

EDITORIAL

## THE LATEST COUNT IN THE INDICTMENT.

By DANIEL DE LEON

**T**HE New Orleans dispatches announce the re-election of Mr. Samuel Gompers President of the A.F. of L. The gentleman's election is not a matter of significance, in itself. Nevertheless, there is in his election deep significance. The significance consists in his UNANIMOUS ELECTION. As the dispatches put it, he was elected "without opposition." Now, look back of the scenes that this fact mounts the stage with.

Before his election, there had taken place a "debate on Socialism" on the floor of the convention. The debate was brought on by resolutions and amendments proposed by members of the Social Democratic party; and these gentlemen were the leading figures in the debate. What was Mr. Gompers' attitude in that episode? It was that of an adversary. Nay, it was worse; it was the attitude of a dishonorable adversary: he fought Socialism by calumniating Socialism and by calumniating the Socialists. Nor yet was this all.

When from the floor of the convention Mr. Gompers hurled at Socialism the poisoned arrow of the calumniator, he there re-emphasized his attitude outside of the convention towards the working class. He stood there the belled cat of his President Hanna of the Civic Federation: he stood there, accordingly, in his role of betraying the Working Class by the fraudulent theory of possible harmony between the Fleecers' Class and the Fleeced Class. The "outside" and the "inside" of the convention Gompers stood rolled into one when he opposed Socialism,—and when he stood for re-election.

One may respect an adversary, who fights with honorable weapons. For an adversary, who fights with dishonorable weapons, with poisoned arrows, no honorable man, if he is a serious man, can entertain any but contempt. Such an adversary can only be fought without let; peace with him, tolerance for him is out of all consideration.

Where were the Social Democratic “representatives of Socialism” at the election? Arrayed against Gompers? Did they set up their own candidate, even if such candidate had to go down in defeat, that defeat that always is a stepping stone to the triumph of the just? NO! And again NO! As the term “without opposition” indicates, the Social Democratic “representatives” of Socialism either positively voted for Gompers, or abstained from voting, and thereby became directly responsible for his—that miscreant’s—election.

Not a trifling incident this, in view of the several hundred thousand votes that these “representatives” of Socialism have just gathered at the hustings and their glee thereat. Their conduct in the matter of Gompers’ re-election is as strong a light as can so far be thrown upon their fitness, and their sincerity:

By acting as they did they have attested the hollowness of their professed sincerity for the Cause of the Working Class;

By acting as they did they have attested their utter unfitness for leadership in a movement that demands moral courage. Too cravenly to stand up and be counted; too well aware that their boast about the “large vote for Socialism in the convention” would be put in a ridiculous light by the vote they could poll against the candidacy of Hanna’s Vice-President;—these “representatives” of Socialism crawled.

The convention of the A.F. of L., so soon upon the recent general elections in the country, was in the nature of a Providential dispensation. It points to crawling as the characteristic of these “representatives”; it furnishes one more count in the indictment against them as betrayers of the cause of Labor; it furnishes one more proof of the justice of their title—BOGUS SOCIALISTS.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded October 2006