SHOULD SOCIALISM BE CRUSHED?
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"Hullo Bill."
"Howdy Jack."
'The meeting of the Union's rather small to-night."
"Yes, the boys don't turn up as they should."
"What's the business before the Union?"
"I don't know. Same old thing I guess."
"Say, Jack, did you see in the paper about the fight that's going to be made on Socialism? August Belmont, Seth Low and the other fellows in the Civic Federation are raisin' money to down Socialism."
"Well, that's a good idea, don't you think Bill?"
"Guess you're right. They say Socialism is going to harm the workin' man."
"Well, it couldn't be much worse than now."
"That's right enough, Jack, we ain't gettin' all the best of it now. But Belmont and Low and some of the rest of that Wall Street crowd think Socialism is growing too fast and they intend to smash it. The papers say that Belmont is coughin' up thousands and that all the bankers and Wall Street magnates are raisin' money to fight Socialism."
"Say, Bill, what is this Socialism anyway?"
"Don't know. They run a political party and 'Gene Debs was their candidate for President. The Socialists say that it's all done for the workin' man, but Belmont and Low and that crowd say it's goin' to hurt the workin' man. What do you think?"
"Well, I never heard of Belmont or any of those Wall
Street fellows spendin' money to help the workin' man.''

"No, I guess that's right."

This conversation took place in a Union Hall not long ago. There is going to be more of that kind of talk during the next few years. Seth Low, President of the Civic Federation, said recently before the bosses of the metal trades: "WE ARE FIGHTING THE SPREAD OF SOCIALISM IN THIS COUNTRY. DO YOU KNOW, THERE ARE SUNDAY SCHOOLS IN THIS CITY WHERE SOCIALISM IS TAUGHT TO LITTLE CHILDREN. WE ARE GOING TO DO WHAT WE CAN TO COUNTERACT THAT PROPAGANDA." At this good news the bosses applauded Seth vigorously.

President Taft said in a speech recently that "IN FRANCE TRADE UNIONS ARE INTENSELY SOCIALISTIC. . . . IT IS ALSO PLAIN THAT THE TENDENCY TOWARD SOCIALISM IN ENGLAND AND ENGLAND'S TRADE UNIONS IS GROWING STRONGER AND STRONGER. I NEED NOT POINT OUT THE DEPLORABLE RESULTS IN THIS COUNTRY IF TRADE UNIONISM BECOMES SYNONYMOUS FOR SOCIALISM." Mr. Taft is also a prominent member of the Civic Federation.

Charles W. Eliot, former President of Harvard College, never loses an opportunity to attack both Trade Unionism and Socialism. His chief title to glory as a Social student is his vigorous defense of non-Union Labor. He calls the scab "the American hero," and in Mr. Eliot's mind those working men who fight their fellows, assist in the breaking of strikes and accept lower wages in order to obtain the jobs of their fellows, are fighting the battles of our Revolutionary fathers. Mr. Eliot is also a member of the Civic Federation.

Andrew Carnegie, known to all men, has also undertaken the fight against Socialism. He has written a book warning the people of the dangers of Socialism. As a retired capitalist he no longer needs to fight Trade Unionism. He now gives dinners and receptions to Labor leaders.
August Belmont, the rich banker, is a bitter opponent of Socialism. Two years ago he retired from the Presidency of the Civic Federation. He has since been made its Treasurer and is now engaged in raising a fund to carry on a campaign against Socialism. The letter which he is writing to his Wall Street friends is as follows:

23 Nassau St., New York.
June 21, 1909.

I do not know whether or not you have observed the headway Socialism has been making in the United States during the past five years, but their vote at elections has jumped from 38,000 to 450,000 which practically means that there are over two million men, women and children preaching class hatred and revolution. I mention the women and children because it is a known fact that the families of Socialists are all becoming trained propagandists.

I am enclosing you a pamphlet which the National Civic Federation is getting out with a view to showing in concrete form the menace of Socialism in this country, and I want you to take the time to read it. At the present time there is absolutely no opposition to this Socialist movement in the United States. England, Germany and France made the same mistake, with the results with which you are doubtless familiar.

In England no organized movement against their doctrine was undertaken until over fifty Socialists were members of Parliament.

In this country a committee of the National Civic Federation, under the chairmanship of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, has been at work for almost a year investigating the situation and preparing plans for a campaign, the purpose of which is to educate speakers and writers rather than to teach the individuals. In other words we are getting out a hand book for them. THE EDITORS OF LABOR, religious, educational and weekly journals are clamoring for material, and we have lists of many preachers, school teachers, college professors, and LABOR EDITORS WHO ARE GOOD TALKERS AND WRITERS, and who need the information necessary for such work.
Such an effort as we are making requires the expenditure of considerable money, and a special fund of $50,000 is being raised for the purpose. Will you contribute toward it? I am deeply interested in it myself and have contributed several thousand dollars and felt that YOU MIGHT BE GRATEFUL to me for calling this matter to your attention and might desire to be interested in the work of the National Civic Federation.

Believe me,

Yours very truly,

August Belmont.

Read that letter carefully. It's worth thinking about. The big fellows intend to spend barrels of money to educate the poor working man. They are alarmed at seeing working men becoming interested in this "dangerous" doctrine.

We say dangerous doctrine because it really and truly is a very dangerous doctrine. Whether or not it is dangerous to YOU, you must be the judge. That it is dangerous to the Multi-Millionaires of Wall Street there is no question.

Now when a thing is so strongly condemned by these men and alarms them so much that they are willing to spend vast sums of money to destroy it, then that thing is worthy of thought.

A horse thief does not love the man that exposes him. A murderer is never grateful to the detective that captures him. The liar will never forgive the man who exposes his lies.

When certain rich men, therefore, denounce a doctrine and spend money among working people to fight that doctrine, the workers may well ask: "Who are these men? What have they ever done for labor and what interest have they now in spending a lot of money to teach US their views?" Well, here is the labor history of at least a few of the leaders of the Civic Federation.

Seth Low is the President. He is a man of great wealth,
has been President of a University and Mayor of New York City. He claims now that he is a friend of Trade Unionism. He pretends to be friendly to labor. He even advocates Trade Unionism and when he speaks he never fails to convey the impression that he is fighting Socialism because Trade Union Leaders have asked him to do so.

But when organized Labor of Greater New York begged and pleaded with him as Mayor to do them a little service, he refused and turned them, the representatives of a quarter of a million men, out of his office.

All the Labor Unions asked was that when Mayor Low granted a franchise to the Pennsylvania Railroad to build a tunnel into New York, he should force the Railroad to put in the contract a provision for an eight hour day, an arbitration clause and a minimum wage scale.

Mr. Low could have done this service to Labor by a turn of the hand. It would have cost him nothing and it would have benefited a multitude of hard working men engaged in a very dangerous trade.

The Central Federated Union of New York was then forced on March 8th, 1903, to publish a circular to the Trade Unionists of Greater New York declaring that SETH LOW AND HIS CROWD "HAD REJECTED THE DEMANDS OF UNION LABOR" AND "HAD KILLED THE LABOR CLAUSES IN THE PENNSYLVANIA TUNNEL FRANCHISE.'"

MR. LOW LOVES ORGANIZED LABOR ONLY WHEN IT HELPS HIM TO FIGHT HIS POLITICAL BATTLES AND SOCIALISM AND NOT WHEN IT ASKS HIM TO AID THEM IN THEIR FIGHT FOR BETTERING THE CONDITION OF LIFE FOR THEIR WIVES AND CHILDREN.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie is now one of the wealthiest men in the world. But it can never be forgotten by the working men of this country that the name of Andrew Carnegie is infamous, tied forever to the brutal Massacre of the iron and steel workers at Homestead. Then it was that Pinkertons were first employed to shoot working men. You remember that tragic struggle and the Pinkertons and troops
that stood guard about the stockades of Carnegie & Co. during the terrible lockout of 1892.

It was a strike crushed in blood, a Union annihilated by the overwhelming brute force of the corrupt political machine of Pennsylvania, and the hired thugs and Pinkerton's which Mr. Carnegie's money enabled him to employ. **MR. CARNEGIE HAS NEVER LOVED ORGANIZED LABOR WHEN IT ASKED A FAVOR OF HIM. HE LOVES ORGANIZED LABOR ONLY WHEN IT HELPS HIM TO FIGHT SOCIALISM.**

August Belmont is the financial representative of the Rothschilds, the richest banking house in the world. He is immensely wealthy, owns race horses, street railways and Tammany Hall. He would like to own the American Labor movement. He is a fine gentleman to whom his employees must always touch their caps. No employee is ever allowed to sit down in his presence. He is prouder of his rank as a Jewish banker than a lord of his title and blood. Once he employed a new stenographer. When she came into his office and sat down at his desk he roared: "What do you mean by sitting down in my presence?" Whereupon the poor frightened girl begged her lord's pardon and thereafter took notes standing up.

Mr. Belmont also has a Trade Union record. A few years ago the men employed on his Street Railway, struck. Their demands were trifling. But he knew that the strike was to occur and Farley with thousands of strike breakers, thugs, pickpockets and crooks were waiting on the boats in the harbor ready to rush in and crush the Union. The strike occurred, Farley did his work and in a few days Union men started on the long tramp.

**MR. BELMONT, THE TREASURER OF THE CIVIC FEDERATION DOES NOT LOVE LABOR WHEN IT ASKS A FAVOR OF HIM. HE LOVES LABOR ONLY WHEN IT HELPS HIM TO DESTROY SOCIALISM.**

William H. Taft is also prominent in the Civic Federation. He is now familiarly known as "The Father of the Injunction." As judge he used his power to crush the railway strike of 1894 and his decisions against the boycott are
now the authority upon that subject. The officials of the Federation of Labor tried to persuade the Republican Party at its last National Convention to pledge legislation giving working men trial by jury in contempt cases. Mr. Taft instructed that Convention to ignore this demand of organized Labor. MR. TAFT DOES NOT LOVE LABOR WHEN IT ASKS A FAVOR OF HIM. HE LOVES LABOR ONLY WHEN IT HELPS HIM TO DESTROY SOCIALISM.

Now these and "other friends" of Labor are the leaders of the Civic Federation. And each one of them curiously enough has played a role in the fight AGAINST organized Labor. Each one has made his mark in the effort to annihilate the trade unions of America. They are now seeking to make themselves equally distinguished in fighting the political organization of the workers. They have cut the fangs and removed the claws from the Trade Unions and they want to perform the same operation on the Socialist party.

These men now profess their friendship for the Trade Union movement. They are moving heaven and earth in their efforts to obtain the friendship of leaders of labor in order to use them as agents in their fight on Socialism.

No doubt some of the leaders may be deceived by this apparent friendship, but in the end they will see how false it is, and, we believe, will renounce all friendship and association with Mr. Belmont, Mr. Low and Mr. Carnegie.

And we ask you, the Trade Unionists of America if you cannot already see why these friends of Labor are now seeking the support of Trade Unionism.

The answer is simple and clear. No one could long be deceived. Mr. Belmont states the matter clearly in his letter to the bankers of Wall Street when he says that Socialism is becoming a GREAT POWER, not only among the workers of England, France and Germany, but HERE also. It is this fear and this fear alone that makes the enemies of organized labor seek the aid of Trade Unionists in the approaching fight that must be made on the political organization of the workers in the Socialist movement.
If little "Augy" with his natty clothes, his tiny patent leather shoes, his fancy necktie, his cane and silk hat, were to come to one of your labor meetings you would think you were at the circus. He would be met with a laugh and would leave with your assistance. But Augy is not coming and none of the other Wall Street gentlemen will come. They know you wouldn't believe them. Consequently they are going to raise money and, if possible, employ labor leaders to tell you that Socialism would mean your ruin.

In the next few years, then, Socialism is to be on trial. We ask you to hear both sides. We ask you to hear those who preach against Socialism, whether they are honest or merely the paid agents of little August Belmont. We ask you to hear them. But when the opponents of Socialism speak, see also that the friends of Socialism speak.

We know the Union men of this country are too intelligent and fair-minded to hear only one side of this great question. There are too many Socialists in the Unions for us to believe that the Trade Unionists would refuse to hear their co-workers and fellow Unionists with the same open-mindedness as that with which they hear the friends of Wall Street and the Civic Federation.

THE REAL ENEMIES OF UNIONISM.

There are to-day two big movements organized by men of wealth "to educate" the workers. One is the Manufacturer's Association. You all know of Post, Parry, Van Cleeve and Kirby. They are to-day raising hundreds of thousands of dollars to crush Trade Unionism. They are organizing the bosses into one big Manufacturer's Union. Wherever a strike occurs that Bosses Union aids the employer to break the strike. The Manufacturers' Union is not fighting Socialism. It is fighting Trade Unionism.

These men are active employers of labor. Directly under them are millions of wage earners. Their immediate battle is to crush an organized movement which is forcing them to pay higher wages, to grant shorter hours and to better conditions of work. Politics is a secondary matter with them. Their chief concern is their immediate profits.
They are in business, and for the moment they care more to fight the Trade Unions which hurt them NOW, than Socialism which may hurt them in the future.

The other organization is the Civic Federation. It is controlled and financed by a few of the richest men in America. They are big bankers, big financiers. They own railways, trusts, monopolies. They control nearly all the public franchises of America. They are IN POLITICS. Their profits come to them largely through their ownership of the old parties, their control of the legislatures and the courts. Nearly all the big trusts have crushed TRADE UNIONISM. When a strike occurred Belmont, Carnegie and others broke its back instantly. They are not seriously menaced by Trade Unionism. When they are they will fight Trade Unionism again as they have in the past, but they believe, rightly or wrongly, that it is better now to destroy the rising faith in Socialism.

These Wall Street magnates hold their power, extort their wealth by dominating the politics of America. They fear the growth of a Political party which they can neither buy or corrupt. They know that if the Socialist party makes headway, trusts, monopolies and all the other financial undertakings, which now dominate our government must surely render an account to the people. Hanna, the old boss of the Republican Party saw that. Belmont, a boss of the Democratic Party sees that. And for this reason the Civic Federation is determined to crush political unionism and to fight every attempt of the wage earners of America to form a powerful Socialist party.

Now think a moment, fellow unionists. Here are two organizations both controlled by men of great wealth. One fights Trade Unionism openly without bothering apparently about Socialism. The other fights Socialism openly without bothering apparently about Unionism. THEY HAVE DIVIDED THEIR LABORS. One set of men is trying to crush united Trade action. The other set of men is trying to crush united Political action.

Suppose both these organizations of millionaires should succeed?
Suppose Kirby and his crowd should break the back of the Trade Union movement?

Suppose Belmont and his crowd should break the back of the political movement? Have you ever thought of this? Has it ever occurred to you what it would mean to the wage earners of America to have both these great movements utterly destroyed?

You must think of this because, as much as we regret it, there may be prominent labor leaders who would help the Civic Federation destroy Socialism. We cannot believe that these leaders understand Socialism, otherwise no money could buy their opposition, and for the sake of them and yourselves we are going to tell you what Socialism is and what it is accomplishing in the world to-day and why we believe every working man should be a Socialist. We want you to think and to be honest and fair with us. We haven’t any Wall Street money. We haven’t any set of rich men behind us who will be helped by what we say and if our words and arguments don’t appeal to you we have no power to force you to change your views. Socialism is on trial and you, friends, are the jury.

If you’re interested in the welfare of your wife and children listen to our argument and think.

What is Socialism? What are the aims of the Socialists? Are they for or are they against the men of toil? Ought Socialism to be crushed? Ought Socialists to be denied a hearing? These are questions you ought to consider.

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

We are not surprised when Belmont, Low and other Wall Street financiers fight Socialism. We expect that. But not long ago a Trade Union leader said that he could not accept the doctrine of Socialism.

He said that he had read Marx and other great Socialist writers, but he differed with them. Now we mention this because we are speaking to trade unionists. Every Socialist, of course, differs with some of the views of Marx.

Karl Marx might have believed in witches, but you
need not believe in witches. Karl Marx might have been an atheist; but you need not be an atheist.

When, therefore, any Trade Unionist says he disagrees with the doctrines of the Socialists, let us ask what doctrines?

Socialist principles are very simple. A child can understand them, and if any Trade Unionist in America disagrees with those principles, or would lift a hand against them, he does not understand those principles.

That's a strong statement. Now let's see if it is true. We will leave it to you.

The Socialist believes that the workers should have the full product of their toil.

Abe Lincoln believed that. Does any working man deny it?

And this is what Lincoln said. "INASMUCH AS MOST GOOD THINGS ARE PRODUCED BY LABOR, IT FOLLOWS THAT ALL SUCH THINGS OF RIGHT BELONGS TO THOSE WHOSE LABOR HAS PRODUCED THEM. BUT IT HAS SO HAPPENED, IN ALL AGES OF THE WORLD, THAT SOME HAVE LABORED AND OTHERS HAVE WITHOUT LABOR ENJOYED A LARGE PROPORTION OF THE FRUITS. THIS IS WRONG AND SHOULD NOT CONTINUE. TO SECURE TO EACH LABORER THE WHOLE PRODUCT OF HIS LABOR, OR AS NEARLY AS POSSIBLE, IS A WORTHY OBJECT OF ANY GOOD GOVERNMENT."

Will you or any labor leader anywhere deny that to labor belongs the entire fruit of its labor? Mr. Belmont will deny it. But will you?

That doctrine is fundamental. It is the declaration of every Socialist movement in the world, and at the present moment in Europe and here not less than 50,000,000 working men, women and children make that demand.

Another doctrine of Socialism is the CLASS STRUGGLE.

Do you deny the class struggle? Is it or is it not a fact?

It's a fundamental matter. If the interests of the
working class and the capitalist class are not opposed, then Socialists and Trade Unionists are wasting their lives.

Do you or any trade unionist or working man anywhere deny the class struggle?

If there is no clash of interest, why are their trade unions?

Why do working men organize, pay dues, strike, starve?

If the workers can depend upon capitalists to raise their wages, protect them from poverty, abolish their unemployed and provide for their old age, why under heaven do 2,000,000 trade unionists pay the salaries of their officials and spend millions of dollars to maintain an organized fight?

Why not leave it all to Morgan and Rockefeller and Belmont?

If the miners can depend upon the good and holy mine owner, George Baer, to fight their battles, what is the need for Tom Lewis, Frank Hayes or John Walker?

No, friends, you will find no trade unionist who can deny this doctrine of the Socialists.

Well, there's a third doctrine, namely: that THE TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS OF PRODUCTION SHOULD BE OWNED BY THE WORKERS.

Will any trade unionist deny this proposition?

They cannot deny it if they profess to believe in the first proposition.

If the Astors and Vanderbilts, the Rockefellers and Morgans, the Belmonts and Guggenheims, the Hills and the Harrimans, the Fricks and Carnegies are to take millions of profit out of the mere ownership of the tools of production, the actual users of those tools cannot by any conceivable method receive the whole product of their labor.

The hundreds of thousands of miners can't receive all the wealth they produce if the mine owners are allowed by the mere title of ownership to subtract from the wealth produced, millions upon millions every year. It can't be done.

No man is stupid enough to be deceived into believing it can be done.
Unless the men who mine coal own the natural resources and the tools they use while at work, there is no possibility under heaven of those men receiving the full product of their toil.

Will you or any other trade unionist anywhere deny that proposition?

If you deny that the workers should own their tools and receive the fruits of their labor, then you must believe that idlers, thieves and pirates should own those tools and force labor to divide up with them the wealth produced.

If labor is to have only a portion of its product then someone else must get the other portion.

And that is exactly what NOW happens! According to figures gathered by the United States government the workers in this country produce on an average $3,500 a year for each worker.

Do you get $3,500 a year?

A man could live comfortably on that sum, but the workers do not receive that sum, because out of the product of their labor, trusts and monopolies, landlords and financiers, must take their millions of profit.

The average wages in this country, according to the figures of the United States government, amount to $437—a year. For that average amount in wages the workers produce on an average of $3,500—of wealth.

Do the workers get that product? Not at all. It goes to others. As Lincoln says: "There are others who without labor enjoy a large part of the fruits of labor."

And that large part now goes to Belmont, Carnegie, Low, Rockefeller, Morgan, who have organized the Civic Federation to tell YOU that Socialism is wrong. Can you blame them?

Isn't it reasonable that they should try to keep you ignorant of your rights and collect money in Wall Street to destroy Socialism?

But all we ask you to consider now is this: IF YOU BELIEVE THAT LABOR SHOULD HAVE THE FULL PRODUCT OF ITS LABOR AND THAT LABOR SHOULD ORGANIZE INDUSTRIALLY AND POLITICALLY TO
OSTAIN THE FULL PRODUCT OF ITS LABOR YOU 
AGREE WITH THE DOCTRINES OF KARL MARX; YOU 
ARE A SOCIALIST AND YOU CAN'T BE ANYTHING 
ELSE.

Either you believe these doctrines or you do not believe 
them. If you do not believe these doctrines you are not 
only opposed to Socialism, but also to the interests of Labor 
itself and favor the robbery and exploitation of every man 
of toil.

If you believe that Labor should turn over to Capital a 
great proportion of the wealth it creates, then you would 
be right in joining with Belmont, Wall Street, and the 
Civic Federation. It is your duty to fight Socialism.

WHAT SOCIALISTS WANT NOW.

Some men say they believe in the doctrines of Social- 
ism, but that Socialism is a thing for the future, not for 
the present.

They say we must organize and fight now to prevent 
abject slavery. They organize therefore to increase wages, 
shorten hours, improve conditions.

Well, no Socialist is opposed to that. Every Socialist 
knows that if Labor is not strongly enough organized to 
increase wages, shorten hours and better present day con- 
ditions, it will not be strongly enough organized to establish 
Socialism.

A Labor movement which is so weak and infantile as 
not to be able to get filth cleaned away from its doorstep 
will not be able to establish the co-operative commonwealth.

Every Socialist believes that labor should organize, that 
every toiler in all this broad earth should join with all 
other toilers to fight.

To fight, here and now, for better conditions. To shorten 
hours, to increase wages, to improve conditions—NOW.

To fight the little employer and the big employer for 
better working conditions in this present day.

They believe that labor should organize in Unions until 
every man of toil is included in the ranks of the fellowship.

And they also believe that the workers should organize 
politically to send representatives into every legislative
chamber, to elect their own public officials and to fight for laws and the enforcement of laws which shall better the conditions of labor IN THIS WORLD HERE AND NOW.

Men who will not fight for increased wages now, will not fight for the whole product of their labor to-morrow.

Men who will not fight against oppression now will not fight to free the children of the future.

All we ask is, do you or do you not believe in what has been said above? Do you consider those doctrines wicked and wrong and that YOU should fight against them? Or do you consider them just and good?

If you believe them just and good, then stand up and fight for what you believe just and right and good.

HOW TO GET WHAT YOU WANT.

Now that is what Socialists want. You see it is not very hard to understand. Of course when the agents of Belmont come around to talk to you they will tell you that Socialism is something else, something terribly immoral. They will say it is free love, atheism, anarchism, spoilation, bombs and dynamite. But never mind.

Read again the above statement of Socialism. Read it carefully and thoroughly and see if you can’t discover why every financial pirate of Wall Street, why every grabber of public franchises, why every monopolist owning vast natural resources, coal mines and gold mines; in a word, why Belmont and the multi-millionaires of the Civic Federation fear the spread of Socialism.

 Isn’t it reasonable to believe that men who are to-day taking billions of profit out of the ownership of industry should be willing to spend a few hundred thousand dollars to make YOU believe that Socialism is wrong? They know that if they came in person to you to denounce Socialism you wouldn’t believe them. You would greet them with suspicion. And therefore don’t you think it a pretty good plan of theirs to induce every labor leader they can get to become a member of the Civic Federation and to preach against Socialism?

Suppose the people of this country should once come to
believe that it is their labor that produces all wealth? Suppose that they were to decide that hereafter they intend to get the wealth they produce, where would Wall Street come in? Well, it is our purpose to preach that the workers—brain workers and hand workers—produce the wealth of the world. And in addition to preaching this doctrine, we are going to teach the people **HOW THEY CAN GET THE WEALTH** they produce.

We know that's the question in your mind now. We know that you are saying to yourself: "Yes, that's right, labor produces all wealth, but how is labor going to obtain that wealth? Labor to-day does not get that wealth; never in the past has it got that wealth. When will it ever get that wealth?" Well, our answer again is very simple. You can get that wealth by **ORGANIZATION**. That is the only way working men have ever yet been able to get anything.

Now let us explain what we mean. You may not realize that trade unionism is only a few years old and that the leaders who suffered, toiled and sacrificed to form the first Unions were as much misunderstood by working men as the Socialists are to-day.

Let us recall to your mind a picture of the days before trade unionism existed.

The workers were very miserable. When their condition became intolerable they selected a comrade to go to the employer to beg for better conditions.

He told the employer about the misery of the men and that unless their conditions were bettered poverty would drive them to revolt. He threatened the employer that the men might unite, might even strike, but they **DID NOT** unite and they **DID NOT** strike and the employers grew more arrogant and oppressive.

At last in desperation the working men **DID** unite and **DID** strike and it was not until then that employers began to make terms with their workmen.

After a few strikes were won working men began to appreciate the value of Trade Unions and one after another
were formed until millions of men are to-day members of labor organizations.

That’s what organization means and it is because the men are united and willing to strike that their conditions have been improved. It was ONLY through organization and strikes that men obtained their demands from their employers.

Now when we Socialists preach organization, we mean political organization. The demands which the Socialists make can only be obtained when the workers are organized politically. And so we say ALL WORKINGMEN MUST ORGANIZE POLITICAL UNIONS TO FIGHT AND TO STRIKE AT THE BALLOT BOX.

But when we preach this political unity we find not only Belmont, Low and other Wall Street friends opposed to us, but even some labor leaders.

Not long ago in the Chicago “Daily Socialist,” a prominent labor leader said that Socialists were unjust in their attacks upon Labor men who exercised the political rights of an independent voter.

His idea was that a Labor Leader, or a trade unionist should vote for any party or candidate whose politics he approved of.

This difference of opinion between Socialists and some trade unionists as to the vote involves a great question which should be discussed calmly and earnestly.

It is desirable to make our position clear, to show justification for such bitterness as unquestionably exists when a Labor Leader becomes a candidate on a Democratic or Republican ticket.

Many Labor Leaders are honest in giving such support, and when we speak of them as traitors to their class they bitterly resent our words.

Perhaps our position can be most easily made clear by asking you this question: Do you believe a Trade Unionist should exercise his RIGHT TO WORK OR NOT TO WORK regardless of the interest of his fellows?

Do you believe that when a large body of Trade Unionists have united to fight the battle of labor, individual work-
men should **AID THE EMPLOYERS** to defeat the Union?

Of course you do not. You see perfectly that without unity of the working class on the industrial field your cause is hopeless. You grant that trade unionists are justified in their bitterness against "scabs". You admit that a workman who assists an employer at the time of a strike is a traitor to his class.

But curiously enough, when the fight is carried on to the political field, you will not see that exactly the same principle is involved.

As a trade unionist you disagree with President Eliot. As a voter you agree with President Eliot that that man is a hero who fights his comrades.

You know the individual workman can't deal with the employer.

You know the individual is helpless to make a protest against injustice. You see there is strength in union, that where one man is powerless, the whole is powerful.

But what about the isolated individual voter? Does he not want to protect himself against political oppression and injustice?

The voter has political demands to be made upon organized parties now existing. And the INDIVIDUAL voter is helpless. The politician will not listen to his demand, and if the voter doesn't like things as they are he can **TAKE HIS VOTE AND QUIT**, just as an individual workman can take his labor and quit.

They are identical cases. The only difference between you and the Socialists is that you believe in unity on the industrial only, while they believe in unity on **BOTH** the industrial and the political fields.

But you may say that would be all right if Socialists really represented the working class, but they have only a few hundred thousand workers in their political union.

But doesn't the same criticism apply to the trade unions? In the early days they had only a handful, and to-day out of many millions they have only two million organized workmen.

It is not, therefore, the number in the union, but the
PRINCIPLE of unionism that should be considered.

No man can deny that wherever Labor is united politically it exercises tremendous power. It forces concessions that are simply incredible to American workmen. Political unions of the workers are altering the political policy of every European government. They don't beg nor plead. They present their demands, and by their POWER obtain their demands.

We want to ask any trade unionist anywhere if in the face of such positive, definite evidence of the power of political unity he will come out and call that man a hero who votes against his POLITICAL union, just as President Eliot calls that man a hero who works against his TRADE Union?

Why is it that some trade unionists see a proposition with absolute clearness in one field of life and fail utterly to see the same proposition in another field of life?

There is bitterness among Socialists when labor leaders become candidates on the employers' ticket. There IS bitterness on the part of Socialists when Labor leaders go out and fight the POLITICAL UNITY of the workers and aid capitalist candidates.

There is no use denying it. It is there. It expresses itself often in unlovely terms. But it is precisely the SAME BITTERNESS the trade unionists feel when they see their fellow working men fight against trade unity, and give aid to capitalists at the time of the strife.

To demand the right to be an unfettered and independent voter in this day of the class struggle is precisely the same thing as to demand the right to be an unfettered and independent workingman, emancipated from any obligation to or association with the united brothers of his trade.

Suppose all Socialists should say to-morrow: "We'll all scab; we'll fight unity on the industrial field." Would not every trade unionist call us traitors and Judases?

You know they would. And we ask you in all honesty and fairness: Wherein lies the difference?

POLITICAL POWER OF LABOR IN EUROPE.

But our readers will say: "This means starting a third
party and a third party can never accomplish anything."

Well, let's see if that is true. Lots of people are saying that just now; lots of politicians; lots of capitalist papers. We won't argue the matter as a theory. We will just tell you a little about what such third parties HAVE accomplished. We want you to read this carefully because what working men have done elsewhere in the world, we also can do here in America.

Now it may be news to you that the workers of every country of Europe have their own political party.

These parties are formed just as Trade Unions are formed. Every member pays dues. The representatives are selected by the Union itself. Every action of the political union is decided by a vote of the membership. In other words IN EVERY COUNTRY OF EUROPE THE WORKERS HAVE A POLITICAL PARTY OWNED, FINANCED AND CONTROLLED ENTIRELY BY THE WORKERS.

Now study the following table. It's worth some thought and consideration. Compare the number of men organized in Unions and the number of men voting the ticket of the working class. In the last column you will find the number of representatives the workingmen of Europe have sent to represent them in the National legislative bodies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of Votes</th>
<th>No. of Union men</th>
<th>Rep. in Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3,258,968</td>
<td>2,382,401</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1,041,948</td>
<td>482,274</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,120,000</td>
<td>957,102</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>492,094</td>
<td>181,115</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>423,969</td>
<td>1,970,700</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>524,181</td>
<td>2,406,283</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>25,197</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>273,754</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>90,432</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>128,300</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>82,494</td>
<td>57,845</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>39,339</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>186,924</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>32,405</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentine</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servia</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study those figures. You see that in almost every country in Europe the workers are MORE strongly organized politically than they are industrially. Great Britain seems an exception. But in this case the table does not convey the real facts. There are actually 1,200,000 men who pay dues as members of the Labor Party. They would all vote for Labor Party candidates if they could.

But in England there is no such thing as a national campaign. Men are put up for Parliament only in those districts where there is a fighting chance to win and as the party is still young it has not yet attempted to run candidates in many districts. However, in these places where it has run candidates it has polled about 35% of the total vote, in other words enough votes, with three candidates in the field, to elect most of its men. The same thing is true of some of the other countries so that the total number of votes here does not by any means show the full extent of the political organization of the working class.

Now let's see the situation in America. Here we have about 2,000,000 Union men and less than 425,000 votes. America then is almost the only country where the political organization of the workers is measurably weaker than the industrial organization.

Now all these European parties are what may be called third parties. In most countries of Europe there exists as here two or more big parties. They used to control the vote of the working class. But during the last 30 years the workers have organized their own party distinct from the hostile and all other parties. In Finland and Austria the workers have more representatives than any other one party and in Germany they poll more votes than any other party. But in every country they are still in the minority and are able to obtain their demands only by driving the other parties to pass labor and reform measures.

Now if we were to tell you that these political Unions of the working class although ONLY A FEW YEARS OLD are already changing the face of Europe, would you believe it? That is why Belmont in his letters to the Wall Street millionaires warned them of the growth of Socialism in
Europe. As a matter of fact they have obtained astonishing reforms and have done away with many of the evils from which the workers of America still suffer.

**WHAT THE WORKERS HAVE DONE IN GERMANY.**

Twenty years ago the slums of Germany were notorious. Cologne, Frankfort, Munich, Breslau and Berlin had acres of vile and overcrowded tenements.

Two years ago an English workman, visiting Stuttgart at the international Socialist congress, asked a German workman to show him where the poor lived.

He took him to a clean well-built quarter, inhabited by the poorest workmen.

"But I want to see your slums," the Englishman said.

"These are the worst we've got," his German friend answered.

The amazed Englishman exclaimed: "Great heavens! If you'll get me a job here I'll stay forever."

If you will visit German cities and ask the same question you will receive the same answer.

For over twenty years every German city has had Socialist aldermen.

They have fought those responsible for slums, vile habitations, insanitary workshops, neglected children.

They have fought all opposing parties and have forced the municipal ownership of public utilities, land reform, taxation reform, the demolition of insanitary districts and the building of sanitary tenements.

The Socialists have forced the municipal councils to tax unearned increment, and the increase in land values is gradually being taken over by the community.

The cities own extensive tracts of land. Strassburg has over 350 square yards of land for each inhabitant. Ulm owns 80 per cent of the land within its boundaries. It buys and leases land daily and prevents all land speculation.

For over thirty years the national government has been hard pressed by an intelligent and powerful Socialist party. And the German rulers were forced to take action to relieve the distress of the people.

Times were critical. The revolt was growing. And the
German Kaiser was forced to introduce a scheme for insuring practically the entire mass of German workers against accident, sickness, invalidity and death.

To-day over 11,000,000 persons are insured against sickness. Over 18,000,000 persons are insured against accident, and about 14,000,000 persons are insured against old age and invalidity. Over $100,000,000 a year is paid in benefits from the Insurance funds of Germany as pensions to wage earners.

In the National Legislative body the Socialists have fought for the rights of the Unions. They have forced the passage of all kinds of Labor Legislation. They have demanded the right of Union men to strike and to picket. The employers are forced to recognize Trade Union representatives and in all Germany, in fact, IN ALL EUROPE, GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION IS UNKNOWN.

The Socialists of Germany are not satisfied. They have fought. They are still fighting. They mean to gain even greater changes than these, which they consider as only trifling by-products of their immense and powerful political organization.

WHAT LABOR HAS DONE IN BELGIUM.

If Packingtown, the great steel mills of Pittsburg, the mining districts of Pennsylvania and the docks of the great lakes were all crowded together into the State of Delaware you would have Belgium.

Karl Marx once called it the "Paradise of the Capitalists" because nowhere in Europe was the misery of the workers greater or the wealth of the few more plentiful.

It was one of the earliest countries of Europe to develop the modern factory system. As early as 1830 the factory owners controlled Belgium. As in most countries, they divided themselves into two parties for the purpose of giving the workers an opportunity occasionally to put one of the parties out and the other in.

When the workers got sick at heart and wearied and fretted by countless oppressions, they put the party in power out and the other party in.
The workers on such occasions, were often very proud, for they thought they had "rewarded their friends and punished their enemies." But their joy was only momentary, for they found that for some strange reason there always seemed to be more of their enemies in the party that controlled than in the party that was out of control.

But however that may be, for the long period of this two party system not a single law was passed for the benefit of the workers.

In 1872 a member of one of the old parties introduced a bill to prohibit girls under 13 years of age working underground in the mines.

Such legislation was not to be thought of, and the bill was given no consideration until 1878. Finding the members determined the bill was then discussed, and all the frightful evils of little girls at work in the mines were brought to the attention of the public; but when the bill was put to vote only five members of Parliament voted for it while 150 voted against it.

This is only a sample of how arrogant and brutal was the rule of capitalism in Belgium.

At last the people could stand their poverty no longer, and in 1885 a cry, or sob, of revolt broke forth from the working class. A Labor Party was formed, and soon every candidate of the two old parties was confronted by the candidate of Labor.

The old parties realized the danger and they tried to deceive the people once more by hastily passing some labor legislation. Law after law was passed, the educational system was developed, child labor laws were passed, the hours of labor were limited, dangerous trades were regulated and pension schemes were developed to take care of the sick, the aged and the crippled.

Certain industries were nationalized and others municipalized AND FROM THAT DAY TO THIS THE BELGIUM PARLIAMENT HAS GIVEN ALMOST ITS ENTIRE ATTENTION TO LABOR QUESTIONS.

The workers found that a few of their own men in Parliament accomplished something. Instead, therefore, of
giving up the new party they went on fighting. And to-day if they had universal and equal manhood suffrage, as we have here in America, the workers would control Belgium.

So long as they put one capitalist party out only to put another in they were humiliated, oppressed and robbed. Anything for the benefit of the working class was too costly. So that everything done was to benefit the rich.

To-day some of the cities of Belgium are controlled by the workers. They are remodeling them on new lines. They are cleaning streets, building clean and wholesome tenements, municipalizing public services, establishing parks and playgrounds in the poorer districts, feeding school children and reducing the death rate.

Nearly every unemployed union man in Belgium is pensioned by the joint action of the municipality and his trade union. In the old days the people were looked upon as something to make profit out of; but to-day the people are coming into their own.

WHAT LABOR HAS DONE IN ENGLAND.

We have shown that Socialism is changing the face of Europe. It is abolishing slums, protecting the interests of the workers, doing away with political corruption, breaking down political machines.

It is accomplishing stupendous changes.

It is demonstrating that a third party can become a power and teaching a lesson in practical politics to the workers of America.


Millions of exhausted, broken-down working men and women are thrown on the scrap heap when their labor power is exhausted.

There, as in America, two parties have ruled.

When the misery became intolerable the working class arose to throw out the Tories and to put in the Liberals.

Their misery became more unbearable, and in a few years they threw out the Liberals and put back the Tories.

Before elections old age pensions were promised. Plans for housing reform were proposed, royal commissions were appointed to inquire into the condition of labor, the housing conditions, the factory conditions, the physical deterioration of children.

But for twenty years, from 1880 to 1900, nothing was done.

Late in the nineties the two old parties made a grave
error. So long as they ignored the misery of the people there was no revolt. But at last they made an effort to destroy the unions.

Unions were the one thing the workers had left. They were their only protective agency and a court decision threatened their existence.

Directly the working class of Great Britain saw they had been turning the Liberal enemies out only to put Tory enemies in and it occurred to them to fight both Liberals and Tories.

A combination between Socialists and Trade Unionists brought into existence a great Labor Party. At the first election about thirty Socialists and trade unionists were sent to Parliament.

Since then labor has taken part in two sessions of Parliament. A law was passed reversing the court decision against the Unions. **THE RIGHT OF UNIONS TO PICKET, STRIKE AND BOYCOTT WAS GUARANTEED.**

**AN ACT WAS PASSED FOR COMPENSATING EVERY WORKMAN INJURED WHILE AT WORK. AN ACT FOR FEEDING HUNGRY SCHOOL CHILDREN FOLLOWED.**

**OLD AGE PENSIONS WERE GRANTED TO EVERY WORKER. A MINIMUM WAGE WAS ESTABLISHED BY LAW IN CERTAIN INDUSTRIES.** A new budget provided for taxing the unearned increment going to land-lords and bills are promised at next session to insure the unemployed and to allow cities to buy land and as municipal landlords to plan gardens and tenements for the workers.

Look through the legislative records of the twenty years previous and see the blank pages. Compare them with the last few years, and you will realize that England is at the beginning of vast improvement in the condition of the workers.

That has been accomplished by a third party of **THIRTY-TWO REPRESENTATIVES OF LABOR** in face of 640 Liberals and Tories and the House of Lords.

**SOCIALISTS FEED HUNGRY SCHOOL CHILDREN IN EUROPE.**

We have in America considerably over three million underfed children. At a period when bone, sinew and brain power should be built up and nourished these little ones are starving.

These children constitute our most stupendous problem.
Morally we are committing a gigantic crime in depriving them of adequate food.
Economically we are committing a gigantic crime in forcing these millions to become wastrels, incompetents and weaklings, without physical force or brain power.
They are the children of the unemployed, of the poverty-stricken, and of the weak and incompetent produced by the crimes of previous generations.
These wretched little beings will be sent into the mines, mills and factories as early as the law will permit, to be the victims of our fiendish social system.
After a few years' toll they will be physically broken, mentally stupefied, and morally perverted.
Hundreds of thousands will die of tuberculosis, and all of THIS LIFE, WHICH MIGHT HAVE BEEN SO PRECIOUS, will be scattered throughout our slums to rot and ruin and die.
3,000,000 hungry children!
Labor alone is moved by these tragic figures, each unit of which is the little child of some poor toiler.
Workingmen and Socialists alone wish to solve this problem, and have the power to solve this problem.
OUR BROTHERS IN EUROPE HAVE DONE IT. If you will but look into the schools of France, or Italy, or Belgium, or Norway you will find in connection with the schools, restaurants with thousands, aye, hundreds of thousands of little children sitting down to clean tables before steaming and nutritious soups, plentiful plates of meat and vegetables. You will find doctors taking out the weak ones to give them a spoonful of iron or of cod liver oil.
The workingmen of Europe have not created a new world, but by unity and solidarity, by pounding at the walls of class selfishness, by threatening the foundations of capitalism itself, they have forced the powers that rule to feed hungry children.
SOCIALISTS SEE LAWS ENFORCED AND FIGHT CORRUPTION.
Now, friends, you know that the workers sometimes force through good legislation. It is then forgotten.
Nowhere in this country are the laws protecting labor, the laws ensuring public health and safety, the laws prohibiting child labor, and the laws against criminal wealth enforced.
In Europe they are enforced; enforced because the Socialists see that they are enforced.
In every municipal council, in every legislature, the workers have their representatives. They taunt the parties in power with the squalor, the vile tenements, the high death rates. When workmen are murdered in the mines and on the railroads, the party in power is held responsible.

We pass laws and they are forgotten. Railroad and mining disasters are the stories of a day and then forgotten. Children still labor, women are still oppressed; and people live and work in foul dens and factories with no one to represent their interests in public bodies.

You know how hard it is to get laws enforced by corrupt politicians who would sell you and their country for a few dollars.

But this is no longer possible in Europe. Socialists and Unionists are fighting hand in hand for the rights of ALL workers.

A few years ago conditions in Europe were almost equally bad with ours. Corruption in France was notorious. Italy was eaten through with it. Even in Germany all the rich plums were divided among the few.

To-day the Socialist party stands as a menace to corruption. It is sincerely devoted to the public weal.

Stealing, political corruption, the fattening of special interests, would mean the political ruin of any individual or party involved.

Why? Because the vigilance and power of third parties controlled, owned and financed by the workers of Europe.

Now we mention these various reforms accomplished by the workers of Europe not because we believe them wonderful in themselves. WE ONLY WANT YOU TO UNDERSTAND THAT SOCIALISTS MEAN TO FIGHT EVERY PRESENT-DAY BATTLE OF THE WORKERS. They will not sit down when elected to office to wait the coming of the millennium. They will fight against poverty, low wages, long hours, unemployment, child labor, vile tenements, injunctions, NOW.

Don't let old party bosses tell you that you are throwing your vote away or wasting your present political power by voting for Socialists and by building up your own "third" party. If you have read the above you will see that POLITICAL ORGANIZATION IS AS NECESSARY TO YOUR WELFARE AS TRADE ORGANIZATION.

The workers of Europe accomplished nothing so long as they voted for their bosses. They accomplished nothing so long as they begged the bosses on their knees for higher
wages. When they organized trade unions and fought they got at least something. And remember this, when the workers of America organize a political union and vote and fight for themselves they will be victorious.

Now, brothers, do you think these accomplishments of the Socialists of Europe should be condemned as anarchy, and free love? Do you think any labor men are working in your interest when they fight with Belmont, Low and Carnegie to stamp out Socialism and to disrupt a political movement of the workers, by the workers and for the workers?

In fact, can you see anything wrong with Socialism? Can you honestly oppose political unity and the political organization of the workers?

Do you wish to fight a workingmen’s party, financed by ourselves, controlled by ourselves, and administered by ourselves?

Republicans will fight these views because they need our votes to keep them in power. Democrats will fight these views for the same reason. Both those parties are owned, controlled and financed by the very men who own, control and finance the Manufacturers’ Association and the Civic Federation. They are the men who come pretty near owning this country and they intend to prevent the growth of organizations hostile to them. They believe this country was made and developed by capitalists to be forever owned and controlled by capitalists.

To preserve their trusts and monopolies organized to rob and exploit the people, they have been forced to buy legislatures and courts. To preserve their political machines they will, if necessary, spend millions to fight a workingmen’s party. To convince the people that Socialism is a monstrous doctrine advocated by vicious, immoral agitators, they will even try to buy labor leaders and labor editors. They used to fight Trade Unionism that way. They will fight every new doctrine for the welfare of the people in the same way. Belmont and his crowd are simply fighting to maintain THEIR POWER, just as the slave owners of the South fought to maintain their power. or the Czar of Russia fights to maintain his power.
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