

DAILY PEOPLE

VOL. 5, NO. 306.

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1905.

ONE CENT.

EDITORIAL

BY THE WAY!

By DANIEL DE LEON

THE following puff and endorsement appears on the front page of a certain Chicago daily—the *Daily Review*:

PROMINENT SOCIALIST COMMENTS.

Editor, Chicago *Daily Review*, Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:—The Chicago *Daily Review* represents an interesting and fruitful experiment in journalism. There has long been a need for a paper which in price, size and quality should be suited to the body of persons who desire to know the principal events of current history promptly without necessity of wading through the vast mass of worse than useless stuff that appears in the ordinary daily.

The Chicago *Daily Review* seems to fill this field very acceptably. At the same time its one strong “feature story” each day, and its well edited departments make it an interesting family organ.

Very truly yours,

A.M. Simons,

Editor Charles H. Kerr & Company

What kind of paper may this be?

Rather than answer the question ourselves, let the paper in question speak for itself. Here is an editorial paragraph, in the April 26th issue of the said *Daily Review*, the identical issue that contains the above quoted front page puff and endorsement:

“Mayor Tom Johnson of Cleveland, has been fighting the battles of the people in that city for many years and is still applying his genius to the solution of the traction problem. His latest proposal is that the street car business of the city shall be taken over by a company formed for the purpose of operating the lines in the interest of the public, paying interest to those who hold obligations against the property and then to apply all surplus to betterments. This would be a step in the right direction. It would go far, if successful, toward showing that public utilities can be so managed

that they will be of benefit to all the public.”

Seeing that one swallow does not make a summer, we once more put to the said Chicago *Daily Review* the question: “What kind of a paper may you be?” The following other editorial paragraph, from the identical issue containing the above quoted endorsement and puff, confirms the answer indicated by the first paragraph. It is this:

“New York employers and mechanics in the building trades have taken a long step toward a better condition of things in the labor world by signing an arbitration agreement that will prevent strikes and lockouts. There are few real grievances that cannot be adjusted by impartial arbitration.”

The answer is complete, ample: the Chicago *Daily Review* is a bourgeois radical reform paper, with all the capitalist ignorance of the needs of society, and admiration for the will o’ the wisps that may tangle up the solution of a labor problem, and help safeguard the stolen goods of the capitalist class. There is no fault to be found with all this, a capitalist paper is there for capitalist purpose; it is accordingly perfectly legitimate for the Chicago *Daily Review* to advertise the sham of Simple Simon, otherwise known as “A.M. Simons, Editor,” as a “prominent Socialist”—that is all right. But what does not look all right is the said “A.M. Simons, Editor’s” exhibition of “individual opinion” and the gentleman’s objection to a similar exhibition on the part of Victor L. Berger, of Wisconsin, both gentlemen being unquestionable pillars of the so-called Socialist, alias Social Democratic, alias Public Ownership party.

If “A.M. Simons, Editor,” has a right to his “private opinion” of considering the Tom Johnson scheme of buying the street car lines and “paying interest to those who hold obligations against the property” as a good thing, of applauding the editorial department of a capitalist paper that publishes such views, and of pronouncing such an editorial department “acceptable”—why should not Berger likewise have the right to the “private opinion” of considering a capitalist candidate “acceptable”?

If “A.M. Simons, Editor,” has a right to his private opinion considering “acceptable” the editorial department of a paper that declares “there are few real

grievances (between employer and employe) that cannot be adjusted by impartial arbitration”—why should not Berger likewise have the right to his “private opinion” of likewise coquetting with capitalist views?—even though he may not likewise rake in a copper or two for the “good cause,” while indulging his private views?

If the Wisconsin gentleman is an opportunist and should therefore be kicked out of “A.M. Simons, Editor’s” party, as this gentleman suggests should be done—for what reason should not a generous application of kicks likewise fire “A.M. Simons, Editor,” out of Berger’s party?

By the way, is it not about time for the holding of another “harmony convention” between the Berger Socialists, and Volkszeitung Corporation Kangaroos of whom “A.M. Simons, Editor,” is the Western picket?

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.
Uploaded January 2008

slpns@slp.org