

# A Critique of the Industrial Workers of the World

Throughout the entire history of the American labor movement, there have been numerous attempts to construct independent, class-conscious trade unions. The New Labor Organizing Committee happens to be the most recent; however, the Industrial Workers of the World predates it by over a century. Because of this, and the IWW's prestige and influence among a sector of the independent labor movement, it is worth examining the differences in the line and methods of the modern IWW and the NLOC, and the factors that drove the IWW from a mass, revolutionary labor organization to its present state as a minority group of reformists inside the state union system. This criticism is necessary not just to clearly demarcate the New Labor camp from the "militant" reformist camp, of which the contemporary IWW is a part, but also to strengthen any opposition in the IWW's present line and prevent modern opportunist IWW leaders from hiding behind the principled history of the IWW.

## Origins of the IWW

Early American unions like the Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor were far from revolutionary organizations. In an article published by the Trade Union Education League (TUEL) in 1922, Foster writes, "Despite their militancy, the trade unions of the [late 19th century] (...) were comparatively weak in numbers, stupid in their philosophy,<sup>1</sup> and infested with job-hunters and reactionaries."<sup>ii</sup> Many on the revolutionary left felt that it was necessary to start new unions, considering that it was "simpler to start the labor movement all over again, this time upon 'scientific' principles" than to take on the "unpromising task to convert these primitive groupings into Socialist organizations."

The first labor organization founded on this independent basis was the "Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance" (STLA), founded in 1895 following a split with the American Federation of Labor and the Knights of Labor, essentially out of a personal struggle between Daniel DeLeon and other prominent individuals in the Knights of Labor and the AFL. DeLeon's organization never numbered more than a "handful of militants" and quickly dissolved, but the idea of revolutionary unionism persisted long after it.

The IWW ultimately has its origins in that same growing trend in the United States that pushed to form unions independent of the AFL. In 1905, "socialists, ... anarchists, industrialists, and progressives" convinced by the necessity of dual unionism convened in Chicago to found the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). The IWW was "devised to supplant the whole trade union structure and to realign the labor movement upon a new revolutionary basis." A few delegates at the IWW's founding convention even came representing the STLA.

In the minutes of its founding convention, we can see that the IWW was at least inspired by Marxism. Founding member "Big" Bill Haywood and chairman of the convention expressly says at the very beginning that the convention delegates are gathered to found an organization whose purpose is "the emancipation of the working class from the slave bondage of capitalism" and "to put the working class in possession of the economic power."<sup>iii</sup>

---

1 The main takeaway of "stupid in their philosophy" is that these unions essentially defended capitalism and rejected or smoothed over the class struggle.

The Manifesto read at the beginning of the convention shows further Marxist influence, describing how the development of more and more productive machinery makes skilled crafts obsolete and plunges workers into unemployment or mindless drudge-work. The famous preamble to the IWW's constitution directly quotes Marx's "Value, Price and Profit" in its call for the "abolition of the wage system."

We see that the IWW was also solidly based in the proletariat. It was formed in opposition to the American Federation of Labor (AFL); Haywood even flatly stated at the beginning of the IWW convention that the AFL was "not a working class movement. It does not represent the working class." Nearly all of the delegates at the IWW's convention were trade unionists representing their respective unions in the industries they personally worked in. The largest delegation came from the Western Federation of Miners led by Haywood. Some delegates were just average workers who weren't there on behalf of any organization. Certain "labor leaders" present who were bought-off or considered traitors were even denounced by workers in the industries they claimed to represent during proceedings that dealt with the delegates' certifications.

Unlike most independent unions, the IWW allowed for its members to have parallel membership in both the IWW and another union<sup>iii</sup>. This practice, called "dual carding" or "dual unionism" in the United States, was a very controversial practice that was criticized from both the Right and the Left during the period of the IWW's heyday in the 1900s-1920s. Dual unionism was a centrist or pragmatic concession to the fact that, while they desired "One Big Union", the IWW started out marginal to the business unions who were often affiliated to the American Federation of Labor. The IWW thus sought to limit the effects of their marginalization by allowing workers to become members, while also remaining members of the establishment unions<sup>iv</sup>.

This was organizational eclecticism typical of anarchist-inspired organizations. Instead of organizing independent shop organizations and principled union oppositions within reactionary unions (as was practiced in major centers of red unionism like Russia, China, Italy, France, and India), as well as independent class-conscious unions outside of those unions, the IWW combined all of these forms into one amorphous "general union". This eclectic dual-carding strategy led to criticisms from the Right of the IWW promoting sectarianism and factionalism within the labor movement, which argued that instead of being "dual unionists" the IWW should just join and work within the business unions without a parallel union structure. Meanwhile, the Left would eschew this dual-carding strategy entirely during the TUUL period, and instead function as an independent union with satellite shop committees and union oppositions doing work within the AFL and other business unions.

While it's to the great credit of the early IWW that their militants were able to form the first union in the American context that was founded on a revolutionary and proletarian basis, that enjoyed mass support from workers, anarchist eclecticism like this limited the project. The IWW still practices "dual-carding" to this day.

The IWW's very basic strategy was to organize the working class along industrial lines, and centralize all these industries within one broad organization under the direction of a "general administration" committee. In the section titled "Industrial Organization of the Workers" in the convention minutes, there is some discussion of how the organization to be founded must "provide perfect Industrial Unionism and converge the strength of all organized workers to a common center, from which any weak point can be strengthened and protected." The IWW proposed that "the army of production must

be organized. By organizing industrially the workers are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old."<sup>2</sup>

William E. Trautmann describes a vision of uniting all the different trades and industries into several industrial "departments" along the following lines:

1. *The Department of Agriculture, Land, Fisheries and Water Products.*
2. *The Department of Mining.*
3. *The Department of Transportation and Communication.*
4. *The Department of Manufacture and General Production.*
5. *The Department of Construction.*
6. *The Department of Public Service.*

Each one of these comprises many subdivisions that Trautmann describes at length. But Trautmann's article was only an attempt to describe what a general industrial organization comprising the entire working class *could* look like. He wasn't describing the real level of organization of the Industrial Workers of the World at the time and the pamphlet does not talk about how this organization, if created, would take power.<sup>v</sup>

The founding convention of the IWW opens with the idea that the organization to be created, as it grew and developed, would "build up within itself the structure of an Industrial Democracy—a Workers' Co-Operative Republic." But the crucial point of how to go from this to the seizure of power by the working class is never stated in the convention; only that the development of this "industrial democracy" would reach a point where it would "finally burst the shell of capitalist government." This idea—that the development of the trade unions is synonymous with the development of socialism—is called syndicalism. Syndicalism acts as a brake on the revolutionary movement by denying the necessity of another type of organization—a clandestine party of the proletariat organized on the basis of establishing proletarian dictatorship—for leading the trade unions and other working-class organizations. Without a fortress-like party of the proletariat at its head, the trade unions can easily be undermined from within by petty bourgeois misleaders or simply suppressed militarily by the bourgeoisie. Indeed, it was a combination of these two factors that rapidly depleted the strength of the IWW during and after the first World War.

In Haywood's 1911 speech on the tactic of the "General Strike", he is supportive of revolution, considering that "peace" does not exist under capitalism. But the only thing close to a strategy outlined in his speech comes during a brief question and answer section, he frames the general strike as the *lead up* to the revolution. Presumably to Haywood at the time, the revolution was something spontaneous rather than organized: "A strike is an incipient revolution. Many large revolutions have grown out of a small strike. (...) If I didn't think that the general strike was leading on to the great revolution which will emancipate the working class I wouldn't be here. I am with you because I believe that in this little meeting there is a nucleus here that will carry on the work and propagate the seed that will grow into the great revolution that will overthrow the capitalist class." It seems that Haywood and the other Wobblies of the day didn't think the final "standoff" between labor and capital was much different from the other strikes and labor battles they were accustomed to waging, just on a larger scale.<sup>vi</sup>

## **Decline of the IWW following the October Revolution**

---

2 From the preamble to the Industrial Workers of the World's Constitution.

Following the success of the October Revolution in Russia, the Executive Committee of the Third International sent an open letter penned by Grigory Zinoviev appealing to the IWW, calling them "to rally to the Communist Internationale, born in the dawn of the World Social Revolution." The letter has an urgent but triumphant tone—at the time it was believed that if the working class overthrew the bourgeoisie in one country and took power, a wave of revolutions would follow throughout the rest of the capitalist world. The document is both a popular exposition of political principles central to the Bolsheviks' success and a critique of the IWW's politics.

Zinoviev goes out of his way to critique the IWW's opposition to the state in general and explains the need for the proletariat to create its own version of the state to suppress the bourgeoisie, once it has destroyed the bourgeois state:

*Many members of the I.W.W. do not agree with this. They are against "the State in general." They propose to overthrow the capitalist State and to establish in its place immediately the Industrial Commonwealth.*

*The Communists are also opposed to the "State." They also wish to abolish it – to substitute for the government of men the administration of things.*

*But unfortunately this cannot be done immediately. The destruction of the capitalist State does not mean that capitalism automatically and immediately disappears. The capitalists still have arms, which must be taken away from them; they are still supported by hordes of loyal bureaucrats, managers, superintendents, foremen and trained men of all sorts, who will sabotage industry – and these must be persuaded or compelled to serve the working class; they still have army officers who can betray the revolution, preachers who can raise superstitious fears against it, teachers and orators who can misrepresent it to the ignorant thugs can be hired to discredit it by evil behaviour, newspaper editors who can deceive the people with floods lies and "yellow" Socialists and Labour fakers prefer capitalist "democracy" to the revolution. All these people must be sternly repressed.*

*To break down the capitalist State, to crush capitalist resistance and disarm the capitalist class, to confiscate capitalist property and turn it over to the WHOLE WORKING CLASS IN COMMON – for all these tasks a Government is necessary – a State, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, in which the workers, through their Soviets, can uproot the capitalist system with an iron hand.*

*This is exactly what exists in Soviet Russia to-day.*

Zinoviev goes on to explain what the revolutionary early Soviet government looked like. Unions in the Soviet Union were industrial; all the workers in one industry belonged to the same union instead of being separated by their trade. The unions were a branch of the proletarian state, whose purpose became running industry itself.<sup>vii</sup>

From 1917-1919, mass arrests of IWW leadership and raids by both the US government and far-right paramilitary groups created a political vacuum that deprived the IWW of its most experienced and politically sharp leaders like Haywood. Even still, in 1920, the IWW General Executive Board (GEB) approved of the Third International and favored affiliation to it, explicitly recognizing that the Russian proletariat was using the Soviet government (the proletariat was using *state power*) to hold power

during the transition from capitalism to Communism. The IWW leadership was *trending* towards the historical necessity of Leninism already, though they never acknowledged the need for a revolutionary Party, outlined by Lenin.<sup>3</sup>

A split began to form within the IWW between hard-line anarchists who opposed any and all state power including the Soviet Union, and syndicalists who vacillated in their support for the growing proletarian state. In 1920, the IWW held a referendum on whether or not to affiliate to the Comintern-affiliated Red International of Labor Unions (RILU). The RIAC contended that the vote had been manipulated through fraudulent counting practices, with the consent of the GEB. Despite receiving 1,111 votes in favor and only 994 against affiliation with RILU, the GEB allowed for 127 "no" votes to be counted twice. Affiliation was considered defeated by the GEB, then censorship and expulsions of Communist members who advocated for affiliation with RILU followed in the IWW. The anarchist faction published as many articles as possible in the *Industrial Worker* denouncing the Soviets. James Rowan, a leader of this faction, held a strong grudge against imprisoned Wobblies who had plead guilty to receive a commutation of their sentences. Rowan sought a court injunction against the IWW headquarters to prevent them from holding IWW property and money. "Breaker gangs" affiliated with this faction even raided Communists homes and beat them.<sup>viii</sup> The anarchist side of the split eventually won out and at their congress in 1923, the GEB formally denounced the RILU.<sup>ix</sup>

In their 1922 reply to the Comintern,<sup>x</sup> the I.W.W responded harshly to the Comintern's accusations of "syndicalism" — a term that refers generally to the idea that the trade unions will take power after the revolution, that the trade unions are all the proletariat needs for the seizure of power to occur. The I.W.W. described itself not as "syndicalist," but as "*an economic working-class organization, in which the unit is the industrial union.*" It's hard to see the difference here. It further described its character as "an economically militant organization, which acts upon the theory that the workers learn to fight by fighting. It places no reliance upon political action, nor does it teach reliance upon physical force." But these two very things, political action and reliance upon physical force, are exactly the lessons that needed to be learned from the workers' revolution in Russia. And the IWW certainly understood the *need* for physical force, being experienced in the spontaneous battles that emerge between strikers and scabs on the picket line.

The IWW correctly saw the state's class character as a tool of the capitalists to suppress the workers and knew that any attempt by the proletariat to use the state to help the class struggle would be a waste. They were particularly skeptical of the Comintern's advocacy of "revolutionary parliamentarism" that involved running Communist candidates in elections and using the elections and any bourgeois office as a platform for propaganda. But they also either didn't understand or just rejected the idea that the working class could ever make *its own* state, and that the working class really had no choice but to make its own state so it could suppress the capitalists after taking power.<sup>4</sup> The workers' state would consolidate and ensure the success of the workers' revolution. The IWW considered that a broad

---

3 "The board believed that in so far as the Third International was the only workers' international that had come into existence throughout history that disagreed with the meek and mild parliamentary programs, that we should show our approval of it as opposed to the opportunism of the Second International, and particularly so, because we were convinced that our Russian fellow workers in Russia are only maintaining the political character of the first Soviet government to hold and gain power temporarily during the transitory period from capitalism to industrial Communism." — From *Solidarity*, May 15, 1920, quoted in RIAC, "To Members of the I.W.W." (1925)

4 Engels showed that the state arises from class society as a tool for the ruling classes of history to suppress the different working classes of each economic order in *Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*. Lenin showed how the proletariat would need its own state in *The State and Revolution*, and that this state would "wither away" as class distinctions were overcome.

enough *economic* organization of industrial trade unions was enough for the working class to take power. They therefore rejected the need for a revolutionary Party of the proletariat, hence the accusation of syndicalism by the Comintern.<sup>5</sup>

The RILU continued to try to win over the IWW. They sent a delegation to the IWW's 1924 convention where they tried (unsuccessfully) to convince their industrial departments to join them.<sup>xi</sup> The RILU again appealed to members of the IWW in 1925 in a letter penned by the Red International Affiliation Committee (RIAC).<sup>xii</sup> They describe a downward trend in the IWW: its numbers declined from 38,828 members in 1923, to 30,722 members in 1924, then down to only 16,341 members in 1925, following the split. The RIAC pointed out that the IWW, in major industries where it had little competition and from which the IWW got 88% of its membership, was only able to organize a small fraction of the workers. It is important to note that although the US government heavily persecuted the IWW during this time, the IWW's politics and organizational methods are the main thing that prevented the organization from weathering this storm—for instance, since the IWW made no distinction between "professional" revolutionaries and the organized workers and lumped everyone into one open organization, it was much easier for the state to arrest their leaders.

The RIAC issued a number of suggestions to the IWW: focus on the unorganized workers, establish "shop, job and ship" committees which struggle for demands and connect the workers to the union, and struggle for international unity—in their case, by sending delegates to the next World Congress of the RILU. All this advice still holds good today.

Haywood himself was won over to Communism following the Russian Revolution. "First taking his stand with that group in the IWW which favored adherence to the Red International of Labor Unions, [Haywood] gradually developed his thought further and finally came to the point where he proclaimed himself a Communist and a disciple of Lenin. He became a member of the Communist Party of America before his departure for Russia."<sup>xiii</sup>

The main underlying error in the IWW's philosophy is a problem of not seeing both sides of one thing. They oppose the state in general, instead of opposing the bourgeois state and working for a proletarian state, seeing no qualitative difference between these things. The IWW opposed "politics" in general, which was usually understood to mean bourgeois electoral politics. But they never made a distinction between *bourgeois* politics and *proletarian* politics: they didn't just oppose bourgeois politics and the electoral system, they also rejected the need for the Communist Party. They failed to develop a proletarian line on political questions and instead looked at themselves as only an *economic* organization. These problems laid the groundwork for the split in the IWW.

## The IWW Today

The wobblies and their supporters today have not evolved theoretically since the IWW's disintegration in the 1920s. They are stuck in time, and this is evident in their ideology and politics today. Many have very good instincts and want to form independent unions based firmly on the principle of class struggle

---

5 "The I.W.W. believes that the time devoted to politics is misspent, and that the energy so expended is misdirected and wasted. We believe that the class character of the state will not permit that institution to aid the proletariat in its class struggle. Therefore, we teach the workers that what they really require is not to influence the state favorably toward them, but to put themselves in such position, through an economic class organization, that they will be enabled to protect themselves against the hostility of the capitalist state." From "The I.W.W. Reply to the Red Trade Union International." 1922

and run directly by the workers on the shop floor, but the political frozenness of the IWW makes it incapable of seeing the existing establishment unions properly as tools *of the bourgeoisie*, which are *integrated directly with the bourgeois state*, and that the way forward necessarily means *destroying* these unions as part of the proletariat's revolutionary task to destroy the bourgeois state machinery in general. *New Labor Press* has made this task clear to the US proletariat and the New Labor organizations in its state unionism thesis.<sup>6</sup>

The IWW has not yet embraced this idea. Instead the IWW still generally characterizes any class-collaborationist union practices as "business unionism," a historical term used to describe the American Federation of Labor and its class collaborationist slogan, "a fair day's wage for a fair day's work." In "Class Struggle Unionism: A specter to haunt the billionaire class," a review of labor lawyer Joe Burns' book *Class Struggle Unionism*, Alex Riccio, a writer with the IWW-affiliated publication *organizing.work*, defines "business unionism" as "a machine geared toward establishing legal recognition, securing labor peace through collective bargaining agreements with employers, and operating as a *de facto* extension of the Democratic Party."<sup>xiv</sup>

This inaccurate view of the existing unions inevitably leads Wobblies to wrong conclusions. Riccio's article is a glowing review of Burns' book. We see a lot of ideas and principles similar to what the New Labor Organizing Committee is based on: Burns calls for unions based on "class struggle" and "working-class solidarity," which are "run by workers" and use "tactics that emerge from the workplace" to engage in "open conflict with employers." However, in comparison to revolutionary projects like NLOC or NLP, *organizing.work* and other IWW-affiliated projects are unable to see through Burns' obvious economism and reformism on other points regarding working-class revolution because they suffer from the same fundamental flaw they always have: a petty-bourgeois syndicalist orientation which embraces ideological eclecticism, political anarchism, and organizational liberalism. Modern IWW organizers and affiliated writers constantly contradict one another, and even themselves, as they vacillate between rightist and ultra-left extremes. They are unable to chart a path to revolution because they themselves are confused and unsure on how to proceed and what strategy and tactics to take. They minimize the question of socialist revolution, which should take precedent, and in doing so lose all bearing regarding questions of the labor movement.

For example, in one article Nick Driedger, first an IWW organizer for the Canadian Post and then later "Director of Labour Relations and Organizing for the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees", writes to defend<sup>xv</sup> the IWW's ultra-"left" practice of rejecting written contracts, relying on verbal ones instead. But then in another article he swings to the right to totally tail the state union in their industry, the Canadian Union of Postal Workers. He even goes so far as to say that those who sign up with the IWW should consider themselves "loyal CUPW members." When postal workers came to him demanding the CUPW be decertified so the IWW could take its place, *he advised against it*, and in the article states that the IWW "doesn't occupy the same space" as the state unions. He tails the reactionary arbitration and grievance process implemented by the state union contracts and says that the IWW's low dues are insufficient to pay the \$10,000 required by the arbitration process for every grievance—he does not address *why* the workers should care about abiding by this process *at all*.<sup>xvi</sup>

This eclecticism and degeneration can also be seen in how, by the 1990s, the IWW had all but abandoned industrial unionism. In their 1992 Organizing Manual<sup>xvii</sup>, the section titled "Industrial Unionism" is only three paragraphs in length, while the rest of the manual is devoted to organizing only one individual workplace. In terms of tactics, the approach described in the Organizing Manual is not

---

6 See: "State Unionism in the United States." *New Labor Press*. 2023

radically different from that of the state unions' paid organizers. Some of it is good advice that any class-conscious trade unionist should learn from, like the suggestion to thoroughly research your employer and your industry to have a real basis to start from, or to time actions well to strike when the boss is desperate. But there is no real guidance on what "industrial unionism" is supposed to mean. There is also a lot of good information on tactics the employer may use to counter a potential unionizing campaign. There is guidance on creating and distributing literature specific to one workplace, but nothing on the necessity of creating a newsletter *for the entire industry*, and in fact *starting* from the industrial perspective before even beginning to organize a single workplace, which is the approach taken by the NLOC and its workplace organizations.

The ultimate goal of all the advice given in the Organizing Manual is to eventually win "union recognition" from the employer. The need for this is taken for granted; presumably this is because of labor law, but the class-conscious worker is given no explanation for why they should be interested in their boss recognizing the union at all. Whether this recognition is validated by the NLRB or not is treated like a non-issue; the advice is all centered on obeying labor law and as a result the suggestions amount to more tailism of the state unions—in fact, in the section on "Redbaiting," the advice is to deal with redbaiting by *denying the IWW's Marxist roots altogether*:

*You should be prepared to respond to charges that the IWW is not a bona-fide union. In Canada, an IWW construction local was once refused bargaining rights because a labor board hearing officer ruled that the IWW Preamble proved we did not seek harmonious relations with the bosses. In Los Angeles, an employer similarly tried to quote the Preamble a few years ago to "prove" us a "communist" organization, rather than a labor union.*

*This sort of nonsense (!) is easily refuted. IWW headquarters can provide abundant documentation from the NLRB, the US labor department, etc., recognizing status as a union.*

Just like the state unions, the IWW's legitimacy comes *ultimately* from the US Department of Labor and the National Labor Relations Board *recognizing the IWW's status as a union*. The principled advice would be to respond to redbaiting by *defending* the right of the proletariat to fight against the bourgeoisie which exploits them, and by *upholding* the class struggle as a material reality.

The IWW again advises *no action at all* to contest the state unions' influence on the workers. The Organizing Manual uses a workerist claim, feigning deference to the workers, but actually belittling their intelligence, when it says, "Workers aren't half as interested in jurisdictional warfare as they are in how a union can improve their jobs." But *critiquing* the state unions and *exposing* their role as tools of the bourgeoisie is the very thing that shows the way forward to the workers and raises their political consciousness.

The very problem of letting the state unions freely organize is explained two paragraphs later:

*The other union—if it wins—will negotiate a contract requiring all workers to join it in order to keep their jobs. There's always the danger that it may turn a blind eye to the employer's efforts to get rid of IWW activists. Once it's certified by the government, dumping an unsatisfactory union—or getting out from under a worthless contract—is immensely difficult. In the long run, you may well be better off without a business union entrenched on the job. Should you decide that a business union is better than an unorganized job (!!), try to reach some sort of agreement guaranteeing certain rights for IWW members on the job.*



Should you decide to let the bourgeoisie "organize" your coworkers in a reactionary way, try to keep them from purging you! This is the logic that categorizing the state unions as "business unions" leads to.

## **Conclusion**

We can see that the Industrial Workers of the World was founded on a clear Marxist foundation, firmly based in the proletariat. The early IWW led many successful and heroic battles and it was bitterly repressed by the US bourgeoisie. Lenin and the Third International looked at the IWW favorably; the RIAC even said the IWW was at one time "the leading revolutionary organization of America and foremost champion of working class unity and struggle."

In the course of history, revolutionary tendencies, groups and methods that start off genuinely radical and groundbreaking can get "stuck" when their methods or politics ultimately come up short and they're unable to adapt to changing circumstances. Many Wobblies left the IWW in the 20s to join the new US section of the Third International, the Communist Party. These "stuck" organizations become fossils within the left—the IWW today is one such organization that clings to its positive past but fails to move forward and learn from its mistakes.

In fact we see a regression: the IWW's tactics today ultimately seek to win employer recognition and even recognition by the NLRB, just like the state unions, and their outdated politics lead them to mislead the workers when it comes to the state unions. The IWW does not propose an effective way to raise up the workers' consciousness and bring politics to them, other than making it clear to them the need for a union, because to the IWW, the union really is all that they need for revolution. But this negates the need for experienced leadership by lumping all the workers into one big organization. Ultimately it was not the repression of the IWW that led to its demise, it was its metaphysical political line and inability to grasp the historical necessity of Leninism and the positive experience of the Russian Revolution. It has to be this internal problem with the IWW that led to its demise; otherwise we give up the idea that we can even build organizations that are able to withstand repression in the first place.

It's natural that many well-meaning workers and activists would be drawn to the IWW because of the correct instincts that they find in that organization. The need for the workers to have their own independent unions that work by direct action instead of begging is felt very strongly by the proletariat. But we cannot keep repeating the same old mistakes. Advances in the ideology of our class, the practice of socialist revolution, and applications of these two to our modern context (like State unionism) over the last century means we need new forms of organization; this is exactly what the New Labor Organizations are putting into practice today.

- i Foster, William Z. "The Bankruptcy of the American Labor Movement." Trade Union Education League. 1922
- ii Industrial Workers of the World, Minutes of the IWW Founding Convention.  
<https://archive.iww.org/history/founding/>
- iii The Role of the Dual Carder in the IWW <https://archive.iww.org/PDF/DualCardIWW.pdf>
- iv The Case for Dual Carding <https://industrialworker.org/the-case-for-dual-carding/>
- v Trautmann, William E. "One Big Union." 1911
- vi Haywood, "Big" Bill. "The General Strike." 1911
- vii G. Zinoviev (President of Central Executive Committee of the Third International), "To the I.W.W. A Special Message from the Communist International." 1920
- viii Renshaw, Patrick. *The Wobblies: The Story of Syndicalism in the United States*. p. 261-262. 1967, 1999
- ix Molyneux, Cameron. "Industrial Suicide: Understanding the 1924 Split of the Industrial Workers of the World." University of Washington. 2020
- x Industrial Workers of the World. "The I.W.W. Reply to the Red Trade Union International." 1922
- xi Renshaw, 1999
- xii Red International Affiliation Committee. "To Members of the IWW." 1925
- xiii Cannon, James P. "William D. Haywood — Soldier to the Last." *The Daily Worker*. 1928
- xiv Riccio, Alex. "Class Struggle Unionism - A specter to haunt the billionaire class." *Organizing Work*. 2021
- xv Driedger, Nick. "Contracts and the present-day IWW." *Organizing Work*. 2022
- xvi Driedger, Nick. "On Dual-Carding (Or how revolutionaries should approach mainstream unions)." *Organizing Work*. 2018
- xvii Industrial Workers of the World. "Organizing Manual." 1992  
[https://archive.iww.org/PDF/Official/IWW\\_organizing\\_manual.pdf](https://archive.iww.org/PDF/Official/IWW_organizing_manual.pdf)