VOL. 3, NO. 184.

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1902.

ONE CENT.

EDITORIAL

TOSSING 'EM ON A BLANKET.

By DANIEL DE LEON

N article in the *Bakers' Journal*, on the "Socialist discussion" and vote at the late New Orleans convention of the A.F. of L., and bristling with points, is making the rounds of the trade journals. Two of these points merit mention.

The first point goes to confirm the views, often expressed in these columns, that the hurrahs of the Socialist party, alias Social Democratic party men, on the score of "the large vote that their resolution got," are the merest bunkum. The *Bakers' Journal* states that "the Socialist politicians" were, by reason of that vote, given "a prominence quite unwarranted by actual facts and sentiments." And it proceeds to convey the valuable information that the original resolution was whittled down by the "Socialist politicians" so as "to make it suitable to all tastes" until it became "a very harmless affair." Accordingly, so far from the said "large vote" being what it has been termed in some quarters, "a lie given to the Socialist Labor Party theory," it, together with all that thereby hangs, is just what *The People* has all along claimed: the regulation farce comedy "Boring from Within," which is annually performed on the stage of the A.F. of L. conventions by certain schemers as the leading actors, backed in good old classic style by a chorus and semi-choruses of the fatuous and the designing.

The next point made by the *Bakers' Journal* is supplemental to the first:

Approach the subject as you may, by opening the doors of trades unions to party politics you will have to let in all parties for there is none that has not the welfare of the working class upon its program...Now{,} trades unions have the mission to unite all workers for the purpose of pooling their strength...on questions having passed the state of theoretical discussion.

Who, what holds this language? Why, one of those pure and simple organizations, whom the above referred to "Socialist politicians" speak of as "noble wagers of the class

struggle." And what is more, this organization voices accurately the sentiments of its whole kith and kin. Here, then, we have organizations, that claim to be limbs of the working class, and who, in this year of grace 1902, still consider the class interests of Labor as not yet "having passed the state of theoretical discussion"! who placidly look upon the economic-political issues raised by the parties of capital as questions that, once they shall have passed the "state of theoretical discussion," may yet form a part of the pool on which it is the "mission of trades unions to unite their strength"!

The trades union theory advanced by the *Bakers' Journal* supplements its exposure of the "Socialist politicians." It explains why, and it justifies the ill concealed contempt it has for the set by placing them in line with the capitalist parties. Men who will presume to handle so revolutionary a question as Socialism, and who resort to the quack doctor's artifice to ingratiate themselves; who, on the top of that, pursue the patent medicine man's craftiness of seeking advertisement by "endorsements"; and who cap the climax by the cowardly act of supporting with their vote the arch-adversary of their "principles" for president, and by the dishonest act of themselves accepting an election as "representative" abroad of a body that, if they are sincere, they can not act as a representative of;—such men are fit only to be tossed on a blanket, as the *Bakers' Journal* neatly does the "Socialist politicians."

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.

Uploaded October 2006