

SOLIDARITY

EASTERN ORGAN of the INDUSTRIAL WORKERS of the WORLD

Editorial & Business Office
Akers Building
112 Hamilton Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio



Published Weekly By The
I. W. W. Publishing Bureau
Under the Ownership and Supervision
of the General Executive
Board of the Industrial Work-
ers of the World

B. H. WILLIAMS

Managing Editor

SUBSCRIPTION:

One Year \$1.00
Six Months .50
Three Months (Trial Sub) .25
Canada and Foreign \$1.50
Bundle Orders, per copy

One and One-Half Cents
Cash Must Accompany All Orders

Address all communications to Solidarity, or the I. W. W. Publishing Bureau. Make all checks, money orders and drafts payable to I. W. W. Publishing Bureau.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD

General Headquarters—Room 307—164 W. Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

GENERAL OFFICERS J. J. Egan, P. H. Little, J. M. Foss, Vincent St. John, Gen. Sec'y-Treas. George Speed, Gen. Organizer
GENERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD Ewald Koettgen, P. Eastman

Entered as second-class matter April 19, 1913, at the post office at Cleveland, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The Constructive Program of the I. W. W.

LOCAL AUTONOMY DECENTRALIZATION

In Solidarity, No. 178, we dealt in a general way with the structural forms of the Industrial Workers of the World, as provided for by its present constitution. Referring to "local unity" we said in part: "Without strong, healthy and vitalized local organizations, a general movement is impossible along the line. The I. W. W. cannot properly function from the top down; it must function FROM THE BOTTOM UP." The recognition of this principle has, lately, given rise among I. W. W. members, to a discussion of what some writers are pleased to call "decentralization." The main argument advanced by so-called "decentralizers" consists in a glorification of the "rank and file," and a desire to get rid of all executive boards, and central committees. "The abolition of the General Executive Board"; "the doing away with conventions"; "making the general secretary assume functions similar to those of a 'hello girl' at the telephone exchange, that is, simply to carry out orders received from the rank and file"; "bulletins and referendums in place of conventions and G. E. B.;" "district or zone organization, with a district secretary as a 'hello girl' merely, substituting the existing form of the I. W. W. provided for in its constitution"—all these, and more are being proposed in the name of "decentralization." Almost without exception, these various proposals come from the mixed locals of the Western states, where industries are scattered; where the local industrial units are few and far between, compared with industrial sections of the East, and where the "zone" or territorial form of organization suggests itself most logically to nomadic or migratory workers. The territorial idea does not appeal to any extent to Eastern slaves. All these and similar proposals are, in fact, a return to the existing form of the I. W. W.

In order, if possible, to straighten out the kinks in the "decentralizers'" argument, let us first of all get a clear understanding of the principle of LOCAL AUTONOMY and its limitations. As stated in our previous article the LOCAL INDUSTRIAL UNION is the unit of I. W. W. organization. It embraces all workers in a given industry in a given locality. It is first of all INDUSTRIAL and only secondarily territorial. The sense of "a given locality" is territorial. The form of the local union is similar for all localities, and is determined by the similarity of industrial development. The I. W. W. constitution gives to the Local Industrial Union the power to handle all LOCAL affairs. The general practice of the I. W. W. has always been in conformity with the constitution in that respect. Local autonomy has prevailed in affairs that concern the locals alone. But here is where a distinction becomes imperative; all affairs that concern a local industrial unit are not necessarily local affairs. For instance, a strike for an increase in wages, may be successful, involve all the locals of a given industry throughout the country. A consensus of opinion on the advisability of a strike, may be advisable and necessary before the strike shall take place. The right of a single local to inaugurate such a strike without first ascertaining the consensus of the other locals concerned, may be open to question. The local in such an instance, becomes perforce subordinate to the general organization—say the National Industrial Union—representing all the locals. While many strikes are forced on local unions before they have time to consult the general organization, this is not to be objected to, but that fact—the local industrial union is not sufficient unto itself, but is a part of a larger grouping. Again, in the matter of an official organ, say of the textile workers, unless it is purely a local organ, it becomes necessary to secure it as a general representative of the textile workers throughout the country, or of a single local or group of locals. The right of any local or group of locals to protest its policy or to seek to prevent it from becoming the organ of any official or group, cannot be questioned; but that in turn does not change the fact that it is a general and not a local organ. Carrying this same principle over to the future society as outlined in the I. W. W. Preamble, we might say, that the local autonomy of a given textile union, for instance, would not permit it to produce only 10,000 yards of cloth per day, when it was possible to produce 20,000, and the latter amount was demanded by society. The larger organization would enforce its will on the smaller group. Neither "individual freedom" nor "local autonomy" would be allowed to interfere with the interests of society as a whole.

We may now be able to perceive the significance as well as the limitations of local autonomy. Its significance consists in making the local industrial union fully responsible for local affairs. That means to give full play to the local to develop the intelligence, efficiency, self-reliance, organizing and fighting ability of the local group. While the larger organization would suffer from an ineradicable weakness. No amount of official interference from the top can possibly cure that weakness, unless that interference is wholly and sincerely directed to the removal of the weakness. Even then the issue is doubtful. Local autonomy must be made a reality, and we are to perform it by exercising its revolutionary function of overthrowing capitalism and supplanting the latter with the industrial commonwealth. But, at the same time, the limitations of local autonomy must be recognized. In other words, the autonomy of the larger group to which the local is attached, must also be recognized and respected by the local. Otherwise, industrial organization becomes impossible and universal chaos prevails.

Here we come to some of the phrases used by the self-styled "decentralizers" in their attacks on the present organization: "Yours for the rule of the rank and file." None of us could well object to that as an ideal. But some of us refuse to take for granted something that does not exist. The "rank and file" has never to date shown any inclination or taken any initiative towards "making the rank and file" do anything, or any thing, apart thereof. We ask our fellow workers who make this contention, to take stock of their own local situation. Except in times of industrial warfare, the "rank and file" are a passive element. Even in strikes, only by much prodding and scolding and directing by organizers and committees that imported from without onto the picket line or brought out in mass demonstration. A small minority of militant spirits do the work of prodding the rank and file into taking the necessary action. Likewise in local unions where some protest against the policy of officials or larger groups is made, that protest is initiated by a few, debated by the few (often with a majority of the members absent) and is carried through with the passive consent of the majority, present. True enough, the I. W. W. seeks to develop the initiative of larger and larger numbers, leading up to the ideal of "the rule of the rank and file." But we cannot assume a grave error in assuming that there are there yet. For instance, a great strike breaks out in the steel industry. It is largely spontaneous, the workers never before having had any experience in organization or in conducting a strike. The question of handling strike funds comes up at once. A local committee is organized, and the "rank and file" are active while those that are allowed to proceed unhampered are not worth mentioning. The masses are particularly distinguished for their good work.

rendered. Under such circumstances, unbridled local autonomy becomes a crime; it would seem rather to be the imperative duty of the organizer, or of the general organization to appoint some competent financier to assist the local committee and see that the accounts are kept straight. The interests and reputation of the organization as a whole would demand such a procedure. It is not fair to ask the rank and file to have developed competent financiers, no such "interference" would be necessary from the outside. We might make many more enumerations or suggestions showing the actual status of affairs as far as the "rank and file" is concerned. It is without question the duty of all I. W. W. militants to develop the initiative of the rank and file to the utmost extent. But that work will be facilitated by a recognition of the actual status of affairs, rather than by a mere mouthing of phrases.

Let us assume that some of the "decentralizers" have this development of initiative in mind in their proposals to "do away with conventions" and to "abolish the G. E. B." They propose as a substitute "the bulletin, and the referendum on all organization matters." We fear our "decentralizing" fellow workers do not take into full consideration the fact that the I. W. W. is a FIGHTING organization. Considering the general "passivity" of the rank and file, as above indicated, the loss of time and the dissipation of energy involved in such an exclusive method, would render quick action when necessary impossible. Unless, of course, the general secretary should assume the functions of the G. E. B. But our general secretary is to be a "hello girl" merely, executing "orders received from the rank and file." Consequently, his hand, likewise, would be paralyzed, since he must wait until he has ascertained the "will of the rank and file" through the referendum, before executing the same. Such a "hello girl" method won't work, fellow workers. There can be no objection to the "bulletin" for discussing internal affairs, and deepening the intelligence and understanding of the militants everywhere. Referendums on important matters that do not require immediate action, are already provided for by the constitution. Another means of promoting universal understanding is the general and national union conventions, which can be made more effective with enough financial resources to render stenographic reports. To do away with the G. E. B. and the conventions would be decentralization in the sense of developing local initiative and responsibility, but would rather mean disintegration and paralysis for the entire organization. If any official or executive board usurps power or functions not belonging to the same, or detracts from the organizational functions of the subordinate bodies should see that the official "comes clean," and they have the power to do so today. That power does not lie in separating or threatening to separate from the general organization, or in boycotting the official organs, which are only acts of disruption wholly unworthy of revolutionists. The program of the I. W. W. is not the elimination of necessary parts, but THE ADJUSTMENT OF ALL PARTS TO ONE ANOTHER. Earnest effort to that end will result in healthy growth for the organization and a clearer understanding by militants of the constructive program of the I. W. W.

The Vatican and Sing Sing

The mutiny of the Papal guards, coming, as it did, at the same time as that of the prisoners at Sing Sing, is a striking example of the prevailing social discontent. In legal parlance, it was done with a vengeance, men wrestling with conditions and seeking improvement. Good for the mutiny! Intellectuals and art-mongers may talk of "the right to work" for "labor" to make toil beautiful and to unite the workers in the struggle. But too much drudgery and monotony in our working lives to have what little beauty there is, stolen from us. No, once more, good for the finisiers!

Say, did you ever notice how "the anti-I. W. W. non-violence" organizations always get mixed up in violence despite their protestations? For instance, there was Rudolph Katz, of the "civilian phalanx," for instance, who, a year ago, got six months in jail at Paterson, N. J., for conducting a "civilized" plant strike by means of the Western Federation of Miners' strike in the Calumet district. This peaceful strike, however, resulted in the governor sending several thousand militia there, to preserve that peace, that is, the peace that the workers enjoy peace, there is riot and bloodshed instead. The answer is simple: the violent class is always the capitalist class. When the I. W. W. is accused of violence, it is the accused of the acts of the capitalists. Our friends, the peaceful protestants, will find that out for themselves.

The executive council of the A. F. of L. reports that the A. F. of L. is "2,026,716 strong." That is some strength when measured by numbers; but, when measured by results, what does it signify? Did those "2,026,716" strike in the structural iron workers' tussle with the steel trust? Did they win in the West Virginia coal strike, or in the Chicago building trades lockout? Did they win on the Pullman railway strike, or on the Peru Marquette? What that have those "2,026,716 strong" defeated recently? Have they succeeded in helping the bakers to defeat the bread trust, or the cigarmakers the tobacco trust? What great strike of recent times did those "2,026,716 strong" win? Was it the Chicago-Fresno's strike against the Hearst's? Or the Jewish writers' strike against the great newspapers in New York? The I. W. W. with its ragged army of 100,000, is more powerful, judged by the actual results of its "2,026,716 strong" of the A. F. of L. The I. W. W. beat the Wooten Trust and freed Editor Giovannianni and associates, also, at the end of the same time. The milk manufacturers, the A. F. of L.'s, the Pennsylvania whippersnapper capitalist class, with its unscrupulous press campaign, and the strike of the Paterson strike! "2,026,716 STRONG!" I want rot!! "2,026,716 STRONG!" I want rot!! "2,026,716 STRONG!" I want rot!!

Dean Swift refined satire and showed its use. It remained for the editor of the New York Call to show its stupidities. "Direct action will not get you out, Pat," he said to Pat Quin when he was in prison at Trenton. As Mayor Brukman of Haledon was also arrested for aiding the Pat-Jewish writers' strike against the great newspapers, it is evident that political action will not get Pat out either. On the contrary, if Pat believes in political action of the Brukman brand, he'll find that, instead of being out of jail, it will help to keep him in it.

When satirists ignore facts in order to make a point we have a display of perversity. When they ignore facts and sense are always one. Direct action freed Durand in France; it secured his comrades proceeding for the Tampa cigarmakers. It was a great factor in the Etor-Giovaninni strike in the Pennsylvania whippersnapper and a Belgium socialist. The Call finds all right, but we are not to be misled. It is then it is a subject of "satire." It is to laugh!

Well, there is satire and satire. The satirical socialist monthly, The Masses, does it there yet. This is revealed in the honor bestowed upon it by the Associated Press, which is making it the principal item of a publication that is attacked by the capitalist class in its most effective way while those that are allowed to proceed unhampered are not worth mentioning. The masses are particularly distinguished for their good work.

"Strike Tactics"

Judging by the rambling, incoherent two-column editorial that usually appears in the New York Sunday Call, the editor of that paper must be in the habit of indulging in a regular Saturday night "pipe dream." The last number contains one entitled "The Question of Strike Tactics." Its reproduction, except in part, is unnecessary, as none of our readers would be able to discover where the subject is touched upon throughout the entire editorial. But for the purpose of showing how assinine some "political actionists" may show themselves to be, we quote from the "Call's" article:

"Lawrence was won by the I. W. W. There are at present over 12,000 people out of work in that city. It is not a strike. It is a shutdown. At Little Falls there has been no jail delivery in spite of the money spent on legal expenses. The waiters' strike may have introduced some new ideas, but it has resulted in chaos. The barbers' strike has not improved the trade. It has bedeviled it. There is an instance where the wise man of the middle class has used his wisdom to put his competitor out of business. Akron is the slave town it was when the strike began, more slave, perhaps, for the hope has been crushed out of the workers. Would it be just to demand an accounting from the I. W. W.? Here is so much money poured into the strikes. What have you done with it? Here are so many promises made. How have they been carried out? Here are so many boasts of superior tactics. Where are the goods? It is about time to get down to earth and realize there is no short cut to the industrial republic, and that a theory does not stay a starving belly. This may seem crass materialism, but we maintain that the class struggle is a thing that can be comprehended by persons of sense, and that a boast does not help the workers. You can't bluff a dollar, and capitalism is the personification of dollars. They rule society today, and the workers give them to the capitalists. So it is only fair to ask how I. W. W. promises, boasts and brag size up with results. It is easy to answer. The only capitalist map is still all black, and you can go to any battlefield and find out what the results have been."

And so on, to the remedy—"political action," seizing the "powers of government," as the only preliminary to "filling empty bellies." The futility of such logic is so obvious as to really require no comment. What an insult to the intelligence of hundreds of Socialist Party members, who threw all their energies and resources into these mentioned economic struggles, and who, according to the same editorial in the Call, "seldom stopped to preach his creed or pray for the success of his organization." What a denial of the very class struggle, which the Call mouths with so much unctious. In other words, the workers need no other experience, according to the Call's logic, except that of voting some middle class lawyers into office, in order that the latter may hand the working class a brand new society labeled "Socialist Commonwealth," where bellies will be filled and the woes of defeat at the hands of the capitalist enemy will be forgotten. Talk about promises!

What has the I. W. W. to show? Let us see. All the strikes mentioned by the Call were spontaneous outbreaks of low-paid slaves against unbearable wage and working conditions. None of these groups of workers had any considerable organization before the fight. Nevertheless, under I. W. W. guidance, they all put up fights that brought universal attention to the fighting qualities of unskilled workers and the I. W. W., which led their fights. The workers gained a wealth of experience for themselves and for other slaves that would have been impossible without the application of the I. W. W. "theory, which does not stay a starving belly." That they failed to end the class struggle, or to permanently improve conditions by one manifestation thereof, seems to the genius of the Call, an unforgivable sin. If the Call were really a socialist paper, instead of berating the workers for their folly in struggling under the banner of the I. W. W., it would understand that only through such constant struggles can the working class finally be brought to sufficient unity to overthrow capitalism. But what's the use? There are none so blind as those "political socialists" who only see Congressmen with plug hats, and "red buttons" on their swallow-tailed coats, or policemen with red bands in their helmets. We opine that in spite of all alleged defeats, the class struggle will go merrily on according to the I. W. W. conception, notwithstanding the Call's aversion to such "strike tactics."

Local 26, 1900 Lawrence
Cleveland, Ohio
Entered as second-class matter
October 2, 1900
Published Weekly
Agent and Com. H. C. Sharp

