

EDITORIAL

## WHEN NOT CRIMINAL, CHILDISH.

By DANIEL DE LEON

**T**HE communication from “S.T. & L.A.,”<sup>1</sup> that appeared in our correspondence column telling of the action of the local organization of the International Typographical Union in blackballing an applicant for admission on the ground that he had worked in the composing room of this paper, and had not demanded wages high enough to make impossible its publication, is a timely contribution to the understanding of the “pure and simple” frame of mind. The contribution is especially timely in that it must tend to chasten the indignation, bound to be severe, that every right-minded man must entertain for that abortion of a labor organization known as the “pure and simple” Union.

However coarse-grained an I.T.U. Fakir may be, however habitually vinous his condition, however constitutionally crooked his make-up, he knows that this paper is a bona fide Labor Paper, an unflinching upholder of the Working Class. Due to their unworthy characteristics, these Fakirs may hate the paper, but respect it they are bound to. Now, then, their attitude, as correctly depicted by “S.T. & L.A.,” is that “Union Wages” is a thing so wholly the be-all and end-all of human endeavor, is a principle so rigidly to be adhered to that, even at the risk of killing a Labor paper, such wages must be enforced. Such childishness goes far to lame indignation; in sight of it one is seized with that feeling of pity that comes over the sane at the motto of the “Scientific Anarchist,” who loves Liberty “tho’ it slay him.”

Without life no Liberty is worth having; the Liberty that slays is the pet of the calf. And so with “Union Wages.” Intelligently understood, Union Wages is one of the means towards the emancipation of the wage slave class; a Labor paper is a still stronger weapon to that end. Accordingly, the Labor organization, that, like the Socialist Labor Party, sets up such a paper, would be supremely childish if it were to insist, within its own ranks, upon measures that are intended only against the exploiter; and its

---

<sup>1</sup> [See page 2.]

childishness would be more calfy still if it were to insist upon such measures to the extent of crippling, or strangling the paper to death.

Looked at from one side, examined by the light of his malfeasances in the Labor world, the Labor Fakir appears like a criminal, and the gathering indignation of the awakening Proletariat seems disposed to treat him as such by giving him but short shrift. But does not the manifestation herein examined point to a mental condition that deprives these gentlemen of responsibility and, while spurring the full-grown workingmen's movement to cashier them, invokes pity in their behalf?

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### More Light on the Lifting of the *Sun* Boycott: More to Come.

To the *Daily People*.—The action of the Organized Scabbery that runs No. 6, International Typographical Union, last Sunday, in "lifting" the boycott on the New York *Sun*, was only the culmination of a dirty Organized Scabbery scheme long concocted.

That something of this kind was in the wind, was smelled by those who had noses to smell at the January meeting, when the very same clique, that now favored the lifting of the *Sun* boycott, violently, and with bloody dollars in their eyes, opposed a resolution in which it was proposed that "Big Six" stand by T. Sherlock, Editor of the *Unionist*, (a paper which had been subsidized by No. 6, to defend its cause in the fight with the *Sun*,) in the matter of appealing against a decision of a court by which Sherlock was found guilty of "libeling a *Sun* employee." It was the very same Mr. Duncan, so well characterized in yesterday's *Daily People*, who, at that January meeting, favored the "dropping of Sherlock," to forget that man's services in the interest of No. 6, and to "let him do his time." Whether this was "one of the agreements" with Mr. Laffan, the manager of the *Sun*, that those workingmen who had hurt the paper most were to go to jail, before negotiations could be carried on, is a point on which Mr. Duncan might be able to throw some light if he chose.

Mr. Duncan made the statement, at the January meeting, in the Sherlock case, that though that article in the *Unionist*, for which Sherlock was sentenced in court, not a subscriber, advertiser, or anybody else was influenced to quit the *Sun*. Unfortunately for the fakirs in general, and Mr. Duncan in particular, these gentlemen always manage to run into somebody who knows a thing or two, and then your fakir gets it in the neck. This was the experience of Mr. Duncan when he ran into Sherlock. Sherlock certainly "knows something," otherwise he never could, on that January occasion, have given the witty retort that he did when he answered Mr. Duncan, saying: "I don't know

what good that article did, but I am convinced that the article did, at least, just as much good as the Secret Committee, with its \$100,000, and not able to give account.”

This retort must have hit bull’s-eye; and not one bull’s-eye only, but as many “bull’s-eyes” as were implicated in that immortal Secret Committee, and who, their dues being away behind, suddenly (Secret Committeely,) paid up all their arrears, began to take three square meals a day (’tween meals and drinks not counted), and swaggered forth on the high and by-ways in new trousers, flashy waistcoats, dandy coats, new overcoats, and knobby hats. Sherlock’s retort hit all those {“}bull’s-eyes.”

No wonder Mr. Ben Hanford, of Secret Committee celebrity, felt stung to the quick, and led the van at yesterday’s meeting of No. 6 in two actions that go “arum in arum,” as Pat would say, viz., the lifting of the boycott on the Sun, and the black-balling of an applicant for membership, Gust. Wittrock by name, on the ground of is having worked for the *Daily People*, and not having demanded wages high enough to make impossible the publication of that grand workingmen’s paper that makes all Secret Committees, and other scabs on Labor, turn color when they but think of its name.

S.T. & L.A.

New York, Feb. 4.

*Daily People*, Vol. I, No. 220. Wednesday, February 5, 1901

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded January 2006