

EDITORIAL

ETTOR ARRESTED; WHY NOT WOOD?

By DANIEL DE LEON

FOR the man Joseph J. Ettor this office has no use. His siding with the bolters from the Industrial Workers of the World who struck the political clause from the I.W.W. Preamble, and, through their organs, advocated, among a variety of improper things, physical force only for Labor's emancipation, proved him a man of unballasted mind; his methods reveal him a blusterer; his leading acts as Chairman of the Strike Committee in Lawrence exhibit him incompetent. For all this, Ettor is a human being, a citizen of the United States, at that. In both capacities he is entitled to justice and fair play.



JOSEPH ETTOR
(1885-1948)

For William M. Wood, the President of the American Woolen Company, this office has even less use. At the head of the Lawrence corporation with which the living of the stockholders is the prime concern, the health and even lives of the operatives negligible quantities, Wood is a type of a class that is a menace to the well-being of the country. For all this, Wood also is a human being; he is also a citizen of the United States. On the broad principle that he who himself commits injustice and is guilty of play that is unfair injures himself first of all—on that principle, if on no other, this office maintains Wood also, even a Wood, is entitled to justice and fair play.

On Monday, the 29th of last month, a riot occurred in Lawrence. The affair certainly was a riot. Street cars were stopped on Essex street; the passengers were ordered out; the cars were derailed, and wrecked; worst of all, shots were fired, and one killed a woman, an operative named Anna Lopizzo.

The accounts that appear in the Lawrence papers differ markedly regarding

who were the rioters.

One account is to the effect that the rioters were striking operatives, doing picket duty, and intent upon preventing would-be workers from reaching the mills. These accounts give the number of rioters as 1,500 and more, too many for the police to handle.

Another account sets forth in detail that there was only a small group of pickets at the place where the cars were stopped; that there were plenty of policemen on the north side, and plenty of militiamen on the south side of the street; that in plain view of these large numbers of “guardians of law and order,” and without any interference on their part, the trolley was pulled off, the windows broken and the cars smashed. This account adds the significant item that “the only cars that were wrecked were old cars.”

Obviously—

If the first of the two accounts is true, then the rioters were striking operatives, or their agents.

If the second of the two accounts is the true one, then the rioters were the agents of the American Woolen Company, with police and militiamen stationed where the Company’s hooligans could do their work undisturbed.

Again, and also obviously—

If the first of the two accounts be the right one, then the finger of suspicion points to Ettor as having engineered the riot which caused the death of the female operative Lopizzo;

If, however, the second of the two accounts is correct, then the person upon whom the finger of suspicion rests for the “frame-up” of the riot, with the resulting death of the female operative Lopizzo, is Wood.

One of the two is the guilty party. Which is which? The guilt of the one establishes the innocence of the other.

Ettor, the Chairman of the Strike Committee, has been arrested on the charge of being accessory to the murder of Anna Lopizzo. How comes Wood, the President of the American Woolen Company, to be at large, unmolested? Who has acquitted him?

Is there in all Lawrence not one man with rectitude and backbone enough at

least to endeavor to cause the wheels of Justice to operate with that evenhandedness that will render certain the discovery, and will render impossible the escape of the criminal, whichever he be?

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official website of the Socialist Labor Party of America.
Uploaded January 2013

slpns@slp.org