

time will have the power to save society from utter destruction, by abolishing every trace of capitalist exploitation and laying the foundation for a Socialist society; that while such a program cannot be carried out unless the majority approve of it, the party must be ready to act when it has the masses with it. The proletariat as the new ruling class must be prepared to safeguard the new Socialist order and be ready to crush all opposition. Only in this way can be realized the ideal of democracy, a free people in a free land, living by free labor.

5. The party must engage in all political campaigns, in order to utilize them for the purpose of carrying its message to the workers. Its elected officials must not however use their positions in the legislative chambers for the purpose of securing the passage of reforms. If they are numerically insignificant they will not be able to do more than merely introduce them; if they are numerically powerful, they will not waste time passing reform bills. The elected officials should use their position rather as forums for Socialist propaganda.
6. The Party must make clear to the workers that in the struggle for the abolition of the wage system, the economic organizations of the workers are a most important factor, and that to be most effective, labor must be imbued with the spirit of the class struggle; must aim at the complete abolition of the capitalist system; must work for the re-organization of labor along industrial and class lines to meet with equal force the ever extending inter-industrial forces of capitalism, and that it must be aggressive in its tactics and methods.

A "Formula" for Social Revolution

By J. B. SALUTSKY

Comrade Isaac A. Hourwich is worried beyond measure over the fact that practically nowhere, not even in the most industrial countries, do the proletarians form the majority of the population in the cities and villages. Here are some of the data submitted by our comrade.

In the United States, in 1900, the proletariat, including hired farm laborers, made up 41.2 per cent of the total number of persons engaged in gainful occupations. The industrial wage earners alone for the same year composed only 34 per cent of the same category.

The figures for 1910 show an increase of the proletariat in the ratio of over 10 per cent. The census of 1910 gives the industrial wage-earners 38.2 per cent and the whole proletariat of both city and farm—45.6 per cent of the total number of persons engaged in gainful occupations. France, as Comrade Hourwich tells us in the last issue of *The Workers' Council*, is even less proletarianized. There, Hourwich calculates, the agricultural wage-earners, together with the industrial proletariat, represent about 40 per cent of all breadwinners. The census of 1911 is the basis for the above. The industrial proletarians alone represented 26 per cent of the active population.

There are no available figures for 1920 as yet. But Comrade Hourwich gives an approximate estimate of what these figures may be, basing his calculations on the established and certain ratio of increase of the proletariat as compared with the other groups of the active population. He states:

In spite of the existing confusion and the discord in the ranks of the Socialist and Communist parties in America, large sections of the workers in America are awaiting the organization of a movement which will answer their needs. The war, the "liquidation of labor" following the war and the ever-increasing unemployment have helped materially to disillusion them as to the nature of American "freedom" and "democracy." Many workers have learned the lesson of the class struggle. They have been and are face to face with it. They are ready to enlist in the ranks of the revolution. They are ready to serve in the cause of Socialism. Likewise thousands of comrades scattered throughout the country who were at one time members either of the Socialist party or of the Communist parties are anxiously awaiting the opportunity to get into the movement once more.

The time is ripe for laying the foundation of a truly revolutionary movement in the United States. The programs of none of the existing groups or parties can fill the need of the hour. The members of the Socialist Party have it in their power to decide whether the Socialist Party shall be used as the medium for the inauguration of such a movement in the United States—a movement which will unite all the truly revolutionary elements in the country.

The alternative facing the Socialist Party is decay and death. Which shall it be?

"From 1900 to 1910 the relative number of the proletariat of the United States increased by 10.7 per cent. If the same ratio be applied to France, its proletariat cannot represent to-day more than 45 per cent of all adult males, which is still short of a majority."

Applying the same method of calculation to the United States for the period of 1911 to 1920, we find that the proletariat of the United States will represent in 1920 50.5 per cent of the total sum of breadwinners, and that it will have gone "over the top." In order to meet Comrade Hourwich and his argument we shall, however, ignore the one-half of 1 per cent and we shall take it that the wage-earners represented in 1920 just one-half of the active population, a sort of a political "No Man's Land" sui generis.

Now, what worries our comrade in view of these statistical data, he states in a recent issue of the *Socialist Review*, and to that statement the article in *The Workers' Council* supplies but further argument. Says Comrade Hourwich:

"The proletariat is not yet a majority in this highly developed industrial country. That means that the democratic political machinery which is operated upon the principle of majority rule furnishes to the proletariat no means to enact Socialism. What, then, is to be done?"

Pointing to the solutions of the problem offered respectively by the Syndicalists, the Communists and the moderate or reformistic Socialists (German majoritaire and the Milwaukee branch in the United States), Hourwich concludes:

"One can argue for and against every one of these three policies. But to cling to the old tactics, which were

built upon the erroneous assumption that the proletariat is a large majority, means to condemn the American Socialist movement to remain a perfectionist sect."

The Syndicalists reject the political method. They hold to the view that the proletariat has already the economic power to eliminate capitalism from industry. So they tried to work in Italy but they failed, and Comrade Hourwich does not honor the Syndicalists' view.

Again the Communist position of bringing about Socialism by the forces of the proletariat alone through a dictatorship of the proletarian minority, does not suit our friend any more than the Syndicalist panacea.

What remains, then, is either of two courses. One is the German majority mode of procedure—of coalition with the bourgeois parties—typified in the United States by the Milwaukee policy of seeking an alliance with the Farmers' Nonpartisan League (capitalistic in its own politics) and the Farmer-Labor Party (non-existent in politics, non-socialistic in principle and opportunist to the core). The alternative is the present policy of the Socialist Party, that is, neither for dictatorship by a proletarian minority nor for a combination, alliance, or fusion with other political groups, but just waiting "with folded arms" until the working class will become the majority.

Comrade Hourwich has no patience with this policy of "a perfectionist sect," as he calls it. What, then, does he propose? The Milwaukee method? An alliance with anti-Socialists for the purpose of bringing about Socialism? Comrade Hourwich is a better logician than that. Yet he offers no way out. Why?

* * *

Were Comrade Hourwich of the mental make-up of most of the "regular" Socialist Partyites his attitude toward majority and minority could be easily discerned. "Why, the constitution prescribes 'majority rule'." So claim our constitutionally constituted good Socialist comrades. "Won't you please wait until we are the actual majority? In fact wait until we attain an actual majority of votes. We are not law-breakers!" But Hourwich knows that the great American "democratic political machinery which is operated upon the principles of majority rule" was never brought about by a majority of the people. Hourwich knows American history. Furthermore, our "democratic political machinery" never was operated or controlled by the expression of the will of the majority. Hourwich knows this too well. It is the minority that always ruled. At best the minority claimed that it was speaking the will of the majority. Ordinarily, that classical definition of government by the Irishwoman is to the point: "Them few gentlemen at Washington sees what is best for themselves and do it for the people." Hourwich knows more about the essence of government than his statistically corroborated fears would betray. He knows that no actual majority ever ruled this boss-made world and none ever will rule if our glorious "democratic political machinery" is to prevail. Even our political babes,

the liberals, have conceded it. Why, then, does Hourwich scare us with that majority ghost?

And then . . . The proletariat was not a majority in 1920. It was only 50 per cent. But the Hourwich statistics would give the proletariat in the United States 55 per cent in 1930. In fact, at this writing, if the Hourwich statistics operate regularly, and presumably they do, the proletariat is well-nigh above 51 per cent of the gainfully engaged population. Furthermore, in his calculations of the numbers of the agricultural and industrial proletariat, Comrade Hourwich eliminates the class of servants, somewhere between 5 and 6 per cent, and the "professional persons," of whom a goodly half, another 3 per cent, could be safely placed in the proletariat column. Or, is there any good reason why a civil engineer working for the Interborough, or a draftsman, or a teacher in the New York City School system, or even a "servant" could not be induced to accept Socialism sooner than or as soon as a railroad clerk?

If the industrialization and proletarianization of the people of the United States should proceed at the same ratio as Hourwich establishes, to wit 10.7 per cent for a period of ten years, then in 1930 we shall have a pretty good working majority of proletarians to usher in the Co-operative Commonwealth. And nine years is by no means too long to wait for it. But isn't there something to be said about the Socialist education of the masses? Will Comrade Hourwich ignore this side of the problem? Hourwich establishes the rate of increase for the proletariat to be 10.7 per cent in 10 years. The ratio of increase of the Socialist sentiment for the whole of the United States, as evidenced by the Socialist Party vote, hardly justifies even so much optimism. Yet, without being unduly sanguine, we may accept, with a fair degree of accuracy, that we are likely to attain a majority vote, by due process of law, that is—considering the stealing of our votes, elimination of our candidates by imposing upon them long prison terms, etc.—some time between 1998 and 2084. Encouraging as such an outlook may be, it is on the whole too far off to be taken into account for any practical purpose.

* * *

Hourwich Repudiates Syndicalism. The idea of dictatorship of a proletarian minority is not to his liking either. The Socialist theory of inactivity as practised by the American Socialist Party he discredits as "perfectionist sect" stuff. He does not accept the Milwaukee Socialist Party plan of trading Socialism either. What, then, does he propose? Nothing so far but discussion. But how does it happen that Hourwich of all should turn to be fruitless at an attempt to solve this all-important problem? Hourwich knows thoroughly, as few do in the United States, the working of our political machinery of democracy. He has at his finger tips the industrial development of our country. And he holds no illusions as to the value of our common carriers of political democracy, such as the Farmers' Nonpartisan League, the Farmer-Labor Party, our Liberals, Radicals, Prohibitionists, et tutti quanti. If he thought so he would not fear to state openly that