

DAILY PEOPLE

VOL. 7, NO. 273.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1907.

ONE CENT.

REPORT

GLEANINGS 'LONG THE ROAD. {3}

By DANIEL DE LEON

NEVADA, ON THE ROAD TO TONOPAH, MARCH 21, 1907.—The last 7 days have been strenuous days, made all the more strenuous by wrecks ahead, delaying my trains. Then also the cumulation of information received is huge enough to make one pant for breath.

Almost the first thing that struck me when I reached Denver was the deep penetration exhibited by Covington Hall, the talented Socialist party member of the New Orleans Local, who, when reviewing in a recent article to *The People* the conduct of certain S.P. luminaries, said: “When the history of the Haywood, Moyer, Pettibone iniquity will have laid bare the full facts in the case, Orchard and McParland will be found to be not the blackest villains in the plot.” Covington Hall called attention to the fact that instantly after the kidnapping of Haywood and the others, followed by the prompt arrest of St. John in Idaho, Simons’ and Max Hayes’ papers, both S.P., began to announce jubilantly that they had it from leading men in the I.W.W., especially the W.F. of M., that the Revolutionists would be thrown out of the next I.W.W. convention. How came they to know? At the I.W.W. convention the reactionists and corruptionists did make the attempt. That they failed signally does not affect the link of evidence which connects them with the kidnapers of Haywood and his companions. It is positively asserted in Denver that the kidnapping was but part of a scheme to place the W.F. of M. in the hands of men of the kidney of the Mahoneys, the O’Neills and the Kirwans for the purpose of derailing the W.F. of M. in the interest of the A.F. of L. and smashing the I.W.W., and that the performance, announced to take place in Chicago, was not an invention of the pure and simple political Socialists who did the announcing. It is claimed they had their cues from the Mahoneys. The defeat of that portion of the scheme which was to be carried out in Chicago upset the plans of the foul plotters. The immediate result was the

further putting off of the trial of Haywood and the other kidnapped men, so as to afford the Mahoneys and O'Neills more time; the next result was the lockout of the I.W.W. miners in Goldfield and Tonopah as the alternative for—what? For lower wages? No, that is not the immediate purpose—as the alternative for going into the A.F. of L., where they would find themselves tied hand and foot, like the rest of the A.F. of L. rank and file, impotent to do aught but break out into sporadic riots, impotent to organize for the war of their emancipation.

The prolonged imprisonment of Haywood is being put to all the use the plotters can. Mahoney and O'Neill, in league with Schmeltzer, and with McMullen of Butte, and such others, are scurrying around in A.F. of L. interests, looking to the next W.F. of M.'s convention. Even where they succeed, their work has been regularly overthrown wherever the attempt was made. Most important and conspicuous is the instance in Butte. There, a scheme was set on foot to organize a body that was to serve as a connecting link with the A.F. of L. Of course, John D. Ryan, mine and railroad owner, was back of the Butte plan. But, cleverly tho' the plan was laid it went to pieces. At the convention in Butte, where the plan was to come to perfection, it was frustrated by the unexpected development of the revolutionary spirit. McMullen fought the educational clause. He was met with the question: "Does any man present object to get all he produces? If there be any such let him stand up." McMullen had to earn his price. He rose and said: "I am one, I do not want all that I produce." The reactionists, in full sight of Mahoney, once more, once more under the leadership of McMullen, were beaten. The revolutionists once more "mesmerized" the uninformed, but honest delegates upon whom McMullen, Mahoney and O'Neill had counted. The favorite dope cry, ever on the lips of the crooks and weaklings—"DeLeonism!" "S.L.P.!" "Dictator!"—once more resounded, but vainly.

The most signal bump that the plotters received, and that announces to them the "wrath to come," was received by them on the Executive Board of the W.F. of M. During the Chicago convention Kirwan wrote to W.F. of M. delegates to withdraw, and that he knew his organization would not stand for "DeLeonism." What I am now going to say I can not yet give in full detail. The information leaked out accidentally. It would not be known at all but for the rage that overcame Kirwan or

Mahoney, I forget which, and that caused them to drop sufficient information from which to draw a conclusion upon what had happened. With round oaths one of them denounced the majority on the Board for passing a vote of censure upon Mahoney's convention conduct. "But," blurted out the enraged and unwise leak, "they had to withdraw the vote of censure; we both handed in our resignations unless the censure was withdrawn; they had to withdraw the censure because we are conducting the defense fund of the Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone!" It would seem from this that under the pressure of the plight of the three kidnapped men the censure was "withdrawn." This act was unwise on the part of the majority. It was done in the belief that the three kidnapped men would otherwise suffer harm. A great mistake! Nothing but harm can come to them from any act that looks like truckling to the capitalist agents of Belmont's Civic Federationized A.F. of L. Nothing but good can come to the three Idaho martyrs from acts that denote that the organization is not run by cravens. At this season, timidity only encourages the foe. But be this as it may, the lucky circumstance that rage drove Kirwan or Mahoney to lose his head, discloses the temper that is rising against O'Neillism, as indicated by the vote of censure.

DANIEL DE LEON.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.
Uploaded August 2009

slpns@slp.org