

EDITORIAL

THE SAME HILLCOWITZ OF OLD.

By DANIEL DE LEON

WHATEVER error may have crept into the “verbatim report” of the recent Haywood-Hillquit debate, published in the *New York Call* of the 14th of this month, there surely was none in a certain passage.

The passage is this—

Endeavoring to illustrate Mr. Hillquit’s A.F. of L., that is, the gentleman’s anti-working class mentality, Haywood read, from the arbitral decision in last year’s conflict between the Cloak Makers’ Union and the Manufacturers’ Protective Association, bearing Mr. Hillquit’s signature as one of the arbitrators, the following passage:

“In conclusion we wish to express our gratification at the fair and harmonious relations between the parties to the protocol, and our conviction that eventually the arrangements between the employers and employes as embodied in the protocol will develop into a lasting and permanent adjustment of the relations between the employers and employes of the cloak manufacturing industry and will serve as a model for many similar industries.”

We have it from reliable authority, the identity which we are ready to disclose in case Mr. Hillquit, over his signature, denies the allegation, that it was himself who, from beginning to end, wrote the document in which the above clause occurs.

And what was Mr. Hillquit’s answer that count of the indictment that Haywood read against him? It was this:

“I was not a cloakmaker, nor was I their attorney.”

Who does not recognize in this answer the answer that, Victor L. Berger having charged Mr. Hillquit with being a land speculator, Mr. Hillquit made in the now defunct *Worker*—“I don’t own any land, my wife does”; who does not recognize the

same Hillcowitz of old in the answer to Haywood”

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

slpns@slp.org