

8210326 Joy, J.  
ADS5774  
"IRISH MESSENGER" 1d. BOOKS.  
SOCIAL ACTION SERIES.

No. 10

# SYNDICALISM

BY

REV. J. JOY, S.J., M.A.

---

Dublin

OFFICE OF THE "IRISH MESSENGER"  
5 GREAT DENMARK STREET

1914

**Price One Penny**

7

**Nihil Obstat:** WILLIAM HENRY, S.J.

**Imprimi potest:** ✠ GULIELMUS, *Archiep. Dublinen., Hiberniæ Primas.*

---

## The Irish Hierarchy and Social Questions

Speaking of these questions, and of the evils of Socialism, Syndicalism, Strikes, and Lock-outs, His Eminence the Cardinal, the Archbishops, and Bishops of Ireland, in their recent joint Pastoral, write as follows:—

“These subjects, indeed, cannot be too well understood by the shepherds and guides of the people; and it is a great acquisition of strength on the side of right that they are discussed in a variety of excellent little Catholic publications that are within the reach of all, and that all may read with lasting advantage.”

### PRESS NOTICES.

*The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for January, 1914, speaking of the earlier books of the series, says:—

“We cannot too highly recommend the above seven pamphlets published at the Office of the *Irish Messenger*, 5 Great Denmark Street, Dublin, at the price of one penny each. They are written, needless to say, in full harmony with the Catholic teaching on social questions, and come at the present time as a welcome contribution to the sadly vexed controversies that are troubling the Irish world of Labour. . . . We welcome these pamphlets for their intrinsic worth; we recommend them heartily to our reverend readers as splendid material for distribution among the workers of their respective parishes; but we also welcome them as evidences that the Irish clergy are willing and able to defend the cause of truth with the powerful influence of the printed word.”

*America* writes:—“The Editor of the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, which with its numerous cheap but precious publications, has rendered invaluable service in our day to Ireland’s material as well as spiritual interests, has met the demand (for social betterment) by announcing a continued series of popular booklets on the countless variety of subjects involved in the social question. . . . The first six pamphlets give promise of capable and practical work. Consisting each of about 8000 words in some twenty pages, they are popular in style and price, and more original in conception and exposition than one is wont to expect in such treatises. . . . The author . . . has mastered much more than a book knowledge of the subject.”

# SYNDICALISM.

THE terms "Syndicalism" and "Syndicalist" have been freely used in recent controversies, and often with seemingly little appreciation of their meaning. There seems to be a haziness about this subject on the part of the man in the street, which it is the aim of the present pamphlet to remove in some degree. The limits of space and the very nature of the subject forbid anything like exhaustive or even adequate treatment, as will of course be evident to students of the countless protean modes and forms through which various social theories are evolving, never the same from day to day or place to place. Because these movements are living and not dead, it is a hopeless task to attempt to label them off and sort them into various categories and give exhaustive and final expositions or refutations. This pamphlet will attempt nothing so foolish in the case of Syndicalism.

**Aim of this Pamphlet.**

The word "Syndicalism" is an immigrant from France. When in France it was originally innocent and void of terror, for "*Syndicalisme*"

**The Meaning of the Term "Syndicalism."**

means nothing more or less than trade unionism. But within the ranks of French "*Syndicalisme*" or trade unionism, there arose two camps — "*Syndicalisme réformiste*" and "*Syndicalisme révolutionnaire*." The former was law-abiding and orthodox; the latter revolutionary and extreme. The English word "Syndicalism" is used exclusively for the latter doctrine. Hence this pamphlet shall not deal with

“*Syndicalisme réformiste*,” which is simply trade unionism, of a more or less orthodox type, and is in France propagated by the *Syndicats jaunes* or Yellow Unions. It will deal merely with the “*Syndicalisme révolutionnaire*” propagated by the *Syndicats rouges*, or Red Unions, and the spread of its doctrines in other countries.

Syndicalism, so understood, is in the main the social policy which, on its destructive side, advocates the upheaval of the present state of society by industrial methods of a drastic and sometimes violent nature ; and, on its constructive side, so far as it is at all constructive, the reconstruction of the ruins of the world on the basis of Trades Unions and Trades Unions alone. Class hatred is to it the breath of life. Improved relations between Capital and Labour would lessen the zest of Labour for the fight, and so the extreme Syndicalist will have none of it. Politics and a political State, even the Socialist State, stink in his nostrils. Hence the Syndicalist is very far from being a Socialist. He regards Socialism as being an out-of-date dogmatism, to be cast away into the lumber heap of the ages. The Socialist is conservative enough to believe in the need for a State, and State machinery ; to the Syndicalist this need is a superstition, the mother of a litter of other superstitions—patriotism, militarism, nationalism, and the rest. In the Syndicalist world there will be no strife, no conflict, no war ; all will be forbearance and peace between individuals and nations in the universal brotherhood of Trade Unionism. Such in rough, very rough, outline is extreme Syndicalism and the extreme Syndicalist. Though rough, yet this description will be shown to be not unfair, admitting, of course, that these doctrines are held in different degrees of completeness and intensity by various Syndicalists, and bodies of Syndicalists, according to local circumstances and temperament.

**Syndicalist  
Teaching in  
Brief.**

We will examine these principles in greater detail later, having first cast a glance at the history, constitution, and strength of the movement.

It is a disputed point when exactly and where Syndicalism had its birth, or whether it is to be considered as a separate movement at all, but

**Rise of  
Syndicalism.**

we may with the majority of writers regard it as separate and trace it to France and the last decade of the

last century. It is, then, young in years, though rapidly ageing in experience. It was born of widespread discontent and unrest, due to increase in the cost of living, without corresponding increase in wages. Orthodox economic and political pressure was applied, but failed wholly or in great part to secure the desired redress. Genuine grievances, though serious enough in all conscience not to require exaggeration, have been magnified, when shown through the lenses of the literature of discontent. This literature, without giving the workingman any really well-grounded social education, has acquainted him with the social theories of many lands, and preached the solidarity of Labour. Thus the labour cause has become international: it has lost its parochial and even national character; and this fact has been influential in the rise and spread of Syndicalism. For it would seem that the Syndicalism of these countries, if it does not owe its whole being and existence to French influences, yet certainly was brought to consciousness of itself by the formulation and crystallisation of its doctrines in the writings of the Syndicalist philosophers and propagandists of France—Sorel, Berth, Lagardelle, Griffuelhues, Pouget, Pataud, Yvetôt, and the rest. France, too, has supplied a model for Syndicalist organisations in the *Confédération générale du travail*. In the words of Ramsay MacDonald: "France is the birthplace of Syndicalism and the General Confederation of Labour is its embodiment."

Trade Unions were legalised in France in 1864, but even in the Congress of 1878 they disclaimed any Utopian ideas for the reform of the whole social order. They confined their attention to mutual benefit and collective bargaining on the old lines.

**Preparing  
the way for  
Syndicalism  
in France.**

But the Congress of 1879 at Havre saw a change. A political Socialist party—the *Guesdistes*—had been formed and now created a schism, and expelled the more moderate section of the Congress. Thus the 'seventies ended with a victory for political Socialism, and a new era opened up for labour in France, lasting till the rise of Syndicalism in 1895. The years that followed were full of domestic strife and schism in the Labour ranks, but the flow of the tide was towards extreme views. In 1888 the Congress at Bordeaux approved of the general strike. In 1892 was formed the *Fédération des Bourses du travail*, and a resolution was passed to the effect that reliance must be put not in political efforts for legislation, but in an economic revolution, the general strike. In a sense this was the beginning of Syndicalism, but it did not take definite form till a few years later. In these few years there was a sharp struggle between the Federation and the *Guesdistes*, who defended political action. In 1894, at the Congress of Nantes, the Syndicalists, with the help of the able advocacy of M. Briand, who since has had such a strenuous political career, succeeded in condemning political action and expelling the *Guesdistes* from the Congress. Thus Syndicalism and Socialism were divorced, and Syndicalism began its separate career.

The following year—1895—a new Society was formed—*la Confédération du travail*. This was at first in rivalry with the *Fédération des Bourses du travail*, but, being far inferior in zeal and revolutionary fervour, it eventually had to recognise its own futility, and amalgamated in 1902 with

**Origin and Aim  
of the C.G.T.**

its old rival. The amalgamated Society was known as *la Confédération générale du travail*—the C.G.T., since become so familiar. The personnel and the spirit of the *Fédération des Bourses* ruled the C.G.T., and in 1906 the new Society declared its independence of Socialism. This was not, however, without a struggle and a division, but those who favoured alliance with the political Socialists were defeated by an overwhelming majority. A resolution was then passed which was an official statement of Syndicalist ends and means. It declares that, while the C.G.T. will fight for immediate ameliorations, yet its ultimate object is expropriation of the capitalist class; that its means will be the general strike; that the Syndicat or Union is to be a group for production and distribution; that individual Syndicalists may take part "in any form of struggle which corresponds to his philosophical or political ideas," but must not introduce politics into the Unions; that "direct action" against the employers is most effective and the Confederation should be independent of all political parties. We may notice incidentally the weakness of the position of the Syndicalist who abuses and decries all political action within his union, and outside it throws himself with full vigour into political propaganda—usually Socialist.

The C.G.T. has undoubtedly exercised great influence in the economic warfare of France since its foundation. In 1905 it had 158,000 members; in 1906, 203,273 members; thence the numbers rose to 357,814 in 1910; 450,000 in 1911, and something about 500,000 in 1912. The

figures have been disputed; but we may take it that the C.G.T. includes somewhat more than one-third of the organised labour of France. Now only one-tenth of the labour of France is organised, and so the C.G.T. represents only, roughly, one-thirtieth of the manual workers.

**Strength and  
Influence of the  
C.G.T.**

Furthermore, it has been estimated by Ramsay MacDonald that at least 250,000 of the members are opposed to the revolutionary programme of the *Comité Confédéral*. Bearing these facts in mind we see that while the Syndicalist organisation in France may exercise, and has exercised great influence, still it has not the grip on the labour of France necessary for its sweeping programme.

This fact is being realised within the ranks during the last few years. Violent methods have been tried and failed, and many of the members of the C.G.T. now favour political action and more peaceful means of redress. The Secretary of the C.G.T. declares that recruiting is becoming difficult: the C.G.T. "seems like a wearied body whose activity relaxes more and more each day." A former secretary, M. Griffuelhues, says: "There reigns in the Syndical world a deplorable state of mind, a profound ignorance of the necessity for action . . . the Syndical idea has lost its force and vigour. The Syndical movement is going through a crisis which may be fatal." Pouget and Lagardelle might be quoted in a similar sense. The latter says that Syndicalism is being undermined on the one hand by Anarchism, and on the other by *Guesdisme* or political Socialism. Against *Guesdisme*, however, the C.G.T. declared again in 1912, at Havre, its independence of all politics. But, as we have already suggested, this independence is in great part destroyed by the fact that individual Syndicalists take an active part in politics, usually in the Socialist ranks. Even within the unions, Lagardelle declares that there is "a Syndicalist parliamentarianism as bad as the Socialist parliamentarianism." From these and other quotations which might be given, it seems that, especially as regards recent years, Ramsay MacDonald's conclusion is near the mark: "Syndicalism

**Violent Counsels  
yielding to more  
moderate views:  
Syndicalism  
weakening.**



as a policy is absurdly weak and is not making progress even in France, its most suitable soil."

A Syndicalist manifesto, published in 1912, by five of the militant leaders of the C.G.T., and approved of by the Congress, recognises this want of progress. It condemns individual, hasty or violent action, and recommends more moderation. This is suspect by some of being merely an opportunist recruiting move; but it may be a sign of a return to a saner frame of mind in French Trade Unionism. In other respects also Syndicalism is becoming mellowed and mild. It now recognises the necessity of a strong war-chest, and no longer recommends living merely on enthusiasm. It has given over its contempt for numbers and the unthinking majority, and is troubled at its want of recruits. It is less centralised, more respectful of local needs and opinions. It no longer glories officially in violence, though it permits it. Some Syndicalists discard sabotage. They are becoming more reconciled to the idea of half the loaf till the whole is forthcoming. M. Keufer, Secretary of the *Fédération du Livre*, congratulates himself on the fact that the revolutionary unions are becoming wise and practical. Niel, once Secretary of the C.G.T., and amongst the most respected of its leaders, has always fought against the theory that Syndicalism was out to convulse society, and has counselled the step-by-step advance along purely economic lines, with a clear head and practical grasp of the conditions and necessities of the hour. Now it would seem that slowly French Syndicalism is veering towards these saner and steadier views characteristic of the old steady, practical, John Bull Trade Unionism; while English Trade Unionism has of recent years shown signs of trending towards the discarded doctrines and methods of French Syndicalism; though there are indications that even already it is recovering its temporary loss of balance, and that the Syndicalist influence is not considerable or lasting.

**Syndicalism in other countries.** Syndicalism has spread to most of the important European countries, to America, Australia, South Africa, and even Japan. The spontaneity with which it has been adopted makes for the theory that it is not the French system imported, but merely local Trades Unionism off its balance ; yet its leaders have always looked to France and French writers for inspiration and justification. Obviously it is impossible here to treat of the developments of the movement in all these countries. Everywhere it has certain common characteristics, but everywhere also it has taken on a local colouring, and it would require a more pretentious volume than this to do justice to the movement as a whole. In America the Industrial Workers of the World—the "I.W.W."—is a vigorous Syndicalist organisation, helped considerably by the corruption so largely existing in American public life, against which it is in revolt. The violence and extent of the recent South African strike has been widely assigned to Syndicalist influence. In Germany Syndicalism as understood in France scarcely exists. It manifests itself merely in the peaceful "political strike," which is not much more than a form of demonstration ; and also in an antimilitarist campaign. In fact Syndicalism, though it has spread to most countries, seems destined to have but an ephemeral influence over any. In moments of violent outburst its creed is invoked, but it is in no sense a world-force.

**Early Syndicalist views in England ; Owen ; the Chartists.**

In England Ramsay MacDonald holds that Syndicalism "is negligible both as a school of thought and as an organisation for action." As early as the third decade of the last century, Robert Owen had advocated federation of unions, the general strike, and the reconstruction of society on the

basis of the trade union as the unit of production and distribution, with one Grand National Council. He established his Grand National Consolidated Trades Union, and enrolled in a few months half-a-million members. The movement caught on for a time, but ended in failure. The Grand National was broken up; and in the inevitable reaction Trade Unionism was left paralysed for some years after. Though the Chartist movement was political, yet it had all the Syndicalist vision of the omnipotence of the general strike; but it engendered violence, and violence called out the military, who crushed this labour upheaval in 1848.

**Reaction to moderate views and methods.**

Then followed in England a reaction in favour of more hard-headed and practical Trade Unionism. Reserve funds were amassed, and the unions fought for local and pressing needs by collective bargaining and

hard blows struck at the crucial moment. The movement was, on the whole, free from French anarchical and communist ideas. The leaders were cool, practical, business men. They regarded business as business and not as war. They fought for a fair share of the profits: not for the whole. "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work," was their motto.

**Change again to New Unionism.**

A change has, however, been passing over English Trade Unionism. Within the last twenty years the old pilots are being dropped. An active minority, imbued with Socialist principles and believing in political action, has ousted the quiescent majority, who sought no social revolution and believed that the true scope of Trade Unionism was the betterment of the condition of Labour, outside politics by strong benefit funds and collective bargaining, with the strike as a last resort. The Taff Vale judgment, making the union funds responsible for actions of union officials, showed the need for a Labour

Party in Parliament, and in 1906 that Party was definitely established.

**Reaction again  
from Politics  
due to discontent  
with Labour Party.**

This Party has done much for the cause of the workers, but they have not been able to realise the dreams of many of their impatient supporters. Capital controls the party machine through the party purse under the present party system of government : and against this control by Capital of the other great parties the Labour Party has waged an unequal fight. The result has been disappointment with political methods and a swing back of the pendulum towards pure industrialism. Much of what is called Syndicalism in England is simply a renewed fervour of faith in the old weapons. The wider federation of Labour and wider extent of strikes is due to the wider federation of Capital. In this intense and more violent industrial warfare authorities so intimate with English labour movements as Ramsay MacDonald, W. V. Osborne, Philip Snowden, and Sidney and Beatrice Webb, refuse to recognise the direct influence of doctrinal Syndicalism.

**Views of Labour  
Leaders on  
Syndicalism in  
England :  
Mr. Osborne.**

Mr. Osborne ascribes the lawlessness and unrest of recent years to the irresponsibility conferred on the unions by the Trades Dispute Act of 1906, which secured that the union funds could not suffer for the misdemeanours of its members. Little success, he says, attended the efforts of the small band of Industrial Syndicalists before or after that Act to capture the unions. What passes as Syndicalism in England is merely the development of *Trade Unionism* into *Labour Unionism* : the fight for the interests of Labour as a whole, and no longer those of one trade, by means of unions no longer confined to workers in one trade, but open to several trades and even unskilled workers. The federation of unions and centralisation

of control, joined to the violence of the "New" Unionism are, in his view, responsible for English Syndicalism. Syndicalism in England was not imported and has no separate existence apart from this Unionism.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald analyses in a somewhat similar way the constituents of English Syndicalism: "A leader or two who never held any balanced judgments upon anything, a section or two moved by the impulses of the moment, a certain number of people disappointed with majority rule, and claiming majority rights for the particular minority to which they belong, others convinced . . . that change by political methods is slow and uncertain, have embraced the new propaganda and have ranged themselves under the new banner of revolutionary direct action." Yet it is not true to say that there is no distinct Syndicalist movement in England. Though small and not influential, there is such a party, which differs *toto caelo* in its view of means and ultimate end from Socialist or orthodox Industrial Unionism. Ben Tillet, Tom Mann, and Haywood are the best known leaders, and their views are distinct from those of even the "New" Unionism in its extreme forms.

In 1910 Tom Mann founded the *Industrial Syndicalist* as the organ of the English movement. That paper and also the *Daily Herald*, during recent troubles, has advocated Syndicalist views and fanned the passions of the Labour Left. Though Syndicalism did not cause the strikes of 1911-1912, the Syndicalist leaders infused into them the intense bitterness of class hatred and class war. The *Industrial Syndicalist* itself admitted that not five per cent. of the leaders of those strikes knew what the word "Syndicalist" meant ;

Recent History  
of Syndicalism in  
England: Philip  
Snowden's views:  
Syndicalism  
weak and destined  
to become weaker.

yet the Syndicalist leaders tried to utilise the occasion for their own propaganda. But these strikes were, on the whole, a failure, and the Unions are chary of entering into similar struggles again. Instead of leading the workers towards Syndicalism there are signs that these strikes have discredited the movement. The Sympathetic Strike is now universally condemned by the representative labour leaders. No trade union has accepted Syndicalism officially; there is no considerable Syndicalist organisation; and though, in periods of stress and strain, there will always be violence and violent doctrines, yet revolutionary Syndicalism will not take root. All through the century there have been similar outbursts, due to disappointment with the poor results of political methods, and the slowness of the lumbering Parliamentary coach; but these outbursts have ended in reaction against violence and the hasty strike, which has so often failed. Recent events would seem to point to the fact that England is now again going round in the same cycle. Mr. Snowden, in his able and moderate work, *Socialism and Syndicalism*, says that "the present Syndicalist movement in Great Britain is due to the fact that a new generation of trade unionists has grown up who know nothing from their own experience of the former failures of the methods they advocate; to disappointment, because a Labour Party of forty members in Parliament has not established the millennium in six years; to increased difficulty of living, owing to the increased cost of commodities; and to the attraction which dramatic action always has for youth and inexperience." However, he regards the Syndicalist crisis as past. If it did not get a following of settled converts in 1911-12, it never will; it will soon be as much ancient history as Owen's General Strike and the Chartist Movement. The recent Labour Congress (December, 1913) in London, has been practically unanimous in its assertion of confidence in its leaders and rejection of the Syndicalist attacks

on them. It was a severe blow to Syndicalism, and the opinion of the meeting was clearly and strongly against the policy of the general and sympathetic strike as suicidal.

## THE TEACHING OF SYNDICALISM.

It is extremely difficult to give a satisfactory exposition of the teaching of Syndicalism. It is more a tendency and an impulse than a settled system of doctrine. Some of its leaders have advised that there should be no attempt at analysis or reasoning. The native hue of resolution must not be sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought. "Man has genius only in proportion as he acts without reflection": thus the ex-prophet of the movement, Sorel. Hence there is no settled agreement on Syndicalist reconstruction of society, though their destructive programme is fairly clear, and to this we will now turn.

In common with the Catholic and the Socialist, the Syndicalist is unsparing in his criticism of the abuse of the present Capitalist system. In common with the Socialist he regards that system as incapable of being humanised, or Christianised. The Syndicalist, as well as the Socialist and the Catholic, sees the great staring fact of present-day economics—that the wealth of the world is multiplying under the whirr of Machinery as if under a magic spell; that Capital and directive ability are receiving a correspondingly increased share in wealth and comfort; while manual labour alone has received little or no increase in its *real* as contrasted with its *nominal* wages. He sees with Leo XIII. (*Rerum Novarum*) that "a very small number of very

**No very settled  
System of Doctrine.**

**Destructive policy :**  
**(1) Capitalism  
must go.**

rich men have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the labouring poor a yoke little better than that of slavery itself." He sees a state of society in which one-tenth of the population own nine-tenths of the wealth. Statistics might be multiplied indefinitely to prove this, but it is useless. No one acquainted with the facts ventures to deny the existence of widespread injustice and unchristian action in the treatment of the worker. It is this glaring fact which makes the Syndicalist demand the abolition, root and branch, of the Capitalist system, as it has inspired all the revolutionary *isms*. Hence it is childish to imagine that one can crush those movements by a theoretic refutation of this or that principle of Marx or Engels or the rest. Marx and Engels have been revised almost out of existence by later schools, and the revisers have themselves been revised.

These movements are not dead, static things, but living and dynamic, with all the motive force of a great wrong. When you work yourself into a fine frenzy over some treatise on Socialism of twenty, ten, or even five years ago, the modern Socialist will simply smile at you, agree with your criticisms for the most part, and ask you have you read Philip Snowden's *Socialism and Syndicalism*, or Ramsay MacDonald's *Socialism*, or some other such modern exposition. Give the workers a larger share of the profits, good homes, good recreation for mind and body, education, respect and reasonable comfort, and an interest in the success of their work, and you will do more to kill revolutionary ideas than by years of syllogism spinning, and quixotic tilting with wind-mills.

As a consequence of the Syndicalist's loathing for the Capitalist system  
 (2) **Class Hatred and Class War.** there follows his doctrine of class war—bitter, unrelenting war, that will give no quarter and ask for none, that has drawn its sword and thrown away the scabbard. "The class



struggle, there is the basis of Syndicalism," says Felicien Challaye, the writer of one of the most reliable books on Syndicalism. The Syndicalist wants no go-betweens to arbitrate this war: he wants no compromise, no parley; for he believes that he is strong in his cause, and that the future is with him. Hence, though he will work for increase of wages, less hours and better conditions, yet his real and openly avowed aim is social revolution. Hence he will have no lasting contracts, no hard and fast agreements, which might fetter his efforts or retard for an hour the coming of that revolution. He is intensely, bitterly "class conscious," and is determined to remain so. He holds that the worker differs only in name—the unmeaning name of political freedom—from the slaves of old; and that charity between a slave and his lord is out of the question. Furthermore, this line of cleavage is clear cut and insurmountable under the present system.

**(3) Rejects  
Orthodox Trades  
Unionism.**

Hence the Syndicalist rejects orthodox Trade Unionism. This can only organise a fraction of the workers, and the Syndicalist wants all. It has achieved no appreciable results. It is too slow, and has been out-witted by Capital at every point. It recognises Capitalism, while Syndicalism says that Capitalism is incompatible with the liberty of the worker and the dignity of his humanity. The worker will not be free till he owns the factory; till he gets economic control; and that he can never accomplish under the wage-system, the child of Capitalism.

**(4) Wage-System  
Condemned.**

The wage-system, then, must be abolished. Industry must be so organised that the workers will obtain the whole product of their labour and work under no dictation from a higher class.

These were the aspirations of the Owenites, the Chartists, the French Communists, and of Labour for

several generations. But Labour has failed to realise them. Co-operation has failed to abolish the wage-system, and prospered only by recognising that system in its own management. Hence the Syndicalist will not recognise such Co-operation as his ideal. Thus he has broken with the Capitalist, the old Trade Unionist, and the Co-operator as we know him.

With the political Socialist he is on no better terms. They differ both as to end and means; though more as to means than end. For we shall see later that the Syndicalist is forced to interpret his ideal Co-operative Commonwealth very much in the sense of the Socialist all-fathering State. However, there is no doubt as to the Syndicalist antagonism to Socialist political means, and with this we shall now deal.

The early Utopian and Marxian Socialists did not expect to gain their end by political means, though the Marxian school regarded Socialist politics as a useful preparation and education for the great day of the automatically realised revolution. They dreamt of a great upheaval, social and political. Such an upheaval was the only hope of the proletariat when political power was in the hands of Capital, and Capital had no conscience or no fear of public opinion to take its place. This upheaval, so near at times in vision, in concrete fact seemed more and more remote. Gradually, too, political power, or its semblance, passed from the "classes" to the "masses." Capital still held the purse strings and so controlled the party machine, inspired legislation and influenced administration; but, nominally at least, the people became supreme by a numerical superiority of votes. Then arose Revisionist Socialism—the hope of a revolution by constitutional means—a capture of the State by the workmen's votes. Many of the visions and theories of early Socialism were discarded, and all efforts were concentrated on

gradually securing the central control of property by elected bodies for the common good. There was no longer talk of one great *coup d'état*, which was to usher in the millennium. The practical heads saw clearer than that. They saw that it was hopeless to expect to abolish the wage-system at one stroke; and many admitted the impossibility of doing so at all completely. Hence they settled down to the humdrum work of nationalising more and more of the public services and enterprises—the post office, the telegraphs, the railways, the land. They advocated the taking over of certain industries as state monopolies for revenue; the municipalisation of services such as the tramways, the water, gas, and electric and milk supplies. Thus Socialism would be gradually realised, not by dynamite, or bayonet, or barricades, but by the ballot. But the ballot has put the Socialist at the mercy of the other classes for sympathy and votes. Under this political and parliamentary influence the revolutionary red has faded away to a mild pink. Men have entered Westminster red and reeking from the barricades and returned with awe and reverence and forbearance on their lips. They have quickly taken a broader and more responsible view of national and imperial affairs. They have realised the essential necessity of order, control, settled authority and bureaucratic machinery in government, the chaotic influence of mob rule, the need for circumspection in launching big political schemes; and one by one they have gone back to the barricades as messengers of peace to temper the passions of their more violent supporters.

**Discontent with  
compromise and  
diplomacy.**

It is little wonder that many of their followers were suspicious of this change. "You promised us," they cried, "that we, the manual workers, should own all the work of our hands and work under no man's rod.

Now you tell us that not we alone, but the whole State,

of every class—the poet, the artist, the philosopher, the cleric, the lawyer, the man of letters, and the thousand others—who know not our hard toil, as well must own what we produce. We must give them share and share or even greater shares of our wealth, and we, the manual workers, will be a minority and subject still. You tell us that we must work for a wage and under official control. Where, then, is our boasted liberty from the slavery of wagedom? We value that freedom more than the little extra bread you may give us.” This has been the cry of Syndicalism, “Economic freedom,” “A free workshop”: not on bread alone does man live. Louis Levine, in his able and exhaustive work, *The Labour Movement in France*, asserts that this desire for economic freedom from the arbitrariness of the individual employer is the main motive which stimulates the militant workingman to his collectivist hopes.

The Syndicalist despises Socialist diplomacy, compromise, and desire for numbers. “The free man, even if he stand alone, is superior to the servile crowd.” “French Syndicalism,” says Lagardelle, “was born of the reaction of the proletariat against Democracy.” And Ramsay MacDonald: “Socialism must be parliamentary, or nothing. And there is nothing more galling to enthusiastic reformers to whom the alluring vision of human perfection is very near, as in a dream, than the heavy, lumbering coach of Parliamentary progress.” Politics, too, presupposes a community of interests and interests of a community. The Syndicalist denies that a wolf and a lamb—Capitalism and Labour—exploiter and exploited—can form a community or have any common interests. The nation and patriotism are shibboleths and can be nothing else under existing economic conditions.

Politics  
detrimental to  
fervour for the  
Class-war ; no  
mediation wanted.

Furthermore, Labour loses its sting in contact with other classes ; its *esprit de corps* weakens ; it loses its zeal for the Holy War : " The bourgeois, bourgeois interests, bourgeois ambitions and vanities, penetrate even the parties which call themselves working-class." The classes must be kept rigidly apart : no traitorous intercourse must be allowed ; and that is inevitable in politics. For politics are contaminating. In them money and wire-pulling rule. They are coming more and more into the hands of the wealthy bourgeoisie ; and the bourgeoisie are the hardest task-masters. They may grant an Old Age Pension or Insurance Act, but they will keep their heel well planted still on their victim's neck. But the Socialist in Parliament allows himself to be fooled by these crumbs thrown from the Capitalist table. He is fooled, too, by the mock show of statesmanship and influence which is conceded to him. The Syndicalist mocks at the bourgeoisie patrons of Socialism, the Fabian Society, and the rest, as " middle class, showing the mask of Socialism, snobbish on the one hand and cunning on the other." He wants no outside interference in his fight with Capital. He rejects the aid of clergy and politicians sympathetic with the cause of Labour. Ben Tillet recently said in Dublin (*Evening Telegraph* account, December 8th, 1913), " Clergymen could not help them . . . Even if the priest and the parson were anxious to help them he would still say to them—' Clear the ring and let us fight it out.' " The working-class organisation must be working-class through and through and nothing else. " The workers' emancipation can only be the work of the workers themselves." Mediators mean peace and compromise, and Syndicalism wants neither. " Unionism," says Tom Mann, " that aims only at securing peace between employers and men, is not only of no

value in the fight for freedom, but is actually a serious hindrance and a menace to the interests of the workers."

What, then, is the worker to do (6) "Direct Action" if he has rejected collective bargaining and political methods? "Direct the only way of redress; Sabotage. Action"—the general strike: this is the watchword. Direct Action means action by the workers for

their own interests without intermediaries—politicians or others. It is to proceed along the lines of the "Irritation," the Sympathetic, and the General Strike. The "Irritation Strike" consists in a deliberate campaign to lessen, while remaining at work, the quantity and the value of the output. "Bad work for bad pay." The employer can be assailed only in his profits. Hence the Syndicalist must reduce those profits, thus to eliminate by degrees the shareholders who own the industries, and compel the owners to give them over as unprofitable to the workers. Carelessness and inferior work is recommended as a means to this. Another is what the French call "Sabotage"—deliberate damaging of machinery, wasting time, displeasing customers, and every conceivable means of interfering with the successful running of the enterprise, whatever it be. Some Syndicalist leaders, as Pouget, have even suggested the details of this warfare, such as "scoring lines on rollers by a pennyworth of sand," and others of the same sort. "Simple common sense," says Pouget, "suggests, that as the employer is an enemy, it is no more disloyal for the workman to entrap him into ambuscades than to fight him face to face."

Sorel and those who follow him condemn this "sabotage" as hindering the efficiency of the worker, though they approve of violence and the general strike. They ask

how can the workman, who has accustomed himself to inefficient work, be a fit instrument in the recon-

struction of a purely industrial State, either morally or economically. But the fact is that Syndicalist warfare in almost all cases has been accompanied by this practice. When you preach revolution and class-war it is not easy to say, "thus far and no farther" to thousands of passionate and uneducated men. If it is war, let it be war, with the ethics of war, says the Syndicalist rank-and-filer; and granted his premiss it is not easy to quarrel with his conclusions.

(7) **The General Strike.** This guerilla warfare is, however, but a preparation for the great final war—short, sharp, decisive—which will once for all crush Capitalism.

That is the General Strike. This idea is, as we have seen, as old as Owen; but it has received special prominence from the Syndicalist. All in Syndicalism leads to it and from it; it is the centre. It is the revolution itself; with it automatically will come the Syndicalist millennium. "We shall prepare the way as rapidly as possible for 'The General Strike,' of national proportions. This will be the actual social and industrial revolution": so Tom Mann. The strike is to be "general" in its widest sense. On one day, at one word of command, the workmen in every trade, every industry, every State service, will all "down tools." There will be violence and "sabotage." The State will be paralysed; the army will be powerless or will revolt; the bourgeoisie will be deprived of all the comforts of life. Things will come to such a pass that the rich will flee the country and thus the workmen come into "their own." It is this blessed consummation that is the object of the General Strike, not any partial amelioration. General Strikes for partial amelioration have been for the most part a failure; it will not be so when used for the upheaval of the whole existing social order, says the Syndicalist. The General Strike is "direct action" in its purest form: no voting; no representatives; no compromise; no tantalising delays

and makeshifts ; one sharp blow and all is won. " Violence is a thing very beautiful and very heroic ; it is of service to the primordial interests of civilisation ; it can save the world from barbarism," writes Sorel.

Yet Sorel\* is not strong in his faith that the General Strike will ever be realised as a historical fact. But, he says, even if it does not happen, still as an ideal, a "myth," leading on to action, it will be the cause of anything else which may happen. A "myth" he defines as "a mixture of fact and art for the purpose of giving an aspect of reality to the hopes on which present conduct depends. Such a mixture is the General Strike, and the intuition of it as the realisation of the Syndicalist millennium will bring about the millennium. Furthermore, relying on Bergson, he teaches the superiority of Intuition to Intellect as a guide to action. Hence he says that we must not analyse or question this "myth," but follow on where the light leads. Reflection means death to action ; inspiration is the one thing necessary, not reason. Inspiration brings emotion, and emotion successful action. Now the "myth" of the General Strike is, by its dramatic appeal, eminently suitable to act on the masses as a spur to intense ideals of loyalty and self-sacrifice for the Revolution. Hence its value for Sorel. " Strikes have given birth in the minds of the people to the noblest, deepest, and most inspiring of motives, but it is the General Strike that groups all these ideas into a universal picture and, by bringing them together, gives to each its maximum of possible influence. We obtain thus such an intuition of Socialism that language is impotent clearly to express it, and we obtain this intuition in a perfectly timeless whole. In fact, it is the perfect knowledge of the Bergsonian philosophy."

\* Sorel has recently completely lost faith in and renounced the Syndicalist creed.



**Constructive  
Schemes ;  
None for Sorel.**

What, then, of the day after the Revolution? Sorel, Berth, Lagardelle, and a large section of the Syndicalists bid us not ask the question. It is vain to try to schematise the future. Bring about the Revolution first and then see what comes. "Directly we think of definite aims endless disputes arise. Some will say that their aims will be realised in a society without government. Others say that they will be realised in a society elaborately governed and directed. Which is right? I do not take the responsibility of deciding. I wait to decide whither I am going until I have returned from my journey, which will itself have revealed whither I am actually going": thus Griffuelhues.

**Pouget and Pataud's  
Reconstruction.** Another school has, however, given us a hazy picture of the future Syndicalist Community. Pouget and Pataud, as they have thrown on canvas their vision of the General Strike, so too they have planned their future State. Everything is in ruins after the Great Upheaval; but at the voice of the charmer the damaged machinery is made whole, the ruined walls rise to the music of Apollo's lyre. The workmen seize the works; a co-operative brotherhood is formed; a co-operative society of workers rules each factory and each mine; they are federated into larger societies of the same trade; and the Federations are united in the Grand Central Organisation, the C.G.T. itself in France, which will not only determine the relations between different trades and industries, but also perform whatever diverse functions of government may still be necessary. For there will be no State. The brotherhood of man will be such a binding social force that the functions of government become very few and simple. There will be no politics, no internal strife needing State adjudication. The wage-system will be abolished,

and with it all the tyranny of the past. There will be no army, no navy, none of the immense bureaucratic machinery of the modern State. All that will be needless.

**No satisfactory explanation of how this Revolution, is to be realised or the working of the new State.**

inspired prophets as such.

Neither is it clear how several departments, essential to social life, such as education, will be provided for. Even as regards religion, the supreme social importance of which few even of the extreme iconoclasts have ventured to deny,

**Syndicalism, Socialism, and Religion.**

the Syndicalist has no clear message. Sorel would respect religion as an elevating "myth," for the same reason that he advocates the General Strike; both make for higher aspirations and nobler conduct, though both are, or may be, equally unreal. But in judging of the relations of Syndicalism to religion, just as in the case of Socialism, we must be guided, not by the isolated declarations of leaders or the occasional diplomatic resolutions of Congresses—but by the whole tone of the movement. Syndicalism, as Socialism, is not a set of formularies—it is a living, throbbing movement. It is mere academic folly to judge the spirit and the real tenets of such live movements otherwise than by a broad outlook on the spirit of the men who follow after. The sound judgment of the man of the world who is in daily contact with his fellow-men, is more reliable here than any astute professor or theorist's analysis of resolutions and declarations. Hence it is idle to advance, as Mr. Snowden

How all this is to come about we are not told; at least we get no explanation which will satisfy any person who does not accept the fundamental principles of renouncing reason and yielding himself up to a blind faith in the "myth"—a wild, unceasing pursuit of a will-o'-the-wisp, acknowledged by some of the

inspired prophets as such. Neither is it clear how several departments, essential to social life, such as education, will be provided for. Even as regards religion, the supreme social importance of which few even of the extreme iconoclasts have ventured to deny, the Syndicalist has no clear message. Sorel would respect religion as an elevating "myth," for the same reason that he advocates the General Strike; both make for higher aspirations and nobler conduct, though both are, or may be, equally unreal. But in judging of the relations of Syndicalism to religion, just as in the case of Socialism, we must be guided, not by the isolated declarations of leaders or the occasional diplomatic resolutions of Congresses—but by the whole tone of the movement. Syndicalism, as Socialism, is not a set of formularies—it is a living, throbbing movement. It is mere academic folly to judge the spirit and the real tenets of such live movements otherwise than by a broad outlook on the spirit of the men who follow after. The sound judgment of the man of the world who is in daily contact with his fellow-men, is more reliable here than any astute professor or theorist's analysis of resolutions and declarations. Hence it is idle to advance, as Mr. Snowden

does, as an argument for the purely economic character of Socialism, a declaration of the German Social Democratic Party, that Socialism has, in its corporate capacity, nothing to do with religion; that religion is the individual's concern. He might have advanced other declarations of a similar nature; but the inwardness of these declarations is apparent when we study the circumstances and motives which prompted them. They are mere vote-catching devices. The shrewd leaders of Socialism know that they must not give too violent a shock to old convictions. They tell the workman he can be a Socialist and a Christian; but once he is a Socialist he very quickly casts off Christianity. "I cannot," says a prominent American Socialist, Joseph Leatham, "at the present moment remember a single instance of a person who is at one and the same time a really earnest and intelligent Socialist and an orthodox Christian." And another, Mr. Hillquit, acknowledges that ninety-nine per cent. of Socialists are agnostics. This is no peculiarity of American Socialism. From the Socialist literature and speeches of every country quotations could be multiplied in defence of a materialistic and determinist interpretation of the universe, an educational policy frankly secular, a policy of exclusion of religious and clerics from the schools, even a condemnation of Christianity or any form of theism as superstition. The spirit is there and runs through the whole movement, and those leaders who are really sincere in their conviction that Socialism is not incompatible with Christianity, seem to be powerless to check this tendency. For our part we must judge the movement as a whole and, so viewed, it stands condemned as anti-religious, while we pay homage to the efforts of those men who would preserve some vestige of religion to the masses of their followers.

What we have said of Socialism and religion is true also of Syndicalism. In this respect they are at one. The French Syndicalists, the Industrial Workers of the

World in America, the British, Italian and German Syndicalists all adopt the same attitude in varying degrees towards Christianity, which Socialism does. Catholicism in particular is the *bête noire* of both, inasmuch as it is the strongest, and most uncompromising and consistent opponent of secular education and all vagaries in moral and religious teaching.

#### EXAMINATION AND CRITICISM OF SYNDICALISM.

I have dwelt at such length over the history and exposition of the doctrines of Syndicalism that there is but little space available for criticism. Yet, perhaps, the best criticism would have been fuller exposition; for the extreme Syndicalist is one of those whose destruction is most easily accomplished by freedom and enough rope. The Syndicalist teachings on class-war, sabotage, irritation, sympathetic and general strikes, need but to be explained in detail to refute themselves. It is for this reason that Sorel, Berth, and Lagardelle wisely abstain from such detailed and concrete exposition, and shroud themselves in a cloud of mysticism and vague generalities; while Pouget and Pataud have committed the unpardonable sin of explaining what they mean, and thus have done more than any of their enemies to refute the doctrines they uphold. From their explanation it is clear that Syndicalism is founded on principles which are untrue; that its destructive policy is ethically objectionable, and its constructive schemes impracticable.

The fundamental principle of Syndicalism, that society is rigidly divided into two warring classes—the exploiters and the exploited—needs much modification. Of course there is such a division, but it is by no means clear-cut and irreconcilable, nor does it embrace the whole population; there are large sections of the population which

**The "Class-war" theory needs modification.**

are partly in one class, partly in the other. There is an interdependence of interests and much good-will and respect between the various grades of society, and within the ranks of Capital as well as of Labour there are warring interests. Hence the war is by no means a war of Capital and Labour merely. It is often a war of one industry with another, or of different grades within the same industry. There is, of course, a struggle—an intense struggle—going on between Capital and Labour, but we must not lose sight of the fact that they have many interests in common ; that society is a very complex organism of mutually interdependent parts ; that a victory for Capital or Labour in one industry may mean a defeat for its brother Capital or Labour in another. Any solution of the social question must recognise the essential unity amidst diversity of society. The dichotomy of the Syndicalist is an unreal abstraction untrue to life. The interests of Labour and Capital are not irreconcilable, and with good-will, a sound and vigorous public opinion and Christian charity, Labour will get more and more of its due share of profits without the loss to Capital of what may rightfully belong to it. It is the duty of those who have the welfare of society at heart to create an efficacious public opinion and contribute, by practical schemes, to the realisation, through many blunderings and much error, it needs must be, of a better and worthier social order, in which the higher joys and the beautiful things of life as well as the fulfilment of lower needs will be attainable by all who care to strive to attain them ; and in which worth of any kind will have opportunity and adequate reward. This will mean fighting, but the fighting we trust will ultimately lead to mutual understanding and good-will. War always, everywhere, in everything—a truceless war—is by no means necessary or inevitable. Even already the social conscience of the public is roused to some extent, and it lies with the friends of the poor and of peace and Christian

charity to rouse it more. Thus, by legislation, by private effort, by kindly feeling and organised social works, war will be averted and men realise that they are brothers one to another and all to Christ.

**“ Direct Action ”  
most detrimental  
to the workers.**

When we turn to the destructive policy of Syndicalism we see that it is ethically unsound and practically impolitic. “ Direct Action ”—i.e., action by the workmen on their own initiative and without intermediaries—will be necessary to remedy special grievances, while the fight goes on. But experience has shown that even the ordinary strike is morally detrimental to the workers, and should be used with caution. How much more so, then, the “ Irritation ” Strike, and the General Strike ! The Irritation Strike is dishonest and destructive of industry and thus injures the workers materially and morally ; the General Strike can never be realised on the huge scale contemplated ; and if it did arise it would bring most misery on the poor, who always suffer most from a paralysis of industry. If the poor suffer so much in the course of partial strikes, when they can get relief from their unions and the help proffered by those in work, what will be their sufferings when all are out and the funds of the unions speedily exhausted ? Furthermore, they would be bound to suffer intensely in the depression of trade which would follow. The most experienced and wisest of the Labour leaders have seen this, and have condemned the Sympathetic Strike and all attempts to widen the area of conflict unnecessarily. The federation of Capital has necessitated a certain widening of the strike area ; but that is recognised by these men as an evil, and the General Strike is losing the fascination which it had over the imagination of the workers. A policy which ignores elementary economic laws is unworthy of leaders of men, and, if followed, can but bring destruction to those who adopt it.

The Syndicalist  
Strike Policy  
ignores Elementary  
Economic Laws.

Now, an unthinking strike policy ignores the fact that to raise wages in one industry often means raising the cost of living all round, so far as that industry affects the community ; and a general rise of wages, out of proportion to the margin of profit, means a general rise in the cost of production and the selling-price, and a consequent lowering of the purchasing power of money. Furthermore, a policy of unrest begets a difficulty in procuring, and so a rise in the price of Capital and a consequent decrease in wages, or the ruin of industry, and unemployment ; and thus the last state of the workman is little better, if at all better, than the first. Of course most industries could give an increase in wages without these evil consequences ; but some could not, and there must be a discrimination, which the old Unionism was generally careful to make. The Syndicalist strike policy ignores the fact that the support of the community has great influence on the success or failure of the strike. Now, the community would certainly resist a Syndicalist General Strike ; it would organise " free " and volunteer labour, and use all the resources at its command, even the army and citizen forces, to put down organised revolution. This we have seen lately in South Africa, where there was a citizen force of 60,000 men. It is useless for the Syndicalist or Socialist to say that the abolition of Capital would alter all our economic laws, until they explain how modern industry is to be run without the help of Capital. We cannot, even if we would, reverse the wheels of progress and do away with costly machinery and big factories, which have centralised industry and made Capital a necessity for economic and national welfare. The substitutes for Capital provided by both systems would speedily be found in practice either futile or containing most of the objectionable features of Capital.

To realise this in the case of Syndicalism we will suppose that the General Strike is an accomplished fact, in spite of the obviously insurmountable difficulties in the way of getting all the workers of the world, or even of one country, thus to combine. We will suppose, further, that the community has been foolish enough not to defend itself, that all government and authority has collapsed in a most inexplicable manner, and that Capital has handed over its house, furnished and in order, in spite of the violence and sabotage of the revolution, to Labour. What then? The miners take over the mines, the dockers the docks, the railwaymen the railways, and so on. Even if we suppose that these co-operative societies can surmount the difficulty of beginning without Capital—a formidable difficulty, even where the plant and machinery were so cheaply acquired—will they be able to abolish the hated wage-system and subjection to authority?

**Syndicalism  
will not abolish  
the Wage-system.**

In the course of a very able article, published as a Supplement to the *Crusade*, Sidney and Beatrice Webb examine Syndicalism from this point of view. They show that in the future Syndicalist State there would be necessary the same hierarchy of officials and managers which exists at present; that bureaucracy instead of disappearing would be largely increased; that the allowance to the individual worker would have to take a form identical with the weekly wages system; that this allowance would have to be fixed on a scale, based not merely on the output of the individual worker, but also on several other considerations. Neither could the rate of allowance be determined by the workman's own Union, or even by the National Council of the unions of his trade, but by the General Council representative of all the National Councils of different trades. This would be necessary in order to adapt supply to



demand ; to prevent any one trade or industry sending up prices at the expense of others ; to make a fair division over all the workers of the advantages arising through special and natural circumstances in rich industries such as the railways or mines. For the Syndicalist admits that, after all, it is impossible to have the railways *merely* for the railwaymen, or the mines for the miners, and so on ; that these things must be for the community first, and through the community for the railwaymen and the miners and the other workers also.

Furthermore, this central General Council would have to perform all the organising, legislating, and regulating functions of the present directors, and managers, and "bosses" of every description. These regulations would in practice, if there were not to be utter chaos, be pretty much what they are at present in their broad outlines. The new "bosses" would, of course, be more humane and considerate, but they would be "bosses" still, and experience of Trades Union and Co-operative Society officials shows that even when the workingman is "boss" the shoe of authority and obedience pinches. Abolition of authority and obedience is then as impossible as the abolition of the wage-system, or the establishing of a uniform wage for all workmen, elsewhere than in the airy and nebular regions where so many of the social castles of the future have been built. They will not bear the test of the concrete, hard, practical experience of human nature and human conditions as we know them, and any sane, responsible leader will build on what we know, and not on a floating vision of what human nature and human life may be in the millennium to come.

**Further objections  
against  
Syndicalism :**

**(a) The Constitution  
of the  
General Council,**

**(b) its impossible  
functions,**

Further flaws, running through the whole foundations of the Syndicalist city, have been pointed out—for instance, the constitution of the General Council and the immense, complex, and utterly impossible nature of the functions which it must perform. First, as regards its constitution, it is elected on a representative basis and represents merely the workers. Now, the mode of its constitution opens up the way to all the politics and political methods and the political State, which the Syndicalist abhors ; while the fact that it would represent merely the workers is obviously unjust, when we consider the nature of its functions. It is clear that in regulating for production it must also regulate for consumption and affect consumers as such ; yet consumers, as such, have no representation in its councils.

Furthermore, it must, in the absence of any other body, fulfil all the functions of a modern Parliament and the modern bureaucracy. It will have to see to Education, amendments of the Social system, Foreign and Colonial affairs, Police, the Judicature, National Defence, and many other departments of the modern State, which cannot be superseded ; and in addition it will have the more than herculean task of dealing with the countless industrial and social problems, which the new social State will throw on it. In other words, it will have to take on itself the work of all the modern Parliament and Government departments, and, in addition, that of all the governing boards, directors and managers of modern industry, complicated even beyond modern complication. While the wisest of modern statesmen are declaring the necessity of decentralising government and leaving local affairs to local management, in their despair of dealing efficiently with them by a central representative body, the Syndicalist is clamour-

ing for a State centralised beyond the wildest dreams even of Napoleonic centralisation. Of course it is inevitable that in such a State there would be only just as little and as much intimate knowledge and sympathy with the life of the manual worker amongst the governing classes, whatever name we call them by, as there is at present.

The Community has yet another  
 (c) Minorities would suffer. crow to pluck with Syndicalism. It has been said that Syndicalism was born of a revolt against the superstitious worship of democracy and majority rule: it professes reverence for the "conscious minority" above the unthinking and lethargic mob: and in this there is much to be admired, though we have a greater faith in the sound sense of an instructed democracy than the Syndicalist. Yet in the Syndicalist State minorities would suffer even more than now. It is by no means clear what would be the lot of the learned professions except that, if they were to have any voice in government or administration, they would have to organise themselves on the footing of Trades Unions, if the Syndicalist manual worker State would allow that, at the sacrifice, it would seem, of consistency with many Syndicalist declarations. So, too, individual workers, students, literary men, journalists, poets, artists, inventors, ecclesiastics, and many others who could not be organised into Unions, must suffer. The fact of the matter is that the Syndicalist takes too simple a view of life and society: the functions and the people who make both possible are far too complex and intricate and interdependent to be ticketed and labelled, regimented and drilled, in the way he proposes; and if he got his way life would be deprived of all that makes it most livable.

We see, then, that the Syndicalist State is undesirable, even if it could be realised; that it cannot be realised

by the means proposed ; and that even if it could be realised by those means, they would be ethically undesirable, and so could not be justified by the end proposed, however good.

But we must not conclude this essay without pointing out the good tendencies of Syndicalism. It is right in insisting on the fact that success for the workman depends even more on industrial action than on politics ; though, of course, it should give more generous recognition to the work of social reform of the Labour Parties in the Parliaments of the world. It should admit also that much can be done by political means even within our present political States, when the public conscience is properly aroused ; that even with the grip which Capital has on the modern State, yet there are indications that it too will have to yield to ethical considerations and yield to the demands of public opinion for more Christian treatment of the worker. It is right in exposing the wire-pulling and corruption that is almost inseparable from party politics ; but the remedy for this again is not revolution, but an instructed and shrewd public opinion, a better press and publicity, as far as possible, in matters of State. Lastly, but far from least, Syndicalism is right in the homage which it pays to the Co-operative ideal. Agricultural Co-operation, as practised in Ireland, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Italy, and elsewhere, has proved an unquestionable success, and wherever its work has been temporarily retarded, it has been due to accidental reasons ; while the story of the fabulous success of the English Co-operative Societies reads like a romance in the fairyland of figures. Co-operation such as this should be encouraged in every way : but this Co-operation, does not abolish Capital, but distributes it more widely and increases the ranks of the capitalists by making the workman and the farmer themselves investors and capitalists.

Some good  
tendencies in  
Syndicalism.

With a gradually realised Co-operative Commonwealth of this kind, which is in a true sense a proprietary State and respects all rights which should be respected, we have every sympathy; but this is very far from being the ideal of the Syndicalist. We must refer to other pamphlets of this series, which are to follow, for a fuller treatment of the Co-operation we have commended and the benefits which accrue from it.

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

### ENGLISH WORKS.

- GUY BOWMAN: *Syndicalism, Its Basis, Methods and Ultimate Aims.* (London, 1913.)
- J. G. BROOKS: *American Syndicalism: The I.W.W.* (Macmillan, 1913; 5s. 6d.)
- G. D. H. COLE, B.A.: *The World of Labour.* (Bell, 1913; 5s.)
- A. ESTEY, D.Ph.: *Revolutionary Syndicalism.* (King, 1913; 7s. 6d.)
- J. H. HARLEY, M.A.: *Syndicalism.* (Jack, 1913; 6d.)
- LOUIS LEVINE, D.Ph.: *The Labour Movement in France.* (King, 1912; 6s.)
- A. D. LEWIS: *Syndicalism and the General Strike.* (Unwin, 1912; 3s. 6d.)
- J. R. MACDONALD, M.P.: *Syndicalism.* (Constable, 1912; 1s.)
- TOM MANN: *The Industrial Syndicalist.* (Bowman, London, 1910-1912.)
- PHILIP SNOWDEN, M.P.: *Socialism and Syndicalism.* (Collins, 1913; 1s.)

PROF. W. SOMBART : *Socialism and the Social Movement*. (Dent; 3s. 6d.)

SIDNEY AND BEATRICE WEBB : *What Syndicalism Means*. (National Committee for the Prevention of Destitution. 1913; id.)

## FRENCH BOOKS.

C. BOUGLÉ : *Syndicalisme et Démocratie*. (Paris.)

F. CHALLAYE : *Syndicalisme Révolutionnaire et Syndicalisme Réformiste*. (Paris : Alcan, 1909.)

PATAUD ET POUGET : *Comment nous ferons la Révolution*. (Paris : Tallandier.)

G. SOREL : *Réflexions sur la Violence*. (Paris : Rivière, 3<sup>e</sup> édition, 1912.)

An English translation of Sorel's work is announced by Messrs. Swift.

# **Handbook of Catholic Charitable and Social Works in Ireland.** 1s. Post Free

EDITED BY REV. J. McDONNELL, S.J.

**His Eminence Cardinal Logue writes of it:**—"I find it to be a very interesting and useful publication . . . . I am sure it will prove a very useful book of reference."

**His Grace the Archbishop of Tuam writes:**—"It seems to me a very timely publication—singularly full and accurate for a first edition . . . . It will come as a revelation to many of the variety and extent of the charitable and social work being quietly accomplished by the priests and religious of Ireland."

**The Most Rev. Dr. Sheehan, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, writes in reference to this book:**—" . . . . You have certainly, by its publication, supplied a long felt want in this country; and, all things considered, I think it will be agreed that you have supplied it well . . . . We must all feel grateful to you for having undertaken this religious and patriotic work, and for having performed it with such energy and success."

**"The Month" says of it:**—"Father McDonnell has produced a most useful volume, which gives a comprehensive view of the vast work for social betterment which is being carried on in Ireland."

**"The Irish Monthly."**—The late Father Matthew Russell, S.J., wrote of it:—"The compilation of this volume must have entailed great labour and care. It is the first of its kind. It describes all the social and charitable works carried on in each of the dioceses of Ireland by priests and nuns and lay Catholic associations, arranged in four sections, according as they are aids in distress, or in sickness and affliction, aids to reformation or to religious, social or physical development. Please God, this Handbook will gain new friends for these benevolent institutions and may lead to the formation of new ones."

# Social Action Series.

The Social Question—Introductory. { 2nd Edition.  
10th thousand.

By Rev. P. J. Connolly, S.J.

No. 1—The Church and Labour.

No. 2—The Church and Working Men.

No. 3—The Church and Working Women.

No. 4—The Church and the Working Child.

No. 5—The Church and Trades Unions.

No. 6—The Church and Social Work.

All by Rev. L. McKenna, S.J., M.A.

No. 7—The Pillars of Socialism.

By Rev. Michael J. Phelan, S.J.,

No. 8—Our Schools and Social Work.

By Rev. E. Boyd Barrett, S.J., M.A. D.Ph.

No. 9—Socialism and the Working Man.

By Rev. J. McDonnell, S.J.,

No. 10—Syndicalism.

By Rev. J. Joy, S.J., M.A.

No. 11—Effects of Strikes.

By Rev. E. Boyd Barrett, S.J., M.A., D.Ph.

*Others in the press.*

We strongly recommend these books to Catholic working men and women, to priests, and to all who are interested in Irish industrial problems. We ask our Promoters and readers to spread them broadcast, and to see that they are placed in all church book-boxes. They are calculated to exercise a very important influence for good.

Nos. 1 to 6 handsomely bound in Cloth, 1/- ; 1/2 post free.

2nd Edition, completing 16,000  
copies of each.