ELSEWHERE in this issue we reproduce, under the caption “Mitchell Would Like to Know”, a paragraph from the *United Mine Workers Journal* of the 5th instant. The paragraph contains a number of questions that raise further questions.

Mitchell asks, if Debs, De Leon, and Hagerty are asked to address meetings of Union men, “why not get Post, Kirby or Parry at once?”

—Which question suggests these others: Why are the names of Belmont and Easley omitted from the above galaxy of names? Are Belmont and Easley, the recent hirers of Farley to break the strike of the Interborough Unions, less hostile to “organized Labor” than Post, Kirby or Parry? Can it be that there is a difference between the smashers of Unionmen’s aspirations and the smashers of the Unions themselves and outright? If there is any difference between the two can the difference be that the smashers of the Unions themselves smash the base of supplies for the Mitchells, whereas the smashers of the Unionmen’s aspirations leave the above-named base of supplies unsmashed and carefully nurse it? Is the mission of Unionism the keeping of the Mitchells in food, and clothing, and drinks, and trips abroad? Is that what Unionism is for?

Mitchell asks why should Debs & Co. be invited to speak on Labor Day when they have “abused and blackguarded all that Labor Day stands for?”

—Which question suggests these others: Does Labor Day stand for nothing else than to furnish the Mitchells an opportunity to display the rank and file of the Working Class as the merchandise that they trade in, to display it before the reviewing stands occupied by the political agents of the plunderers of that same Working Class? Does Labor Day stand for nothing else than to furnish an annual opportunity for the incubatees of the Civic Federation’s Kindergarten on economics
and politics to inoculate the rank and file of Labor with the Civic Federation pest vaccine? Is that all that Labor Day was ever meant for?

Mitchell denounces Debs & Co. for having “separated themselves from Socialism”.

—Which declaration suggests this other question: Mark Hanna, the defunct President of the Civic Federation and Belmont’s predecessor, also had his preference for the “good Socialists”, is Mitchell Hanna’s residuary legatee on Socialism?

Evidently, like the genial Falstaff, who was “not only witty himself but cause that wit was in others”,¹ Belmont’s candle-holder Mitchell is not only inquisitive himself, but cause that inquisitiveness is in others.

¹ [Shakespeare, Henry IV, part 1 or part 2, or The Merry Wives of Windsor. Track it down.]
MITCHELL WOULD LIKE TO KNOW

[From the United Mine Workers' Journal, August 5]

Why should Eugene Debs, Father Hagerty, Dan De Leon or any of the enemies of the A.F. of L. be asked to address a meeting of union men on Labor Day? Why not get Post or Kirby or Parry at once? There would be no more impropriety, as Debs & Co. met at Chicago, renounced labor Day and denounced all that it stands for and substituted May 1st as “their day.” Why not let them celebrate “their day” and keep them from using Labor Day as a means of raising money to fight everything that that day stands for? The Journal does not care how many “wheels”, or days, or schisms Debs & Co. evolve and use to further the ends of the Posts and Paryys, but it does insist that Debs is entirely out of place as an orator on Labor Day. He is opposed to, has abused and black-guarded all that it represents and should be permitted to use May 1st as his vehicle of abuse. Post and Parry have not done organized labor one-half the harms that Debs and De Leon have, and while Post with his Citizens’ Alliance and Debs with his “wheels” do not openly fraternize, yet they work in harmony for the same object and use the same language. The “wheels” separated them from Socialism and announced their sole purpose as that of destroying the autonomy of the American Federation. Therefore when these men are asked to speak on Labor Day the people asking them are asking enemies—uncompromising enemies—into their camps and supplying them with the means to carry on their warfare.