EDITORIAL

A KNOTTY PROBLEM.

By DANIEL DE LEON

ARTHUR Caroti had in the New York Call of last May 31 a two-column letter which offers a rather knotty problem for solution.

Caroti’s letter expresses admiration only for Industrial Unionism. Nor is the admiration an abstract admiration. From not a line does it appear that Caroti indulges the common duplicity of claiming to believe that the A.F. of L. is “fast traveling towards Industrial Unionism” and that “boring from without” is harmful. He knows better; and he is honest enough to say so. He says specifically:

“Be the future of the I.W.W. what it may be, we must not forget that the I.W.W. has given the greatest impetus to the theory of industrial organization, and that, even if the I.W.W. should entirely disappear, the cause of industrial organization cannot be abandoned . . . . the general policies of the A.F. of L. are what they were seven years ago and they must be changed.”

Here we have one of the two elements of the problem offered by Caroti—to turn the craft-unionistic, Civic-Federationized, and Militia-of-Christized A.F. of L. into an Industrial, that is, a Socialist, that is, a class-conscious, that is, a bona-fide Union.

Caroti then proceeds to declare that the task of bringing about the transformation of the above named A.F. of L. rests only with the Socialists who are members of the A.F. of L., and he enumerates May Hayes among these, and all of them Socialist Party men.

A consequence unescapable from Industrial Unionism is anti-scabbery, or labor-solidarity. Such a thing as one set of workers in a shop striking, and yet another set remaining at work, and thus rendering the success of the strike difficult, if not im-
possible,—such a thing is unimaginable in Industrialism. Indeed, it is against just
such iniquitous manifestations of A.F. of L.-ism that the I.W.W. rose in loudest pro-
test. Now, then, at the very latest convention of the A.F. of L., at Rochester, barely
seven months ago, just such an ulcerous A.F. of L. growth came upon the tapis—it
was only one of many. The particular ulcer was the scabbery that the International
Typographical men had just perpetrated upon the pressmen in Chicago. It was ven-
tilated on the 8th day of the session. And who was the chief justifier of the iniquity?
Why, Max Hayes of the S.P. Some non S.P. men may have spoken longer than
Hayes; none spoke so effectively in betrayal of Industrialism, which is of Labors
cause. None did because none other strutted as a Socialist. Thus Hayes’ “Socialism”
served as a cloak for rampantest anti-Socialism, that is, anti-Industrialism.

Another consequence, inseparable from Industrial Unionism, is the unification
of the proletariat on the political, as well as the industrial field. This posture, or
characteristic feature of Industrialism bars from the councils of Labor all creed rep-
resentation, creeds being, without exceptions, political volcanoes, some, extinct;
some, semi-extinct; some in eruption. “ As a consequence, all creeds represent re-
actionary politics, so reactionary that, like their mantle of “religion” notwithstanding, creeds are at war with one another. Foregone is the conclusion that the unifica-
tion of the proletariat where ambassadors of creeds have a hand is an impossibility.
Now, then, again at the very last convention of the A.F. of L., at Rochester, the
Committee of Credentials recommended the seating of the delegates from the Fed-
eral Council of the Churches of Christ; the delegate from the American Federation
of Catholic Societies (Militia of Christ); and the delegate from the Church Associa-
tion for the Advancement of Labor,—a bunch of four delegates. And who presented
the report, making the recommendation? The S.P. man Duncan McDonald, who fig-
ured as secretary of the Committee; and the report was adopted unanimously.
Unanimously? Yes, unanimously: not one of the 40 or 50 S.P. delegates raised his
voice against the medieval Church-and-State stab in Labor’s back.

Thus, the knotty problem that flows from Caroti’s letter is:

“How many thousands of centuries will it take to cast out of the A.F. of L. the
‘divvil’ of reaction and animate it with the soul of Industrialism, if the only hope of a
successful performance of the operation lies only with the Hayeses and other such S.P. A.-F.-of-L.-ites?”