

REVOLUTIONARY
INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

The Industrial Workers of the
World in Australia

VERITY BURGMANN
*Department of Political Science
University of Melbourne*

 CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1995
First published 1995

Printed in Australia by Brown Prior Anderson

National Library of Australia cataloguing-in-publication data

Burgmann, Verity.
Revolutionary industrial unionism: the Industrial
Workers of the World in Australia.

- Bibliography.
Includes index.
1. Industrial Workers of the World – History.
2. Trade-unions – Australia – Political activity – History.
I. Title.
331.886

Library of Congress cataloguing-in-publication data

Burgmann, Verity.
Revolutionary industrial unionism: the industrial
workers of the world in Australia/Verity Burgmann.
p. cm.

- Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Trade-unions – Australia – History – 20th century. 2. Labor
movement – Australia – History – 20th century. 3. Industrial Workers
of the World – History. I. Title.
HD6892.B87 1995
331.88'6:0994-dc20
95-3722

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 0 521 47123 0 Hardback

Contents

List of Illustrations

Acknowledgements and Dedication

Abbreviations

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 1 | 'Flowers to the rebels failed' | 1 |
| 2 | 'On the industrial as well as on the political field':
the IWW Clubs, 1905–1910 | 11 |
| 3 | 'Wild men from Yankeeland': the arrival of the
Chicago IWW, 1910–1914 | 27 |
| 4 | 'Education, organisation, emancipation':
the revolutionary project | 41 |
| 5 | 'We, the hoboes': who were the Wobblies? | 61 |
| 6 | 'No barriers of race': the challenge to working-class racism | 79 |
| 7 | 'It's great to fight for freedom with a rebel girl':
the answer to the woman question | 92 |
| 8 | 'A real democracy': organisation and practice | 111 |
| 9 | 'A poor day's work for a poor day's pay': ethics and economics | 130 |
| 10 | 'Bump me into parliament': the critique of Laborism | 143 |
| 11 | 'An injury to one an injury to all': direct industrial action | 159 |
| 12 | 'Let those who own Australia do the fighting':
opposing the war | 181 |
| 13 | 'With the ferocity of a Bengal tiger': the state responds | 203 |
| 14 | 'Set the twelve men free': the release campaign | 229 |
| 15 | What happened to the Wobblies? | 246 |

March 1914, according to one long-standing member, they were 'stagnating through inactivity'. The Clubs gave 'unlimited opportunities for the exercise of philosophy' but they did 'not create that stamina which comes only from participation in the work of a concrete union'.⁵¹ Clearly, the action was now with the Chicago Locals. The ASP's attachment to the Clubs indicated serious reservations about the aims and methods of the Chicago IWW.

The bitterness of the ASP's disillusionment with the Chicago IWW, with its representatives in Australia, is revealed in the *International Socialist* editorial of September 1913:

The more one listens to non-political I.W.W. speakers the more disgusted he becomes at the barbarous crudeness of their views.

They are an impossible lot, and the end of their story is brute force and transparent cunning. Their view of sabotage would be amusing if it was not so dangerous to the workers themselves. . . . The anarchist is sane and sound compared with the I.W.W.-ite whose interference in labour disputes generally leads to disaster. . . . the workers ought to know by this time that the armed forces of capitalism are not to be played with by those who sing 'Hallelujah I'm a Bum' and throw brick-bats.

The working class here will never be led by wild men from Yankeeland, but must be convinced by reason and argument. . . .⁵²

However, the Australian adherents of the Chicago IWW showed that during the First World War a significant section of the working class was prepared to be led by these 'wild men from Yankeeland' and that in many cases IWW 'interference in labour disputes' resulted in workers securing a better deal than the established union would have won. Moreover, the 'armed forces of capitalism' revealed they were considerably more concerned about the sabotage, singing and brick-bat throwing of the IWW than they were by the 'reason and argument' of the socialist sects. As for 'the barbarous crudeness of their views', it is to this allegation that we now turn.

CHAPTER 4

'Education, Organisation, Emancipation': the Revolutionary Project

The IWW was one aspect of the general dissatisfaction with the existing forms of socialist doctrine and working-class organisation that became apparent in the early years of the twentieth century. Capitalism had survived the mass discontent associated with its birthpangs: the initial disruption of economic relations, and the social misery of an uncontrolled market in all commodities. This revolutionary new mode of production had spread to encompass the globe, it had generated new organisational forms, including the large-scale company, and it enjoyed the support of a vastly expanded state apparatus. The principal working-class response in the English-speaking countries, the trade union, accepted the reality of the capitalist labour market and simply sought a larger slice of the cake. On the continent of Europe the socialist parties and their industrial wings espoused a purely formal antagonism to a class order they were unable to contest – a fact recognised in the socialist Second International between 1889 and 1914 in the debate between the revisionists and the custodians of Marxist orthodoxy. The debate turned on the undeniable fact that Marx's prediction of a growing immiseration of the proletariat leading to a breakdown of capitalism had not occurred. To the orthodox, material conditions were expected to create class-conscious workers and the socialist millennium must wait until this necessary process was complete.

In response to this apparent impasse there emerged a number of new departures. One was syndicalism, which eschewed parliamentary strategies and emphasised struggle at the point of production. Strongest in France, Spain and Italy, the IWW was commonly deemed an Anglophone variant of this phenomenon. Another was guild socialism, which sought to redefine socialism to encompass consumers as well as producers. In central and eastern Europe, where workers' parties operated in

conditions of semi-legality, a restatement of Marxism occurred that placed new emphasis on the party as the catalyst of working-class consciousness and the vanguard of revolution. This process began with Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* in 1902, but it was not until 1917 that his Bolshevism became more generally known as Communism.

Formulated in response to particular conditions and drawing on particular cultural traditions, the boundaries that separated these doctrines were at first indistinct. The Englishman, Tom Mann, came to Australia in 1902 as a trade unionist and an ethical socialist of the Independent Labour Party. As a socialist and trade union organiser in Victoria and Broken Hill, he became increasingly dissatisfied with the limitations of craft unionism, parliamentary activity and arbitration, and in 1909 published a pamphlet, *Industrial Unionism*, as a manifesto of militant industrial action. In the following year he launched the *Industrial Socialist* in London and in 1920 he became a founder-member of the Communist Party of Great Britain. He had left Australia just as the IWW was established, yet it expressed many of his concerns and attitudes. While the IWW responded to the fatalism of the Second International with a new emphasis on industrial organisation, in other respects it retained a conventional socialist doctrine. As we shall see, it affirmed an orthodox Marxist critique of capitalism and expected an understanding of Marxism to catalyse the experience of workers; its particular novelty lay in the temper with which it expounded Marxism. Wobblies had little patience with the laggardly progress of history. Instead, they employed a calculated effrontery to unmask the capitalist lie, and their educational effort was conducted not just in study circles but also in humour, denunciation, iconoclasm. The stock figure of the boneheaded wage slave was at once an acknowledgement of the immensity of their task and a reassurance that they would prevail.

Academic commentators have tried in varying ways to squeeze the IWW into the pre-existing doctrinal pigeon-holes. The result has been a degree of confusion that has obscured the true identity of the IWW and its distinctive contribution to left-wing theory and practice. Syndicalist one minute, anarchist the next, sometimes anarcho-syndicalist, very occasionally Marxist – such a schizophrenic political personality as the IWW hardly merits serious investigation.

Most commonly the Wobblies are classified as syndicalists or anarcho-syndicalists, because they shared with this movement a belief that socialism was the administration of industry directly by the workers themselves and was not a form of government or state. Moreover, socialism, to Wobblies and syndicalists alike, could only be achieved by workers acting in their capacity as workers and through their unions or syndicates, and not by proxy either through representatives in parliament or a

revolutionary seizure of state power.¹ This similarity notwithstanding, the Australian IWW maintained a critical distance from syndicalism and anarcho-syndicalism. Though it attacked the *Age* for a hostile review of Sorel's *Reflections on Violence*, most references to the syndicalist movement were at best ambivalent. One article in *Direct Action* lumped the French syndicalists of the *Confédération générale du travail* with the ALP and the German Social Democrats, because, on the outbreak of war, they 'combined their inefficiency with the blackest treachery'. Another piece referred to the 'bankruptcy of French syndicalism', which indulged in 'theoretical declarations' while neglecting the 'practical revolutionary fight'.² Yet the syndicalists were clearly the closest political relatives of the IWW. Bill Gentry, who joined the Melbourne Local in 1916, conceded in a 1969 interview that Wobblies regarded the IWW as 'an offshoot' of the syndicalists.³

In their alleged espousal of sabotage and valorisation of spontaneity and in their real hostility to hierarchical and bureaucratic forms of organisation, the IWW is occasionally deemed anarchist, an accusation also made in the form of abuse by political opponents, both conservative and socialist, at the time.⁴ Norman Rancie, one-time editor of *Direct Action*, responded to the comparison in 1957:

Anarchists believe in complete individual freedom and each man a law unto himself. They refuse to recognise any form of organisation or authority. This is the very antithesis of all the principles of the I.W.W. which believes in organisation, discipline, and not 'every man a law unto himself', but every member responsible to his organisation which has a book of rules and a constitution, which of course is the very negation of anarchism.

Anarchists, he was adamant, 'would never by any standard fit into the I.W.W.'⁵ When asked by a New Left student whether the Wobblies considered themselves anarchists, Bill Gentry replied quite definitely that they did not.⁶ The real anarchists of the time agreed. Distressed by the tendency in some quarters to confuse the IWW with anarchists, a purist anarchist sect published an attack on the IWW in 1916, 'that rotten mass of rules', in order 'to clear Anarchism and to disqualify I.W.W.-ists as Anarchists'.⁷ A perceived similarity with anarchism existed primarily in the minds of the IWW's detractors and cannot be detected in any serious analysis of its political practice, which emphasised collectivity, unity, organisation and centralisation.

In many ways the IWW was more classically Marxist than syndicalist, anarcho-syndicalist or anarchist; it frequently and fulsomely acknowledged the profound influence of Marx on its outlook and strategies. The IWW Manifesto, a much longer and more analytical piece than the

punchy Preamble, clearly reflected a Marxist world vision, which IWW theorists such as Trautmann and Hagerly had derived from books, and American workers from experience of what seemed the classic Marxian pattern of monopoly capitalist development.⁸ In Australia, in addition to the Marxist mould brought in from the American organisation, the cast of the ASP remained with the Chicago Locals, and fresh Marxist imprints were made by the new breed of leaders after 1913, notably Tom Glynn and Tom Barker.

Yet the Wobblies were not Marxists, pure and simple. A more obscure nomenclature is needed, that which they used themselves: they were revolutionary industrial unionists. This term is used to refer both to the organisational procedure of the IWW – methods of obtaining a uniform structure for the entire labour movement – and to the attitudes and philosophy of members. It refers also to the means by which the IWW hoped workers would attain control of production. Only wage-workers were eligible for membership, because only wage-workers, through revolutionary industrial unionism, could achieve the transition to socialism; non-wage-workers, having different economic interests, would subvert the purposes of the organisation.⁹

The IWW's three-stage strategy for social transformation was: education, organisation, emancipation. It aimed, firstly, to educate the working class into an understanding of its exploited position in capitalist society and to inspire workers with a class-conscious determination to end this wage slavery; secondly, it aspired to organise the working class, now educated, into industrial unions, not craft unions, ultimately joined together in the One Big Union, containing all the country's workers; finally, it planned that this One Big Union, the ultimate attainment of proletarian solidarity, would emancipate the working class, and bring freedom from wage slavery, by assuming control of the means of production, distribution and exchange. In the content of its education, the form of its organisation and its concept of emancipation, the IWW developed its own unique and coherent approach of revolutionary industrial unionism, while owing its greatest philosophical debt to Marx.

Education

The IWW was concerned, first of all, to change the ways in which the working class comprehended the world. In waging this propaganda war, Marxist ideas were foremost, especially Marx's theories about the nature and dynamics of the capitalist mode of production. Enamoured of Marxist theory in general, the IWW was especially convinced of its ability to clarify workers' thinking by exposing the exploitative relationship of which they were the unfortunate half. Former Wobbly, Guido Baracchi,

maintained in a 1968 poem about the Wobblies that, in spite of their 'unseemly larks', they 'kept a high regard for Marx'.¹³

Marxist terms such as 'surplus value' and 'ruling class' were the standard vocabulary of IWW propagandists. One of these, Alf Wilson, insisted: 'Marx is undisputed and he is my intellectual master.' J.B. King, during his 1914 speaking tour as General Organiser, was billed as 'a convincing and earnest expositor of scientific organization, and Marxian Economics'.¹¹ In *Industrial Efficiency and its Antidote*, one of the first indigenous productions of the Australian IWW, Tom Glynn referred and deferred frequently to *Capital*, where Marx revealed how 'the history of the capitalist system affords many illustrations of how blind competition amongst capitalists, with the resultant phenomenon of over-production, affects the economic and social well-being of the workers'. Articles expounding Marx's ideas appeared in most issues of *Direct Action*. Many Locals held regular classes in Marxist economics; the Sydney Local explained this was necessary to spread knowledge of the structure of capitalism among the working class to help speed the day when, by their knowledge, the workers would be able to abolish the wage system and rear in its place a newer and saner form of society.¹² Amongst the regular items of literature distributed by the Australian Administration were *Capital* in three volumes, *Value, Price and Profit* (6d.), *Wage Labour and Capital* (1d.) and a *Summary of Marx's Capital* (2d.).

Capitalism was not only a system of exploitation but one of ideological domination that secured the consent of the exploited to their own exploitation. Well before Gramsci wrestled with the problem, the IWW groped towards some formulation of the problem of hegemony: 'The proletariat holds the same opinions as the capitalist class in spite of the fact that their interests are not identical.' While the ruling class controlled schools, churches, and press, it was impossible for most workers to think for themselves.¹³ Late in 1913 the Australian Administration published and distributed an American IWW pamphlet, *How Capital has Hypnotised Society*, which noted the inconsistency between working-class reality and working-class consciousness:

The working class, as a class, is compelled to be at war with the capitalist class almost continuously. At every point, their interests are exactly opposite. . . . And yet, the mass of workers act, when it comes to the test, as if the system of mastership and slavery were a sacred system, and any violation of it a criminal and blasphemous thing.¹⁴

Every ruling class, *Direct Action* noted, sought to impose its interpretation of moral tenets upon the subject class, and every ruling class justified its overlordship by appealing to the prevalent moral code. One of

the chief functions of the propagandists, therefore, was to destroy the belief held by the great mass of workers in the absolute nature of capitalist morality, for whilst such a belief existed, the work of revolutionary unionism was sorely handicapped.¹⁵ Essentially, the IWW sought to challenge the hegemony of the capitalist class, to undermine by audacious and iconoclastic means the consent given by the masses to the authority of the ruling class, and establish instead its own hegemony.

The backwardness of the Australian working class was, according to *Direct Action*, because they were at best only job-conscious, not class-conscious. Until the workers understood the fundamental facts of their existence there could be no cohesion, purpose or collective will; knowledge was the key to power. Part of the Wobbly indictment against trade unionism was that it had not combined class education with organisation and had even promoted ideas which prevented the development of class consciousness. Mick Sawtell explained in *Direct Action* that, until there was an understanding of economic laws and the capitalist system of production, there could be no class-conscious working-class movement that would seize the industries of the world and run them in the interests of the workers; there would merely be purposeless revolt.¹⁶

It was the mission of the IWW to foster the necessary spirit of class consciousness. *Direct Action* announced:

It is the function of the I.W.W. to educate the workers of the world into right ideas concerning the economic relationship of the workers of the world . . . The workers can never be emancipated without first being inspired and permeated with new ideas . . . First, education; second, organisation; and finally, emancipation.¹⁷

The IWW emphasised the importance for revolutionary action of a subjective, as well as an objective, common interest: 'The economic laws can only be modified or mitigated in favor of the workers by themselves through scientific economic organisation, combined with a conscious knowledge of their slave status under Capitalism . . .'¹⁸ Capitalist class consciousness had to be countered before the capitalist system could be challenged.

We can do nothing, absolutely nothing, TILL WE UNDERSTAND

We must destroy capitalism, and close the class struggle.

This will surely take place when the conscious workers successfully explain capitalism with all its ramifications to the . . . deluded workers. The class war will cease when we have explained the national and international conspiracy of the capitalist class. The class war will cease when we rouse the workers of the world by explaining . . . Explain till our class becomes class-conscious; till it sees itself, sees itself and its class power.¹⁹

Syndical members, on the other hand, were not expected to subscribe to any particular political philosophy; in syndicalist thought, common economic interest alone was the unifying force, not comprehension of this common interest and its significance. The IWW was an association of choice, a group of workers with a common set of political beliefs; the syndicalist was merely an association of necessity, of workers in a common industrial situation.

Unlike the syndicalists, then, the IWW did not consider objective economic interests as a sufficient basis for proletarian organisation. A change in consciousness was also essential; the working class had to become, in Marxist terms, a class for itself.²⁰ Indeed, the projected One Big Union, with its rallying cry of 'an injury to one an injury to all', could be seen as the ultimate realisation of the working class as a class for itself. Marx allocated the important role of bringing revolutionary ideas to the working class, encouraging its transformation from a class in itself to a class for itself, to the Communists, the 'advanced and resolute' workers who clearly understood 'the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement'.²¹

The IWW believed it could fulfil this function, that it could teach revolutionary, Marxist, ideas to the rest of the working class but from within that working-class movement. It did not, like the Detroit IWW, place its own organisation in a superior position of authority over the working class; rather it hoped that the One Big Union would become coterminous with the class and that no decisive revolutionary action would occur before that moment. De Leonism, and later Bolshevism, interpreted the role of Marx's Communists in a more restricted way, replacing the Marxist trust in the proletariat with an approach which reposed confidence in a vanguard party organised separately from the working class itself.²² The IWW, on the other hand, shared Marx's and Engels' faith in the revolutionary potential, with the goading of the revolutionaries amongst them, of the great mass of workers organised as workers. The IWW depicted its part in the working-class movement in much the same way that Marx described the role of the Communists as being merely the most class-conscious section of the wider movement.²³

Education had necessarily to precede organisation and emancipation: 'We have not penetrated . . . far enough into the enemy's country to overthrow capitalism. The ignorant worker is the soldier we have to overcome; him we conquer by the appeal of reason . . .'²⁴ Impatient to proceed with its revolutionary project, the IWW frequently expressed its irritation with the level of development of those whose minds had first to be changed. Despite its commitment to non-hierarchical and democratic organisational forms, the peculiarly insulting nature of Wobbly vocabulary made the IWW seem even more patronising and elitist towards

'ignorant' workers than the other left groups of the time or revolutionary organisations generally. It regretted that

the few who step out are held back . . . by the BONEHEAD, who succumbs to his fear and instead of awakening and grasping fraternal workers' hands, and taking the step in advance, he rushes back to his old familiar sensations - doped - weakened and hypnotised . . . they who hold the reins of the Earth's Government, WITH THE BONEHEAD'S DUMB PERMISSION, PUT THE LASH ON THE FEW, WHO HAVE STRIVEN TO GO FORWARD AND THEY CRUCIFY, HANG, SHOOT, OR JAIL THEM.²⁵

A regular cartoon strip entitled 'The Amazing Adventures of Mr Simple' cruelly ridiculed the worker who was easily duped by the bosses because he trusted them. Mr Simple was the Australian IWU equivalent of the American IWU's Mr Block, whose head, according to the song, was made of lumber and was as solid as a rock.²⁶ The stultifying effects of capitalism on the mentality of the working class was a continual theme in *Direct Action*.

However, revolutionary industrial organisation, and therefore emancipation, would not be possible until all the boneheads were educated. In this sense, IWU elitism differed significantly from other forms of vanguardism, such as Bolshevism's emphasis on the leading role of the party of professional revolutionaries in the revolutionary act and syndicalism's reliance on the activities of the class-conscious minority who would, when the moment came, 'goad the inert mass to action'.²⁷ IWU elitism took a different, merely temporary, form: the boneheads, and boneheads it insisted they were, had to be made to interpret the world differently so all, together, could change it. The IWU relied on both economic necessity and the enlightening effects, not of 'dogmas and theories' but of correct ideas tested in practice, to persuade all workers into revolutionary industrial unionism:

the worker's mind is too untrained to grasp a plan for a world-wide and revolutionary reconstruction of society. *He will gradually wake up to that later on.* But the appeal to his sense of solidarity is apt to be most successful if it is made to the stomach first, then to his intelligence . . . The big mass are 'gross materialists' who move only in obedience to economic necessity, like a herd of buffaloes, and can only gradually acquire the power of unselfish social vision by class education . . .²⁸

So, while often arrogant and intolerant in the meantime with boneheads, the IWU believed ultimately in the inherent wisdom of all workers, their capacity to become class-conscious. Thus, the IWU was more classically Marxist in this respect than syndicalist: it would and must bring revolutionary ideas to the working class in order to build the One

Big Union, for emancipation was not possible if only the minority were class-conscious and organised.

Organisation

Direct Action claimed that Marx's theory was never clearly established in practice until the IWU Convention in 1905. Tom Glynn argued that Marx realised the vital need of the working class for thorough organisation instead of 'futile grasping' at a collection of ballot papers thrown together every three or four years, only to go up in smoke with the first whiff of grapeshot.²⁹ The IWU saw itself as the true heir and interpreter of Marx, who turned his ideas into action, his philosophy into practice; by so doing, it believed it was acting in the real, revolutionary spirit of the Marxist tradition, in contrast with both the reformism of the mainstream labour movements and the abstract philosophising of many Marxist intellectuals.

Because of its rejection of parliamentarism, the basic strategy of labour and social democratic parties, the IWU did have much in common with syndicalism in its emphasis on direct industrial action as opposed to parliamentary action and its associated endeavours. However, the two movements differed substantially in their responses to the question of how best to organise the working class in the extra-parliamentary, industrial arena.

In the first place, syndicalists were 'borers from within', a tactic contemptuously dismissed in Wobbly propaganda. Just as the IWU did not consider that working within the Labor Party could bring any revolutionary returns, so also did it reject all arguments that gaining positions of power within the existing craft-based trade union movement would advance the cause. Syndicalists, however, were mostly active within craft-union oriented labour movements. Peter Stearns acknowledges that syndicalism had a 'special appeal to craftsmen' and deems French syndicalism 'antimodern in its appeal to craft traditions'. Though not hostile to industrial unionism, syndicalism had emerged from the existing craft unions and remained reasonably content with the old form of organisation; it was militant but nonetheless sectional unionism and based its conception of present organisation and future society on craft autonomy.³⁰

The organisational form of the IWU was a response to the perceived inadequacies, from both a reformist and a revolutionary viewpoint, of trade union organisation. *Direct Action* explained the historical processes that prompted its formation. The industrial revolution of the nineteenth century rendered obsolete the craft form of organisation, based upon particular skills. With the centralising of a large body of workers into one

factory, craft unionism became disunion, because those workers, slaves of the same capitalist, should have been organised together, instead of which they were divided into probably a dozen or more separate trade unions, each with its own narrow craft interests, and without regard to the interests of the working class as a whole.³¹ Recognising the sectional nature of craft unions, which followed the occupational divisions of capitalism rather than uniting workers as a class, the IWW aimed at creating a new kind of unionism that would weld workers so tightly together that they would be in a position to overthrow capitalist society by assuming control of the means of production: 'By organising industrially into one big union of all workers, regardless of sex, creed, or color, we will be able to attain that solidarity which alone can abolish wage-slavery and usher in the new society.'³² Revolutionary industrial unionist organisation, unlike craft unionism, could and would result in working-class emancipation; in the meantime, its superior organisational methods would better enable workers to defend their immediate interests.

Direct Action claimed that craft unionism, which necessarily involved a hierarchy of unionists, with skilled workers jealously guarding their status and privileges in relation to unskilled and semi-skilled workers, fostered division within working-class ranks, hindering solidarity; it bred systematic, organised scabbery and upheld capitalist society. Industrial unionism, on the other hand, was 'scientific'; and its tactics were not met with approval by the boss, for it aimed to make 'an injury to one an injury to all'.³³ The IWW would organise workers on a solid basis, on the lines of the class struggle, where the workers would not fight in sections, but as a class: 'Trade unionism has got to go, industrial unionism must take its place... Link up into the fighting union of the working class, which recognises no peace between the master and the slave.'³⁴

Syndicalism also favoured highly decentralised, even disorganised, patterns of protest, which reflected the decentralised status of industry in France and southern Europe.³⁵ The syndicalist militants within the CGT protected vehemently the autonomy of the syndicates, the lowest units of the movement, and opposed centralisation as an evil in itself.³⁶ The spontaneous activity of the class-conscious elite, 'the minorities which sow and propagate new ideas',³⁷ would, according to these syndicalists, be jeopardised by disciplined mass proletarian action; moreover, the self-conscious action of this elite was, they believed, the motor-force of change, not economic laws such as those laid down by Marx and accepted, to a large extent, by the IWW. Activism to syndicalists was not so much a means to an end as an end in itself.

The Wobblies disagreed with this decentralised, spontaneist approach. They preferred mass not minority militancy, solidarity rather than spontaneity, discipline not disarray in industrial action. The structure of the

IWW clearly indicated a recognition of the 'centering of industry into fewer and fewer hands', the tendency towards monopolisation occurring in both the United States and Australia. The indictment against craft unionism in the Preamble of the IWW could as easily be directed against the syndicalists. Syndicalism relied on a coincidence of militancy which, when it failed, resulted in scabbery. As Child points out, instead of the chaos of warring interests which seems possible under syndicalism proper, the IWW offered a highly centralised organisation of society transcending the limits of individual industries just as it overleapt craft divisions.³⁸ It believed in fighting like with like, the ruthlessly efficient capitalist system with a well-organised and unified counter-force, a disciplined proletarian army. In aspiration at least, the IWW was highly centralised; whatever the actual level of organisation achieved in practice, it believed in the need for organisation.

No more elaborate blueprint for the future, no more detailed 'fantastic picture in the air' was ever devised than Father Hagerly's 'Wheel of Fortune', the Chicago IWW's diagrammatic vision of the One Big Union, its departments and sub-departments, that would form the basis of the IWW's new, intricately centralised and highly organised world order. Revolutionary industrial unionism aimed at substituting industrial government for political government; syndicalism had no use for government of any sort. The ramblings of syndicalist 'theorists' such as Georges Sorel have little coherence when compared with the very concrete programme of the IWW.

Early in 1914 *Direct Action* serialised B.H. Williams' *The Constructive Programme of the I.W.W.* The lowest unit in the structure of the IWW was the shop branch, enabling workers to confront the boss directly; but, for the purpose of local unity in a given industry, all shop branches were to be bound together in a local industrial union. General local unity of all industries would be ensured by the industrial district council of representatives from each local industrial union. Local industrial unions would be linked to form national industrial unions, such as railwaymen, to enable workers in a given industry to maintain the nation-wide unity and solidarity considered essential for defence and aggression against the capitalist enemy. These national industrial unions would then be grouped into six huge departments: agriculture; mining; transport and communication; manufacturing and general production; construction; and public service. Ultimately these departments would be brought together in one general union of the entire working class, to bind together all workers of all industries into one cooperative commonwealth. In reiterating this elaborate plan in 1917, Frank Callanan boasted of the IWW's determination to match the level of organisation of the capitalists, to 'meet the requirements of a highly centralised

industrial system'.³⁹ In stark contrast to syndicalism's faith in the industrial efficacy of the lowest and smallest units, the One Big Union was premised on the organisational advantages of centralisation.

Emancipation

The 1906 Convention had inserted a new phrase into the Preamble: 'By organizing industrially, we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.' The IWW was to be both the embryo of the new society and the revolutionary instrument for achieving it.⁴⁰ Crucial to the successful realisation of the new order was a rejection of state-based means for achieving social change.

The IWW lamented that many workers looked upon the state as a social saviour, whereas the function of the class state was simply to perpetuate plutocratic power, the state being one gigantic scheme of oppression and exploitation. All governments in modern society, Tom Barker argued, existed for the purpose of protecting private property and the interests of the propertied class; whether the politicians were Socialists or Conservatives, they could only safeguard and perpetuate the system. All institutions of the state had one end in view, the maintenance of bourgeois property and power: education, for instance, made the workers more efficient slaves. 'The State does not represent society, but only tries to administer things in the interests of the ruling minority', *Direct Action* explained; 'all established institutions are adjuncts to the scheme of exploitation which is centred and functions in and through the medium of the State'.⁴¹

Whatever the form of the capitalist state, the IWW insisted it was primarily an organ of class rule; the working class could not therefore lay hold of the state machinery and wield it for its own purpose but must instead seize power where it really existed – at the point of production. The IWW's rejection of political action in the parliamentary sense stemmed from this classically Marxist analysis of where the locus of power lay in capitalist society:

Political action at best only attacks a reflex of property; re-shuffles the cards, while direct action from below aims straight at the foundation of exploitation – private property . . .

The power of the master class does not rest on legality or Christianity . . . This power is essentially economic, and rests on Force . . .⁴²

Political institutions, according to the IWW, were a reflex of economic forces; there was no point appealing to a reflex. 'The class struggle is fought between the worker and the capitalist – not between the politi-

cian and the capitalist.' It took place in 'fields, factories, workshops, mines and in every other sphere of economic production and distribution, and not in Parliament House'. Reliance on the ballot box to effect change was pointless, because the control of industry lay in the Chambers of Commerce and the Stock Exchanges of the world.⁴³

The real business of the state was performed behind the scenes. Parliament, according to the IWW, was akin to the games and circuses of ancient Rome 'by means of which the Roman rabble were kept in a good humour and out of mischief'.⁴⁴ It was an arena in which the working class dissipated much energy in struggling for the assumed power that parliament offered.

It isn't the shame and it isn't the blame
That stings like a white hot brand,
It's the cursed foolishness of a jay
Who'll work ten hours for two hours pay,
And vote for the thing on election day,
And will not understand.⁴⁵

The Immediate Demands of the I.W.W. insisted 'it is a waste of time for the workers to attack or capture capitalist government'. *Direct Action* argued that parliamentary activity, 'political action', was a played-out weapon of the working class and that the place for action was at the point of production – on the job.⁴⁶

Unlike parliamentary socialists, the IWW did not regard the state as a potential sphere of opposition to capital: 'Parliament is a failure, as no worker has any say in placing laws on the Statute book, unless it is suitable to the capitalist class, and if the boss favours it, then it must be useless to the working-class.' Under capitalism, 'legislation leads to exploitation of the poor, *never to economic salvation*'. The hope for the future, it contended, the way to emancipation, lay in industrial organisation on the lines of revolutionary militant action, not the 'supine, cowardly subterfuge of revolution by proxies'. Political action was irrelevant to the conduct of the class struggle and the ultimate emancipation of the working class; the IWW was convinced that, given the requisite solidarity on the industrial field, the attainment of the One Big Union, the working class could get all it wanted without the aid of parliament.⁴⁷

'The I.W.W. is not anti-political, but simply non-parliamentary', *Direct Action* explained.⁴⁸ Its stance was indeed a highly political rejection of state-based means for achieving socialism, an implacable anti-parliamentary posture, an expression of unmitigated contempt for the Labor Party and similar reformist parties, and a declaration of wariness also about the aims and ambitions of revolutionary political parties. The

IWW's notion of revolution was different: the emancipation of the working class had to be achieved by the workers themselves, acting as workers, through the One Big Union assuming control of the means of production, distribution and exchange. Parties, whether reformist or revolutionary in intent, could not achieve change on the workers' behalf. *Direct Action* frequently sported above its front-page logo Marx's famous maxim: 'The Emancipation of the Workers Must be Achieved by the Working Class Itself.'⁴⁹ It took extremely seriously Marx's advice that there was none better to break the chains than those who wore them.

Revolutionary parliamentary political parties were an impossibility: 'Politicians must, of absolute necessity, become conservative. Their very jobs demand it. Their very lives prove it . . .' A revolutionary party, the IWW insisted, would, if engaged in parliamentary activity, 'become as conservative and corrupt as all their predecessors.'⁵⁰ The very fact of a socialist party getting into office would convince the capitalists that the older parties were no longer competent to protect business interests; property owners would transfer their support to the new party in office and the Socialist Party would in consequence become the party of a united capitalism, and would have to protect the interests and solve the problems of capitalism. The Socialist Party was destined to go the same way as the Labor Party, destined to become the sport and plaything of middle-class property owners and exploiters, its 'revolutionary' spirit becoming smothered in reforms and palliatives.⁵¹ Socialist parties were no exception to the iron law of conservatism for political parties: all political parties become less radical as they begin to capture political offices, 'and when they really capture political power they are always conservative.'⁵²

This categorical rejection of the role of political parties in the revolutionary process was informed also by the IWW's own experience with attempts by organised revolutionary groups to 'capture' the IWW as their industrial wing. The IWW not only guarded its independence jealously, ferociously even, but clearly resented the inference that could be made from parties' attempts to use the IWW for their own purposes that the IWW did not cover all the needs of the working class.⁵³ On the contrary, only the IWW was all-sufficient, because it combined the propagation of correct political ideas with practical industrial organisation. The IWW was, as Mick Sawtell pointed out, something more than a mere propaganda group.⁵⁴ The IWW hoped to persuade workers not to listen to those who saw salvation in parliament or party, but to trust to themselves alone, through the One Big Union, the task of ending capitalism and establishing the cooperative commonwealth.

Direct Action commented scornfully that socialist parties often accused the IWW of reformism because it advocated a six-hour working day. The

SLP, in particular, disputed the value to workers of reforms under capitalism; the IWW, on the other hand, insisted that, while it was a revolutionary movement, it nevertheless believed in reform, even petty reform, 'but the reform we stand for starts with the pay envelope and job conditions and winds up with the whole works. . . . the full product of our labor'. Reforms, the IWW warned, could not be won from within the parliamentary process, where reforms were conceded by politicians it was due to pressure, militant working-class activity, at the point of production.⁵⁵ *The Immediate Demands of the I.W.W.* maintained that the first step in the revolutionary process was to make immediate demands in regard to wages, hours and conditions and to fight for them; and the building of industrial unions to serve as organs of production and distribution in the new society, the ultimate function of the IWW, was the second step.⁵⁶

This strategy marked an important difference between the two wings of the IWW and helps explain the greater success of the Chicago section. For the De Leonite IWW rejected the struggle for immediate demands, 'mere palliatives', and insisted instead on raising the necessarily rather abstract demand for the immediate realisation of socialism. To the Chicago IWW, starting with material issues was common sense because 'the easiest and most natural way to begin the attack upon the employers is to demand the abolition of abuses which even the dullest worker can not fail to see'. Memory of this victory would provoke new demands and each little battle strengthen the organisation and build a revolutionary movement by the changing consciousness of the workers in struggle. These immediate demands for improved conditions, shorter hours and better pay were the rallying cries by means of which the IWW could wake up the dormant mind of the average worker, educating and mobilising him for efforts of a higher order such as building the new society.⁵⁷

The importance of gaining reforms lay in the relief obtained, however slight, from the effects of exploitation and the psychological effects such advances had on the workers concerned. The amelioration, even under capitalism, of the material exploitation of the proletariat was regarded as progress. Any diminution in surplus value extracted, any betterment of pay and conditions, was an advance and a step towards ultimate victory. Similarly, any deterioration was a set-back, because 'exploitation in its manifold insidious forms, goes on sucking the life blood of the workers, crippling the men, ruining the women, and slowly murdering the children'. The crushing experience of exploitation was the key to all forms of oppression endured by the working class. All social evils, such as drink, crime, prostitution, poverty, disease and war, the IWW insisted, could be traced ultimately to the fact of exploitation of one class by another. Such evils helped keep the working class in subjection, so any economic reform was both a material and social benefit that would aid proletarian

self-activity. Revolutions, the IWW insisted, were not made by a demoralised and beaten working class, but by a working class on the offensive, continually making demands on their employers. The winning of reforms was both valuable in itself and valuable as a morale-booster.⁵⁸ The IWW, then, was not hostile to reforms as reforms, as long as these were not regarded as sufficient palliative, these crumbs not viewed as the entire loaf.

The tactical emphasis on reforms notwithstanding, the IWW remained adamant that a 'world set free' could only be achieved through a revolutionary reconstruction of society. It could be argued that it was only the tactics of the syndicalists, illegal direct action, that were revolutionary; their aims fell far short of the elaborate IWW plans for the complete reconstruction of society. As the Adelaide Local's sticker declared: 'One Enemy: The Employing Class. One Goal: Complete Industrial Control.'⁵⁹ It was, in fact, the IWW's concept of how this revolution would occur that made the battle for reforms an important component in the revolutionary process. For this battle for immediate demands, for reforms achieved through industrial action, was 'the cement which gradually binds us together into the unions forming that structure', the One Big Union, which would form the framework of the new society within the shell of the old.⁶⁰

Reform and revolution were intimately connected for the IWW, precisely because the revolution was to be the result, not of a forcible seizure of state power nor the winning of an election, but of mass proletarian organisation. The building of the One Big Union presupposed the formation of the proletariat as a class for itself, a process dependent upon the propagation of class-conscious ideas and their successful application in class struggle. An insistence on the mutual interdependence of class consciousness and class struggle lay at the heart of the IWW strategy for revolution. Correct theory and successful practice in the winning of reforms encouraged the organisation of the workers into One Big Union, and this One Big Union was, in essence, the revolution itself. The general strike, during which the working class would calmly assume control of the means of production, distribution and exchange, merely celebrated the completion of the revolution; it would prove that the proletariat had reached the ultimate stage of organisation, the One Big Union, and was thus ready and able to take control of society. For the syndicalists, the general strike would produce the revolution; for the IWW, the revolution, the successful organisation of the class into the One Big Union, would produce the general strike. Thus, IWW theory, like that of Rosa Luxemburg,⁶¹ did not accord the general strike the catalytic role apportioned it in syndicalist theory. Of far greater importance was the necessary attainment first of absolute working-class unity in the One Big Union.

The revolution was therefore the outcome of organisation – at all levels:

the workers can drive away the shirters and take real possession and control of the world's resources only by beginning at the bottom, that is, by *organizing on the job*, by making one immediate demand on top of another, and thus gradually *growing into control* of the industries and throwing off the control of the shirters . . .

The road to our emancipation is paved with 'immediate demands' successfully fought for, and not 'revolutionary' phrases or political dogmas. Real control of the industries is gained, not by means of bayonets held by our hands, but by means of knowledge held by our brains and by intelligently organized and co-ordinated industrial action . . .⁶²

The additional and final paragraph of the Chicago 1908 Preamble declared:

It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organised, not only for the every-day struggle with capitalists, but also to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. By organising industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.⁶³

The hope of the future lay in industrial organisation, not the activity of a few representatives in parliament. Only one big union of all workers regardless of sex, creed or colour, would guarantee the abolition of wage slavery and the ushering in of the new society.⁶⁴ The IWW 'seeks the abolition of the present system of production and distribution, with all its misery and suffering for the millions who toil, introducing in its place an Industrial Democracy of peace and plenty for all'.⁶⁵

The central administration of the One Big Union would form the future central government of this Industrial Democracy; the departments and locals were the future subordinate governing agencies.⁶⁶ Does it not follow, the IWW asserted rhetorically, that after the workers have secured control of industry, their organisation will provide them with all the necessary machinery to handle the problems of the new society?⁶⁷ Rushton argues that the IWW was 'blissfully ignorant that the implementation of such an administrative structure would have demanded a bureaucracy surpassing in size and complexity any state structure which then existed'.⁶⁸ On the contrary, the IWW argued forcefully that the organisation of the future would be relatively simple because the exploitation of one class by another would be ended, and so the systematic repression of the majority, the main purpose of the state in capitalist society, would not be necessary.

The new society would replace the government of people with the administration of things; the Industrial Unions, the nucleus of the future society, required in its leaders *administrative abilities* only.⁶⁹ Tom Glynn explained: 'The I.W.W. does not seek to "rule", that is, it has no ambition to govern people; but we desire to establish the administration and government of the economic resources which were meant by nature, not for the enrichment of the few, but the welfare of all.'⁷⁰ The future society would require comparatively little organisation, since it would be devoid of the exploitative relationships that necessitated elaborate systems of control in the present society. With the war of the classes over, society would be able to revert back to communism, its natural state:

Authority, with its costly machinery, parasitism, oppression, incompetence, and injustice, must then rapidly dwindle into insignificance. No longer will we need huge penal establishments and judicial bludgers . . . the domination of one section of the community will not be possible, and society will be just, because it is lawless.⁷¹

The future parliaments would be the union meetings.⁷² In these days of the One Big Union there would be democracy, majority rule, for differences of opinion would always exist; in fact, there would be more rather than less democracy after the organisation of society along OBU lines:

In the new order of society . . . workers can afford the utmost divergence and difference of opinion; every view-point may have free play: so long as all agree on this one vital principle, namely: That Production shall continue to be carried on for the use and benefit of the working class, and not for the profit of a few capitalists, as at present.

But, *Direct Action*, acknowledged, in the unlikely event that the majority wished to revert to capitalism, it would be open for them to do so.⁷³

In this new society, there would be a place for former capitalists: it was the 'historical mission' of the IWW 'to put the Australian boss into hobnails and overalls'.⁷⁴ The Wobbly response to the argument that the capitalist contributed to the production of wealth was: 'The Capitalist produces nothing and should get all he produces.' Some 'brainwork' was necessary in industry, the IWW conceded, but this could in the future society be provided by true experts, properly qualified people suited to oversee certain tasks such as engineers and other technical experts whose skills deserved respect, whose temporary, invited authority in a workplace would be based on something substantial, unlike the arbitrary, imposed and unnecessary authority of the boss in capitalist society.⁷⁵ In making this distinction between spurious authority and real authority, the IWW reasoned like Bakunin in *God and the State*:⁷⁶

Ideally, the transition to this lawless, because classless, society would be effected peacefully since the level of organisation reached in the One Big Union should ensure that violence would not be necessary. As a prisoner on trial in Western Australia in 1916, Mick Sawrell insisted: 'By revolution we do not mean bloodshed. We workers have seen enough of that business in the French Revolution and in the Commune.' Revolutions could be of a peaceful order, without any violence. Sawrell maintained this position not only for public consumption but in private correspondence.⁷⁷ *Direct Action* was adamant:

A working class organisation which depends upon the use of violence for the furthering of its objects is unscientific, antiquated and dangerous. . . . Far mightier than the might of the master class with all their machinery of oppression, is the power the working class possess in Industrial Organisation. Better far than the bomb and the bullet, is the war of the folded arms. In this battle no life need be lost, no blood need be spilt. The power of One Big Union of the working class can stop all capitalist violence and bring the captains of industry to their knees. . . .⁷⁸

If, however, the employers dismissed from their posts retaliated with armed resistance, then the revolution would be defended by a brief dictatorship of the proletariat; but it would be a dictatorship exercised not through a central committee of a revolutionary party but by the workers themselves. In this situation the One Big Union would become, at its moment of triumph only, the ruling class: 'it will only be a "ruling" class for a moment – just long enough to make sure of victory'. This temporary formation of the proletariat as ruling class would then abolish classes altogether, and let the former capitalists, defeated, come into the industries – to work.⁷⁹

The IWW definitively abjured Bolshevik activity, a forcible seizure of state power by a revolutionary party. And it rejected such a strategy in the name of historical materialism, basing its position on classically Marxist lines. In a remarkably prescient passage, *The Immediate Demands of the I.W.W.* warned:

the law of economic necessity is such a vital factor in our life that no limited group of men or political party can abolish wage slavery by merely conspiring or co-operating to capture the political offices and the government buildings. Such procedure would only give the people a new master, a bureaucratic autocracy. . . .

It deplored the very notion of revolution from above: 'the dogma and theory-bound movements of political socialism which would reconstruct society from the top downward in accordance with programs expressing the special economic urge of the would-be leaders of the working class in revolution, instead of the economic urge behind the mass of the workers . . .'⁸⁰

The IWW, unlike the Bolsheviks, did not believe that the vanguard could give history a push. It wished to act upon industrial and social conditions, but only in accord with the general tendency of economic development and only with the workers themselves, not their delegates, actively involved in the revolutionary process: the formation of One Big Union.

CHAPTER 5

We, the Hoboes: who were the Wobblies?

There are many theories about the origin of the term 'Wobbly'. One legend ascribes it to a Chinese restaurant-keeper on the American West Coast who agreed to feed some IWW strikers. When he tried to ask: 'Are you IWW?' the nearest he could manage was: 'All loo eye wobble wobble?' Thereafter the laughing term among them was 'I Wobbly Wobbly'. Another authority argues that a possible derivation is from the 'wobble saw', a circular saw mounted askew to cut a groove wider than its own thickness. Whatever its precise etymology, it has been used to imply, literally, wobbliness.¹ Similarly, the character of the Wobbly has been impugned by the wilful misinterpretations placed upon the acronym, such as 'I Won't Work', 'I Want Whiskey' and 'Irresponsible Wholesale Wreckers'. Unstable, disreputable, work-shy was the assessment of the movement's denigrators; the Wobblies themselves replied with the refrain, 'Hallelujah, I'm a Bum', and embraced the hobo stereotype of themselves.

However, the characteristics of the Wobbly that to their enemies signified instability meant to the Wobblies themselves the steadiness of solidarity and class consciousness. Tom Barker, after attacking the spinelessness of the Second International, wrote:

Let us get to work, we of the Industrial Workers of the World, we, the countless, the pariahs, the hobos, the migratory workers. Let us throw off . . . the pusillanimity of political sentimentalists . . . Economic conditions are bringing us together in spite of ourselves . . . We, the workers of the world, are dependent upon one another.²

To Barker, the nomadic male worker, in the fact that he had really nothing to lose, epitomised strength not weakness, steadfastness not wobbliness.

- 29 *IS*, 9/8/13; Rushton, 'The IWW in Sydney', p.62.
 30 Minutes, Sydney Local, IWW, 10/6/12, ML A1334.
 31 *IS*, 22/7/11; Minutes, Sydney Local, IWW, 3/6/12, ML A1334.
 32 *IS*, 28/9/12.
 33 J.M. Ring, Nat. Sec. IWW, to fellow workers, 24 Dec. 1912, NL2576/3, SLP, *The Unity Question*, pp.7, 12, 19.
 34 *IS*, 16/12/11, 13/1/12; SLP, *The Unity Question*, p.7; *IS*, 1/6/12.
 35 Rushton, 'The IWW in Sydney', pp.62-3.
 36 AA1979/199 Item WAI10244 vol.1, p.3; Correspondence between Glynn and others, various dates, NL2576/5, 2576/2; Rushton, 'The IWW in Sydney', pp.86-7.
 37 E. Moyle, 31/1/13, to J.A. Keefe, ML A1334.
 38 *IS*, 9/8/13, 6/9/13, 13/9/13; Geo. Reeve, 9/12/16, to Hugh Wright, ML A1334.
 39 E. Moyle, 4/6/13, to G. Reeve, ML A1334.
 40 Rushton, 'The IWW in Sydney', p.79.
 41 Farrell, 'Donald Grant', p.75; McNamara, 'Donald Grant', p.63.
 42 *Sol*, 4/5/18, p.3.
 43 Farrell interview.
 44 Boothe, *The Case of Grant*, p.7.
 45 Quoted in Rushton, 'The IWW in Sydney', p.86.
 46 AA1979/199 Item WAI10244 vol.1, p.4; Rushton, 'The IWW in Sydney', pp.87-8; Olssen, *The Red Feds*, p.128.
 47 AA ACT CRS A3932 Item SC292 pr.3; AA1979/199 Item WAI10244 vol.1, p.4; Rushton, 'The IWW in Sydney', p.89; McGillick, *Comrade No More*, p.36.
 48 *Socialist*, 21/3/13, quoted in Rushton, 'The IWW in Sydney', pp.122-3.
 49 *IS*, 12/7/13, 19/7/13 (L), 26/7/13, 27/9/13, 29/11/13; SLP, *The Unity Question*, pp.7, 9, 12.
 50 See *IS*, 20/12/13.
 51 R. Mackenzie, IWW, Detroit, 14/3/14 to L. Klausen, Sec. Sydney IWW Club, NL2576/3.
 52 *IS*, 6/9/13.

Chapter 4

Education, Organization, Emancipation: the Revolutionary Project

- 1 Spargo, *Syndicalism*, pp.13-15. Recently Salvatore Salerno in *Red November* has traced the influence of the French syndicalists and anarchists upon the American IWW's home-grown industrial unionism.
 2 *DA*, 13/5/16, p.4; 15/12/14, p.4; 15/5/15, p.2.
 3 Genery interview.
 4 Garvey interview.
 5 Norman Rancie, Sydney, 21/5/57, to Hugh Buggy, NL6206/62/5.
 6 Genery interview.
 7 Groupe D'Etudes Scientifiques, *Manifesto-Protest*.
 8 Dubofsky, *We Shall Be All*, pp.79, 56.
 9 Bedford, 'The IWW', p.40; *DA*, 14/10/16, p.3; IWW, *The Immediate Demands*, p.14.
 10 Guido Baracchi, 18/2/68, to Bob and May Brodney, LTI10882/5/13.
 11 Wilson, *All for the Cause*, pp.58, 137; *DA*, 1/5/14, L, p.2.
 12 Glynn, *Industrial Efficiency*, section III; see, for example, *DA*, 31/3/14, p.4; 31/3/14, p.2; 1/5/14, p.4; *DA*, 26/5/17, p.3.
 13 *DA*, 15/5/15, pp.1, 4.

- 14 IWW, *How Capital has Hypnotised Society*, pp.4, 20-2, 24, 29.
 15 *DA*, 7/7/17, p.3.
 16 *DA*, 15/6/15, p.4; 13/5/16, p.4; 17/2/17, p.3.
 17 *DA*, 11/12/15, p.2.
 18 *DA*, 6/5/16, p.2.
 19 *DA*, 12/5/17, p.3.
 20 Marx argued that the proletariat was a class *in itself* by virtue of its common situation and common interests against capital, but that this mass did not constitute a class *for itself* until it became united in struggle and realised that the interests it was defending were class interests (Bottomore and Rubel, *Karl Marx*, p.195).
 21 *Communist Manifesto*, in Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, p.46.
 22 See McKee, 'Daniel De Leon', p.270.
 23 See Hyman, *Marxism*, pp.4-11; *DA*, May Day 1915, L, p.3; 1/6/15, p.1; IWW, *Direct Action*, p.7.
 24 *DA*, 24/6/16, p.1.
 25 *DA*, 14/4/17, p.2.
 26 Quoted in *DA*, 14/4/15, p.2.
 27 *La voix du peuple*, May 1901, quoted in Conlin, *Bread and Roses*, p.27.
 28 IWW, *The Immediate Demands*, p.11.
 29 *DA*, 1/5/14, p.4; 15/9/15, p.1.
 30 Stearns, *Revolutionary Syndicalism*, pp.3, 11-12; Conlin, *Bread and Roses*, p.17.
 31 *DA*, 12/5/17, p.2.
 32 *DA*, 12/5/17, p.2.
 33 *DA*, 1/5/14, L, p.2; 31/3/14, p.2; 20/5/16, p.1.
 34 *DA*, 1/6/15, p.1; 15/9/15, p.4.
 35 Delfer, *Socialism since Marx*, pp.21, 77. Stearns qualifies this explanation in *Revolutionary Syndicalism*, p.20.
 36 Ridley, *Revolutionary Syndicalism*, pp.168, 119, 127.
 37 *La voix du peuple*, May 1901, quoted in Conlin, *Bread and Roses*, p.27.
 38 Child, *How Labour Governs*, pp.142-3.
 39 *DA*, 31/3/14, p.1; 12/5/17, p.2.
 40 Brissenden, *The Launching of the IWW*, p.41; Renshaw, *The Wobblies*, p.21.
 41 *DA*, 15/6/15, p.3; 15/7/14, p.4; 28/7/17, p.3; 10/6/16, p.3.
 42 *DA*, 15/6/15, p.3.
 43 *DA*, 14/4/17, p.2; 15/7/14, p.4.
 44 *DA*, 19/5/17, p.4.
 45 *DA*, 28/2/14, p.1.
 46 IWW, *The Immediate Demands*, p.4; *DA*, 15/7/15, p.3.
 47 *DA*, 1/10/14, p.1; 15/6/15, p.3; 15/12/14, p.4; 3/2/17, p.2.
 48 *DA*, 3/2/17, p.2.
 49 For instance, *DA*, 15/5/14, p.1.
 50 *DA*, 15/7/15, p.3.
 51 *DA*, 14/7/17, p.4.
 52 Nilsson, *Political Socialism*.
 53 IWW, *Direct Action*, pp.5, 11.
 54 *DA*, 11/12/15, p.2.
 55 *DA*, 19/5/17, p.3; 25/12/15, p.4.
 56 IWW, *The Immediate Demands*, p.3.
 57 IWW, *The Immediate Demands*, pp.7-9.
 58 *DA*, 25/12/15, p.4; 9/10/15, p.4; 16/10/15, p.4.
 59 IWW Stickers, NL3222/6.

- 60 IWW, *The Immediate Demands*, p.12.
- 61 Luxemburg, *The Mass Strike*, pp.153-218.
- 62 IWW, *The Immediate Demands*, pp.11-12.
- 63 Preamble. In every issue of *DA*.
- 64 *DA*, 15/12/14, p.4; 12/5/17, p.2.
- 65 IWW, *Direct Action*, p.9.
- 66 Conlin, *Bread and Roses*, pp.24-5.
- 67 IWW, *Direct Action*, p.8.
- 68 Rushion, 'Revolutionary ideology', p.443.
- 69 Williams, *Eleven Blind Leaders*, Introduction.
- 70 *DA*, 2/10/15, p.2.
- 71 *DA*, 15/9/15, p.3.
- 72 *DA*, 23/12/16, p.2.
- 73 *DA*, 27/5/16, p.3.
- 74 Anon., 'The iron heel', p.475.
- 75 *DA*, 15/7/14, p.4.
- 76 Lehning (ed.), *Michael Bakunin*, p.132.
- 77 IWW, *Speeches from the Dock*, p.12; Williams (ed.), *Eureka and Beyond*, p.71; Mick Sawtell, 1/2/19, to Beth Pole, Item 1/2/1919, A6286, 5th Military Dt, 3/1/18-30/8/19.
- 78 *DA*, 12/5/17, L, p.2.
- 79 *DA*, 15/7/14, p.4.
- 80 IWW, *The Immediate Demands*, pp.10-11.

Chapter 5

'We, the Hoboes': who were the Wobblies?

- 1 Renshaw, *The Wobblies*, pp.21-2.
- 2 *DA*, 15/12/14, L, p.2.
- 3 St John, *The I.W.W., History, Structure and Methods*, 1917, pp.23-4, quoted in Brissenden, *IWW*, p.341. Against the grain, Conlin's research has shown that, according to American West Coast police records, the membership of the IWW was much like a cross-section of the region's population (Conlin, *Bread and Roses*, p.69).
- 4 Preston, 'Shall this be all?', pp.441-2.
- 5 Perlman, *History of Trade Unionism*, p.305, quoted in Zieger, 'Workers and scholars', p.255.
- 6 Parker, 'The I.W.W.', p.106.
- 7 Dubofsky, 'Dissent', pp.192-3. See also 'The I.W.W. - an exchange of views', p.371.
- 8 Walker Galenson, *Labor in Norway*, Harvard, 1949, p.61, quoted in Renshaw, *The Wobblies*, p.291.
- 9 Oissen, *The Red Feds*, pp.17, 38, 86, 108.
- 10 Beattie, 'Memoirs', p.35.
- 11 Fry (ed.), *Tom Barker*, pp.20, 34.
- 12 Childe, *How Labour Governs*, p.136.
- 13 Childe, *How Labour Governs*, pp.132-3.
- 14 Churchward, 'American influence', p.274.
- 15 Items 17/4/18, 15/5/18, A6286, 1st Military Dt, 26/12/17-29/6/18.
- 16 Rushion, 'The IWW in Sydney', pp.269-71.
- 17 *DA*, 15/7/14, p.1.
- 18 Wilson, *All for the Cause*, p.72.
- 19 Audley interview (with Gowland and Saffin).

- 20 Garvey interview.
- 21 Baracchi, paper read to Fellowship of Australian Writers, 1941, p.2.
- 22 *DA*, 9/12/16, p.4.
- 23 Seamer interview.
- 24 *DA*, 2/12/16, L, p.2.
- 25 *DA*, 5/2/16, p.2.
- 26 Item 22/1/18, A6286, 1st Military Dt, 26/12/17-29/6/18.
- 27 F. Ellis, Innisfail, 7/8/18, to A. Shepard, Ayr, Item 24/8/18, A6286, 1st Military Dt, 3/7/18-30/10/18; Mary Jeffery, 6/3/19, to Norman, Item 26/3/19, A6286, 1st Military Dt, 1/3/19-7/6/19.
- 28 For instance, on Norman Jeffery, see Sendy, 'The founders', pp.1-3; report on a meeting on the Domain, Brisbane, Item 19/2/19, A6286, 1st Military Dt, 2/11/18-26/2/19. On Alf Wilson, see Wilson, *All for the Cause*, Preface by T. Gilmore. On Mick Sawtell, see *Daily Mirror*, 15/11/71, p.26.
- 29 Draft of May Brodrey's autobiography, LT10882/8/23; handwritten notes, LT10772/3; Bertha Walker, 20/2/64, to Roly Farrall, LT10772/3. See also Walker, *Solidarity Forever*, pp.128, 131.
- 30 Quoted in Cutler, 'Sunday, Bloody Sunday', pp.83-4.
- 31 Minutes, Broken Hill Local, 29/4/17, SANSW7/5588.
- 32 Shor, 'Masculine power', p.97-8.
- 33 List of names of members attending first meeting IWW Sydney Local who signed list going to Ed. Moyle, Gen. Sec.-Treas., ML772/20/13-15.
- 34 List no.1, AA ACT CRS CP404/1.
- 35 *DA*, 14/7/17, p.2.
- 36 Coombe interview.
- 37 List of names of members attending first meeting IWW Sydney Local who signed list going to Ed. Moyle, Gen. Sec.-Treas., ML772/20/13-15.
- 38 List of names of members IWW Sydney Local (Chicago) 1908 Preamble organised 27/12/11, ML772/20/3.
- 39 List no.1, AA ACT CRS CP404/1.
- 40 C. Reeve, State Penitentiary, 4/6/21, to Dear Little Mother, p.2, ML5653.
- 41 Tom Barker, St Pancras Town Hall, 23/10/59, to John Playford, ABLN57/213; AA1979/199 Item WA 1024A vol.1, p.2; Taylor, 'Worker's vanguard', p.34; Barker, 'Self-portrait', p.19.
- 42 *Argus*, 11/10/16, p.8; AA1979/199 Item WA 1024A vol.1; Minutes, Broken Hill Local, 10/9/16, 15/10/16, 20/5/17, SANSW7/5588; Cain, *The Wobblies at War*, p.259; Churchward, 'American influence', p.276; Rushion, 'The IWW in Sydney', pp.211-12; Shor, 'Masculine power', p.98.
- 43 From police records quoted in Hunt, 'Labour movement in north Queensland', p.296.
- 44 List of names of members IWW Sydney Local (Chicago) 1908 Preamble organised 27/12/11, ML772/20/3; List no.1, AA ACT CRS CP404/1, Bundle 1.
- 45 Winters, *The Soul of the Wobblies*, *Argus*, 11/10/16, p.8; Cain, *The Wobblies at War*, p.242.
- 46 Coombe interview; McGillick, *Comrade No More*, p.36.
- 47 Childe, *How Labour Governs*, p.140.
- 48 *DA*, 15/5/14, p.2.
- 49 *DA*, 27/5/16, p.3.
- 50 Minutes, Broken Hill Local, 25/3/17, SANSW7/5588; Ted Moyle, note-book no.2, Moyle Collection.
- 51 *DA*, 31/3/17, p.2.