

Capitalizing Debs' Imprisonment

To aid in sending a prominent individual in the revolutionary movement to a federal prison and then to use that imprisonment as a means to cajole money out of the gullible public is about the lowest tactic to which any institution can descend. Yet that is precisely what "The Appeal to Reason," that notorious petty bourgeois and jingo paper, is resorting to at the present time in order to swell the bank account of the adventurers who manage and edit it.

While the war was on the "Appeal" denounced as "pro-German" every criticism, no matter how justifiable, of the war policy of the United States government. It rendered effectual service to the American jingoes by arousing the spirit of hatred against the socialists of this country who stood true to the principles of internationalism. In that respect it was even more vile than the rest of the capitalist press. Did the capitalist press print a deliberate lie about a revolutionist or some one else who had incurred the enmity of the capitalist class the "Appeal" magnified the lie a hundred fold. In the case of Debs, its action was the same as in other cases. When Debs delivered his Canton, O., speech and was arrested and charged with violation of the infamous espionage act, did the "Appeal" denounce it as an official crime? No, indeed! Instead of denouncing the acts of the petty officials of the United States government and the higher officials at Washington as despots drunk with power, this loathsome publication printed a scurrilous attack upon Debs, written by that asinine assumption of humanity, Allan L. Benson, wherein it was insinuated that Debs was the victim of a fanaticism which resulted in giving "aid and comfort to the imperial German government."

Throughout the entire war that alleged socialist publication besmirched and traduced any and all socialists who did not meekly submit to the czaristic tactics of the imperial government of the United States. It supported the imperialistic war as a measure of self-preservation, knowing full well that the same administration it supported would have suppressed it had it been a real socialist paper. In that respect, however, it acted quite in harmony with its previous reformistic attitude. Although recognized as an organ of socialism by that travesty upon socialism, the Socialist Party of America, it has never in its whole existence been a Socialist publication, but simply an organ of petty bourgeois reform. Not a single editor of the "Appeal" ever had understood even the fundamentals of socialism. J. A. Wayland, its founder, and Fred Warren, for years its editor, were as rare a pair of muddleheads as one would be likely to meet in a life time. The present editors and managers, Louis Kopelin and Emanuel Halde- man Julius, combine their muddlehead- edness with a sinister viciousness that places them in a distinct category as enemies of the working class. It is that sublime pair who directed the war policy of the "Appeal." They were unique in one respect: No journalist prostituted to capitalism could sink so low that the "Appeal" outfit could not crawl beneath him. Kopelin and Julius could grovel lower and lick longer than any other lickspittles the world has ever seen. It would take them both a thousand years to remove the corns acquired upon their bellies while crawling before their masters.

But in the case of Debs it has plumbed absolutely the lowest strata in the aggregation of degenerates. If it previous

tactics have been vile they are now immeasurably infamous, as at the present time it is using the name of Debs, the man it helped to imprison, in order to boost its subscription list. In connection with its subscription campaign it is trying to make its readers believe it has sufficient "political influence" with the government to secure amnesty for Debs. Has the ruling class thrown aside this vile crew now that it is through using it for a time, or is the fake amnesty campaign it is waging merely another manner of serving its masters? Is the "Appeal" in a position to know that the government is soon to grant amnesty to its political prisoners, and is it using its amnesty campaign so that it can claim another of its alleged "victories" for the working class when amnesty is granted, thus placing it in a position to again receive the support of imperialistic capitalism when that capitalism finds it convenient to use it?

The revolutionist is also anxious to secure amnesty for political prisoners, but he realizes the utter futility of appealing to any capitalist government for anything. The only tactics that will open the prison doors before the capitalist State is willing to open them is a manifestation of power on the part of the working class. An appeal to a capitalist government is not a manifestation of power, but a confession of weakness. Instead of making overtures to the government, the revolutionist will urge the workers to use the political strike for the liberation of class war prisoners.

"The Appeal to Reason" is a true servant of the ruling class and a subscription sent to that publication is merely a dagger placed at the heart of the workers.

Is the Syndicalist Movement Revolutionary?

The first principle of present day syndicalism is **no politics**. To the syndicalist, politics is a bourgeois delusion, unworthy the serious consideration of a revolutionist and, as he considers himself the revolutionist par excellence, he leaves politics for children and idiots to exhaust themselves upon.

The word "syndicat" is of French origin and is applied to any combination of individuals. Up to the time the idea of syndicalism began to influence the workers of the United States the word syndicate here was taken to mean a combination of capitalists. In most European countries the word now applies to a certain type of industrial unionism, which aims at the abolition of the capitalist system. This goal is to be obtained by the direct action of the unions, without parliamentary or any other kind of political action. Union activity is considered sufficient in itself to accomplish the complete transfer of industry from the hands of the capitalist exploiters into the hands of the workers, organized into industrial unions.

Anti-political syndicalism dates from the syndicalist congress, held at Amiens in 1906, when the vast majority declared in favor of a motion proclaiming the absolute separation of the political movement (of socialism) and syndicalism.

The anti-political propaganda of the syndicalists dates from the year 1900, when M. Millerand, one of the leaders of parliamentary socialism, entered the bourgeois ministry of Waldeck, Rosseau and Gallifet. Since that date the open antagonism between syndicalism and parliamentary socialism has been a feature of the labor movement throughout the world.

Both the syndicalist and the reformist socialist claim to be revolutionary, and although they have hitherto bitterly opposed each other, their conflicting tactics are not impossible of reconciliation, as events transpiring in European nations conclusively prove. Both of them fall into the fallacy of attempting to accomplish the revolution by the working class within the confines of the capitalist state.

The typical reform socialist, while desiring the abolition of capitalism, imagines the revolution to be an extremely gradual, almost imperceptible movement, culminating in the peaceful transfer of control of prevailing institutions from the hands of the capitalist class into the hands of the working class. This transformation is to be accomplished by making certain demands upon the state that will strengthen the position of the working class and gradually weaken the

position of the ruling class, such as workmen's compensation laws, the shorter work day, old age pensions, right to work bills, sanitary workshops, heavy progressive income taxes, etc., and through an indefinite continuation of such reforms within the capitalist state, finally legislate the capitalist class out of existence. These changes are to be realized by electing reform socialists to the various legislative bodies who are sworn to work diligently for such reforms, or to poll such a large socialist vote that the capitalist political parties will be compelled to grant the "socialist" demands. The reform socialist parties, of which the Socialist Party of America is an example, draw up long platforms, containing many demands upon the capitalist state and the politicians at the head of such organizations are always elated when a capitalist political party "steals some of its planks." Instead of a reorientation of their position in order to find out why a capitalist political organization should desire part of their program, they consider themselves flattered and boast of the fact that the public is beginning to accept "part of the socialist program." That brand of political action can only result in one thing—state socialism, or, more properly speaking, state capitalism.

The dominant socialism of the United