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This debate goes forth as the stenographer took it down, without comment from Mr. Harriman or myself. The shrimp illustration used in my first speech will be found commencing page 82, in "Germs of Mind in Plants," the second volume of the invaluable "Science for the Workers" series published by Chas. Kerr & Co., of Chicago.

I can think of no better use to which this preface can be put than to strongly recommend all comrades and others, to form a library of their own composed of this splendid series. Especially is the Vol. I "The Evolution of Man," a book without peer in the popular literature of science.

The closing pages of this pamphlet are occupied by an abridged speech by Jules Guesde in the French Chamber of Deputies. I have placed it there because I regard it as a perfect model of Socialist exposition. As such it should be of great value to aspiring speakers, while it is well worth the careful reading and re-reading of the general reader.

ARTHUR MORROW LEWIS.
The meeting was called to order by the chairman, Benjamin Fay Mills, who spoke as follows:

Ladies and Gentlemen: The discussion which we are to listen to tonight is a discussion both of principle and method, but perhaps more largely of method than of fundamental principle. The men who are to speak to us are both of them lovers of their kind, whose regard for their fellow-man has been shown by their words and by their deeds in all of their utterances and acts for the past years. We know them both, and we respect them heartily.

Men may have the same object in view, and yet may honestly differ as to the best methods of attaining that object, which is the case in the divergence of opinion between the two gentlemen who are to speak to us tonight.

We are all of us philosophers, and I know that there is one thing upon which we all agree, and that is that we need a radical, fundamental, general and determinate change in our politics. I can say that we all as philosophers agree upon two things—and the other thing is, that we are going to get it. (Applause.)

I suppose that most of us who are here this evening, certainly a very large proportion of us, would be glad to be called by the term of Socialists, which is a very broad term (applause) and includes a great many various kinds of people with various ways of thinking.

The question to be debated tonight is, "Resolved, that it is the duty of all Socialists to support every economic or political struggle into which organized labor, as such, enters." As to the points of the contention, it is not my part to try to indicate them; that will be done by these friends, than whom none could be better equipped. The affirmative side of the ques-
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Mr. Harriman:

Resolved, that it is the duty of all Socialists to support every economic or political struggle into which organized labor, as such, enters, is the question for discussion this evening. I cheerfully take up the affirmative of this question. In doing so, I want to say to this audience, if there be any who think to the contrary, that I have not changed my opinions regarding the principles of Socialism, and that I think the position I take is a logical deduction from the sources from which the Socialist philosophy arose. It is incumbent upon me to show this.

Organized labor! What is organized labor? Why does organized labor appear in the field? Why does any organism appear in life? Why does organization prevail over dissipation?

Let us see if we can solve this question. Two particles moving separately are less efficient in their power than they would be if united. We are told that the power increases as to the square of the mass, or as to the square of the velocity. Two particles, therefore, uniting, though they have the same power, are more efficient than those same two particles are when they move separately. The very fact that they are more efficient moving as a mass than moving separately is the reason why they unite. If you please, the increased efficiency of the number of the united particles over the power of the particles when moving separately is the cause of the evolution of all the forms and manifestations of life. All organisms grow up into masses because molar motion is more efficient than molecular motion. First molecular, then molar motion. If molecular motion were more efficient than molar motion, then the battering of the particles upon the or-
ganism would destroy it, but if molar motion, or integration of matter, is more efficient than molecular motion, then it will be able to overcome the molecular obstacles in the orbit of its movements; it will be able to assimilate them; it will be able to build them into an organism.

The greater efficiency, I say, arising out of an integration of matter, over the power of the particles when not integrated, is the cause of the growth of organism. This fact I lay down without fear of contradiction. This is a biological fact, and all authorities on science support the proposition.

Now, let us move into the economic field and see if these biological facts apply to society after we reach the stage of what we call civilization.

A colony of ants can tunnel a river working together, but a million ants could not tunnel that river if each worked alone. Ten men will lift a ton. A million men could not lift that ton, one at a time. The efficiency is in the association. The increased efficiency—not the increased power; the power is the same; the efficiency is increased—this is the cause of organization.

Now, our capitalistic mode of production arose with the development of the machinery system. Our philosophy arose at the time this capitalist mode of production was developed.

Let me illustrate. This glass would hold a certain amount of water. The water would be sufficient to quench a man’s thirst in proportion to the quantity in the glass. If you pour the water out, it will still contain human labor, as it contained the water. It will contain human energy, human power—labor power. Just in proportion as a man in the commercial field can manipulate that power, to that proportion it will gratify his desires for wealth. Not the material of the glass, but the labor that was bestowed upon the sand to transform it into a glass determines the value of that glass in the market. So with every commodity in the commercial field. The exchange value of the commodity is determined by the amount of human labor put in it.

Now, if labor is able to produce more glass than is required to generate the energy expended in that production, then there is a surplus value produced over and above the energy expended. This is Marx’s great discovery. The surplus power, the surplus labor in that glass, which is not required to generate the energy that put it there, constitutes the germ of the capitalist system. This is the bone of contention that cuts society into two great classes—the capitalist on the one hand struggling for that surplus; the worker on the other struggling to keep that surplus.

This surplus constitutes so much human power, so much human life, so much energy which, if the capitalist can grasp, will become a mighty en-
gine, a living power in his hands, with which to gratify his desires more easily than if he expended his own energy alone. It is this power of labor thus transferred from the working class to the coffers of the capitalist that integrates—this power that increases as to the square of its mass. This power that becomes capital, that becomes a living, moving energy, just as it does in a living organism. So much human power transformed into commercial life. The men that wield this power seek by it to take still more of the surplus, to force wages down, to lengthen hours of labor, until they have taken all the energy that the worker can spare, and then he begins to resist.

He resists first as an individual; he finds that he stands against the capitalist with all his accumulated wealth. The fight is unequal. He begins to unite with his fellow-men in order more effectively to resist, and this union is a trade union in the economic field of the working class.

This is the origin of labor organizations. The capitalist, by owning his wealth, possessing his individual power, develops the philosophy of individualism. The worker, possessing no wealth, but associating with his fellow-men, and forced to depend upon his fellow workmen, develops the philosophy of altruism. The real struggle for the product thus commences! The capitalist owns it, and the worker says, "We, as individuals, cannot own it. It is impossible. If we take a capitalist out of his position and place a worker there, we make a capitalist of him. This would not change conditions. But if all workers form into a labor union and fight to increase our wages, fight for shorter hours, fight to take more of the product, and to keep more of the product, it becomes our interest to take back from the capitalist the product that he has taken from us, and to own that property in common." (Applause.)

Thus the idea of common ownership is born! Thus the birth of Socialism comes forth from the womb of the interests of the working class! (Applause.) Their interests are one; to own the property in common. They may not know it always, but they will work it out. Thus arises the philosophy of Socialism, and this is the cause of it.

The capitalist class stands on the one side, the working class on the other. The capitalist class is organized by means of their capital. Each capitalist takes from his capital and pays it into a common fund to support and fight with the Citizens' Alliance against the trade union. The trade union on the other hand struggles by means of their organization against the capitalist class. These two economic organizations are the two great fundamental factors; these two constitute the armies between which the struggle goes on. The economic struggle of the capital-
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ist class proceeds in order to gain economic power in the form of capital. The economic struggle of the working class proceeds in order to gain economic power in the form of community property. This is the struggle, this is the essence of their effort.

The trades unions come forward with their struggle for higher wages, with their struggle for shorter hours; they undertake to force their label; they have other methods by which they fight. One method after the other they use, each according as conditions demand, always fighting for an advantage. By the use of these methods they develop class-consciousness. Every advantage increases their power, every increase of wages cements their power, just as an increase in any organism makes it more able to compete with competing organisms, so every increase in wages increases the power of the working class. Every shortening of hours increases the power of the working class, and with this increase of power they are able to take another step forward against the capitalist class, because they have increased power with which to do it.

On the other hand, the capitalist employs first the lock-out, the law, the injunction—every political power at his command. And when they join in the lock-out, when they make use of the law, they are class-conscious. They are working for the interests of their class. When they use political means, they are class-conscious. When the worker fails to obey the injunction and the Gatling guns sweep the streets, leaving streams of blood, the capitalist is class-conscious! He fights to support his interests. Look at Russia! The efficiency of half a million Cossacks who are organized makes headway against millions of people that are disorganized. They have greater efficiency by reason of organization. The capitalist class, with its injunction and other legal restraints, drags organized labor into politics. They cannot stay out. They are bound as a wage-earning class to their economic condition. They cannot depart from it. Mark what I say—the wage worker is the essential product of the capitalist system, and as long as capital is produced and falls into the hands of the capitalist, the wage-working class must remain, and its surplus power will be taken from it for the benefit of the capitalist class.

The wage-working class therefore is a fixture. It cannot depart from its position. It cannot depart from its interests. It is held there by the great vise of the economic system where it must remain until such time as the dynamic power of the organized portion of the working class becomes greater than the static power of organized capital when it will burst asunder the capitalist system of production and establish a co-operative industrial system dominated by the working class, who have become
altruists, because they are forced to depend the one upon the other. (Applause.)

They enter politics—not because they have an ideal. No, not at all. They enter politics because it is the line of least resistance, to build up their organization to a point of sufficient power to overthrow the capitalist class with its laws, and to establish a working-class government with its laws. (Applause.)

They are bound there by their interests. They cannot depart from their interests. The capitalist class is bound to its position by its interests. It cannot depart from its interests. They are the two great economic phases of modern civilization moving on, on to the development of this civilization to its highest pitch, until capitalism is overthrown and socialism takes its place by force of necessity. (Applause.)

The working class cannot depart from its interests, because it is held there by economic conditions. Now, let the trade unions enter politics as an organization. They have the power to enter. Why? Because the unorganized portion of the working class cannot resist it. They are not organized, they have little power to resist. Here are two million working men organized in the economic field, not as capitalists, not as middle-class men. There is not an employer inside of their organization. It is the distilled essence of working class interests compelling them on and on. Can they depart? No, no, no; they are bound there and must remain until the capitalist system is overthrown by them and by their increased power. (Applause.)

They go into politics as the organized expression of the working class. The unorganized have no power to resist because of their inefficiency. The organized have power to enter because of their superior efficiency. Will you support them? Will you support them in their struggle, in their fight against the capitalist class? They have no other struggle. They can have no other struggle. They have nothing to struggle against but the class that is taking their product. The fight is over the product. Will you support them when they enter politics, or will you fight them? Will you tell them that the philosophy in which you believe, and which you have drawn as a logical thinker from their interests, is greater than their interests, and should dominate them?

Or will you tell them that their interest is the all-powerful, predominant fact and push on with the organized portion of the class? Will you say, “Whither thou goest there I will follow,” for I know that the economic conditions will force you to follow your interest, and you cannot depart from it.

Is not this interest the safest guide of any class? You have heard of corruption in the capitalist class—but is there a man or a woman here to-
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night that could imagine a condition of corruption in politics sufficiently great to divert the capitalist class from its interests? No, no. Can you imagine corruption in the working class party, whatever may be its form, sufficiently great to divert that working class from its interests? No, no. Corruption is but a result, not a cause. The interest is the cause. The economic condition determines the interest and binds men there and forces them on and on forever.

Resolved, that it is the duty of all Socialists to support every economic or political struggle into which organized labor, as such, enters. I say, yes, it is our duty. (Applause.) Because our philosophy is but the philosophy drawn from the interests of the working class. Our philosophy is an outgrowth, a result, not a cause. It gives us a clearer vision of whither the working class is tending, a clearer vision of the struggle than we otherwise would have. (Applause.)

Chairman: I am sorry to interrupt Mr. Harriman at this interesting juncture, but it would be impossible to interrupt him at any point where it would not be interesting. We will now listen to Mr. Lewis while he speaks to us for thirty minutes on the negative side of this question.
Mr. Chairman, Mr. Harriman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

There is a word in the resolution—and I am not going to repeat the resolution, you have heard it several times already—the word “economic.” I am glad my opponent has not taken advantage of the presence of that word to digress from the question. I should in any event refuse to discuss that phase of the question on this occasion. It is the political side of the matter, we are here to discuss tonight. Several of my fellow members of the Socialist party however have asked me to briefly make clear our party position towards organized labor in its economic struggles. I think the majority of Labor Unionists would admit, that there are no men who support them more faithfully than do Socialists. (Applause.)

I have walked through Los Angeles on three different occasions with Socialists and observed them buy their cigars, and on each occasion they asked for the Labor Temple cigar. But I do not believe they thought they were going to solve the labor problem in that way. We do not make our criticisms of Organized Labor with any intention of injuring Organized Labor. There are criticisms and criticisms! For example: I picked up the Los Angeles Times the other day, and I read that a certain Reverend, Mr. Smithers undertook the criticism of Organized Labor, and said it was a pity that in the workshop, the unions insisted that all men should have the same wages, regardless of their producing capacity. We Socialists would say to Mr. Smithers, that the ethical conception of the Union, that a man being weaker or less keen of brain than another, is no reason why he should have less food or clothing, or a poorer home, is vastly superior to his own. Whenever it comes to an ethical question, you will find the working man, organized or unorganized, far above the average preacher. (Applause.)

My opponent mentioned the boycott and the label. We Socialists have often been considered antagonists of Organized Labor because of our criticism of these weapons. But the point of our criticism is vastly different to that of Organized Labor's enemies. We criticize because the attempt of Organized Labor to defeat Organized
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Capital by means of the label and boycott, reminds us of the contrast in weapons between the gatling gun of Uncle Sam and the rope corded wooden cannon of the Filipino. But we have no sympathy with criticism of the boycott put forward by men of the Smithers’ type. We think if these gentlemen of the cloth would confine themselves to questions they understand—if there are any questions they understand, which is doubtful—it would become them much better. (Applause.)

Besides, I am not so sure that these gentlemen do not employ the boycott about as much as the unions of which they complain. Suppose a man and a woman decide to live together without the ceremonies and incantations of the church—(mind you, I am not advocating such a course)—and, as a result of so doing a child is born. What is the attitude of the average preacher in such a case? Does he not do everything in his power to ostracise and outlaw and, if you please, boycott that child because it comes into the world without carrying his Union Label. (Laughter, renewed laughter.)

It is less than two months ago since I saw Mr. Harriman for the first time, and from the moment we spoke together, I came to the conclusion that, much as I may differ from Mr. Harriman’s philosophy and tactics, at least I was in the presence of a man loyal to his views and voicing his real convictions.

But I deeply regret to see my opponent and one-time comrade—if we are using the term comrade as signifying loyalty to Socialism—in the ranks of the opportunists. This fate has overtaken some very prominent men in the Socialist movement and I believe those men, at the beginning were just as sincere and honest as Mr. Harriman is at the present time.

I believe that Millerand of France, when he began to diverge from revolutionary principles was probably honest, but Millerand today is advocating increased militarism, which is only used to suppress the French working class.

John Burns, of England, was undoubtedly sincere in the days when he used to stand on the soap box on the street corner and address the workers. But he gave way to opportunism and where is Burns today? A member of a Bourgeois Cabinet! And when appealed to by the unemployed workingmen, whose cause he once championed, replies that while it may be desirable to alleviate the unemployed problem “we must remember that we cannot afford to endow pauperism”! Such is the end of opportunism!

The Union Labor party has produced its own instance of political degeneracy, in San Francisco. George B. Benham, what has become of him? An able speaker, and, I believe, sincere before opportunism took possession of him. Today he sits in the City Hall, appointed by Mayor Schmitz.
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He owns a saloon. When you pass by 19 Taylor street, step in. (Laughter.) When you find Mr. Benham there, you will find him in the midst of as fine a collection of pot house politicians as are to be found anywhere in the United States. If you happen, in your remarks, to drop the word "Socialism" you will observe the nasal organ of Mr. Benham begin to curl like the caudal appendage of a ring-tailed monkey. (Laughter.)

It would be an interesting study for the psychologist as to why it is that when a man departs from the principles of revolutionary Socialism and takes up opportunism, he usually becomes a political degenerate and eventually a renegade. Yet I think the reason is not very far to seek.

There will come a time, after the Union Labor party is established in Los Angeles, when those Socialists who are foolish enough to go into that party, will discover that their mouths are closed and their jaws locked against any utterance of the principles of Socialism. Every Socialist in San Francisco, who went over, made that discovery and came rushing back into the Socialist camp, excepting of course the renegade Benham. Those who do not return, but stay with the Union Labor party will, of course, reconcile themselves to their position and finally come to forget what Socialist principles are.

And now I come to Mr. Harriman's argument. My opponent has chosen to put his case on philosophical ground. Nothing could please me better. At the same time, I fear that quite a number of the people in this audience were puzzled to understand what the integration of matter and the dissipation of motion or what molecular versus molecular motion had to do with this question of Socialists joining the Union labor party. I followed that argument carefully throughout. I knew there must be a mighty weak link in it somewhere. I knew there must be something that Mr. Harriman had strangely overlooked. And it seems to me that every socialist in the audience must have seen it before Mr. Harriman stepped aside and I was given the floor.

"The point therefore is," says Mr. Harriman, towards the close of his speech in summing up the argument which that speech developed, "That the working class cannot depart from its material interests." I take issue on that statement. If that statement is true Mr. Harriman is right and I am wrong. If that statement is not true I am right and Mr. Harriman is wrong. If it is true that the working class cannot depart, in any of its acts, from its own material interests there is no justification for the existence of a socialist party, and the only logical course for us, would be to abandon our organization and follow Organized Labor wherever it leads. (Applause.) But is it true? Is it true that the working class or that part of it which constitutes Organized Labor, acts in accordance with its own material in-
terest? I deny it. As a socialist, I deny it.

Let us take a sample out of the mass as a botanist would take a specimen, and examine it. Let us take a workingman and trace his life from his birth and see what happens to him from the point of view of this question of his acting in his own material interests. The moment he comes out of the cradle, before he is well able to toddle he is set upon by a gentleman who seeks to twist that little baby brain of his and warp and distort its every convolution with a philosophy of life that is contrary to his material interest if he is going to be a wage worker. And his destiny is easy to foresee even in the cradle. If he is born outside the pale of capitalist property he is as surely doomed to wage-slavery as though the badge was burned into his brow with a branding iron. (Applause.) This gentleman is the preacher. He is there in the interest of the capitalist class. It is his duty to take the defenseless brain of that child and warp it with capitalist ideas and capitalist theories; to teach it that the capitalist system is ordained of God and that to resist it is nothing less than blasphemy. Then the preacher is through for the time being, though he never lets up.

Now comes the schoolmaster. He fills this boy's head with patriotism and teaches him to speak of his country when it isn't "his." He imbues his mind with the duty of defending his country, until he is ready to shoot down his fellow proletarian on strike. Or, he will shoulder a musket and march to Cuba. What for? To defend his own material interest? No, Mr. Harriman, but to enlarge the dividends of the tobacco trust and increase the profits of the sugar corporation. (Applause.) Then he begins to read the newspapers and the editor gets his chance. Now he learns that the philosophy which really stands for his material interest, which we call Socialism, is the same thing as anarchy. That it will destroy the family and the home, that it will abolish ambition and morality and shipwreck civilization. About this time, perchance, he comes in contact with bourgeois science. The professor informs him that the laws of capital are an integral part of the laws of the universe and cannot be successfully resisted. He might as well resist gravity or object to the Nebular Hypothesis, or complain about the conservation of energy or the indestructability of matter. Then the preacher calls again and tries to get him into his church that he may teach him to be content with the position in which it has pleased God and John D. to place him. If the preacher fails in this, in his anxiety to demonstrate his usefulness to the master class whose hireling he is, he attempts to break into the Union that he may reach the working man there, shake his chloroform rag under his nose and stupefy his brain.

As a result of this mental training
and environment what is the condition of the mind of the average member of Organized Labor? And when these men, in this mental condition go into politics, their heads full of capitalist ideas, their brains saturated with a capitalist philosophy, will they act according to their own material interests? To expect this is to expect the impossible, as every Socialist knows by bitter experience.

It is now my turn to venture into the biological world. Perhaps you have observed that there are some creatures that cannot bear to lie on their backs. The moment you turn them on their backs they begin to wriggle and squirm until they regain their feet. This is true of crabs. If you lay a crab on its back it cannot bear to remain so. Do you know why? That was a problem which puzzled biologists for a long time, but finally they discovered that the crab had an organ of gravity, a sort of gravity sense, by which it was able to locate itself in space and know when its feet were toward the center of the earth. After wondering much how this was done, the scientist discovered that the crab took little pebbles of sand in its claws and place them in its ear, or an organ very like an ear and these pebbles constituted a sort of plumbbob by which the crab was always able to regulate its position. If you take a crab and place it where pebbles cannot be obtained, the poor creature can neither stand nor walk and if placed upon its back will lie there as peaceful as a sleeping infant. All this is also true of the shrimp. Now scientists have played a very clever trick on the shrimp. They placed it in a dish of water and instead of allowing it to get pebbles to fix its proper position by, they sprinkled the bottom with metal filings. The unsuspecting shrimp put those metal filings in its ear. Then the cunning scientist brought a magnet and held it above the dish and the poor duped creature immediately thought that the magnet was the center of the earth and proceeded to swim upon its back, or its head, or anyway the scientist with his fake centre of gravity dictated.

Does not this perfectly illustrate the behavior of Organized Labor in its present state of intelligence. The preacher, the schoolmaster, the editor, the professor, the writer, all these men are what has been called “unproductive laborers” whose function in society is to fill the heads of wage slaves with capitalist ideas, so that when the politician comes with the magnet of a Republican, Democratic or so-called Union Labor party, because of the presence in his head of capitalist ideas Mr. Workingman forgets all about his own material interests and goes sprawling on his back or with his feet in the air. He is fooled and duped every time.

Let Organized Labor shake off its capitalist mind, and study and understand the Socialist position. Let it move into politics with the clear purpose of abolishing the wage-system.
and establishing in its place a free society and every socialist in Los Angeles will go with it to a man. (Applause.) But if Organized Labor is going into politics to still further rivet its chains, it is our duty to stay outside and keep at least one platform open for the teaching of that gospel of socialism, which alone can emancipate the working class. (Applause.)

---

Mr. Harriman: I once played somewhat at the religious question myself, and I used to tell my congregation, "If you don't do this, or if you do do that, you will go to hell"—and they would say "Amen." They would become vociferous about it. The amens in the corner would sometimes become even annoying. So now you are being told "If you go with organized labor you will become renegades and outcasts," and there is laid out before you a renegade picture of the place where I am going. I will take my chances with organized labor. (Applause.) If organized labor goes to the eternal bow-wows I shall have good company, I shall be with the class that is bound by its economic interests to remain wage workers.

He says he will not discuss the economic proposition. He had best not. (Applause.) The economic grounds are holy ground upon which he dare not tread. And I want to say to you Socialists here tonight, and I will say it as a Socialist, that there is no other question but the economic question involved in this debate. I say to you that the strike is merely a method to carry out economic interests; that the boycott is merely a method to carry out economic interests; that political action is merely a method to carry out economic interests. And the Socialists stand upon an economic platform, whether they are conscious of it or not. Whatever my friend may say to the contrary, the sole purpose of the Socialist party is to carry out the economic interest of the working class. No other!

Now let us look at our pathway as it goes down among the renegades, as my opponent has it. I shall not refer to the question of the religious training of boys. -- is not a part of the question involved. And I don't think I need to protect myself before a Los Angeles audience, and shall not
refer to his remarks on this question. As to Mr. Millerand going astray and what he is! Any man who knows Millerand’s position in the Socialist party knows he never was considered a Socialist by the French movement. He came into the Socialist party to use it as a means of furthering his ends. He was a parliamentarian of marked ability, but was never looked upon as a Socialist, though in the Socialist ranks. He was so considered at the Paris International Socialist Convention in which I had the pleasure of sitting some five years ago.

Let us take John Burns. He went astray, and Millerand went astray. Did they? Suppose we say yes? Then I ask did they stay with the trade union movement? Answer this question. Has the trade union movement of France and England gone astray? No, no. These were individual cases. Men may go astray, for when some one comes with sufficient coin to purchase organized labor. Benham? Did Benham go astray? Suppose he did. I don’t know. Did the trade union movement of San Francisco go astray?

No, sir. The best organized labor movement in the State of California, or in the United States today, stands in San Francisco—master of the situation! I told our men in the Socialist party three years ago, that the Union Labor party movement had come to stay, and that they would have to go into it, for our philosophy fits upon their interest. If we were with them the Union Labor party would soon become a Socialist party—if we were not among them, it would become a Socialist movement in spite of us.

Today, if you please, San Francisco took the Geary street line from the capitalists’ hands. What do we propose as Socialists? To take other municipal plants when we get in power. They are in power and have taken the plant, and Mayor Schmitz said “If you mean to resist us, I will take it by force.” Why did he say it? Because it was the economic organization, the Trade Union movement of San Francisco, that was moving. Moving where? Toward the ultimate ownership of productive capital. Every time the trade union movement takes a street car line for the city away from the capitalists, it weakens the capitalist class and strengthens the working class. It increases their power and makes them that much more able to take another street car line, to take a water works, to take anything in the line of their interests. Everything and anything that increases their power.

About twelve years ago, in England, our friend, Mr. Hyndman made the same sort of an appeal as Mr. Lewis—I would have called him Comrade Lewis, but he says, he cannot call me comrade any more, so I shall not bur-
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den him with my comradeship. But Mr. Lewis, I shall insist on remaining a Socialist, although I have been charged with being a heretic. I have been classed as a renegade for these opinions. Three years ago there were members of the Socialist party who said the Union Labor party issue was dead. Now they say it is alive, and I say, yes it is. It is the liveliest corpse the Socialist party will ever meet. In England twelve years ago, the Socialists made the same sort of statement concerning the Independent Labor party as Mr. Lewis is now making. They said it was a movement on the downward grade, that it was dominated by the preacher element. Though it was conservative then, it is the Socialist party of England today, not because the Socialists assisted them, but in spite of their resistance.

Why is it that the preachers all over the land are complaining that the working class don’t attend the churches? You know this is true. And if the preachers dominate the mind of the working class, why do they not attend the churches? (Applause.) Mr. Lewis expresses only a superficial view.

The capitalist church is an organization whose duty it is to preach that the interests of the capitalist class are right. The Socialist party is a church whose duty it is to preach that the interests of the working class are right. The two churches are evolved out of the interests of the two classes. The one is born of the interests of the capitalist class, the other is born of the working class. It is the preaching of capitalist class ethics that drives the working class from the church.

Going back to England! The Socialists said that the I. L. P. was a milk-and-water party. That it was going to the bow-wows, because the leaders were corrupt and the working class was dominated by the capitalist church and had a capitalist mind. Can you imagine that men working for wages, who spend their lives in the shops, will not struggle for more wages and less hours? Is it possible always struggle for more wages and less hours? Is it not this struggle for more wages and less hours that develops trade unions? Is this a capitalist mind? This is the very essence of the working class movement. It is by low wages and long hours that surplus value is increased, and by which the capitalist class increases its economic powers. This is the heart and the soul of the struggle. Do you believe the I. L. P. when it stood on a so-called reform platform, containing conservative working class demands, but with no revolutionary demands, I say do you believe they were going astray? You forget the revolutionary impulse is inherent in the working class. Why? Because they get only a part of their product while the capi-
talist gets the rest. They take it from the workingman without rendering an equivalent return. As long as the capitalist class can take the product from the working class without rendering an equivalent return, it is the easiest way they can gratify their desires, but it adds to the burden of the working class and makes it correspondingly harder for them to gratify their desires. The capitalist class being in power, therefore, continues to rob the working class until the working class rebels against the capitalist state which is an institution for purposes of robbery. This makes rebels of all the workers, though unconscious of it.

I say the revolutionary spirit is born by reason of the fact that the wage worker does not get the full product of his labor. That revolutionary spirit is expressed by organized labor in the strike for higher wages, and for shorter hours, or by political action for the common ownership of productive property. In England organized labor went on this principle, and the I. L. P. had forty delegates in the international congress at Paris, while the Social Democratic Federation had dwindled to eight delegates.

About one year ago the Social Democratic Federation was practically swallowed by the I. L. P.

The Union Labor party, that is the I. L. P., by reason of its interests, has evolved into a Socialist party in England. In Germany and Austria, especially, the Socialists aided the trades unions. But the Socialist party of America, like the Social Democratic Federation of England, stands against the unions and fights them when they enter politics.

I do not think it worth while to pay any more attention to the opinions my opponent expressed upon organized labor, for if organized labor has a capitalist mind because of its religious and educational training, so also has unorganized labor the same capitalist mind, and for the same reasons, and nothing can be done with either faction.

Organized labor is the more intelligent of the working class. Workingmen who are not members of labor organizations evince little if any realization of their economic condition, and they still plod on scattered to the winds. But in labor organizations, workingmen are in a bunch, and they not only move together, but we can reach them with our propaganda. Unorganized labor we cannot reach, even for political purposes.

Organized labor is a powerful organization, moving in the line of least resistance. They enter politics because political action is the line of least resistance, and it therefore affords the greatest opportunities by which their power may be increased. They will remain in politics if for no other reason than that they are powerful, and propose to increase their power in the easiest manner, and the
Socialist party can not prevent them from so doing.

Having the power and being the genuine expression of working class interests, the only thing for Socialists to do is to support them and to apply our philosophy to the organized labor movement, and thus aid them to understand Socialism and to develop into a Socialist movement.

Now, I wish to summarize the arguments I have placed before you by showing you, first, that according to the principles upon which labor organizations proceed they are forced to enter politics, and, second, that they will proceed from a conservative movement to a radical Socialist movement.

I am surprised to hear Mr. Lewis say that he doesn't see what the integration of matter has to do with the question under discussion. I do not understand how a materialist can undertake to say that matter operates differently under one form than it does under another.

All matter moves in the line of least resistance, and its efficiency increases with its mass or its velocity. These are the laws of its operation everywhere and under all circumstances, from sands to stars, from moss to man.

When particles of matter integrate into an organism they continue to move in the line of least resistance. In forming social organisms, the individual organism, like the atom, proceeds along the line of least resistance until by integration social organisms develop. Then the integrated social organism will move in the same manner. It will proceed along the line of least resistance, integrating, organizing and increasing its power. Thus, the working class economic organization developed, and thus it will proceed until it takes its stand in the political field, the line of least resistance. This done, it will at once proceed further along the line of least resistance, ever seeking to increase its power, first by enlarging its organized force and, second, by taking from the capitalist his productive capital and converting it into common property. Thus will the integration go on, and the power of the working class increase until it has the power to take all and become all. This is the law of growth in all organisms, both individual and social. But Mr. Lewis cannot understand this.

I want to cite you some authorities on the question of the attitude of the Socialists toward the trade unions. First, from the pamphlet of N. I. Stone, one of the standard works which is endorsed by the Socialist party, if you please.

He says the question was asked of Karl Marx: "Should the trade unions be primarily subordinate to a political organization, in order to be able to exist?"

The answer was: "The trade unions should never be brought into an inner
connection with a political organization, nor should they be made dependent on such, if their object is to be carried out; if that is done it is equivalent to rendering a death blow to the union. . . . The trade unions are schools for Socialism. In the trade unions the workingmen are educated to Socialism, because there they are daily engaged in a struggle with capital. All political parties, be they what they may, fill the masses with enthusiasm only from time to time; the trade unions, on the contrary hold the mass of working people permanently; only they are in a position to represent a real labor party, and present a solid front to the power of capital. There is one thing on which the greater part of the working people, no matter what party they may belong to, are agreed, and that is that their material condition must be improved.

Now, mark you, I am going to read from the Communist Manifesto, written by Karl Marx and Engels. Digest this. It says:

"The unceasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their (the workers') livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form combinations (trades unions) against the bourgeois; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there the contest breaks out into riots."

Again, he says:

"This organization of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves. But it ever rises up again: stronger, firmer, mightier."

That is just the condition you have now. He says:

"Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product." . . .

"The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative."

Furthermore, he says in the Manifesto:

"The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties.

"They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.

"They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own by which to
shape and mould the proletarian movement."

Why? The interest works out in the movement.

"The Communists are distinguished from the other working class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoise has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole."

Listen to what Frederick Engels says in his preface to "The Condition of the Working Class in England."—He and Karl Marx were the pioneers of the great world-wide Socialist movement. He says:

"To bring about this result, the unification of the various independent bodies into one national labor army, with no matter how inadequate a provisional platform, provided it be a truly working class platform—that is the next great step to be accomplished in America."

Am I going to the bow-wows? We shall have good company there. We shall meet Marx and Engels, and the wage-working class there.
Mr. Chairman, Mr. Harriman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a pleasure to listen to Mr. Harriman’s exposition of the Communist Manifesto. That pleasure, however, is tinged with regret when we reflect that in Mr. Harriman’s new party such an exposition of so revolutionary a document, will be strictly out of order. Now, before we Socialists of Los Angeles surrender our charter to the state, or the Socialists of California yield up the state charter to the national, surely we have a right to know something about this new party which exists in San Francisco, and is presumably being born in Los Angeles, and the state of California generally. We should know something of what it is, and what it stands for. Is it even a genuine labor party? Does it represent the material interests of the working class or of that part of it which constitutes organized labor? If it did, my attitude in this debate would be vastly different from the one I now take.

I am here tonight to oppose Mr. Harriman because I believe and am thoroughly convinced that once more in its history organized labor is being duped and betrayed.

This conclusion is based on some years of direct contact with the so-called Union Labor party of San Francisco. I know as every other Socialist in that city knows, that organized labor in that metropolis of the west is the dupe of one of the shrewdest disgruntled Republican politicians that ever pulled wires on the Pacific coast. I shall devote almost all this speech to an analysis of this party, because I believe that an exposure of its hocus pocus nature is altogether fatal to every argument of my opponent, so far as the purpose of this debate is concerned.

I will begin with Los Angeles. Just one week ago I attended an open meeting of the Carpenters’ Union, where some of the new party’s leaders were advertised to speak, so that, perchance, I might discover what kind of politics they would advise the Carpenters’ Union to go into. It may be objected that it is not always fair to judge a party by what its speakers say, but with this party there is no other method, for it has no platform, as it has no principles. At this meeting of a week ago, the first speaker was Mr. Bell, introduced as Brother Bell, and as my memory goes, president of the organization. Brother Bell explained that “for many years”
he had “opposed the idea of organized labor going into politics.” Now, however, he had “changed his mind.” He had discovered as a result of much reflection, that “working men pay almost all the taxes, and if some of our men could be elected to office and draw salaries we should in that may get some of that money back!” Surely there can be no failure for a party composed of men with such far-reaching ideals! As a piece of political philosophy, Brother Bell's declaration of principles should be handed down to posterity as "a gem of purest ray serene." It stands in a class by itself. There is nothing else exactly like it in the literature of political economy. If it was placed "like a jewel on the stretched forefinger of all time" it "would sparkle forever." But perhaps we should not be too hard on Brother Bell, he has voted old party tickets for so many years that it has probably affected his intellect.

Then Brother Thompson was invited to hold aloft the virtues of the new party. In order to give force to his contention, Brother Thompson recited an instance of how well it had worked in San Francisco. During the early part of that recital I was so deeply meditating on the profound wisdom of Brother Bell, that I am not quite sure I got all the details exactly as Brother Thompson gave them. As there are many people in this audience who attended that meeting, if I make any mistake I hope I shall be corrected. Mr. Thompson said that while he was in San Francisco recently, a number of unorganized working-men were working on a job at $1.50 per day. They decided they should have $2.50, and went on strike to get it. The union at once sent down a gang of men to take their places at the lower rate. The strikers refused to make way for them. Then the boss or the Business Agent telephoned to the City Hall, and Mayor Schmitz sent down a squad of police to drive the strikers away, and the union men went on peacefully at $1.50 per day. Is that as Mr. Thompson told it?

(Cries from the audience, Yes! yes!)

I thought it was. Well, I suppose that kind of thing may be what some people mean when they talk about "organized scabbery."

One of the new party's committee of fifteen is Mr. H. L. Atwood, editor of the Union Labor News. In a recent issue of that paper, he referred to Socialism as a Debs pipe dream. But I believe the workers of America would have more confidence in even a pipe dream of Debs than in anything likely to emanate from Atwood. The workingmen of Los Angeles would pay more money to hear Debs explain his "pipe dream" than they would give for a carload of Mr. Atwood's editorials.

Mr. Stanley B. Wilson, the pet speaker of the new party, addressed the meeting of a week ago, and declared that he was a Republican in politics. Then, upon reflecting that
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this might not gibe with his role of leader of the new party, he took it back and said he “didn’t know what he was.” To say what Mr. Wilson is, would be a task beyond my powers, but I have no difficulty in saying what he is going to be. Mayor Schmitz is the puppet of Abe Ruef; Dr. Houghton will be the puppet of Schmitz; Mr. Wilson is already playing puppet to Houghton. When the strings are all in order and get working, he will have the distinguished honor of being the pet puppet of a puppet’s puppet! (Laughter and applause.)

A few weeks ago this new party held its first mass meeting in this hall, and I was present. From beginning to end, not a single Socialist note was sounded. Mayor Schmitz appealed to the merchants to support the new party, and declared that they had nothing to lose by so doing, as “all organized labor asked was a fair day’s pay for a fair day’s work.”

What is this party’s record in San Francisco? With Mayor Schmitz in the chair and his satellites in office, it is at this moment notoriously, one of the most corruptly managed cities in the United States. When we were fighting the battle for free speech on the street corners of San Francisco and being thrown into jail night after night, we appealed to Schmitz, but in vain. Schmitz was too anxious to curry favor with the small business men who were egging on the police to care what became of free speech. Even when many unions joined us in a free speech league, he refused to respond. We were obliged to fight that battle with his police and their labor-hating chief, Witman, to the bitter end. We had to spend thousands of the quarters and dimes of working men carrying the case higher than Schmitz to the superior courts, before we could get even so much as free speech in a city governed by this union labor party.

Again, the city charter of San Francisco says that one of the five members of the Election Commissioners’ Board shall come from the third strongest party in the State.

Mayor Phelan, the Democrat, who preceded Schmitz, behaved, at least in this respect, like a gentleman. He said that that position was clearly ours to protect our party in the elections, and he told us to select our man for the place. We elected our financial secretary, Comrade Oliver Everett, who served the party faithfully all through his own and Phelan’s term. Then Schmitz was elected. Did he follow the example of Mayor Phelan in carrying out this provision of the city charter? No! He broke the charter and appointed one of his toadies, one Leffingwell, who never was a Socialist, and it is to be hoped never will be. There is no demand, in the Socialist movement, for men who will call themselves by any name to get a salary of $80 a month.

Again, we fought the Mayor at an
expense of hundreds of dollars, in court after court, and if I mistake not it is now on the calendar of the Supreme court—I know it was.

At the last election this bogus labor party marched in procession along the streets of San Francisco. In that procession was a banner which read as follows:

"Is not your capital safely invested?"

"Is not labor steadily employed?"

"Let us have peace."

My opponent has said much about what the Socialists of Europe would do. Does he mean to say that the members of the English I. L. P. would march behind that banner? I tell you No! Not a single man of them. Would any Socialist in France or Germany or Italy, or anywhere in the world where the International exists join a party that stands for the safe investment of capital! Again I tell you No! This is on a par with Dr. Houghton’s contending that there "should be no labor struggles, as they have a tendency to disturb the present satisfactory prices of real estate." Does it follow that because organized labor can be duped in this way that Socialists also should stick their heads in the noose?

I now ask my opponent, would he march behind that banner? As for myself, if ever I so far take back my Socialist opinions or forget my revolutionary principles as to join such a party and walk behind such a banner, to please duped organized labor, or for any other reason, I hope the Socialists of that day will set me in the lime light and brand me as a coward and a deserter.

Lying on a table in my room is a stack of letters which I have received from Socialists all over this country. They want to know where the Socialists of Los Angeles and California are going to stand. They want to know whether you are going to stand true to the Socialist party or going to become the dupes of Abe Ruef and his puppet politicians? At the close of the debate you are to vote on two questions. Once as to the merits of the debate as presented by Mr. Harriman and myself. As to how you vote on that question I care nothing. But I am concerned as to how you vote on the merits of the question itself, and so are the Socialists of the United States. They want to know and have a right to know whether or not the Socialist party is going to be deserted by its followers in Los Angeles and Southern California.

One of those letters is from a little man who came to this coast from the east, against the advice of his doctors, to preach the gospel I have the honor to defend on this platform. He just managed to crawl back home alive, and he writes me — "let me know where our folks are going to stand. These are trying times, and loyal comrades are of great value." That man’s name is known far and wide; we call him "Ben Hanford the printer." Before I go to bed tonight I hope to write
him and tell him that the Socialists of Los Angeles will stand by their party and their principles. That we shall continue our affiliation with the State at Oakland, the National at Chicago, and the International at Brussels.

This problem is a world problem and can only be solved by a world party, such as ours.

Let us tell the Socialists of this country that we Socialists of California will not surrender. Nay, we will fight until the last wall and bastion of capitalist society is laid level with the ground, and we have planted in triumph on the topmost turret of a new civilization, the blood red banner of the Social Revolution. (Applause.)

---

Mr. Harriman:

I have no doubt that the socialist agitation and the labor movement will continue in both the economic, and the political field until the social revolution is worked out. Our friend's effort was very good, especially the final wind up, praising the Socialist Party, and it is commendable as an agitation speech. But it had practically nothing to do with the argument or with the question under discussion.

The labor party is in the field to stay. Whether it enters as a political factor or as an economic factor, it can't leave the struggle and it enters because of its revolutionary interests, and it will remain there until the revolution is worked out.

Since the Socialist philosophy is a product of this Revolutionary interest (our friend does not deny that this is a fact) the Socialist party can only be an expression, at the most, of this philosophy. It can be no more, it can go no further, it can fight no harder than the power and interest of the class will enable it to fight. Mr. Lewis would make of the political movement one movement, of the economic movement one movement. The two separate and distinct. Now, I tell you that the working class movement in its economic organization and in its political organization, whatever form it may take, is one and the same thing. They cannot be separated. A political party without an economic movement is of slight significance.

The idea that Mr. Lewis should stand here and tell this audience that there is enough corruption in the
party of Schmitz and whomever else he named, to corrupt a class away from its interest! A ridiculous proposition! Absolutely impossible! I admit that there is corruption in the capitalist class parties, but that corruption never can reach proportions sufficient to divert those parties, and that class from their economic interests—it is impossible.

So, the corruption that may enter into any working class party can never divert that movement from its economic interests. It is an impossible proposition. I admit that when a working class party form, and the great mass begins to move, there will be combinations that we as Socialists dislike. I pointed that out three years ago in my argument on this very question. But, I said, mark you, that was three campaigns ago. “The conflicting interests between the working class on the one hand and the capitalist class on the other will separate them, and the workers will go on their road alone, and the capitalists will combine against them.”

What happened in San Francisco this last election? On the one hand was the Trades Union Party standing alone in the majesty of its power! What happened? On the other hand the Democratic and Republican parties combined against them. What else happened? The Socialist party stood out against the Trades Union party and fought them.

I say it is a shame! They should have joined with them in their struggle. They should have gone among them. What did they do during the last three campaigns? A mistake? No, a wrong. Done honestly? Yes, but wrongfully. They called them fakers, they called them corruptionists, they attacked the Trades Union party in every way that was within their power, as Mr. Lewis has done here tonight, openly and on the street, to defeat their power.

Then what did they do? They asked Mayor Schmitz to protect them in their free speech, thus aiding them in their opposition to the party he represents. Let me tell you men here tonight, that every organization, or organism, no matter what it may be, will protect itself if possible against those who seek to destroy its power. The Union Labor party was merely striving to do this when Schmitz declined aid. If the Socialists had gone among them, had taught them their principles, they would have been heard in California as they were in Australia and as they were in England, and as they will be on this coast and in this city of Los Angeles.

He says that the Union Labor party sent police down to take men out of work and put Union men in at a lower wage. Why? The Union has its scale of wages and will not break it, nor permit it to be broken by scabs. Why? Because the capitalist will pay higher wages in order to destroy the Union, is being done in the "Times
office" in this city. By paying higher wages they seek to destroy the Unions and then they can force wages down. This is the fact, and this is what they meant to do in San Francisco, while the unions maintain the union rate, and they will not raise the rate until it is raised all along the line.

As Marx said it is the wages all along the line that the working class strive to raise. The Union works for the interests of the entire class, and when we, as Socialists, work against the organization helping to destroy their power, political or otherwise, instead of helping them raise wages, or increase their political power, we work against the interests of the entire class. In this way we destroy their efficiency, for whenever there is a raise of wages, or decrease of their hours, then there is a corresponding increase in their power and in their efficiency.

This is the reason why I say, support them in the struggle. But Mr. Lewis said in his first remarks—and pay attention to this—if the Trades Union movement were a bona fide political movement in California, if they had entered, for the interests of the working class, I would say that Mr. Harriman is right and that I, (Mr. Lewis) am wrong. That is all we are discussing, nothing else.

Resolved, that it is the duty of all Socialists to support every economic or political struggle into which organized labor, as such, enters. They can only struggle for their interests. That is all we are discussing. He has admitted that if this be the issue, I am right and he is wrong.

If organized labor as such has not entered the political struggle in San Francisco, if it does not enter the political struggle here for class interests, then I am not supporting such movement. If it does, I am right and Chairman: he is wrong. This is admitted, and this is the question under discussion.

I stand by organized labor, and he has been unable to show that organized labor in any instance has gone wrong, has departed from its interests, though he points to some few individuals who, he says, have gone to the bow wows.

The debate being closed, we are now going to take two votes, and I want to ask the friends kindly not to pass out for the next two or three minutes. I am sure that none of us have to go at this moment.

The first vote will be concerning the merits of this question, without any reference to the merits of the debate tonight, what is your personal conviction. Should Socialists support every political and economic struggle into which organized labor, as such, enters? Vote without any reference to the debate here tonight. (Voice—We don't understand.)

The question is this:
Resolved, That Socialists should support every economic and political struggle into which organized labor, as such, enters. The affirmative of this question has been presented to you by Mr. Harriman, and the negative side by Mr. Lewis.

Those who wish to vote in the affirmative will please rise. About 210, I should judge.

Those who believe the justice of the question lies in the negative will please rise. About 800 on a rough estimate.

Those who consider that Mr. Harriman made the better argument will please rise.—350.

Those who consider that Mr. Lewis made the better argument will please rise.—525.
Speech by Jules Guesde in the French Chamber of Deputies.

I am ready to unroll before you the reason why and how the idea of collectivism gathers around it large masses, not in France alone, but throughout the civilized world, and that today it numbers among its supporters more than seven million workers.

Why are we collectivists? Why do we believe that the solution of the social problem and social peace can spring only from an organization of society where there will be no class distinctions; where, in the stead of a capitalist class—mistress of the means of production—and of a proletariat—stripped of such means—the great human family will at last be reconciled? The reason of it is that the system of modern production, such as is brought on by machinery, imperatively demands such a social transformation.

The day when the machine entered the field of production, private property was displaced by another species of property, which you confuse with private property. Capitalist property then planted itself upon the ruins of individual property. Handicraft was supplanted by mechanical work. This transformation took place throughout industry—in weaving, forging, farming—everywhere steam and like agencies supplanted the former methods.

Now, then, wherein does the capitalist distinguish itself from the individual system? In this: that, under the capitalist system, property is found in the hands of those who do not work in the production of the goods brought forth.

This capitalist species of property is born of the extension of machinery as a factor in production, and it has divorced property from labor; it has placed property on one side and labor on the other.

For instance, the railroads. Can it be denied that they belong mainly to stockholders and people who never have co-operated in any of the branches of labor required to operate a road?

It is this divorce between property and labor that creates the whole social problem; a problem that does not date back one or two centuries, but that dates from our own days.

The social problem presents the following phenomenon: The working class, the proletariat, is reduced to the level of merchandise, an element of production that may be hired or bought; which, at a given time, is replaced by machinery, and is day after day thrust deeper into the hell of enforced idleness, as we may judge by the appallingly increasing number of the unemployed.

Thus two classes face each other; the one, having become only a sort of raw material, lives only in the measure in which it may be needed; it sees its means of existence become less and less, thanks to machinery. Opposite to it stands the capitalist class, the accomplice in that crime of crimes where woman is dragged from her fireside, the mother torn from her child, and the wife from her husband, in order to become the tender of a machine; or where, with even greater heartlessness, the child is put in competition with his father and mother, and is thus turned into a lever whereby they may be thrown into idleness.

Therefore, I call upon you, the commonwealth of France, the commonwealth born of our Revolution, the commonwealth that sought the emancipation, not of France alone, but of the whole of humanity—I call upon this commonwealth to resolutely turn its face to this problem.

We are charged with being revolutionists; with urging on a social war.
This is false. We urge on the social war no more than he urges on the equinoctial storm who foresees and announces it.

You charge us with provoking a civil war. Yet they who truly provoke it are those who shut their eyes to its approach.

I have spoken of the concentration of industry. Let us now see how far capitalist concentration reaches.

It is today the mistress of the world's commerce. Is not the small shopkeeper expropriated by the large bazaars on the Louvre? Do you not hear the plaintive wails of the small traders who have become the serfs of the large stores, and are compelled to surrender their sons as clerks and their daughters as saleswomen to the very stores that have ruined them?

You are well aware that there are capitalists who have never cultivated their own lands, but are satisfied to pocket their rents. They step into the category of those who concentrate property in their individual hands without co-operating in production. In what, pray, consists the work of the stockholder in a mining company or in a railroad corporation? I am sorry, gentlemen, to give you pain, but I am constrained to place my finger upon the aching nerve of the consequences of this social phenomenon; if I did otherwise we could justly be styled utopians, if not quacks. We are neither the one nor the other. It is a deep study of these questions that has caused us to become collectivists; it would be well for you to show some respect for adversaries who are ready to spill their last drop of blood in the support of the faith that is in them.

Collective Property.

Next, I wish to show you that this collective property, that seems to frighten you so much, is taking shape now. It is not we Socialists who created it. Will you deny that a railroad is not private property? Whose is this depot, that car, yonder rails? This property is today represented by a fictitious property, a creature and a protege of the law, and consists in a certain number of leaves of paper. The same is the case with regard to mines, the mills, the factories and the large stores. Whether it please you or not, we now live under a collectivism system. The question is, what species of collectivism will afford to each individual the largest amount of well-being, the greatest enjoyment of life?

The collectivism which you have today is that of the single class; we aim at the collectivism of the whole of humanity. Instead of having the mines, railroads, etc., operated by slaves, wage slaves, we say: "Let the mines, the railroads, and all the other necessary industries of France be operated by the free workers of France." The same argument applies in other departments. Are not the highways and the colleges of France the property of the nation?

The Oncoming Social System.

Can you now understand or conceive of a France in which all the instruments of production are held in common? Do you not see that then the struggle for existence and the strife between man and man for a living will have vanished, leaving room for a union of human forces? Nature will then serve as a benign mother to all the children of the earth and supply them bountifully.

In modern society, the one thing that is developed, the one thing that will develop faster and faster, is the evil side of humanity. Each will perfect himself in the trick of pulling the blanket his way at the sacrifice of all others; if he does not, he is condemned beforehand to thraldom. What we
want is a social system in which man will not be held to such a dilemma, where individuality will be consolidated with the collective interest, where the efforts of each may redound to the comfort of not alone himself, but of all his fellows.

The Incentive to Labor.

We are often told: "But in the future society all incentive to labor will have disappeared." This thing that you apprehend in the future is the very thing that exists today. Indeed, today the workers in the mills have nothing to incite them to yield a maximum of productivity. Just the reverse. Were they to work twice as hard one day, they would simply have thrown away a whole day's wages.

It is under the modern social system that there is no incentive to work. This is so palpable a fact that you are constantly increasing the number of your spies in the factories; you are well aware that the human machine, left to itself under this system of yours, has so little incentive to work and so much reason to lower its productivity, that it would drop to a minimum. The worker who would get away with too much work would increase the chances of enforced idleness for himself and his fellows. On the other hand, when the people own the machinery of production, if six or seven hours be needed for a given quantity of product, then, tomorrow, if the productivity of labor has increased, five hours and a half or less will suffice to accomplish the same results. In the oncoming social system there will be in all the shops and factories a natural tendency to produce as much as possible in the least possible time, because such an effort would result in an increase of repose and enjoyment to the workers themselves. And men of science, who are now held subject to capital, and do not receive the fruits of their triumphs, will exert themselves to further perfect the mechanism of production, lifting still more of the burden of toil from the shoulders of the workers, and adding to the happiness of all, by increasing leisure and opportunities for intellectual development.

The Machine Makes Happiness Possible for All.

That social system will not be one of savages, of barbarians. It will be the only humane social system that ever existed—except in ancient Greece, where the citizens—mind you, I say "citizens"—lived in the enjoyment of philosophy under the clear sky of Attica. But, to the end that these citizens should enjoy themselves, the majority of the people in Greece were made up of slaves who were held to starvation. Accordingly Aristotle declared that slavery was necessary, and would not disappear until the day of the machine.

Today the machines are here; such are the steam horses and other creations of the genius of man; these are the iron and steel slaves of today; it is because they are here that the hour for human freedom has struck.

Instead of trying to aid this evolution, you have imagined that you could bottle up the tempest, muzzle the hurricane and hold back the march of humanity. Your world is coming to an end. Chattel slavery was followed by serfdom; this in turn made place for wage slavery. "The wage system," said your own Chateaubriand, "is the last form of slavery."

The Present Form of Slavery.

The wages system offers none of the guarantees offered by the earlier forms of slavery. The slave was property, and was carefully housed, because the illness or death of the slave would be a loss to his masters. The
children of the slaves were taken care of by their owners, because they represented increase of capital. Do your modern financial concerns take care of the new-born? Just as soon as capital puts on its present anonymous form, no human bonds can continue to exist between the employer and the employes. When a worker is to be engaged, does any boss ask him how many children he has, with the intention of paying him proportionately? The miners, the railroad employes, the weavers and all other artisans are to the employer only so much labor power necessary to set the modern mechanism of industry in motion.

We Socialists do not arraign the individual. The capitalist is no more responsible for living upon the proletariat than the proletariat is responsible for being exploited by the capitalistic class.

Revolution and Evolution.

I have explained to you why and how it is that we are collectivists. I now wish to tell you how and why we are revolutionists. We are revolutionists because revolution has always been the last word, the capstone, of evolution. Do you imagine that the revolution of 1789 was improvised by writers, or by encyclopedists? A far-reaching economic evolution was brought on by the discovery of America, by the commerce that then sprang up, and by the introduction of the first machines. The new conditions under which industry was conducted did not fit in with the feudal world; this had to go down. Our Third Estate, together with the Revolution, only crowned an evolution that had been going on for some time. The taking of the Bastile, the scaffolds and the like were only the illustrations of the revolutions.

The Fourth Estate.

The revolution was accomplished when the Third Estate, compelling the other two orders to bend before it, began to dictate law. We are now in a similar condition. We have a Fourth Estate, the working class. Despite itself, it constitutes an inferior class, because it holds no property, because it has no fatherland; it owns neither an inch of ground nor a fragment of machinery.

The Fourth Estate is not the handiwork of the Socialists. It is there without our aid. What we do is to organize it; it is now marching; it is experimenting. That Fourth Estate sends its deputies here. It has its representatives in the municipal councils. It is approaching with its demands to be put in possession of its own. Yet you who call yourselves the men of the revolution, you are trying upon us the same old and futile game of the royal ordinances of 1777. Nevertheless, the proletariat moves onward. It is uttering its program. It is about to obtain its fatherland and its share in the nation's machinery of production. The day of its revolution will be the close of its evolution.

The Pending Revolution.

What the nature of that revolution may be will depend upon your attitude. If you let it flow onward like a large river we shall arrive peacefully in the land of promise; if, on the contrary, you try to dam the river, it will overflow all impediment, and then it will not be upon us that will rest the responsibility for the devastation caused by the flood.

We do not insist upon the means of violence if you leave open to us the peaceful and lawful ones, but it looks to me as if we shall have no choice.
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