

"AN INJURY TO ONE IS AN INJURY TO ALL!"

ORGANIZE RIGHT

ORGANIZE YOUR MIGHT



Industrial Worker

VOL. 3 No. 1 One Dollar a Year SPOKANE, WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 1911 Six Months 50c Whole Number 105

AGITATE—EDUCATE—ORGANIZE—FIGHT FOR THE EIGHT HOUR DAY

PRIEST AIDS THE BOSS

TELEPHONE COMPANY FEARS INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM—BE LOYAL TO COMPANY, SAYS BOSS.

CHICAGO TELEPHONE COMPANY
General Offices, 203 Washington Street,
Chicago, March 2nd, 1911.

To the Telephone Operators of Chicago:
A call is being sent to you to attend a meeting tonight to organize a union. It asks you to stand together and says the linemen and others now out-on strike will "stick with you."

Not one of the union organizers' names in this notice has ever visited a telephone exchange or knows about your work. We ask you to stand together as loyal employees and continue in your work of giving telephone service to the city of Chicago.

We know of no grievance now existing, but if you have any cause for complaint we will consider it with you at any time, and assure you of fair and liberal treatment.

We ask you at this time to refrain from meeting with agitators. Do not be misled by false statements. You are rendering a service necessary to the entire public and the company feels certain that you will be faithful to your trust.

H. N. FOSTER,
Supt. of Traffic.
N. ANDERSON,
Traffic Chief.

Approved:
A. S. HIBBARD, General Manager.
S. J. LARNED, General Supt.

Chicago, March 1, 1911.

To Our Plant and Traffic Forces:

In order to properly conduct the operations of the telephone exchange in Chicago, the company must have the sole allegiance of all its employees. It has no quarrel with union labor and has for years employed union labor to a considerable extent on construction work, but it has not and cannot do so with reference to the handling of the telephone traffic in Chicago, which it must always keep within its own control.

When it was found that efforts were being made to unionize all of the men in all of the offices, notice was given to the repair men and to all inside men in the outlying offices, that such organization was against the interests of the company and against their interests, and they were instructed not to join such a combination. About fifteen men, in spite of these instructions, secretly joined the union and they at once engaged actively in the effort to unionize the remainder. These men, in accordance with the previous notification, were discharged and their places filled, and the downtown men who had been active in the effort to unionize the others were also let out.

The demand was made by the union officials that the company immediately restore all of these men and withdraw its objection to unionizing the entire force in the city. The company could not properly carry on its business under these conditions and so expressed itself and as a consequence the officers of the union called a strike. As a result of this a number of repair men, linemen and installers left our employ. It was agreed that there was no issue with the company about wages or conditions of labor, but only the demand that the entire force should be unionized. This arbitrary action itself shows the impossibility of conducting our business under full union control in which a walkout like the present would completely shut down the telephone business in the city.

The strikers or their sympathizers immediately began cutting cables of the company and endeavoring to interfere with its service. They are picketing our offices and endeavoring in many ways to induce operators and other employees to leave their posts. The company does not know of a single grievance existing on the part of any of its employees. It has endeavored to treat all of them considerately and as liberally as its income from telephone service permits.

Our employees do better work for themselves and the public in working together as a unit, loyal to the company and its interests, and they should not be dominated by outside influences. Our employees should not be disturbed by untruthful rumors or threats. The present misunderstanding with a small number of our men does not warrant any disturbance in the relations which now exist between us and our other employees in the city.

Statements have been made that on a settlement with the union, non-union employees will

(Continued on Page Two.)

PARLIAMENTARIANISM [WHICH?]



ON TO WASHINGTON



ON TO WASHINGTON

[WHICH?]



BALLO

POLITICIAN

WAGE WORKER

HERE IS THE PLACE WHERE YOU ARE ROBBED

HERE IS THE PLACE WHERE YOU ARE ROBBED

DIRECT ACTION



HERE IS THE PLACE WHERE YOU ARE ROBBED



HERE IS THE PLACE WHERE YOU ARE ROBBED

HERE IS THE PLACE WHERE YOU ARE ROBBED

HERE IS THE PLACE WHERE YOU ARE ROBBED

HERE IS THE PLACE WHERE YOU ARE ROBBED

HERE IS THE PLACE WHERE YOU ARE ROBBED

ORGANIZE ON THE JOB WHERE YOU ARE ROBBED

MASTER CLASS IS SCARED

REVOLUTION THREATENS FRANCE. THE MASTER CLASS IS FRIGHTENED—FRENCH WORKERS LEAD IN ORGANIZATION.

(Under the heading, "Is a New Revolution Threatened in France?" a syndicated article by Frederick Burlingham was recently published in the Sunday edition of some of the leading newspapers. It appeared in the Denver Republican, an ultra-conservative sheet, having but slight circulation among wageworkers. The copyright laws preclude the possibility of producing the entire article without inviting damage suit, so I am adapting it to my own language, not hesitating, however, to use many parts precisely as they appear in the original.)

Is France really on the verge of a new revolution? This question is agitating France since the great railway strike, when the government ordered out the troops and mobilized the railway employes under army regulations. Naturally among forty million people there are divergent views as to what may happen tomorrow or next day. Royalists, republicans, socialists, anarchists, all are putting forth their ideas with courage and more or less dexterity.

That the government is face to face with a serious revolutionary plot to overthrow the republic is the official view of the situation as expressed by M. Briand in the chamber of deputies.

Gustave Herve, who is now serving a four years' sentence for articles published in La Guerre Social (the Social War) has been placed in solitary confinement; a number of leading syndicalists are still in jail, and Peter Pataud, chief of the union of electricians, has fled to Belgium to escape a warrant. For the moment the revolt is crushed.

Those who think the matter ended are unaware that the very silence is ominous. By employing violence the government has alienated itself from the "progressive" movement, which will be heard from again in a short time. Whether the movement develops along legal and orderly lines or breaks out in revolutionary violence remains to be seen.

Many persons think that the government made a tactical blunder in forcing military service on the strikers and then ordering them as soldiers, under severe penalties for disobedience, to return to work. The government has earned the hatred of the entire working population by taking sides in a dispute between the Northern Railway, owned privately and directed by the Rothschilds, and the employees in revolt, asking \$1 per day from the richest international bankers in the world. The army has been given cause for further discontent and are beginning to realize that they do not exist to repel foreign invasion, as glorious tradition has it, but are used as a band of armed Pinkertons to protect the property of the Rothschild family, the famous bankers, who in France are French, in Germany Germans, and in Great Britain Englishmen. (And in the United States Americans.) One of the soldiers, a labor unionist, was sentenced to six months in jail for refusing to march against his fellow workers, and even the most violent revolutionaries do not ask for better anti-military propaganda than this.

In France there are no longer any pleasant illusions about peace and co-operation between the capitalists and the workers. A class war is being waged and both sides are using every means to gain the ascendancy. Both are organized and acting more or less in secret.

The "money trust" in France controls the newspapers and stifles criticism. Allied with it are the industrial employers, who are prepared to demand the same recognition from M. Briand as was given to the Rothschilds. The big steamship companies are preparing, secretly, to insist that the government furnish scabs to break the next strike of the sailors and dockers. If a marine transportation strike can be interfered with "on the ground of public interest" the same reason will exist to mobilize the bakers in case they strike; the butchers, and, in fact, the whole industrial army down to the grave diggers, for bread makers and cemetery workers are just as important in their way to the social system as the men who run the railroads or steamships.

The labor leaders know these plans and are fully prepared to meet force with force. Many persons believe that the employers are, figuratively speaking, playing with dynamite, and if they do not desist and seek a working basis of agreement the revolution is only a question of time. Serious men believe the time will be short. Pataud, "King of the Electricians," who, it will be remembered, not long ago plunged Paris into darkness, says the dance

(Continued on Page Three.)

FOSTER REPLIES TO ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE

THE SOCIALIST AND SYNDICALIST MOVEMENTS IN FRANCE.

Politicalism or Direct Action—Jobs for the Politicians.

In the January number of the "International Socialist Review," in an article entitled "How to Kick," Mr. Robert Rives La Monte sketches a program of action that the American workers must adopt if they are to achieve their economic emancipation. His theory is the well-known one of combined political and direct action. Whilst organizing and using in our daily struggles "such unions as the W. F. of M." we must also pay our dues into the Socialist Party and vote its ticket.

Mr. La Monte lays much stress on the necessity for the development of what he calls the "New Unionism," but which is known in France, its birth place, as "Syndicalism." He considers the condition of the workers as "indeed hopeless" if they don't develop strong fighting genius of this Syndicalist character; unions "that use all their weapons at once" and which in aim, form and tactics are radically different from the conservative A. F. of L. trades unions. Political action of itself, however revolutionary or extensive it may be, can accomplish but little if not backed by real economic power, he tells us. Our economic might must be organized into this modern and potent form of labor organization. However, he hastens to assure us that these Syndicalist unions by themselves cannot accomplish the "miracle" of overthrowing capitalism, nor do they aim to try it alone. They must assist and be assisted by the Socialist Party. The working class direct action and political action organizations must go shoulder to shoulder together to the assault of capitalism. On this condition alone is success assured.

To lend weight to his theory and to illustrate the beneficial effects of this political-economic co-operation, Mr. La Monte cites French labor history as follows:

"In France, where 'New Unionism' has reached its highest development, the political movement, the Socialist Party, preceded it and prepared the ground for it, and was fortunately strong enough to give it much necessary protection in its early years."

American Socialists, who will form the bulk of the readers of Mr. La Monte's article, are noted chiefly for their gullibility and unsophistication when the subject of Socialism is in question. With them the expression "The Socialist Party" is one to conjure by. It covers a multitude of sins oftimes. The "revolutionary" farmer in Kansas, the "class conscious" layer in Kalamazoo, the "proletarian" millionaire in New York, the disfranchised worker in the West—Socialists all—how their hearts beat in glad union when they learn of some new and beneficent ex-

plot of "The Socialist Party." What matter what country it occurs in or what the nature of the Socialist Party is that performs it, or even if it ever occurred at all. They will never investigate. Suffice it for some one to say that one of the great international family of "The Socialist Parties" has done such or such a noble act. Only a vandal or iconoclastic intellectual would be sacrilegious enough to doubt it, and to tear the veil from the beloved "The Socialist Party" in question and find out the facts. Therefore, when Mr. La Monte makes his statements about the French, "The Socialist Party" having "prepared the ground for" and given "much necessary protection to" the redeeming Syndicalism and also broadly hints (though he would hardly dare say so) that the Socialist Party and Syndicalists' organizations still continue to preserve the former fond relations, he will be implicitly believed by the faithful. Such good deeds on the part of "The Socialist Party" are perfectly natural. However, being long since classed amongst the heathen, I will uncover for a few moments the clay feet of this French "The Socialist Party" idol and show the incorrectness of Mr. La Monte's statements and inferences.

THE SOCIALIST PARTIES

The French Socialist Party was organized in 1879 at the congress of the National Federation of Syndicates (local labor unions). Two years later it split into two factions and these quickly divided themselves into still more factions, or "parties." Some of these "parties" were the Guesdists, Broussists, Alleanists, Blanquists, Millerandists, Jaurests. They represented every shade of thought in the Socialist political rainbow from the roughest opportunism to the most impossible impossibilism. They waged an incessant warfare on each other for years. All naturally sought the support of the syndicates and these for about 10 years reflected all the quarrels of the politicians. Many, torn by these dissensions, disappeared, others falling under the control of some "party" were either turned into voting machines or "study clubs."

But the great mass of the syndicates, weakened by the incessant political dissensions, gradually developed and insisted on a policy of "No politics in the union." Some seven of these independent and fighting Socialist Parties were tinkered together into the present nondescript Socialist Party in 1905, nine years after the formation of the General Confederation of Labor (C. G. T.).

Mr. La Monte's "The Socialist Party" during the "early years" of syndicalism, therefore resolves itself into a sort of hash of "Socialist Parties," which not only didn't directly aid in the development of the budding labor movement, but distinctly retarded it. They were too busy helping themselves to waste time helping the syndicates.

SOCIALIST ASSISTANCE

The later neutrality policy of the syndicates toward political action was very unpopular with politicians. The International Socialist Congress of London in 1896 illustrates the latter's attitude towards it. The French Socialist deputies (congressmen) attended the congress with no other credentials than their deputies' cards. The syndicates also sent delegates. To whip the French syndicates into the political line, Millerand, Jaures, Guesde, Gerault Richard Viviana and other prominent Socialists proposed that all neutralist syndicates be excluded from the next congress. The motion lost by a vote of 57 to 56. The French syndicate narrowly escaped being "protected" out of the International movement. Many similar instances of opposition to the neutrality policy could be cited. The Socialists' policy towards the Bourses du Travail also bears witness to the amical relations existing between the political and economic movements during this early period of Syndicalism.

THE SOCIALISTS VS. THE BOURSES DU TRAVAIL.

After the passage of the much discussed "law of 1884," which gave the workers the legal right to organize, (1) a general policy of steering the labor movement was adopted. Many municipalities built fine buildings, subsidized them, and turned them over to the local syndicates to serve as a general headquarters. These ungrateful organizations formed themselves into local unions of syndicates. These unions are commonly known as the title of Bourse du Travail, although this is really the name of their headquarters (labor exchange).

The Bourses are real CLASS UNIONS, including workers of every trade and from their first appearance have been strongly revolutionary. They were the real beginnings of modern syndicalism. They particularly distinguished themselves in the revolt against political domination in the unions. Many municipalities seeing the anti-political viper they were nursing in their bosoms attempted to kill their local Bourses by withdrawing the subsidies or even by closing the Bourses altogether. Emile Pouget says (La Confederation General du Travail, page 14): "It is to be noted that these persecutions are not peculiar to municipalities of reactionary or simply republican opinions, but that the Socialist municipalities have persecuted their Bourses du Travail with the most vigor."

Probably these Socialist tactics should be classed as "giving much necessary protection" to the "New Unionism," as Mr. La Monte puts it.

The popularity of the all-class Bourses in Socialist circles is well evidenced by Georges Sorel—one of Europe's most prominent economists—who, writing in 1896, eleven

(Continued on Page Four.)

