

# DAILY PEOPLE

VOL. 3, NO. 274.

NEW YORK, TUESDAY, MARCH 31, 1903.

ONE CENT.

EDITORIAL

## CARICATURING REVOLUTIONARY FATHERS.

By DANIEL DE LEON

**T**WO were the leading figures in the recent dramatic industrial phenomenon, known as the “Miners’ Strike,” which reached its finale on the 15th inst., when the Arbitration Commission placed upon the event its tomb-slab decision. These two leading figures were Messrs. John Mitchell and Clarence S. Darrow. One of these, Mr. Darrow, in the course of a speech delivered in Springfield, Ill., on March 26, said:

“Not a thing was done by the miners in Pennsylvania that was not done by our revolutionary forefathers. In revolutionary times dwellings were burned, property was confiscated and 100,000 persons were driven out of their country. The refugees settled Nova Scotia and those who drove them out of this country then as now were denounced as hoodlums, murderers, cutthroats, assassins and outlaws. Yet they were the respectable people of those days, and we are proud to be known as descendants of those same revolutionists.”

Translated into the vernacular, this means that Mr. Darrow and Mr. Mitchell are Modern Benjamin Franklins and George Washingtons. A preposterous claim!

The rank and file of the miners did a thing that our revolutionary forefathers did not. A very important thing. They took for their leaders not a Washington and a Franklin: they took for their leaders a Mitchell and a Darrow. A serious difference. How serious may be gathered from the fact that the upshot of the affair was not a Yorktown, where the usurper surrendered, and a Treaty of Peace, where the patriots dictated the charter of their freedom, but a Scranton Convention, where the patriots surrendered to the usurper, and an Arbitral Award where the usurper “read the riot act” to the patriots.

Had the patriots of the American revolution elected for their General a Mitchell instead of a Washington, their revolutionary pulse would have been lowered by his declamations on the “reciprocal,” the “reconcilable” interests between the patriot Cause

(Labor, so to speak) and the Cause of the British Crown and Parliament (Capitalism, so to speak); and the head of their cause would have been placed “in chancery” by the “grand strategy” of keeping one wing of his army in idleness, even furnishing ammunition to the foe, while the other wing was in the heat of the fight: a Mitchell, instead of a Washington, would have allowed the bituminous wing (so to speak) of his army to scab it (so to speak) on his anthracite wing (so to speak). Had the patriots of the American revolution had a Darrow, instead of a Franklin, for their mouthpiece, their noble ardor would have been cooled to freezing point by his twaddle about “fair terms” for the usurper, and their “glorious victory” would have amounted simply to a return to feudal dependence and enslavement,—back to wage-slavery, so to speak, and all that that implies.

No! Immeasurable is the difference between the miners’ strike and the strike of the American revolutionists. Nor will that difference ever be bridged, and the Strike of this generation take its place beside the Strike of 1776, until the pulse, spirit and knowledge of the latter will so completely animate the Strike of this generation as to render impossible the leadership of such caricatures of the Revolutionary Fathers as the Mitchells and the Darrows.

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

Uploaded November 2006