

# The Drift of Things

J. OGDEN ARMOUR expressed himself on Mexico without the intervention of his more democratically astute political sycophants, with this highly candid result:

It's high time the United States used the strong hand in Mexico. The only way to handle those fellows is at the end of a gun. The trouble never will be settled by talking, although it may be easier to talk than to act. The easy way is usually the wrong way, and the hard way is usually the right way and the easiest in the end. Americans have invested in Mexico and should be protected. The situation reminds one of Cuba. It was a land of unrest and trouble until America took a hand and established a stable government, put Cuba on its feet and made investment of capital possible by assuring protection of that capital. Today Cuba is one of the most prosperous countries in the world. But the United States didn't make it prosperous by writing notes. The sooner we use the strong hand in Mexico the easier it will be to make it a decent, prosperous country.

Cuba and the United States are "decent, prosperous" countries, but it appears that the decency and the prosperity are shared by very few.

J. Ogden was thinking in such straight lines about the meat and cold storage and rolled oats business in Mexico that he forget even to mention our "national honor" and the lost lives, the propaganda specials.

What a stirring war slogan: "To make Mexico safe for American capital!"

\* \* \*

IS REVOLUTION POSSIBLE, asks and answers Alvin Johnson in the "New Republic" of November 26th. After eight pages comes the reassuring conclusion: "The general economic system founded upon private property is in no present danger in America. Any future danger to that system is remote"—which is the result of a dispassionate examination of the facts in the case.

Of course we are not dispassionate, which makes our opinion worthless. Nevertheless we have a suspicion that, in spite of our revolutionary exuberances, we are quite as dispassionate in meeting Professor Johnson's query as he is himself. Could anyone imagine any treatment of the facts in the case, and any selection out of all the facts,

by the professorial editor of the New Republic which might produce some other conclusion? Whom is the Professor kidding? Doesn't he know that we all know that he only wrote the eight pages as a sedative for the nerves of revolution-scared gentlemen—and that he dispassionately framed an article for that express purpose? Indeed, the only thing convincing about the entire eight pages is the title. Why the need to allay are themselves the first stages of the revolution.

The dispassionate argument? There are many farmers in the United States and these are the anchors of capitalism. The industrial workers to be reckoned as the revolutionary force constitute only one-third of the population, contained largely within a small section of the country. As yet tenantry prevails on but 40 per cent of American farms. But we can depend on the farm owners to hold the tenants and farm laborers in line. Therefore, no revolution, not for a generation at any rate, during which the proportion of industrial workers and tenant farmers will go up.

Just like an equation in algebra. Of course all history is just like mathematics. With the special proviso that the dispassionate Professor might command the social digits to move according to his will, his nice equation might prove out. However, we have some misgivings about this two thirds force being thrown against the one-third quantity. The fact is that more than two-thirds of the two-thirds have no private property interests; and it is not so clear but that even the farm owners might, under a new social opinion, prefer to make terms with a dominant proletariat rather than do the fighting for the ousted finance oligarchy, which after all has not their profound devotion.

But if we go on we might appear to be making a case for the acquiescence of ninety per cent of the population in the proletarian revolution, though it be consciously determined upon by much less than one-third of the population. But why go on? Our examination of the facts would not be dispassionate, by our own admission. We have a pre-conviction that revolution is possible. We see it happening all about us, and always there are figures and arguments

to prove that the United States is different, though American capitalism is today compelling the cataclysmic mass protests which are the first stages of the revolution.

## A Free Speech Victory.

JUSTICES HOLMES and Brandeis dissented from the Supreme Court decision sustaining the convictions in the case of the United States vs. Jacob Abrams and four others, the notorious prosecution under the Espionage Act for protesting against the intervention in Russia. It was a scathing dissent, as this sentence indicates: "In this case sentences of twenty years imprisonment have been imposed for the publishing of two leaflets that I believe the defendants had as much right to publish as the Government has to publish the Constitution of the United States now vainly invoked by them."

The author of this sentence and many other strong sentences in this dissenting opinion happens to be also the author of the opinion in the Debs case, when the court was unanimous. It is absolutely incontestable that the logic of the dissenting opinion in the Abrams case should have led Holmes and Brandeis to dissent in the Debs case. There never was a more palpable adjustment of legal reasoning to time and circumstance. The class issue could not be ignored in the challenge which Debs made at Cleveland; it could very well be ignored, and the occasion could be used for an attempt to resurrect the fiction of "free speech" under the capitalist democracy, when five negligible aliens and two inconsequential leaflets against the unpopular Russian intervention were all that was before these Liberal jurists. Nor was there ever a more cynical example of the treacherous vice of Liberalism.

Quite consistently, the Liberal journals are making a great ado about the dissent. Quite as consistently, the government prosecutors—backed up by the decision of seven judges, not merely by the dissent of two, whose dissent is hopelessly compromised by their class stand in the Debs case,—are preparing to avail themselves of the full force of the drastic prevailing opinion.

The working class will win free speech by its own dissenting opinion, expressed in revolutionary mass action, and not any other way.

## You Must Unite—Workingmen!

(Continued from Page 1.)

defeated by the united capitalist class, of whose rule and power the government—the State—is the visible expression.

**WORKINGMEN, YOU MUST UNITE!**

**YOU MUST STRIKE TOGETHER!**

The capitalist system is breaking down. Its contradictions are of such a character that it becomes increasingly difficult to make it work. In place of supplying food, clothing and homes to live in to the workers, it is producing misery and hardships. It is the capitalist system which is responsible for the high cost of living. It is the greed of the capitalists that threatens us with the suffering from cold because no coal is being mined. It is capitalism that is responsible for the threatened railroad strike, which may bring hunger and even starvation to the whole country.

The capitalist control of industry will result in more and more strikes, more and more struggles of the workers to force from the capitalists the means and opportunity to live happy, healthy lives.

These strikes can only succeed if the power of the workers is united. The workers must strike together. The capitalists can beat the strikes of sections of the working class. They are powerless against the united working class.

The conservative and reactionary union officials who stand in

the way and betray the workers, who block united action, must be swept aside. Strike councils with delegates from every industry, whether the workers are organized or unorganized, must be united in a district council and the district councils in a national council.

Create your own organs for the struggle against capitalism, workingmen!

Send men who work with you and strike with you to the strike councils. They will represent you. They will not betray you. They will unite all the workers locally, in the district, and nationally. Then you can act together. Then you are invincible.

**ORGANIZE THE STRIKE COUNCIL!**

**STRIKE TOGETHER!**

Your power will be greater than that which the capitalists have through their control of the government. You will have your own organs of working class government.

Then you will beat the capitalists; and victory, and good food, good clothes, good homes, a voice in the management of the shop, and the opportunity for happy, healthy lives will be yours.

**UNITE THE STRIKES!**