

Being unskilled workers and not having any special craft, trade, or property on which they could depend, they were driven to rely upon mass action for life and for protection against the aggression of the employer. To them, therefore, "solidarity" expressed not an ideal, not a distant goal, not a political achievement, as to the Socialist, but that mass-action to which they were necessarily driven and upon which they could alone rely.

Shall we say then that "solidarity" is incomprehensible except to those workers to whom mass-action is imperative?

Such an answer would be close to the facts, for the meaning of "solidarity" can only be learned by experience.

## The Protocol "On Again"

By Isaac A. Hourwich

AS was to be expected, the brief suspension of the Protocol in the cloak industry was but a lovers' quarrel. The union addressed a letter to the Manufacturers' Association, offering to arbitrate all differences. A committee of leading financiers and business men interceded between the contending parties, and the Association gracefully yielded to the mediators' plea for industrial peace.

The letter of the Union reads in part as follows:

"A considerable time ago the cutters requested an increase in wages. An investigation instituted by the Board of Arbitration showed that these most skilled workers in our industry are earning at an average of about \$418 per year; *i. e.*, about \$8 per week. No action was taken following their investigation.

"At the same time, the other week workers in our trade. . . whose earnings are even smaller than those of the cutters, likewise asked that the minimum rate of their wages be raised. In the case of the pressers, the Board of Arbitration granted a partial increase and promised to take up their grievances for a further and final disposition by the 1st of July, 1914, but nothing was done about it at the time or at any other time.

"Upon the request of the other week workers, no action of any kind has so far been taken."

This is clearly a complaint against no one but the Board of Arbitration. The Manufacturers' Association was represented on the Board by Mr. Hamilton Holt, editor of *The Independent*; it is no more than fair to say that he would not have opposed what "the public" might regard as a "reasonable" demand of the workers. Yet even if he did, his vote could have been offset by the vote of the Union representative, or else the Union should have exercised its right to recall the latter and to replace him by a more suitable person. The deciding vote

was with the chairman of the Board, Mr. Louis D. Brandeis. Consequently, if the Union claims to have a just ground to complain because no action has been taken upon its demands, the responsibility must rest with no one but Mr. Brandeis.

The results of the statistical investigation ordered by the Board of Arbitration were published by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics under date of June 13, 1914, with a "foreword" by Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, chairman, which concludes with the following promise:

"The Board of Arbitration will present later its conclusions and recommendations on this subject."

The failure of Mr. Brandeis to present the conclusions of the Board was tantamount to a denial of the demands of the Union, at least for the year following the publication of the report. Yet to whom does the Union now appeal from Mr. Brandeis? Why, to Mr. Brandeis himself.

"In order to secure a complete and speedy adjustment of all disputes and to avoid any prolonged and fruitless discussions and negotiations, we propose," says the Union in its letter, "that our respective contentions be forthwith submitted to a committee or board of unbiased persons *under the presidency of Mr. Louis D. Brandeis*, or Mayor Mitchel, or any other person of recognized standing in the community, upon the express understanding, however, that such board render its decision within no longer than two weeks from the date of its selection."

If, notwithstanding the failure of Mr. Brandeis to grant the demands of the Union, it still declares itself willing to submit to him again the same demands, it admits in effect that he must have had good and sufficient reasons for postponing action upon them, in which case its complaint that "no action has been taken" is unjustified.

If, on the contrary, the Union leaders believe that the workers have a just grievance because their demands have been ignored by Mr. Brandeis, is it good judgment to submit the same demands to him once more? Still Mr. Morris Hillquit, the counsel for the Union, is reported to have expressed great satisfaction over the wise statesmanship exhibited in the letter of the Union to the Manufacturers' Association.

There are other grievances enumerated in that letter, all of which could have been submitted, as fast as they arose, to the Board of Arbitration presided over by Mr. Brandeis. If no redress was secured through that channel for the past year or more, what reason is there to expect more satisfactory results within two weeks from a new Board of Arbitration ruled by the same Mr. Brandeis?

So long as the Protocol was in operation, it might have been embarrassing to recall him. Since the termination of the Protocol, however, the Union diplomats were no longer bound by etiquette to retain an arbitrator whose interpretation of the Protocol had made it an "instrument that kept them [the

Union] in subjection" as President Elmer Rosenberg of the Union characterized it in a recent editorial of the official organ of the Cutters' Union.

So unsophisticated, however, seems to be the faith of the Socialist leaders of the Union in "social justice" that they would readily accept "any other person of recognized standing in the community" as arbitrator, including Mayor Mitchel, who has exhibited his capitalistic bias against labor in the dispute between the school teachers and the city

administration. It is worth noting, on the other hand, that conservative labor leaders are outspoken in their distrust of the common type of arbitrator in labor disputes. In a recent dispatch to the *N. Y. Call*, a high official of one of the railwaymen's organizations is quoted to have said:

"The principles of arbitration are just and equitable, but labor has found it impossible to get that kind. And the proof of the pudding is in the eating."

## French Socialists and the War

By Paul Louis (Paris)

A GOOD many articles have appeared about the attitude of French Socialists before the European crisis of 1914-1915. I shall try to present and explain this attitude very briefly, in order that American Socialists may have a clear understanding of the forces which we yielded to in the past and of the hopes which we are keeping for the future. They will see that we have remained faithful to the traditions of French Socialism and to the injunctions of the International.

First it should be recalled that the thought of the possibility of a war was never absent from one of our Congresses. No Socialist organization was ever more concerned about the fight to be made against a universal war than the French Socialists, and this is equally true of our great syndicalist organization, the *Confédération Générale du Travail* which had come out in the most emphatic terms for the "War against War." This should surprise no one. France has suffered more than any other country from expeditions of conquest and has experienced three invasions in the course of a century, an interval of only fifty-five years elapsing between the historic disasters of Waterloo and Sedan. Besides, in opposing imperialistic and chauvinistic propaganda, and ideas of aggressive revenge and colonial expansion, Socialism and Syndicalism expressed a widespread sentiment of the Nation, as the rural masses were perhaps even more devoted to peace than the wage-earning masses of the cities.

Before the crisis of 1914-1915, French Socialism gave imperialism two strong blows. In 1913 it made an energetic stand against the reestablishment of the three-year term of military service, advocating instead a militia which, ineffective as a reliable weapon of aggression, was the best of all possible weapons of frontier defence. As a result of this propaganda, to which the party owed its great electoral victory of 1914, hopes ran high of a speedy return to a shorter term of military service. The Socialist congress of July, 1914, which adjourned about a fortnight before the declaration of war, voted for the most pronounced resistance to all bel-

ligerent activity and unanimously denounced imperialism.

No one can therefore reproach French Socialists for neglecting their duties to the other members of the International. They went so far in their campaign for peace and for the limitation of armaments that they laid themselves open to the charge of anti-patriotism more than any of the other European Socialist organizations.

If the French government had been the aggressor in July, 1914, if it had willfully provoked the war, it would have run up against a formidable internal resistance. The working class would probably have refused to bow complacently to the ambitions of the governing classes and would have shown them the strength of its pacifist convictions and its hatred of militarist enterprises. Its previous opposition to imperialist ambitions in Morocco was a measure of what it could achieve, in the way of fearless loyalty to its own ideals, should some minister dare to let loose the forces of war. Besides, the working class was sure to be reinforced in its opposition to the established authorities by the small peasant proprietors and the middle class shop-keepers, who were by no means suspected of any liking for militarism, and who could be counted on to exert material and moral pressure against war. The rulers of France, unable to shut their eyes to this profound and deep-rooted feeling of the masses, dared not risk adopting an aggressive policy. For many reasons, therefore, which it is unnecessary to go into further, no European people was more anxious to preserve peace than the French.

The crisis of 1914-1915 was wholly the outcome of the quarrel between Austria and Servia. The Socialist International had long been aware of the danger latent in this perpetually recurring dispute. For Vienna aimed to exercise a more or less official control over Belgrade, so as to facilitate Austrian descent upon Salonica. The Congress of European Socialists held at Basle towards the end of 1912 had definitely specified that it was the duty of all Socialists and especially of Austro-Hungarian and