

DAILY PEOPLE

VOL. 12, NO. 237.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1912.

ONE CENT.

EDITORIAL

SHIELDING WOOD.

By DANIEL DE LEON

WE do not believe the Lawrence Magistrate's decision to hold Ettor and Giovannetti for the Grand Jury, on the charge of being accessories to the killing of the woman Anna Lopizzo at last month's riot in Lawrence, is for the purpose of injuring the textile operatives' strike in that city.—We believe the Magistrate is not such a fool as all that. The prolongation of the two men's unjust incarceration is more likely to stiffen than to weaken the backbone of the strike.

We do not believe the Lawrence Magistrate's decision proceeds from any doubts regarding the innocence, leastwise from any certainty of the two men's guilt.—The two men not only called themselves, they conducted themselves, in point of tactics, at all points strictly according to the Preamble of the I.W.W. The call of the I.W.W.'s Preamble upon the Working Class to "unite upon the political as well as the industrial field," for the overthrow of capitalism excludes the theory of violence, of riot, of "Direct Action." An organization, that calls upon the workers to join forces on the political field, thereby places itself upon a plane of civilized social struggle. All thought of Anarchy or its methods is thereby barred.

Now, then, if the holding of the two men will rather help than hurt the Lawrence strike, and if the impossibility of theoretically connecting them with riot disconnects them from the killing of Anna Lopizzo, what were the premises from which the Magistrate's decision proceeded? what is the object the decision has in view?

At the time of the two men's arrest the *Daily People* said:

"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 re-

garding 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.”¹

Seeing that the testimony, since then elicited at the examination—the fact that Anna Lopizzo died from police men’s shots—confirms the newspaper reports which pointed to the riot as a frame-up on the part of the American Woolen Company, the riddle regarding the Lawrence Magistrate’s decision is solved.

One of the two chiefs in the Lawrence struggle—Ettor or president Wood—is responsible for Anna Lopizzo’s death. By wrongly holding Ettor, the Magistrate aims at improving Wood’s chances of escape; by sacrificing the former the Magistrate expects to save the latter.

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

slpns@slp.org

¹ [“Ettor Arrested; Why Not Wood?” *Daily People*, February 4, 1912.]