

.. THE WAR ..

and the
Sydney Labor Council

An Address Delivered by
E. E. JUDD
at the Trades Hall, Sydney
on March 8, 1917

PRICE - - ~~TWO PENCE~~ 3

PUBLISHED BY
The Socialist Labor Party of Australia
JUNE 1, 1917

THE PEOPLE'S PRINT CITY

EVERY WORKER SHOULD READ

the following Pamphlets dealing with the Social Question :

What Means This Strike (DeLeon) 2d
A concise statement explaining the real cause of strikes

Address on Industrial Union Preamble 2d
The working man who does not know what the W.I.U. Preamble means is not educated. This pamphlet will open his eyes. (DeLeon)

Socialism and Churchianity. 1d
A Reply to Archbishop Redwood's Criticism of Socialism.

Socialism versus Anarchy (DeLeon)
A masterly address showing the difference between Socialism and Anarchy.

THE TWO WARS 3d
A Pamphlet every member of the Working Class should read. It deals with Constructive Industrialism, the Two Wars, and historic events of the Class Struggle in Australia. Price 3d

The Seven Questions (DeLeon) 3d
This is a gem. If you want to know the "How, Why, Where and When" of Socialism, READ these Answers to Seven Questions asked through the Roman Catholic Press.

Obtainable at S.L.P. Headquarters

Rawson Chambers, Rawson Place, Sydney

Sydney Labor Council and the War

Report of an Address Delivered by E. E. JUDD, in reply to
the following motion:

"That as Mr. E. E. Judd is contesting both State and Federal Elections as a SOCIALIST Candidate, against the P.L.L. candidates, he be deposed from the Executive of this Council."

Mr. President and Delegates:

I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the whole of the time I was being attacked I remained silent—although men spoke of me as a betrayer of, and traitor to, my class. I hope that my opponents will be equally fair, and remain silent while I am defending myself. (Hear, hear.) I wish all delegates present to treat this matter very seriously. It is a serious matter to me. I value the confidence of my class. Any action taken against me by my fellow-workers is calculated to discredit me in the eyes of my class.

The attacks of my opponents compel me, as a matter of self-defence, to speak of the fight I put up against conscription. There is not a delegate on this Council who has denounced Hughes and Holman more strongly than I.

Anti-Conscription Campaign

Nearly 18 months ago (23/0/15) my Party and I organised the Anti-conscription League, which was composed of my organisation (Socialist Labor Party) the A.S.P. and the Federated Ironworkers, the Boilermakers and a number of other unions and organisations.

I advanced money for meetings in this hall and for advertisements, etc. I helped to induce unions to send delegates and assisted to carry on the meetings here until the authorities of this hall prevented us from holding meetings here against conscription. After a few meetings in other halls, the Hughes gang prevented us hiring halls in this city. We then went to the Domain, and the Chief Secretary (Mr. Black) indirectly incited organised opposition to our meetings. The Inspector-General of Police was used by Mr. Black to issue statements to the press that were indirectly incitements to hooligans to smash our meetings.

Mr. J. D. Fitzgerald, Labor Government Representative in the Legislative Council, suggested that the "boys" should come from Liverpool and drive us into the harbor. Later on Mr. Black prevented us holding anti-conscription meetings in the Domain.

Whilst we unionists were deprived of the right of free speech, with, I think, one exception, the whole of the "true blue" anti-conscription Storey section of the State Labor Party remained silent—even whilst their Minister indirectly incited people to smash our meeting.

I supported the P.L.L. in expelling the Hughes-Holman combination, and I supported Mr. W. O'Brien when he put up one of the best fights of his life on the floor of this Council against Mr. Guihen during the conscription campaign. I left off work for eight weeks to fight the no-conscription campaign. During the Referendum campaign I made common cause with others in fighting the common enemy.

At many places such as Granville, Newcastle, and throughout this city and suburbs. I spoke on many platforms including those of the P.L.L. I did as much work as any man in the Commonwealth to defeat Conscription.

Further, when men were being called up under the Proclamation, I appealed to this Council and advised my class not to answer the Proclamation. I was arrested for that. Although you know all these things, yet there are men among you who suggest that Judd is both a "traitor" and a "betrayed." (Disorder and hostile interjections). We have all been taught that old precept, "Do unto others as you would like to be done by." If my opponents had acted on that precept they would not have said the cruel things that they have said against me to-night. I am prepared to meet men on broad general principles, but I shall not descend to the depths that some of my opponents have descended to.

I want to be fair. I have never voted to place the gag upon an opponent. I wish to say here that I appreciate the fair and impartial manner in which our President and Vice-President, as officials of this Council, have acted in this matter. They have not allowed their party feelings to prejudice their actions as officers in charge of these meetings. I am always prepared to fight men and respect them as long as they fight fairly. It has been said of us Socialists who are candidates that we are traitors, renegades and players into the hands of Holman and Hughes. You know that we have no

more friendship for the Hughes Government than our critics have. I have to defend myself, but at the same time, in the interests of my class, I have to refrain from using any arguments that may be used by the Hughes and Holman gang against us. (Applause.) I would rather be deposed from the Executive than play into the hands of the enemy by using such arguments. (Renewed applause.)

Class-Conscious Candidate

Mr. Morby stated that in my reply I would no doubt say that I was a class-conscious candidate. I am. I am one of an implacable band of revolutionary Socialists and I shall not apologise to anybody for fighting in the State and Federal elections as a class-conscious candidate.

Challenge to P.L.L.

I am prepared to meet anyone to debate this question and prove that Socialists should oppose both Nationalist and P.L.L. candidates. I am prepared to meet either Mr. Watson, Mr. Rae, Mr. Bowling, Mr. Smith or anyone the P.L.L. Executive appoints and pay half the expenses of any hall in this city and prove that the Socialists policy is the best. I said to Mr. Smith last Saturday night that I was prepared to take any hall in the city and debate as to which policy was the best for the workers. (Although Judd offered to pay all the expenses of such a debate, and give Mr. Smith a free platform, Mr. Smith refused to debate until after the elections.—Ed.) Could anyone be more fair (Voices: "No.") Some of you seem to think that I should appear before you as a white-robed penitent pleading for forgiveness, but I ask for no quarter and I am not going to give any.

Class Solidarity

I believe in solidarity, but it must be on class lines, not on a set of principles from which Mr. Holman and his capitalist class political party can steal 90 p.c. (This reference is to P.L.L. statements that Mr. Holman had stolen 90 p.c. of its platform.—Ed.)

Before you can understand my attitude towards both Nationalist and P.L.L. parties, it is necessary for me to explain many matters.

S.L.P. and Senate Elections

In the first place I shall briefly state what the S.L.P. has done in the past. In the first Senate elections in Australia, when the P.L.L. could only nominate two candidates against the capitalist class politicians, the Socialist Labor Party nominated the full ticket—six candidates, which was quite logical. In the second Senate elections (1903) the only candidate the P.L.L. nominated was Arthur Griffiths. On the other hand we again nominated the full ticket, three.

But what did the P.L.L. Executive do? It advised the electors to vote for Mr. Griffiths and two capitalist class candidates. ("Shame" and a voice: "Its different now.")

Mrs. Matthews: Can you prove that?

Mr. Judd: Yes, I can prove it from the labor press of the time. At every Senate election until the last the Socialist Labor Party has nominated the full ticket. And the Federal Labor Party has done its best—by making us pay a deposit of £25 for each candidate nominated—to prevent Socialists from contesting Federal elections.

In order to understand political parties it is absolutely necessary to understand the system of society in which we live.

Capitalism

At present we are living in a state of society known as capitalism. The capitalist class, who, with their dependents, do not number more than 8 or 10 p.c. of the population, own all the socially-operated means of production—such as railways, tramways, factories, ships, mines, etc.

Then there is the middle and professional class, which, with their dependents, number perhaps 15 p.c. of the population.

Next we have the wage-working section of the community who with their dependents, number perhaps 75 p.c. of the population. These figures are approximate and only for purposes of illustration.

For the present discussion we need only consider the capitalist class who own all the means of production that the wage-workers must get access to in order to live, and the working class, who, as a class, own nothing but their labour power, which they must sell to the capitalist class in order to live. Through their ownership of the means of production which the workers must get access to in order to live, the

capitalist class practically own the working class. There is a clear line of demarcation between the worker who only owns his labor power, and the capitalist who owns a socially-operated plant of production—such as a factory, mine, or railway.

(Interjections, "Is this a defence, or a lecture on Socialism?" "Give us your defence," and disorder).

Mr. Judd: Mr. President, as a man, when accusing another, is entitled to use the arguments which he thinks best suited to his purpose, and to use them in the order he thinks best, surely a man is entitled to do the same in defending himself. If I had said to my opponents:—you must only use such arguments as will suit me,—and in such order as will suit me, my friends would have considered me unjust.

Although my opponents seem anxious to conduct my defence, I claim the same right as I grant my opponents—that is, to use whatever arguments and use them in whatever order I think best.

I shall revert now, Mr. President, to the point at which I was interrupted. The working-class produce all value, out of which they receive perhaps one-fourth in the form of wages. For example a bootmaker may add £2 in value to certain raw materials in a boot factory in a day, after which he may receive 10/- (ten shillings) in the form of wages. The amount of value that the working-class produce over and above their wages, and which is retained by the capitalist class, is called "surplus value."

The larger the amount of value that the working class can force from the capitalists in the form of wages, out of the total amount of value created, the less surplus value there is for the capitalists.

Therefore it is to the material interests of the capitalist class to force the working class to accept as little as possible of the total value they create. On the other hand it is to the material interests of the working class to force from the capitalists as much as possible, in the form of wages, of the total value created. The more value the working class receive in wages the less the capitalist class receive in surplus value.

Therefore, between the capitalist class and the working class what is called the "class struggle" is going on all the time.

(A voice: "I ask is Mr. Judd giving us a lecture on Socialism, or dealing with the charge against him?" Dis-

order and cross firing as to whether the speakers remarks were in order. The Chairman held that they were).

Mr. Judd: As workers we are supposed to enjoy certain rights. (Further interruption and the raising of points of order which were disallowed by the Chairman).

Mr. Judd: I think our Chairman knows that often it is necessary to make explanations in order to lead up to a point. The question is whether I am acting in the interests of my class or against it in contesting these elections? If I am acting in the interest of my class, this Council has no right to depose me from its Executive, but if I am acting against the interest of my class, Council has a perfect right to depose me. As a matter of justice delegates should allow me to state my case in my own way.

Citizens' Rights

To resume, we are supposed to have certain rights, such as the right of free speech, the liberty of the press, the right of assemblage, and the right to organise. Once we had the right to strike.

To be a Labor Party then, a party must assist the wage-working section of the community in their efforts to force from the capitalist class as much value as possible in the form of higher wages, defend all the rights I've just mentioned, and lastly, to assist in organising the working class to abolish class ownership of all the socially operated means of production.

Now let us examine the actions and principles of the State labor party and see if it is labor party according to my definition.

Labor Party's Call for Blacklegs

First let us see how they assist workers struggling for a little more of the value they have created. I have here a copy of the "Worker" of March 6, 1913. The article I wish to quote is in reference to the gas strike, and explains how Mr. MacGowen issued a proclamation calling for scabs to take the place of union men, who had tried for months to get an increase of from eight to nine shillings a day by deputations, etc., and were at last forced to strike. The article is headed "The Labor Government calls for Blacklegs," and "Extraordinary position in N.S.W." The Labor Party called for scabs to assist the gas monopolists to defeat unionists who were

struggling for a mere pittance. The capitalist press "Daily Telegraph," the "Herald" and the "Sun," praised Mr. MacGowen's admirable statesmanship.

The "Worker" says, "In the past few years we have seen **liberal** laws **amplified**, labor platforms **defied**, predatory enterprise assisted, and now we have the Government **out-doing** Wade in the severity of its treatment of sweated workers struggling for justice at the hands of a wealthy and heartless monopoly. The story of the State Government's dealings with the gas monopoly is a labor tragedy, etc."

Mr. Storey and nearly every man who is retiring with him, and seeking re-election as a "true blue" labor man, acquiesced in, and by acquiescing in, endorsed Mr. MacGowen's call for Blacklegs. Mr. Storey and his supporters were equally guilty with Mr. MacGowen for that crime against unionists.

Next let us examine both the platform and the actions of the State Labor Party in regard to their defence of the workers' rights.

Compulsory Arbitration

According to the platform labor members are pledged to Compulsory Arbitration. The State Labor Party took away the right to strike from workers and gave them the Garnishee Act in return. Under that Act the coal-miners, the railway workers, the farriers, the musicians, and other unionists, such as the butchers, have been fined thousands of pounds and in many cases had their wages garnisheed by the Labor Government for daring to strike for better conditions. In this regard Mr. Henwood, Secretary of the Farriers' Union, said that the wives and children of his members who had been on strike were deprived of the money to buy food, through the Labor Government having garnisheed the whole of the farriers' first pay after the strike.

Mr. Conroy, a Liberal member of the Federal Parliament, said he "would be very sorry if the spirit of freedom died out to such an extent that men would be compelled to work—dragooned to work—by soldiers or anyone else. Men under those conditions would be worse than niggers. There was something worse than strikes. It was an ignorant, debased population, afraid to strike. There were no strikes among the slaves of America, because they were slaves. (Hear, hear.) Yet a time of no strikes was the goal towards which

Labor members were looking. A man has as much right to refuse to work as to refuse to sell a bushel of wheat."

The workers of Australia have tended to become more servile slaves since compulsory arbitration has been operating as an industrial peace-making instrument.

Anything which handicaps the workers when struggling for better conditions, and tends to make them more servile, is in the interests of the capitalist class. Therefore, the Labor Party, and its Parliamentary representatives, such as Mr. Storey, have acted in the interests of the capitalist class in introducing compulsory arbitration with garnishee clauses.

Labor Party and Free Speech

Let us consider the Labor Party's action in relation to another right—the right of free speech. When Mr. Black, and those at his command, were indirectly inciting the hooligans to smash our anti-conscription meetings in the Domain from the 10th of July, 1916, onwards, the only man in the Storey group that I know of who rose in his place in Parliament and attacked Black and the rest of the Government was Mr. Stuart Robertson. Although he had the courage to make a stand on the matter, the rest of the party were as silent as sheep. Therefore, the Storey section, with one exception, as well as the others of the State Labor Party, acquiesced in Mr. Black's action. By their silence they were as culpable as Black, their Minister, in preventing us speaking against Conscription in the Domain. (Dissent.) Mr. Black, their Minister, issued an order prohibiting us unionists speaking against Conscription. (Voices: "No, no.") At a previous meeting of this Council, when delegates were asked to endorse Mr. Storey's party, I rose to oppose the Council endorsing him, but did not get the call from the chairman.

Nationalisation of Monopolies

Plank 3 of the Labor Party's platform is "Nationalization of Monopolies."

In Japan the Japanese capitalists have State-owned railways, electric trams, post and telegraph offices, wireless telegraphic system, naval dockyards, and State-owned tobacco monopoly.

In Russia the capitalists nationalized the manufacturing of alcoholic drinks.

In Germany the capitalists have introduced State and municipal ownership of different industries.

The English capitalists have also introduced municipal ownership of trams and Government ownership of munition works, etc., etc.

Mr. Baker: "And France, too."

Mr. Judd: Yes! Should not the Labor Party get suspicious of a form of ownership which the capitalists themselves are introducing? Are the workers in State owned industries part owners of such industries? We know that under State ownership the workers have no more share in the management of the concern than in the management of a trust. Have they any greater security in such industries than in privately owned industries? Do the workers own their jobs in such industries, or are they discharged when the managers think that the profits are insufficient? Has not there been thousands of men discharged lately from State-owned industries? If they were part owners of such industries, would they walk out to starve, whilst others stayed in and drew £3,000 a year out of the business? The workers in the State-owned industries of Australia have to work as long hours, and receive as low wages as the employees of a private capitalist. (A voice: "Often a lower wage.") Have not the workers in State-owned industries had to strike in scores of cases to get a living wage, just the same as in privately owned industries? State ownership of industry is collective capitalist class ownership—instead of individual capitalist or company ownership. Under both State and national ownership, the minority, the capitalist class, own the industry, and the great majority, the working class, have to live at a wage under them.

Although many people will admit that State ownership is not Socialism, they contend that it is a step towards Socialism. Hilaire Belloc defines a "servile State" as a "State wherein every member of the proletariat will be registered as a worker, his tendencies to rebellion against capitalism know and set down, how far he is willing to serve capitalism, whether and when he has refused service, and if so where and why.

I think with Belloc that, instead of State ownership being a step towards Socialism, it is a step towards the servile State. Capitalist class ownership through the State is a negation of Socialism. As Newbold says in "How Europe Armed for War," "The capitalist class are adopting State

ownership because they are realizing that they are more powerful, more capable, and more comfortable when acting in association than when competing with each other." Governments, acting as executives of the capitalist class State, invest the capitalists' money in State-owned industries and guarantee them a return on their money.

Next let us think of the union spirit that State ownership produces. The most anaemic, servile, and spiritless unions in Australia are those whose members work in State-owned industries. ("Lie, lie.") They are tied up with superannuation funds, pension funds, etc. During the Lithgow strike at Hoskin's blast furnace, railway workers transported raw materials—such as iron ore, limestone, and coke—for eight months to the furnace, which was being operated with scab labor. State ownership breeds a mongrel kind of unionism. (Hear, hear.) It is a form of ownership in which the working class are not part owners. They are no more part owners or controllers of the railways than they are part owners of the **Sugar Trust**. The capitalists realise that they are more powerful, as a class, through State ownership of different industries. That is why they are introducing it in Japan, Russia, Germany, France, England, etc. In many cases capitalists are receiving a greater income from State-owned industries than from private or company-owned industries. As State ownership strengthens the position of the capitalist class, and creates a servile spirit of unionism among those employed under it, it is against the interests of the working class. Therefore, the "Nationalization of Monopolies" plank of the Labor Party, if adopted, can only be a bulwark of capitalism.

Perhaps as Japanese, German, and British capitalist Governments are introducing State ownership, we shall shortly hear the Labor Party accusing them of stealing a plank of its platform. As the principle of State ownership will probably be adopted on a large scale by the capitalists of the world after the war, the working class should be on their guard lest they be tricked into becoming servile creatures of servile States. The Labor Party does not propose, nor has it ever attempted, to organise the workers on class lines to abolish the class ownership of the socially-operated means of production. The proposals of the Labor Party tend to perpetuate—instead of to abolish—the class ownership of industry.

Mr. Holman is using the I.W.W. bogey to try and frighten the electors, particularly the farmers, into voting for his hybrid party. And he is trying to bribe the soldiers and their dependents by promising them £2 a week. I have no respect for men who will descend to bribery to get votes.

As the most important planks of the State Labor Party's platform are State ownership, which strengthens the position of the capitalist class and creates a servile spirit of unionism, and compulsory arbitration, which necessitates fines, garnishee orders, and imprisonment for workers struggling to get back in wages a little more of the value that they have created, and makes it a crime for one union to assist another when its members are striking for better conditions, or for any union to advocate a strike, I contend that the Labor Party should not be supported by the working class. As for its Parliamentary representatives, let us consider the actions of Mr. Storey and the majority of those who are retiring with him and seeking re-election as "true blue" Labor men. They were equally responsible with McGowen for calling upon scabs, by proclamation, to take the place of unionists who were struggling against the gas monopolists for a wage of 9s. per day. They were jointly responsible with the other members of their party for placing the garnishee clauses on the statute-book, under which thousands of unionists have suffered. They were jointly responsible with the rest of their party for the workers being deprived of the right to strike. With the exception of one, they were jointly responsible for unionists being deprived of the right of free speech to speak against Conscription.

The Storey Party and Conscriptionists

On Friday, October 13, 1916, Messrs. John Storey, Simon Hickey, J. P. Osborne, and Jabez Wright waited upon the P.L.L. Executive and tried to make it possible for conscription Labor members, such as Hoyle, McGowen, Meagher, Crawford, and Morrish, to be kept in the Labor Party. Messrs. Boston and T. Keegan were also appointed to the deputation, but were not present. Can the workers trust men that have been guilty of the things I've enumerated to put up a fight against Conscription? As their principles and actions are not those of Labor men, I say they cannot be trusted by our class. As neither the State Labor Party's platform nor the action of its candidates are in the interests of our class, Socialists would be failing in their duty to their class if they

did not oppose the alleged Labor Party. As every member of the P.L.L. is pledged to maintain the principle of Conscription in Australia—under which over 26,000 have been prosecuted for refusing to be conscripts—its candidates who are asking for votes as “No Conscriptionists” are trying to get votes under false pretences.

National Sentiment

The P.L.L. advocates the creation of “an Australian sentiment.” What I believe in is that the workers of the world should create among themselves not national sentiments, but an international sentiment. (Hear, hear.) Any party that assists to build up a national sentiment is going against the best interests of the world’s workers. When the Dublin workers were on strike, the Wharf Labourers’ Union here cabled them £200. That is the kind of spirit that is better than “national sentiments.” The capitalists of Europe were able to induce the workers there to fly at one another’s throats, largely because of the national sentiments carefully fostered by the ruling class and the newspapers that are in its power. (“Lie, lie.”)

Illegal Organisation Act

Then there is the recently passed “Illegal Organisations Act.” This Act was denounced in the House of Representatives by Anstey and other Labor men. But what did we find? After explaining the injustice of the Act, after pointing out what a powerful weapon it would be in the hands of an unscrupulous Government, each Labor member, as he resumed his seat, said “But I’ll vote for it.” Can we trust men who vote in favour of what they speak against?

In the Senate the Labor Party, in a solid body, carried this Act on the voices. This so-called “true blue” Labor Party in the Senate could do this without a tremor, and yesterday one of our class (Melrose) was sent to gaol for six months under the Act they carried. (Hear, hear.)

P.L.L. and Militarism

Mr. McDonald, whilst speaking in opposition to this motion, said that I was the only anti-militarist candidate standing in King Division. He is right. For my opponent is, according to the platform of the P.L.L., pledged to support

the principle of Conscription. No. 4 of the Labor Party’s “Planks Made Law” is Citizen Defence Force, with compulsory military training, and Australian-owned and controlled Navy. When a man is pledged, like my opponent, to maintain the principle of Conscription, and he asks for votes on the plea that he is an anti-conscriptionist, is that man not trying to get votes under false pretences? The platform of the P.L.L. binds every member to maintain the principle of compulsory military training, and yet we know that armies and navies only exist to defend the material interests of different sections of the capitalist class. (Hear, hear.) During strikes the military, and at times the navy, is used against the strikers, and in every country the military are used as a bulwark against the workers’ endeavours to obtain better conditions. Any party that places such a weapon as an army in the hands of the ruling class is acting against working class interests. It is the Labor Party itself that has laid the foundations of militarism in Australia. Senator Gardner said in the Senate on 2/11/11, according to Federal Hansard, vol. lxi., page 2147, that:—“The riots that occurred at Broken Hill during the last strike were due solely to the bad management of the police, in my opinion. Suppose that matters had gone a little further, suppose that similar trouble occurred to-morrow, and that an application was made to the Federal Government to call out the Defence Forces. **In that event, the sons of the miners on strike would be called out to fight against their own fathers.**” We cannot escape from that position. **“The compulsory training law gives power to order conscripts to be called out by the Commonwealth to shoot down their fathers and brothers.”** That law was placed on the statute-book by the Federal Labor Party that I am called a traitor for opposing. Let me quote Senator Gardiner further: “What would have been the position if domestic violence had occurred at Mount Lyell? Suppose that the Tasmanian Government declared that a state of domestic violence had occurred, and that they required the assistance of Federal troops. The Labor Government would have had to send troops to shoot down men who had been fighting the battles of Labor for years.”

“Under the pretence of training young men for the defence of this country, **they are being drilled so that they may be used for a different purpose altogether**, without being told that they may be required for such purpose.”

Could any political party have placed a worse law upon the statute-book? Fancy calling a party that makes laws under which boys can be used to shoot their own fathers and brothers a Labor Party! You all know that this party has made conscripts of the voteless and voiceless children of Australia. Yet you charge me with opposing it, as though to oppose it was a diabolical crime.

I am justifying my action, and the action of my organisation, in contesting these elections. I have never asked a man or woman for a vote, and I say now that if any of you do not believe in my principles, do not vote for me. The Socialist Labor Party only wants the votes of men and women who understand the class struggle and realise their economic position.

The Cause of the War

We have been told about the war and the necessity for more men. First let me explain the cause of the war. When the German Empire was founded, by the federation of the German States in 1871, England was looked upon as the workshop of the world. From every nation raw materials were poured into England, and there manufactured into finished articles. But through the industrial and commercial development of Germany from 1871 on, and the wonderful development of America as a manufacturing nation, England gradually ceased to be the workshop of the world. England found that Germany and America, who used to send her vast quantities of raw materials, and take finished goods in-exchange, were not only becoming great manufacturing nations, but powerful competitors with her in the world's markets. From 1871 to 1890 the German capitalists steadily pushed their trade. Then during the 12 years from 1892 to 1903 English exports to Germany increased 17 per cent., whilst German exports into England increased 47 per cent. Germany was rapidly becoming equal to England in her volume of exports. In Russia during the three years ending 1900 imports from Germany decreased 3 per cent., whilst imports from England decreased by 18 per cent. In France, Holland, Argentina, Uruguay, Sweden, Italy, and Spain, English trade was decreasing, Germany's increasing. In Norway during the three years ending 1900 German trade decreased by 8 per cent., English by 11 per cent. In Egypt during the same period

German imports increased by 129 per cent., English imports by 23 per cent. In Australia and New Zealand German imports increased by 23 per cent., English imports by 11 per cent.

Almost everywhere the German manufacturers position was strengthening and the British manufacturers position was weakening.

These figures show the economic struggle for existence between an old and a new power. After the Boer War ('99 to 1902) the struggle became keener than ever. Through technical education, specialisation, concentration of industrial forces, and, etc., the German manufacturers were able to produce goods cheaper and undersell the English manufactures in the world markets. The economic struggle which I have briefly outlined continued until the commencement of the war, when it was estimated that there were £200,000,000 worth of German goods afloat on the different oceans. This economic struggle produced the political conflict and later an extension of the political conflict—namely, the diplomatic conflict, which in turn gave way to the armed conflict. That is why Mr. Hughes describes this war as an "economic war."

I have proved that this war is the result of a titanic struggle for supremacy in the world markets between the British capitalist class and the German capitalist class.

Mr. Hughes' statement in the Melbourne Town Hall a month ago that: "**only the premature interruption of war saved the Empire from commercial disaster,**" is proved by the figures I have quoted.

From when the Kiel Canal was opened in 1895 the German Government set to work to build a strong navy and create a powerful military machine in readiness for the war which they knew the economic conflict would produce.

Labor Leaders and the War

When the war started the great majority of German, Austrian, and other labor leaders, instead of telling the workers the truth about the war, told them that it was a war over ethical matters such as "Liberty," "Freedom" and "Right." The majority of the European labor leaders assisted their Governments to trick the workers into the trenches. Though these leaders knew that the war was purely an economic war, they said to the people "Get your gun and

defend your country," and urged the various sections of unionists into that infernal blood-bath. So much for the European labor leaders' treachery to our class.

Now let us consider the actions of the great majority of Australian labor leaders. Andrew Fisher said "We will give the last man and the last shilling." The forces of labor in Australia have been weakened by nearly a quarter of a million of men, largely because the Labor Party, backed up by labor conferences, has been responsible for exporting these men to Europe. Speaking in this Council, Mr. W. O'Brien warned delegates against this. He said, "This war is killing off a generation of thought." You know the people of the world look to the young people for progress. Is not deporting the young men, and leaving the old and conservative section to rule, playing into the hands of the capitalist class? The workers have been led by the nose, betrayed by the party of which Mr. Morby and others are members. Bowling and Co. are on the recruiting platforms, getting my class into khaki under false pretences, and are prepared to let them perish in Europe. They have turned traitors and betrayed our class. Have I done that? No! The Political Labor Party has made a law under which men have been gaoled for telling the truth about the war. (A storm of applause.) If you believe in all these things that I denounce with scorn, then depose me from your Executive; for if you believe these things are right I have no desire to sit on the Executive. If you are convinced that our class is only fit for exploitation, for goals, and for the battlefield, then vote for the Party that will get into Parliament on absolutely false pretences. (Loud applause).

The motion was carried. Voting—Ayes, 80; Noes, 27. Sixty delegates refraining from voting.

FOR SOUND INFORMATION

on

Politics, Industrialism & Economics

SUBSCRIBE TO

"THE PEOPLE"

Official Organ of S.L.P.

Per Year, 2s 6d; Half-Yearly, 1s 3d Post Free

Address—Rawson Chambers, Rawson Place,
SYDNEY

DO YOU WANT

Knowledge of the International Movement

THEN READ

"The Weekly People"

Official Organ S.L.P. of America

6s 6d. per year; 3s 6d. Half-Year; 2s Quarter.

Rawson Chambers, Rawson Place, Sydney

Extract from Socialist Labor Party's Manifesto

In modern capitalist class States the Government are but Committee for managing the common affairs of the capitalist class.

The solution of the industrial question cannot be achieved by sending politicians into Parliament to administer the affairs of the Capitalist class.

The solution of the industrial question lies in the overthrow, by political and industrial action, of the Capitalist class state, and the institution in the place of the political government, of an administrative body made up of the representatives of the organised industries of the nation; the wiping out of the "State" lines, and the substitution, in place of the "State," of lines of industries; thus instead of the State of New South Wales, we would have "The Industry of Railroads," "The Industry of Mines," "The Industry of Food Production," and so forth.

All the representatives of those industries, representing the people working in those industries would constitute the Government.

Its administrative functions would consist, mainly, of the management of production, supervision of transportation, commerce and exchange, and control of all the socially operated means of production and distribution that civilisation needs.

Such a Government would be the directing authority.

ONE BIG UNION.

As industrial organisation is vitally necessary to overthrow the Capitalist class State and establish an Industrial Co-operative Commonwealth, UNDER THE SHIELD OF POLITICAL AGITATION the Socialist Labor Party aims at organising the wage-workers into one great class-conscious, revolutionary Union, powerful enough to reflect its own political party. The S.L.P. advocates the organisation of the workers on the lines set forth in the Preamble of the "Workers International Industrial Union." Bringing the workers together on such a basis—under one constitution, and with as many departments as there are industries—not only strengthens the working class in its encounters with the exploiting class, in the struggle for reduction of hours, raising of wages, and the adjustment of conditions, but provides the framework for the Industrial Co-operative Commonwealth.