I think it safe to say that a unionism the employers can afford to ignore is not powerful enough to help the employees materially.

Why are your unions so weak? Because they are not true class unions. Because the vast bulk of the workers are not inside but outside the unions. "Today, after fifty years of organization," a writer in the June Atlantic Monthly tells us, "we may say roughly that 70 per cent of the industrial workers and 90 per cent of all wage-earners remain non-union." How can you expect organizations containing only ten per cent of the workers to prove effective? The same writer, himself a manufacturer, tells us, "All an employer needs to win any ordinary strike is the ability merely to shut down, and wait until starvation does its work." This is quite true with 90 per cent of the workers unorganized. But the tables would be turned were 90 per cent of the workers organized. And were their organizations so amalgamated together into unity that all could act as one, so that they would always treat an injury to one as an injury to all.

Such an inclusive, unified class labor unionism as this is what is meant by the words "Industrial Unionism" you see so often in the papers nowadays. And it is upon this unionism
that you will have hereafter to rely more and more in your struggles to obtain decent conditions of livelihood.

But a powerful industrial union movement has never yet developed save in countries where the working class had many representatives in the national parliament or congress. Your votes can help you to develop a unionism that is worth while. If you want to make your vote help you in this way you must vote the Socialist ticket. To cast your vote for any other party is to throw your vote away. Nay, it is worse than throwing it away; for to vote for the Republican or Democratic party is to turn your vote into a policeman’s club or a militiaman’s bullet to be used against yourself the next time you go on strike.

The larger and more powerful your unions become, the shorter will be your strikes, and the less the sufferings of your wives and little ones. We are only now learning gropingly the full powers and capacities of the new industrial unionism. But we already know it has almost miraculous powers as a wage raiser and hour shortener. We are just beginning to realize that it is also a mighty political weapon. Just the other day the Hungarian comrades wrested from an unwilling government promises for an extension of the suffrage by a General Strike. And a few days later the Belgian comrades failed in their attempt to reach the same goal by a political deal with the capitalist liberals. It is thus seen that for purely political objects the New Unionism may prove a more effective weapon than political trading.

There has been a political agitation for a minimum wage law in England for years. It produced no tangible results. Lord Morley of the Liberal Cabinet declared the recognition of the principle of the minimum wage would be tantamount to striking a death-blow at civilization. 2,000,000 human moles of coal miners crawled out of their holes and stayed out on vacation for three weeks and Lord Morley’s Cabinet brought in and passed a law recognizing the principle of the minimum wage—the only law ever passed in England that was ostensibly intended to increase the workers’ share of the social product.

But this law was not passed while the Liberal party controlled the government. It was passed while the striking coal miners controlled all England, including the government.

It was true it was a pretty poor law. How much better
it might have been had the coal miners and the transport workers struck at one and the same time, and thus forced the almost unconditional surrender of the capitalist class of Great Britain!

THE NEW UNIONISM

Industrial Unionism is the power of the future. It is upon it you must rely to improve your working conditions from day to day, and it is upon it you will learn to rely to win your decisive political victories of the future. It will not only prove your great weapon in the struggle to overthrow the wage-system of slavery and degradation; it will also provide you with the organization to carry on production and distribution after your decisive victory.

The development of Industrial Unionism, that is of a truly all-embracing class-unionism containing in one great federal organization the least skilled as well as the most highly skilled workers, is the supreme need and duty of the hour. But it is a task that can only be accomplished with the aid and co-operation of a politically powerful Socialist party. Without such aid and support, the better and more effective your unionism the more quickly will it be ruthlessly crushed by uncurbed capitalism. To elect a Socialist to office is to pull one of the teeth of the capitalist wolf.

That the Socialist party fully understands the imperative necessity of developing a vigorous class unionism and is prepared to do its utmost to aid this great work is shown by the following resolution passed at our recent National Convention in Indianapolis:

"That the Socialists call the attention of their brothers in the labor unions to the vital importance of the task of organizing the unorganized, especially the immigrants and the unskilled laborers, who stand in greatest need of organized protection and who will constitute a great menace to the progress and welfare of organized labor if they remain neglected. The Socialist party will ever be ready to co-operate with the labor unions in the task of organizing the unorganized workers, and urges all labor organizations, who have not already done so, to throw their doors wide open to the workers of their respective trades and industries, abolishing all onerous conditions of membership and artificial restrictions. In the face of the tremendous powers of the American capitalists and their close industrial and political union the workers of this country can win their battles only by a strong class conscious-
ness and closely united organizations on the economic field, a powerful and militant party on the political field and by joint attack of both on the common enemy."

The old unionism was purely defensive. The Socialist party has now officially recognized that unionism must attack the enemy. In other words, the Socialist party now stands officially committed to the aggressive tactics of the new insatiable revolutionary unionism.

With a sufficiently powerful industrial union organization, strikes, when they come, will be short, as the tie-up of industry will be so complete that whether the strike be won or lost it cannot last long. But in most cases strikes will be unnecessary. The power of the organization will be so obvious that it will not need a strike to convince the employers of the policy of yielding with a good grace.

It is quite true that a series of such stoppages to industry as England has experienced during the past year will probably lead to legislation aimed at making strikes impossible or criminal. This legislation may take the form of compulsory arbitration. It is scarcely likely to prove effective whatever form it takes; for it is difficult to frame legislation that will induce a jury to convict a man of crime for merely folding his arms.

But, even should such legislation prove effective, the power of Industrial Unionism would be unimpaired, for an organization that is perfect enough to conduct such struggles as the London Dock Strike or the recent British Coal Strike would also be perfect enough seriously to impede the progress of industry while the men still remained on the pay-roll.

Industrial Unionism is the spectre that dying and greedy capitalism has conjured from the social deeps. It will prove the Ogre that will devour the Magician that called it forth. But the Ogre will be bound helpless hand and foot by the cords of capitalist legislation unless we have an effective corps of revolutionary Socialists in every legislative body in the capitalist world.

USE YOUR VOTE IN THE FIGHT

That is where you and your vote come in. Use your vote to put Socialist watchmen in every legislative tower. Use your vote to put Socialists in command of every policeman and
militiaman. Use your vote to put a Socialist on every judicial bench.

Use your vote to strengthen and intrench the party of your class, and thus make possible the growth and development of that Industrial Unionism at whose growing power the whole world of capitalism is trembling today.

It is easier and cheaper to vote than to strike. Less devotion and self-sacrifice is demanded. If you do not show the stamina to vote the Socialist ticket, dare we trust you to show the courage required to bear your part in the great industrial conflicts that are coming?

We are now in the critical days of the Social Revolution. Every blow that is struck now brings measurably closer the glorious days when we shall have Comfort for All, Luxury for All, Culture for All, Art for All, Freedom for All, the Fullness of Joy for All. Seeing what the task is and the reward is, will you help us now? May we today take you by the hand and call you comrade?

"Come, then, join in the only battle wherein no man can fail, Where whoso fadeth and dieth, yet his deed shall still prevail."

New Canaan, Conn., 1912.
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