EDITORIAL

A MISNOMER AND BURLESQUE.

By DANIEL DE LEON

LOCAL Bellingham of the “Socialist” party of the State of Washington has issued a circular in which, stepping from fact to fact, it arrives at the final conclusion that the ways of Arthur Morrow Lewis would “make the name working class movement a misnomer and burlesque”. The facts that serve as rungs of the ladder up which the Bellingham local reaches its topmost conclusion are that Mr. Arthur Morrow Lewis of San Francisco was engaged and paid by the “Socialist” party of Washington for propaganda work; that he availed himself of the opportunity “to personally electioneer among individual members” against another party member; that the stories he thus retailed were gathered “from a malicious source”; that the tales which he circulated were “slanderous”, that they were “all hearsay”; and that “he had no knowledge of the truth of the reports he so circulated”. The gentleman is no “exceptional instance”; he is a type of a species that grows on a certain soil. Both soil and type merit contemplation.

The ground upon which last year’s national convention finally planted the said so-called Socialist party, and upon which the party machine, together with its privately owned press, keeps it is the soil of the Civic Federationized A.F. of L. The affinity between the Capitalist Class and the Gompers body is sufficiently illustrated by their intimate relations. The one can not choose but partake of the qualities of the other. What the tactical qualities of capitalist warfare are needs no lengthy recitation. Suffice it to say that those qualities must needs be the qualities of the caitiff craven—falsification. Unequipped with arguments, Capitalism has no weapons other than the diffusion of slander against the right and slander against the upholders of right; and it plies its trade thanks to its vast opportunities for propaganda. Thus does Capitalism; thus, consequently, does A.F. of Lism; and thus inevitably do the propagandists set afloat by the machine of the said “Socialist”

party. Indeed, without exception, there is no “Socialist” party propagandist with whom the Socialism is not a pretext to propagate A.F. of L. falsehood. Thus we see the Careys and Sievermans periodically taking the field ostensibly “on a tour of propaganda for the Socialist party”, in fact, however, on a tour to propagate the capitalist falsehood of the Tobin label which guarantees the employers peace while they skin their workingmen; thus we see the Hanfords, whenever jobs run scarce in the shops, placed on the field ostensibly to declaim Socialism, in fact, however, to promote the falsehood of the beloved system of pure and simplesdom, under which “Union” men, with “Union” cards in their pockets, carry militia rifles against workingmen on strike; thus we see the Bergers and Heaths setting up the colors of Socialism and under the false emblem visit capitalist shops on the errand of discharging employes who have joined the Industrial Workers of the World. In each of these, and many more instances that could be cited, the “electioneering” is done as a feature of “propaganda”; in each of these instances the tales thus retailed are gathered “from malicious sources”; in each of these instances what is circulated is a “slander” on Labor; without exception, in all these instances, wherever the “propagandist” is put to his proof he cuts the sorry figure of Mr. Arthur Morrow Lewis. Like the swindler, told about by Artemus Ward, who paid for a keg of applesauce with a bogus check, these retailers of the falsehoods of Capitalism draw upon a bank “that does not have an existence, but far otherwise, and never did”.

The fruit of A.F. of L.ism is Arthur-Morrow-Lewisism. He who would have the bramble bush, must swallow the “misnomer and burlesque” of the bitter berry. He who would none of the “misnomer and burlesque” must cut down the bramble bush and cast it in the fire—whither it certainly will land, eventually if not sooner.