

# DAILY PEOPLE

VOL. 3, NO. 124.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1902.

ONE CENT.

EDITORIAL

## A “SHKANDAL.”

By DANIEL DE LEON

**T**HE New York *Vorwaerts*—Yiddish organ of the Social Democratic party, and edited by persons, who, to a man, belong to that vast crew of “good men,” who either were expelled from the Socialist Labor Party, or left it “in disgust”—published in its issue of Sunday, October 26, two articles recommending capitalist politicians for election, one of these politicians running in Newark, the other set running in East Orange, N.J.

There is in this circumstance nothing new; nothing to entitle it to editorial comment. It is of a piece with the conduct of that organization, that in scores of places throughout the land, stands officially branded with political corruption. What entitles the occurrence to special notice is the “explanation” or “excuse” given by the paper, when the militants of the Socialist Labor Party discovered this new act of treason to Socialism, and exposed it. The explanation is as follows:

“The articles in question did not appear in the body of the paper, they appeared in a supplement. We admit it is a shkandal (scandal). But Comrade Rubin, who is responsible for the articles, is a good Socialist and has the right to his opinion.”

In other words: “Broadness” in a Socialist organization means the toleration of opinions that fly in the face of Socialism. “Tolerance” stands for condoning acts of corruption. “Broadness and tolerance” stand for allowing an officer to deal in boodle, allow him to keep his post, and merely calling his act a “shkandal.”

Who does not see through this veil? A master may have a servant that, unknown to the master, does a dirty trick in the master’s name. But, in that case, soon as the trick is discovered, the master kicks the miscreant servant out. The master, who rests satisfied with condemning the dirty tricks as a “shkandal,” and even goes further and upholds his

servant on the score of his having "a right to his opinion," and allows the fellow to continue in his service—such a master proves that he stands under obligations to that servant; that the servant acted under the master's direction; that the boodle raked off by the servant is shared by the master himself. And that is just what happened here.

To punish "Comrade Rubin" would be to warn all other Rubins that in the transaction of political business with capitalist politicians they have to do with an ungrateful master, who, after pocketing the swag, will turn his agent into a scape-goat. What Social Democratic editor or political leader would give such warning? Such a warning would be disastrous to their "broadness" and "tolerance." Not only would no Rubins be forthcoming after that, but even worse might happen. The Rubins worm might turn and give State {States'??} evidence, as did the Eichmann worm when his fellow criminals of the West Hoboken Social Democratic local sought to make a scape-goat out of him. Such a procedure would smash all "broadness," would annihilate all "tolerance," with the result that "De Leonism" with all its "narrowness and intolerance" would reign supreme. What "broad" or "tolerant" Social Democrat could contemplate such a consummation with composure?

Where would he come in?

Echoes answer—"In der Erd" (in the soup), where already the whole "shkandal" pack feels itself stewing in its own corruption, the broth being kept hot by the dreaded, "narrow and intolerant" fighting S.L.P.

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