

EDITORIAL

## HUNTER “PEACHING.”

By DANIEL DE LEON

“I HAVE seen this big fact loom up—that the power of the organized movement is gradually being diminished, while the power of the free lance and the individual capitalist in the movement is growing by leaps and bounds. I have seen the party members shackling their own wrists and hobbling the only administrators over which they exercised the slightest control, while, at the same time, their devotion and money are being spent lavishly to build up private agencies over which they have no control.”

Who is it that is using this language, S.L.P. to the handle, concerning the ownership of a party’s press? We shall not hold our readers in suspense. The language comes from Robert Hunter.

Hunter? Was it not he who only as recently as three years ago, had a flamboyant article in the *Chicago Socialist* maintaining that his party’s press was wholly under the control of and dependent upon his party?

And how did he get around the fact that the S.P. press, beginning with the *Chicago Socialist* in which the article appeared, was a private corporation, the majority stockholders of which could do as they pleased? Did he not imply that the stockholders were bound to do as the party willed, because, in case they did not, the party would “withdraw its support, without which the papers would die”?

And is he not himself admitting that the stock of {the} Charles Kerr & Co. concern, against which he is taking the field, “is largely owned by the party”? How then can he maintain that “yet the party has no more control over this [Chas. Kerr & Co.] organization than the ordinary steel worker has over the Steel Trust”?

And if it is true, as undoubtedly it is, being an inevitable consequence of private ownership, that, although the stock of Charles Kerr & Co. “is largely owned by the

party," "yet the party has no more control over this [Chas. Kerr & Co.] organization than the ordinary steel worker has over the management of the Steel Trust"—if this is true, then, in what way is it not likewise true with reared of the other S.P. papers, the *Call* for instance, in whose issue of December 27 Mr. Hunter now utters himself as above quoted?

If it is not likewise true with, for instance, the *Call*, which recently allowed Traction moneys to muzzle its editorial columns, how does it happen that the S.P. did not repudiate the scandalous performance and its performers?

And seeing the party conducted itself (on that and similar occasions when other party papers were guilty of similar scandals) as the ordinary steel worker does on the occasions of the scandals that break out periodically in the management of the Steel Trust—seeing that Mr. Hunter's party conducted itself exactly in that way, how does it happen that the gentleman says nothing about those other party papers, but reserves the floods of his wrath for Charles Kerr & Co. only? Why is this thus? Whence this thusness?

Why? Whence? The answer is obvious, and the spectacle instructive withal.

On the same principle that the bourgeois, although they habitually pool their private issues, periodically fall out among themselves and "talk out of school," the S.P. Officialdom-and-Press, true to their bourgeois instincts, private interests and style, although they also habitually make a pool, are periodically bound to clash, and then tell on one another.

When wrong-doers tell on one another the telling is called "peaching."

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official website of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded December 2012

[slpns@slp.org](mailto:slpns@slp.org)