

improved even while we are fighting for its transformation. He also believes that it may be made much worse than it is, and that the fight against its going backward is a necessary part of the endeavor to push it forward. Furthermore, he believes that the classes or groups which oppose the working class in its struggle for a better world are not one uniform reactionary mass, so that it would make no difference either to the workers' condition under capitalism or to their chances of final emancipation which of those class groups succeeds.

The Socialist, therefore, begins by taking an intelligent *interest* in everything that is going on in this world of ours. Nothing that is of *human* interest is a matter of indifference to him. His *interest* extends to the internal or family fights of the capitalist class. This interest becomes an active one whenever serious matters are at stake. And it becomes a passion whenever his great enemy, the capitalist class, is battling against the remnants of feudalism and feudal order. So much so that very often he has to drive his arch enemy, the capitalist, into the fight for the establishment of a capitalistically "free" society. Similarly, he is always ready to help politically that social element within capitalist society, or that group of capitalists, which will push society forward or prepare those materials out of which he hopes to fashion the future social system.

There is one limitation, however, which the Socialist places upon his freedom of action in this regard—a limitation which is implied in his point of view—and that is that nothing must be permitted to break the solidarity of the working class. The solidarity of the working class being the *condition of the emancipation* of that class as well as the *means* whereby it will be affected, it follows as a matter of course that no interest can be great enough from the point of view of the working class to warrant the breaking of its solidarity. From this follows as a necessary corollary the cardinal tenet of Socialist *policy*: that all activity on the part of the working class must be *independent*. The working class must organize politically as well as industrially, and must be as free and independent in its political

action as in its industrial action. An economic organization of the workers that is not absolutely free from any domination by or influence of the master class is not a truly working class organization. Nor is a political organization of workers not absolutely free and independent of any capitalist or other ruling class domination or influence a working class organization or of any real use in the struggle of the working class for its emancipation. It follows that any course of action or policy which does not leave the working class absolute freedom of action—free from interference by or "commitment" to ruling-class elements—must be rejected as inconsistent with the larger aims and purposes of the Socialist movement and the ultimate interests of the working class.

To some persons this position may seem "inconsistent," and to the "practical man" highly "impractical." But there is both logic and common sense behind it. By giving up its independence of action the workers would be giving up their solidarity, which is more important to them than any possible object which it may temporarily have in common with any other class or social group. Furthermore, in giving up their independence of action the workers would be putting it out of their power to ensure the attainment even of this temporary object. For history has proven that ruling classes are not to be trusted with leadership in any struggle for social or political reforms, particularly when these are unattainable except with the aid and assistance of subject classes partly in revolt.

In speaking of what I called the "trade union" policy, I used the subject of "protection" as an illustration. I shall now illustrate by the same subject the points of view which I called "anarchist" and "socialist" respectively.

I have said that the "trade unionist" (pure and simple) believes that this is a question in which the entire "industry," including both workers and capitalists, is interested; and that the workers and capitalists of *the industry* have here a common interest which they should protect by common action on the political field, forgetting for the moment their "internal" differences. The anarchist denies the existence of this common interest and takes the position that free trade versus protective tariff are mere family