copies have been distributed, but the reports have not yet been made available to the general public. The reason is obvious. It is to the interests of the anthracite mine owners that the facts should not be known.

The United States Coal Commission, in its recommendations on the anthracite controversy, proposes nothing that would benefit the miners or hurt the operators. That it is looking out for the interests of the whole coal industry (soft as well as hard) is evidenced in its last recommendation that the renewal date for the anthracite agreement shall be sufficiently far from the renewal dates of the bituminous agreements that suspension in both industries at once shall not be invited.

This division of the miners' forces advocated by the United States Coal Commission is in line with the policy of John L. Lewis. No general strike in the coal industry. While the anthracite is striking and the West Virginia fields are in the throes of a bitter struggle, the bulk of the coal industry is working and producing coal. This policy of John L. Lewis is fostered by the government and plays right into the hands of the coal barons.

### Lewis Machine Helps Jail Progressives.

That the government is keeping its watchful eye on the anthracite strike is evidenced by the reception that was given to the campaign started by the Progressive Miners' Committee in the anthracite. The Progressive Miners' Committee revived many of the issues that were once advocated by the United Mine Workers but which have been relegated to oblivion since the assumption of the presidency by J. L. Lewis. The six-hour day and the five-day week, and the nationalization of the coal mines are among the demands once raised by the United Mine Workers. These, together with other proposals, were raised by the progressive miners in an effort to make the anthracite strike a real struggle in the interests of the workers. Some of the other demands were, a minimum wage, a general strike of all the coal miners, unity of the railroad workers with the anthracite strikers, no settlement without an increase in wages, and the calling out the maintenance men to prevent the prolongation of the strike.

The moment the campaign started for the raising of these demands, authorities began to suppress it. Inciting the local authorities were none other than the agents of John L. Lewis in control of the district union organizations in the anthracite. The meetings of the progressives were broken up and their speakers arrested. Patrick Toohey and Alex Reid were sent to prison as vagrants for six months. The reactionary officials of the Lewis machine appeared in court and testified against the progressive miners and urged that they be jailed. The Federal authorities were on the job also to see whether or not some of the progressives could be deported. The capitalist press raved against the reds. When the progressive miners were sent to prison, Rinaldo Cappellini, president of District One, the largest district of the United Mine Workers in the anthracite, sent a letter congratulating the chief of police of the city of Scranton. The anthracite strike is a clear demonstration of where the policy of class collaboration leads to. It leads to the unity of the reactionary bureaucrats with the employers and their government against the militant progressive workers. It works to the advantage of the union officials and the capitalists. In the anthracite it means millions in the pockets of Morgan and Rockefeller, it means a guaranteed per capita through the check-off for the Lewis bureaucratic machine, and for the miners it means months of idleness with suffering and starvation. For the progressive militants, it means persecution and jail.

The anthracite strike is a powerful argument for the elimination of the policy of class collaboration and the adoption of a militant fighting policy. The anthracite strike clearly demonstrates that the advocates of class collaboration are the agents of capitalism and that their rule must be eliminated from the American labor movement.

# Class Divisions in the United States

## By Jay Lovestone

AN analysis of the class divisions in the United States is timely and instructive for two special reasons at this moment.

The World War destroyed the last shreds of the "happy isolation" that American capitalism once boasted of. The rapid development of Yankee imperialism within the last decade has made the conditions of the United States and those of the rest of the world more closely interdependent than ever before. Hence, the rapidly crystallizing realignment of classes, of political forces, in the United States assumes today a paramount international significance.

### A Cross Section of America.

Since the United States is the world's leading financial and industrial country, many tend to have a distorted picture of the proportions of its urban and rural populations and its class composition. It was not until 1920 that the American census showed a majority of the population residing in cities and towns of 2,500 or more inhabitants. In 1920 the census reports disclosed that 51.4 percent of the total population reside in cities and in towns of 2,500 or more inhabitants. That is, 54,304,603 of the population was urban and 48.6 per cent or 51,406,017, was rural. Even today there are only fourteen out of the forty-eight American states the majority of whose population is urban.

But with the rapid American industrial progress the tendency towards the majority of the population in the United States being urban has become marked in recent years. In the last decade America's urban population has increased 28.8 percent and its rural population only 3.2 percent. The severe agricultural depression which the United States had recently experienced for five continuous years strengthened this tendency considerably. In 1922 alone there was a net



migration of 1,200,000 from the country to the cities, largely because of the dire economic straits in which the farmers found themselves.

### The Gainfully Employed Population.

According to the 1920 census, there are in the United States 41,614,248 persons, ten years of age and over, engaged in gainful occupations. This marks an increase of slightly more than 9 percent over the total gainfully employed in 1910. The persons engaged in gainful occupations now constitute 39.4 percent of the total population.

If we examine the industrial distribution of the gainfully employed we find that 12,818,524 or 30.8 percent of the total are engaged in the manufacturing and mechanical industries; 10,953,158 or 26.3 percent in agriculture, forestry, and animal husbandry; 1,090,223 in the extraction of minerals; 3,063,582 in transportation; 3,126,541 in clerical occupations and the remainder in trade, professional, domestic and personal service, and public service (not elsewhere classified).

### The Trend of Industrialization.

In the last decade America's population increased 15.6 percent. At the same time the persons engaged in manufacturing industries increased 31.6 percent and those engaged in agriculture decreased 13.5 per cent.

An examination of this tendency over a longer period of years is illuminating. Since 1870, there has been a steady decrease in the proportion of those gainfully employed in agriculture. In 1900, 35.7 percent of the total gainfully employed were found in agriculture. In 1910 the proportion fell to 33.2 percent and in 1920 it declined to 26.3 percent. With the continuous development of capitalism there came, not only the start of huge industrial establishments drawing the farming population to the cities, but also the end of free land.

Production in American industry has been taking on an ever-greater social character and more and more resorting to the use of highly-developed labor-saving machinery. In this respect American agriculture has been lagging far behind. The development of labor-saving machinery in agriculture has been limited by the individual production which prevails in American agriculture—the individual farm unit. The world war has only increased the gap between the development of efficiency and organization in American agriculture and industry. Thus the individual farmer is growing more and more helpless before the powerful bankers and manufacturers who are securing a stifling strangle-hold on the land as well as the means of production and exchange. The increasing proportion of deserted habitable farm houses, the rising migration from the country to the cities, the mounting rural bankruptcy figures of recent days are further eloquent testimony of the pauperization of the farming masses and of their consequent exodus to the industrial centers.

From 1910 to 1920 the number gainfully employed in agriculture decreased 1,705,924. In this period the number gainfully employed in the manufacturing and mechanical industries, extraction of minerals, transportation and clerical occupations increased 4,130,497.

The proportion of persons engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries rose from 22.5 percent in 1900 to 27.8 percent in 1910 and 30.8 percent in 1920. In transportation the proportion of gainfully employed rose from 6.9 percent in 1910 to 7.4 percent in 1920; in mining and quarrying from 2.5 percent to 2.6 percent and in the clerical occupations from 1,737,053, or 4.6 percent of the total gainfully employed in 1910, to 3,126,541 (7.5 percent) in 1920. The development of large-scale production and of vast systems of exchange tends to create a need for clerical help and primarily accounts for the increase in the last category of the gainfully employed population.

### The Tendency Towards Proletarianization.

The gigantic strides made by the United States in its industrial development have brought in their wake thoroughgoing changes in the class composition of American society:

Recent years have seen a positive rise in the numerical strength of the wage-earners. From 1910 to 1920 the total number of wage-earners—manual and clerical—rose from 22,406,714 to 26,080,689—an increase of 3,673,975. Today these elements constitute 62.7 percent or the decisive majority of those gainfully employed. These are the wage-earners engaged in the manufacturing industries, extraction of minerals, building trades, transportation, as stationary engineers and stationary firemen, in trade, clerical occupations, as hired-out farm hands, etc. In 1910 these elements constituted only 58.7 percent of the total gainfully employed.

Of these wage-earners the industrial proletariat forms the largest and the constantly growing section. The United States census shows that the industrial proletariat—the wage earners in mining and quarries, manufacturing, building trades, transportation and stationary engineers and firemen—increased from 12,800,325 in 1910 to 15,540,486 in 1920. Within this decade the proportion of the total gainfully employed which was found in the ranks of the industrial proletariat mounted from 33.5 percent to 37.3 percent. Today the industrial proletariat is nearly sixty percent (59.5 percent) of the whole wage-earning group. In the preceding census year the industrial proletariat was 57.1 percent of the wage-earning masses.

While the industrial proletariat has been increasing, the agricultural proletariat—the farm-laborers hiring out—has been decreasing absolutely and relatively. From 1910 to 1920 the latter decreased from 3,143,773 (8.2 percent of the total gainfully employed) to 2,600,612 or 6.3 percent.

Similarly, the wage-earners engaged in domestic and personal services have been decreasing absolutely as well as relatively. In the period 1910-1920 such wage-earners declined in number and percentage from 3,185,907 (8.3 percent) to 2,902,955 (6.9 percent) of all those gainfully employed. These wage-earners, like the agricultural workers who are hired out are steadily being absorbed into the ranks of the industrial, the unskilled, the machine proletariat. Such wage-earners seldom become clerical workers or small business men.

And a consideration of the non-wage-earning elements reveal further instructive evidence of the change in the class alignments in the United States. The group of employers and self-employed among whom are to be found the farm-owners, the manufacturers, bankers, railroad magnates, merchants, etc., has also fallen absolutely and relatively in the last census period. In the years 1910 to 1920 this group engaged in gainful occupations decreased from 13,175,711

(34.7 percent) to 11,974,369 (28 percent of the total gainfully employed). Here we have a loss of 1,201,342 in the decade. The heaviest casualties in this group were suffered by the farm-owners and the capitalists in the manufacturing and mechanical industries. The number of the latter fell from 989,396 in 1910 to 652,308 in 1920—a loss of 337,088 in the period.

Concurrently with the development of industry and the growth of the industrial proletariat, the number of salaried professional and supervisory persons for a certain length of time, increases. The technical experts, chemists, mining engineers, transportation directors, farm managers, physicians, certain types of middle-men, etc., constituting this section of the gainfully employed, have increased from 2,482,478 (6.5 percent) in 1910 to 3,540,608 (8.5 percent) in 1920. It must be remembered, that in this group there is also to be found the "public service" section, largely the government officials. The trend towards industrialization and proletarianization with a consequent sharpening of the class conflicts brings with it the rise of a towering governmental bureaucracy—a huge state apparatus to be used by the bourgeoisie against the workers. This "public service" section rose from 476,347 in 1910 to 801,826 in 1920—an increase of 325,479, or 68.3 percent.

### The Birth of the American Working Class.

The development of America's gigantic industrial machine has naturally served as the basis for the rise of a big and definitely crystallized working class. The marked tendencies towards industrialization and the pauperization of the farming masses are serving to increase steadily and rapidly the urban population of the United States.

While the gainfully employed population is increasing at a slower rate than the general population, the industrial proletariat is increasing at a faster rate than the general population. This sharp trend towards proletarianization of the country is of tremendous significance. Side by side with the growth of the industrial proletariat there has grown the tremendous army of government bureaucracy, a huge centralized state apparatus with a powerful army, national guard, officers' training corps, navy and naval militia. Both of these tendencies are manifestations of sharpening class divisions in the composition of American society.

Add to this development the fact that the overwhelming majority of the bankrupt farming population driven off the land to the cities and into industry are not foreign-born, but native. These Americans deserting the land and individualistically organized agriculture, have been streaming into the basic monopolized industries organized on a social basis. It is true that the restrictive immigration legislation and the world war have proved potent factors for the development of a homogeneous working class in the United States. But this driving of the native farming masses into the industrial centers should prove an even stronger and more effective stimulus towards the development of a native proletariat. It has been conservatively estimated that within the last ten years no less than 6,500,000 have left the farms for the cities.

Once in the industries, these native workers tend to assume a different social and political outlook. Their psychology as well as their economic status undergoes a process of thorough change. Not being skilled as a rule, the pauperized native farmers tend to drift into those industries that require heavy, semi-skilled and unskilled machine labor. Here they come into contact with the foreign-born workers massed in the basic industries. The inestimable political significance of this mass migration of native groups into the basic industries can only be realized when one considers the extent to which the foreign-born workers dominate the gainfully employed in the basic industries.

The foreign-born workers constitute seven-tenths of the bituminous coal-mining operatives, do seven-eighths of all work in the woolen mills, supply nine-tenths of all labor in the cotton mills, make nineteen-twentieths of all the clothing, produce more than half the shoes, build four-fifths of all the furniture, refine about nine-twentieths of all the sugar, and compose at least sixty percent of all the steel workers. It is obvious that the introduction of great numbers of the less politically restricted and the more experienced in American political affairs, the expropriated agricultural masses, into this new economic environment, is of revolutionary meaning to the development of a native, politically conscious, revolutionary working class.

### Revolutionizing Forces in American Life.

When one considers the extent to which recent years have seen the rapid rise of a powerful centralized government in the United States, then only does he become aware of the new, the post-war revolutionizing factors making for the development of the political consciousness of the American proletariat. We need but examine the strike-breaking role of the government in the national textile, railway and coal strikes of 1922, to get an idea of the brazenness, the brutality and the frequency with which the American government throws in its full military, financial, and judicial powers and resources in behalf of the bourgeoisie and against the proletariat in the class struggles in the United States.

In a subsequent article the writer proposes to deal with the marked trend toward the political radicalization of the American proletariat in the United States as a result of the new class alignments in American society,—of the America that the world knew before the imperialist war, before the Dawes Plan, before the rise of a mighty centralized government apparatus, before the crystallization of a big industrial proletariat, before the worst agricultural crisis in the history of the United States—of the America that is no more.

**THE WORKERS MONTHLY**

MAX BEDACHT, Editor.

Official Organ
The Workers Party

Published by
The Daily Worker Society
1113 W. Washington Blvd.
Chicago, Ill.

25 Cents a Copy
$2.00 a Year—$1.25 Six Months

Business Manager,
Moritz J. Loeb