EDITORIAL

TWO CANDLES, TO SEE EACH OTHER BY

By DANIEL DE LEON

HERE they are:

MAILLY IN 1902.
The remarks of Comrade Boomer in The Socialist of February 9, relative to the members of the National Committee, are, to say the least, in rather bad taste. As a member of the Committee...he was not sent to report...that “Carey gave the impression of a politician and a devotee of diplomacy, rather than a defender of stern principles.”—Letter of William Mailly, Boston, Mass., Feb. 22, 1902. Seattle Socialist of March 9, 1902.

MAILLY IN 1904.
Publicity in all party affairs is the safety valve that will prevent the party boiler from becoming congested by intrigue and backstairs politics. Only those who have something to hide need object to nothing being hidden.—Letter of William Mailly, Omaha, Neb., Jan. 4, 1904, to Howard H. Caldwell, in The Worker of Jan. 17, 1904.

Several are the facts illumined by the cross-light shed from these two candles.

In the first place, there stands out clear the doublefacedness of the individual, and, inferentially, of the organization that could smell out and can put up with such an officer. It goes without saying that the principles enunciated by Mr. Mailly in this year of grace 1904 do not denote a change of heart or soul—a clean spirit in exchange of the unclean one he proved to have two years before. On the contrary, by the light of surrounding facts, the evidence is that the unclean spirit has developed into deeper turpitude. The separate features of the two candles are that, tho’ seemingly contradictory, they are crows of one nest—the foul nest of the private Volkszeitung Corporation interests. In 1902—not yet the national secretary of the so-called Socialist, alias Social Democratic party, but a fellowshipee of a Reverend speculator in rich wives and the hired man of the Volkszeitung Corporation, serving at the time a post-graduate term under the Corporation’s nasty pet James F. Carey...
of armory-building and other unsavory reputation—Mr. Mailly was not slow in perceiving that Boomer's graphic characterization of Carey could only hurt his (Mailly’s) paymasters. Accordingly he quickly jumped upon Boomer—jumped upon a national committeeman of his party who was reporting to his Washington state constituency, and conveying to them valuable information, that they could not themselves have gathered. In 1902, Mr. Mailly approved of “intrigue and backstairs politics” such as Boomer’s report denoted. Carey to be a devotee of, and the view that “only those who have something to hide need object to nothing being hidden” was then, as now, of force within him, but then, differently from now, Mr. Mailly had something to hide—the politician quality and, therefore, unfitness of the nasty Carey. Like master, like man.

But the two candles also throw a joint light upon an other, perhaps more important fact—the actual boss-ridden-ship of the so-called Socialist, alias Social Democratic party. The candle or clause of 1904 appears in a letter from Mr. Mailly as national secretary, it is published in the English poodle of that same Volkszeitung Corporation, *The Worker*, and it affects to be an answer to a letter written to him by Howard H. Caldwell, a national committeeman, be it noted, of the said party. Mr. Mailly’s trick is, whenever he wishes to injure a national committeeman of his party, to lie in wait for a letter from him; thereupon he twists his correspondent’s words out of shape, writes him a long denunciatory and self-laudatory letter in “answer,” and publishes both—his correspondent’s as a mere pretext for his own—in whatever privately owned paper of his party will take the lampoon. Of course the English poodle of the Volkszeitung Corporation always does. So it was in this Caldwell case, as the latest instance. The passage quoted under the candle of 1904 is a sample of Mr. Mailly’s trick. Not Aristides, the antique type of honor, not Leonidas, the type of Spartan manliness, rolled into one, could make a Mailly—as he depicts himself in such letters; Adelina Patti in her balmiest days was never bestrewn with as many bouquets as Mr. Mailly bestrews himself with in such letters, and which, by pointed implication, make his addressee out the exact reverse of all the virtues that he lays unto himself. One day it is Massey of Dakota, another it is Caldwell of Ohio, and so on—the national secretary of Mr. Mailly’s “unbossed” party treats the national committeemen of his party like so many dirty-
nosed school boys!—If the national secretary of the Socialist Labor Party dared to so demean himself, he would be ousted in exactly the time it would take to make the motion for his removal, and to count the virtually, if, by accident, not actually unanimous vote.

Thus the two candles contribute their light to illuminate the fact—look out for the crew who yell about “bossism in the S.L.P.”! What stings them is the sturdy and sane democracy of the S.L.P.; there they have no chance to play their gonger tricks; and when they elsewhere get a chance, then “bossism,” “leadership,” “popism,” “pashaism” full soon spring up in their most revolting forms.

Witness William Mailly, the Spanker General of national committeemen obnoxious to the Volkszeitung Corporation.
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