EDITORIAL

QUESTIONS ASKED.

By DANIEL DE LEON

In the strike belt in New Jersey certain questions are being asked of the agents of the Chicago, or Anarchist so-called “I.W.W.,” who are “butting in” and seeking to create confusion among the ranks of the I.W.W. workers on strike.

The questions are peculiarly pertinent.

One of the questions, the one most frequently asked, regards James P. Thompson, “General Organizer” of the said Anarchist organization, now prowling around Paterson; it is to this effect:

“For what reason did the three Lawrence strikers thrash you in Lawrence, and why did you immediately thereupon flee from Lawrence?”

Another question, addressed to the agents of the said Anarchist body, concerns another of their leaders—William D. Haywood. Concerning Haywood the question is:

“Haywood was the National Secretary of the Western Federation of Miners when he, together with Moyer, the President of the Union, and Pettibone, were kidnapped from Denver, and taken to Boise, Ida., there to stand trial on the charge of complicity in the dynamite explosion that killed ex-Governor Steunenberg. All the three men were acquitted. Now, then, how comes it that, while at the very first national convention of the W.F. of M., after the acquittal of the three men, Moyer was re-elected to the presidency of the Union; Pettibone continued to be held in the esteem of before, but Haywood was dropped from his office—and no questions asked?”

To both the questions, it is possible, perfectly satisfactory answers may be made. Nevertheless, the questions are forcibly suggested by the facts, and they are of a nature that imperatively demand categoric answer.

While the Labor Movement does not, nor need not, ransack “ancient history” concerning those active in its camp, the Labor record of those who take a leading
part in the Labor Movement, is a legitimate object of inquiry. The inquiry is all the more legitimate if it concerns matters of recent date. The safety of the Movement, the good name of the Movement, demands that it have no “dark corners.”

While, primarily, the I.W.W. textile strikers in New Jersey, and, through them, the whole Labor Movement, are deeply, and justly so, interested in securing an answer upon these two questions, both Haywood and Thompson, if at all worthy of the posts of confidence to which they aspire in the Movement, should be foremost and most anxious to throw light upon a cluster of facts that cry for “LIGHT!”