EDITORIAL

UNADJUSTABLE ILLS.

By DANIEL DE LEON

MISS CRYSTAL EASTMAN’S pamphlet is a genuine product of our times.

No doubt there is a de facto press censorship in the land. Much that should be said and known is suppressed in “ways that are strange.” For truths to appear, unpalatable truths, it requires boldness and mental integrity. Times of tyranny breed daring. Miss Eastman’s pamphlet, a part of it, is of this sort.

It requires daring to uncover and publish the fact that the loss of a workingman’s eye in the factory more than once goes entirely unindemnified, and that the highest indemnity it has obtained in Allegheny County, Pa., was $200.

It requires daring to uncover and publish the fact that in most cases a man may lose an arm in the factory without redress, and that the loss of a leg has been “indemnified” with the insulting sum of $55. And so forth.

To bring out such facts, centering obviously around the plant of Carnegie’s Steel Trust requires daring.

But times of tyranny frequently are traceable by another feature—a certain caution or mysticism that the daring wraps itself in. Miss Eastman’s pamphlet illustrates the point.

After having boldly revealed the miserable indemnity received by the wage earner (when he is lucky enough to recover any), and after showing that the wages are not adjusted to cover the risk—after that feat of daring Miss Eastman concludes, not that the social system of which such iniquities are a feature should be abolished, but that “special legislative adjustment” is called for—in other words more of the kind of legislation that makes lawyers the beneficiaries of labor accidents.

1 [Presumably Work-Accidents and the Law.]
These no doubt are times of tyranny. In the days of Montaigne and Bacon philosophy dared not say all it meant. It satisfied itself with stating certain facts; relied upon the thinking powers of the thinking few to digest the facts thrown out and draw from them the legitimate conclusion;—having done that, having ventured so far, philosophy would surround itself with a mist of orthodoxy, and thus secured its safety with certain generalities that palpably were at war with the facts which it announced.

This is the law that underlies Miss Eastman’s pamphlet; in which respect the pamphlet is a genuine and characteristic product of the times.