

# DAILY PEOPLE

VOL. 8, NO. 234.

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1908.

ONE CENT.

CORRESPONDENCE

## THE "OTHER SIDE."

By DANIEL DE LEON

I.

Herrin, Ill., Feb. 3, 1908.

**D**ANIEL DE LEON,  
Editor *Weekly People*,  
New York, N.Y.

Fellow-Worker: In reading the report of the meeting of the G.E.B. of the I.W.W. in New York on December 22, I see an account of where you had preferred charges against James Connolly.

Is the report, as published, correct?

If not, please state falsifications. Were you instructed to use those tactics by the S.L.P.? Are you backed by that organization?

You may think this is none of my business. However, I am an S.P. and I.W.W. man, who has been working for the last two years to unite the two political parties. Was formerly a member of Local Butte, Mont., S.P., and made the motion which invited you to speak before that organization.

I will enclose five cents in stamps for which please send me *The People* giving your side of the controversy.

Yours for Industrial Freedom,  
M.A. Gurley.

II.

New York, N.Y., Feb. 15, 1908.

M.A. Gurley,  
Herrin, Ill.

Fellow-Worker: You were notified in advance by Letter-Box (*Daily People*, Feb. 9; *Weekly*, 15th) that the "other side" would be essentially documentary.

The "controversy" started with a series of letters from Otto Justh, clerk at the Chicago I.W.W. headquarters, making unsubstantiated charges against Markley of Youngstown, O. Markley had been in the employ of the Chicago headquarters as an

organizer; was dropped; was taken up again. He may have become worthless. If so, it would be well to place me on my guard against his correspondence. Something more than mere denunciation was wanted, and surely not from an irresponsible fellow in the office. The Otto Justh series culminated with the following letter:

Chicago, Oct. 21, 1907.

Mr. Daniel De Leon, 28 City Hall Place, New York, N.Y.

Fellow Worker: Enclosed find letter. If you want to avoid trouble about *The People* don't publish any more of Markley's junk. His last effusion does not conform with actual facts. If those things get into *The People* continually it will lose its reputation for printing the truth only. Have no time to go into details. I just put you wise. Markley evidently is drinking again. 'Nuff said.

Yours for industrial freedom,  
O. Justh.

The *Daily People* of Oct. 27, 1907; *Weekly* of Nov. 2nd, gave Justh this Letter Box answer:

O.J., CHICAGO, ILL.—*The People* does not endanger its reputation for truthfulness if correspondence happens to appear in its columns containing untrue statements. *The People* would forfeit its reputation if it refused to publish the refutation of such correspondence. No paper can "know it all." Send the opposite facts and they will be published. Mere assertions are not proof.—See above answer to A.E., Ogden, Utah.

The Letter Box answer to A.E., Ogden, Utah, referred to, was as follows:

A.E., OGDEN, UTAH.—Only in the measure that a man is a good judge of evidence is he a reasoning being and reliable. The statement of a Labor-Lieutenant of the capitalist class concerning "corruption in the S.L.P." is no evidence. None but an unreasoning man will accept such unsupported statements as truth. He who does is worse than useless in the Labor Movement. No man's and no organization's character would be safe in such a man's keeping.

On November 2nd, I received the following letter from Justh in reply:

Chicago, Oct. 31, 1907.

Mr. Daniel De Leon, 28 City Hall Place, New York, N.Y.

Dear Comrade: In a letter of recent date I informed you that some statements in a communication from Markley in the *Daily People* did not conform with the actual facts in the case.

I also advised you to take with a grain of salt anything you may receive from him.

Since I and many others know that he gets frequently drunk, and when in that state sees "things," and after waking up he writes about them, just as if what he has seen in his pipe dreams were actually true. It was so with a convention that was to take place last year in Pennsylvania, whereupon Fellow Worker Thompson was sent at his request, and which turned out to be only a political meeting, and not a convention of coal miners, as he stated. Likewise the labor day affair in Youngstown, at which Haywood and others were supposed to speak was his own scheme, about that something was in the *People*, and also in the letter-box, if my memory serves me right.

In the letter-box answer to "O.J.," is stated that no paper can "know it all," and that is just one more reason why attention should be paid to a communication sent in from a man who has never told a lie when it comes to matters pertaining to organizations of working men, warning against the man who is a drunkard, and does not always state the truth in communications sent in for publication. It is true enough—mere assertions are not proof, and that is just what Markley is guilty of. I see in yesterday's *People* again a communication from Youngstown where he is guilty of the same offense in some instances. That I did not go into details and write an article, and refute Markley's statement, is no reason why you should have answered me the way you did in the letter-box, under "O.J." and {"}A.E., Ogden, Utah.{"}

You say "only in the measure that a man is a good judge of evidence is he a reasoning being and reliable." That is true. Now I will just give you an instance where you failed to show evidence of reasoning. How about Sherman? You were written to—you were told, and shown, and still you took Sherman's appearance, winning ways and word for more than of those who have had a clean record in the labor movement, and also a reputation to know what they were talking about before opening their mouths. But still, up to the last moment you thought he was O.K. and you came, according to your own statement, to make his renomination speech for president.<sup>1</sup>

Again I want to remind you that on the floor of the last convention, when speaking of James Connolly, you referred to him as a "walking delegate." "Walking delegate," when spoken of by an S.L.P. man, means all that it implies. In other words, it means a grafter, crook, etc. Now where is your proof that he is all that, which the word "walking delegate" implies, and if you want other people to believe that he is in reality just a "walking delegate," then produce the proof, since as you say yourself that "None but an unreasoning man will accept such an unsupported statement as truth, and he who makes such a statement which is not backed up is worse than useless in the labor movement," or if you can prove, why don't you do it? Read the answer you gave to A.E. of Ogden yourself a few times. Don't publish anything I don't mark for publication.

Yours for Industrial Freedom,  
Otto Justh, 22 Maple St.

---

<sup>1</sup> [See proceedings.]

The above was not written, as Justh's letters usually were, on I.W.W. letter head, but it was forwarded by him to New York in an envelope of the I.W.W., and not direct to me, but under the address of the National Secretary of the S.L.P. A certain feature of this letter can not be reproduced except by photography. The letter is typewritten, but contains a large number of manuscript corrections. Most of these are in Justh's own handwriting, SOME ARE NOT.

I immediately sent the original itself to Trautmann with the request that it be returned to me; and I called Trautmann's attention to the impropriety of his clerk's conduct, and especially to the peculiar lies the letter contained, seeing I had never mentioned Connolly's name, and this was the sudden injection of a curious political subject into the affair about Markley.

Later in the day came the *Bulletin* of the same date. It contained a report signed by Trautmann, in the course of which he reported that Markley was making injurious use of *The People* against the I.W.W. I wrote a second letter to Trautmann, asking him to specify, seeing that I could not detect any such injurious matter to the I.W.W. in Markley's correspondence. I kept no copy of those two letters.

No response came from Trautmann until November the 8th. It was a copy of a thick type-written report made by him to the G.E.B. under the heading "E.R. Markley Matter." At the head of the top page there appeared in Trautmann's own handwriting:

To Daniel De Leon:

Will answer in full to-morrow. Read this statement. You are allowed to use whatever is suited for purpose of protecting *The People*.

Wm. E. Trautmann.

Seeing that three days elapsed without the promised letter for "to-morrow," I again wrote to Trautmann:

New York, Nov. 11, 1907.

Dear Trautmann:

I write you again under an envelope marked "strictly personal." The precaution is taken on the same ground that it was taken on the 2d of this month with the two letters I sent you on that day. As then, "strictly personal" does not imply that this is private; on the contrary, it is official. The precaution is taken simply to insure the letter's reaching you.

I duly received last Friday, the 8th instant, and appreciate the courtesy of your furnishing me with, a typewritten copy of the circular report marked "E.R. Markley Matter" which you make to the G.E.B. On front of the top margin you inserted a few manuscript words promising "an answer in full to-morrow" to my two letters of the 2d.

Three days having elapsed without the promised answer, I apprehend that may be happening to you that often happens to me—stress of work causes the postponement of doing a thing, that further stress of work postpones indefinitely. I apprehend such an indefinite postponement, in this instance, all the more seeing you seem to consider the above-mentioned circular in the nature of an answer to my question, to wit, in which issue of *The People* did Markley do what you charge him with having done recently: “using the *Daily People* against the I.W.W.”? As the above-named circular in no way answers my question, or proves your charge, and as I consider this matter too important to the I.W.W. to let the grass grow under its feet, I write again.

Understand me well. In the issue that has arisen between your office and Markley I have no right to meddle as Editor of *The People*. It does not fall within my province. It falls entirely within yours. I shall go further and say that, as far as my private sentiments are concerned, my sympathies are on your side. I know what trouble men of intemperate habits can throw one into. I can sympathize with the irritation Markley causes you. Further still, as one who realizes the necessity of discipline, and the firm stand that must be taken against anarchy, I am free to say, at this stage of the Markley matter, or Youngstown matter, and again, as a private opinion, that my sympathies are wholly on your side against any manifestation of insubordination, and that, should the Youngstown matter ever come before me, as a private member of the I.W.W., upon a call from headquarters for a general vote, I shall emphatically cast my vote for order and against the insubordination of a locality. In short, in point of principle I stand with you in the Markley-Youngstown affair; in point of practical action, the affair does not fall within the province of this office, and this office does not presume to meddle. I hope that is clear.

This affair, however, has suscitated an issue that DOES fall within the province of this office. That issue is the one raised by you in your official report, published in the *Bulletin* of the 2d instant. You there say Markley is using the *Daily People* “against the I.W.W.” While Markley’s misconduct in Youngstown, and the misconduct of the Youngstown Local, are none of my business and it would be impertinent for me to take a hand in them, your statement respecting Markley’s action **through *The People*** is a statement that I may not ignore. Upon reading your statement, I hunted up the recent articles of Markley in *The People*. I found that, since the convention, there were three of them.<sup>2</sup> I read them carefully. I found nothing **against the I.W.W.** With your statement upon my mind that Markley was using the *Daily People* “against the I.W.W.,” I concluded the articles may be innocent only on their face. I am aware how crafty men have a trick of insinuating into a paper articles that look innocent, but have a vicious purpose perceptible, not to the Editor of the paper, but to others in special localities. I wondered whether that could be the case with Markley’s articles. I

---

<sup>2</sup> [To be appended.—R.B.]

therefore wrote to you on the spot, asking for enlightenment. That enlightenment your typewritten circular does not furnish me.

Down to the middle of the seventh page of your circular there is nothing remotely on the subject that I am inquiring after. It is only the last half of that page and the first two lines on the next and last, in which Markley's articles in *The People* are touched upon and commented on. Taking your own words—"In the article published in the *Daily People* Markley again rushes in print with barefaced falsehoods about the Socialist Party national organizer Isaac Cowen," etc.—there is no evidence to justify the statement that Markley is using the *Daily People* **against the I.W.W.**, as you say in your report of the 2d instant, or to justify the reference you now make in this circular to "misrepresentation of I.W.W. affairs" in *The People*. Granted, for the sake of argument, that everything Markley narrates in his account of the public meeting addressed by Cowen was a "barefaced falsehood" and the pipe dream of a drunken man—granted that, for the sake of the argument—in what way can that be construed as using the *Daily People* **against the I.W.W.?** Cowen is not a national officer, he is not a local officer, he is not even a member of the I.W.W., at least not so far as appears from anything you say. Indeed, the only description you give of Cowen is that he is a "Socialist Party national organizer." Is the lying, supposing that you have been correctly informed and that Markley did lie, against a "**Socialist Party national organizer**" a using of *The People* **against the I.W.W.?** That is the only construction your words will bear. Think the matter over. If that letter of Markley's is all the evidence, don't you think you have been either played upon, or have allowed your anger at Markley to drive you into a hasty charge involving *The People*? Don't you think you should recall that unhappily worded sentence, a sentence that would imply the identity of a political party with the I.W.W., when the fact is we are both, you as well as I, anxiously at work to keep the I.W.W. free from any political entanglements with presently warring parties?

In your circular you promise to call the attention of *The People* to what you say are Markley's "barefaced falsehoods" about "the Socialist Party national organizer, Isaac Cowen." If what, at any time, a correspondent in *The People* says is false, I should consider information to me upon the subject an act of kindness to *The People*—whether the falsehood is about a "Socialist Party national organizer," or anybody else. But in no such instance—unless the person sinned against is known to be connected with the I.W.W.—could the alleged falsehood be called, what you call it in this circular, "a misrepresentation of the I.W.W."

Now as to the Otto Justh matter, which was the subject of the first of my two November 2 letters.

I received from Justh a letter dated the 6th instant in which he apologizes for having written to me the letter which I sent to you. By the way, you did not return me that letter. I sent it to you, instead of a copy, in order to enable you to inspect the

typewritten original itself, in which a number of corrections were made in different handwritings, and I requested its return. Do not fail to return it. Even if you should not have time to write, just slip that Justh letter into a wrapper and forward same back to me. Justh asks my pardon, etc. Of course such a letter as his had a personal feature. In so far as it had, an apology is in order. So far as that goes you may say to Justh the apology is accepted. But there was more than a "personal" feature to that letter. If that had been all I never would have bothered you with the matter, least of all through an official communication. That letter contained a feature of infinitely more weight than a personal affront.

I shall say nothing concerning the four first paragraphs. It is mere impudence for a lad to expect me to accept his unsupported assertions against the truthfulness of a letter to *The People*. I shall not even bother with the passages in which Justh presumes to lecture me on my policy towards Sherman. The passages concerning Connolly are a horse of a different color.

Everyone at all posted on the movement is posted, not by hearsay, but by official records of *The People*, that Connolly, when still the New Jersey member of the National Executive of the S.L.P. and a member of the Sub-Committee of that N.E.C. made, last January or February, a slanderous report to the New Jersey S.L.P. State Convention concerning certain actions of the N.E.C. and myself. That matter appeared in *The People* in full.

Connolly was thereupon removed from the N.E.C. by his New Jersey constituents, and another member elected in his place. That fact appeared in *The People* properly authenticated.

Connolly was then removed from the Sub-Committee of the N.E.C. at the N.E.C.'s last, the July, session of this year. That fact also appeared authentically reported in *The People*.

Finally from the reports in *The People* since last July, the public has learned that there is an element in Section New York and vicinity which has taken sides with Connolly in this controversy, and has caused some internal party disturbance.

All these facts are of recent date, of public notoriety, and authentically attested.

Now, then, how comes Justh to take up the cudgels for Connolly? How comes he to put into my mouth, or into my mind, Connolly's name during the debates of the I.W.W. convention, when the fact is I never mentioned the man's name, nor did any other speaker on the floor of the convention? If anything that came up before the convention did at all affect Connolly, how comes Justh to have such secret knowledge, when even I myself did not have it, and certainly never could have been his source of information? In short, how comes Justh to inject into an I.W.W. correspondence a matter so remote therefrom as the present internal dissensions in Section New York of the S.L.P.? This is matter that personal apology does not cover.

I am entitled to know, the headquarters of the I.W.W., where Justh is an employee,

are entitled to know, how this happens.

I am, the headquarters of the I.W.W. are, entitled to an explanation from Justh of that astounding performance.

Nor yet is this all.

Justh's typewritten letter, as you will have noticed, contained a number of corrections in different handwritings. One of these handwritings is Justh's; the other IS NOT. I am entitled to know, the headquarters of the I.W.W. are entitled to know, who my correspondents were in this case. One we know—Justh. **Who is the other, or others?**

Again, as I notified you, Justh's letter was not sent directly to me. It came through the National Secretary of the S.L.P. It reached me OPEN. I am entitled to an explanation, the headquarters of the I.W.W. are entitled to an explanation upon that manoeuvre.

These are not matters that an apology settles. **These are matters that call for light.**

As a very busy man myself, I am not likely to be forgetful to the strain of work upon such another busy man as yourself. But a stitch in time saves nine. The matters mentioned herein have a direct bearing upon the welfare of the I.W.W. I again express the confident hope that *The People's* tried loyalty to the I.W.W. and my personal friendship to you will be considered the justification for my troubling you by bringing up these matters officially to your notice, expecting they will receive prompt and satisfactory attention.

Awaiting your speedy answer, I remain, as ever, fraternally yours,  
Daniel De Leon.

On Nov. 19th, I finally received an answer from Trautmann. I do not reproduce below the letter in full. I expurgate fourteen lines out of it. Should Trautmann demand their publication they will be given. They are two paragraphs. I leave them out simply because the first touches upon delicate internal matters concerning the Chicago office, and has no bearing upon the issue; while the second, although it would have a bearing upon the issue, I do not care to give publicity without Trautmann's consent. Moreover, it is superfluous. His arraignment of Markley is quite strong enough without that paragraph. Even the passage about Debs and Cowen I would have felt like omitting as unnecessary, were it not that Trautmann made the same statement before the Board here in New York in a room full of spectators, and also not to expose myself too much, however temporarily, to the charge of "garbling." This was Trautmann's answer:

Chicago, Nov. 16, 1907.

Mr. Daniel De Leon, New York City, N.Y.:

Dear Comrade: You have good grounds to feel angry. I should have answered sooner.

\* \* \*



Justh's impertinency certainly needs and deserves the strongest rebuff; in his anger about matters of which he should keep his nose out, he repeated parrot-like all that he had heard, superficially, though only from a few delegates of the East who quite publicly discussed matters at general headquarters during the convention days. I'll revert back to these affairs later on. Justh has been given a good trimming, and although I agree with you that an apology cannot mend nor explain such an impertinent and uncalled-for act, yet I can assure you that he will not, nor can he be, a party to any scheme devised by disrupters.

I'll dig now right into the "Markley" affair. Take up the *Bulletin* again and you will find that my circular letter to the members of the G.E.B. contains the following passage:

"And he (Markley) is **even** using the *Daily People* to misrepresent the I.W.W. and write things which are contrary to the truth."

Here are a few illustrations. You will find Markley's articles anent the Youngstown Labor Day manifestation with Haywood as speaker, although Haywood was never written to; "500,000 people will be in Youngstown on that day." That wasn't a misprint; we have a letter of Markley wherein he speaks of "one million enthusiasts." It requires 20,000 passenger cars to carry 500,000 people to and from a given point in 24 hours; don't you think that it injures the reputation of any paper if such a "rot" be published without comment? But you were on the way to Europe when these announcements appeared, yet I think you should have heard about the unpardonable "fraud" worked by Markley and others under the name of the I.W.W.

And then again Markley's article which I alluded to in my protest against any further tolerance. It is not true that 21 labor fakirs of the A.F. of L. were in Youngstown during the I.W.W. tinnners' strike; all counted there were 6; it is not true, as one must logically think, that these strikers of the I.W.W. were fighting a clear-cut I.W.W. battle; only three days organized by "Markley," they were promised \$5.00 per week strike benefit, rushed out on strike, and Markley had to make good his promise and give "fake reports" in order to hold his own. \* \* \*

Committees were sent to Pittsburg by the strikers asking the removal of Markley, or all honest workers would withdraw from the I.W.W., and I had to proceed to Youngstown and intercede in behalf of the I.W.W. supporters. Markley had to promise to "redeem" himself; there were at least 15 active good men from different places present when he made the promise, but he has gone from the bad to worse, and that is one of the reasons why any prominence given to his vaporings in the *People* will injure not only the paper but any party or organization which a Markley will laud and praise and speak for.

But not only in that instance last referred to did Markley misrepresent the I.W.W. and facts as they occurred; the last article presents the top-notch of falsifications. Not Isaac Cowen lied, it was Markley, who, using the *Daily People*, without argument

advanced, and billingsgate abounding, who cries "thief," so to distract attention from his own freakish and fakirish doings.

Isaac Cowen has good substantial reasons to look askance at the I.W.W. The affairs of the Amalgamated Association of Engineers, which he represented as elected official at the G.E.B. of the American Labor Union were only slightly touched in my report to the second convention of the I.W.W. I am writing a history of the "Industrial Union Manifesto" to be published in the *Industrial Union Bulletin* in December, and will more in detail dwell upon this point, but I shall state to you beforehand that it was Isaac Cowen who stated in the second meeting of "four" that he would insist that Daniel De Leon be invited to the "Industrial Union Manifesto Conference," and it was so decided until Eugene Debs, who did not attend that committee meeting (November, 1904), was shown the list of all those who were to be notified and invited, and he was the one who demanded that Daniel De Leon's name be stricken from the list of those to be invited.

I only mention this to show that Markley had no right to "misrepresent affairs of the I.W.W." in the *Daily People* by calling others, among them Isaac Cowen, "liars, fakirs, etc.," while it is known that Markley is not only looked upon as a fakir, but **is one in reality.**

Again I repeat "Markley **even** used the *Daily People* to misrepresent the I.W.W." The "even" is qualification enough. I never wrote nor said that "Markley is using the *Daily People* against the I.W.W."

If Gompers would write to-day articles in the *People* commendatory of the I.W.W. this fact alone would suffice to formulate the conclusion that he is using the paper against the I.W.W., and I and many others would say so. In Markley's case I have only said that he "uses even the *Daily People* to misrepresent the I.W.W."

Two letters of Markley, written since I publicly in the *Bulletin* denounced the "Labor Day" fraud in Youngstown, have led to the conclusion that he believes and thinks he can defy any official mandate of the I.W.W. because he happens to be connected with the S.L.P. Any attempt of enforcing the required measure of discipline, which we must have, meets with the same response: "I dare you!" If you wish to learn what this implies I may supply you with copies of letters such as written by Markley. You can find redress when imposed upon; I must remain quiet and swallow many a good dose; there are too many who would use anything that looks like personal friction to hamper and to set back all efforts of establishing "Unity on the political field," which, when once accomplished, will assure a more rigid enforcement of self-imposed discipline, and the peremptory weeding out of elements that can only harbor in the dirt and dust stirred up in this inevitable and necessary rush for a clear road.

Of course I believe the sentence in the letter sent by me to the members of the G.E.B. should be modified, **and I will make correction accordingly, so that no one will have cause to infer that the *Daily People* had been used against the I.W.W.** I will

mail copy of corrected statement which will also appear in the *Industrial Union Bulletin*.

(More within 24 hours.)

Yours for Industrial Freedom,  
Wm. E. Trautmann.

The "more," promised to come "within twenty-four hours," never came. The fuller information I demanded in the matter of Justh, and promised to be "reverted to later on," was never reverted to. The unknown hand who made some of the corrections in Justh's letter has remained undisclosed. And Justh remains at headquarters, shielded by Trautmann.

The underscored lines in Trautmann's letter are underscored by me. Compare them with Trautmann's points Nos. 5 and 6 in the *Bulletin* of the 8th instant. He does not charge me in this letter with misquoting him, as to Cowen. Whether the word "even," upon which he lays such labored stress in his first charge against *The People*, allows the construction he implies, you may judge for yourself. I should add that this letter of Trautmann's brought back Justh's original letter to me.

Finally the following self-explanatory letter from me to the G.E.B. member, Wm. Yates, and his answer, should cover all that is essential FOR THE PRESENT.

New York, Feb. 9, 1908.

Mr. William Yates, Member of the General Executive Board of the I.W.W., New Bedford, Mass.:

Fellow Worker: I received yesterday yours of the 5th instant, requesting me, under instructions of your Local No. 157, I.W.W., to deliver in the near future an address in your city on "Industrial Unionism."

The same mail that brought me your letter also brought me the *Industrial Bulletin* of the 8th.

Already the *Industrial Bulletin* of the 1st contained an alleged report of what happened at the recent session of your G.E.B. in this city on December 23 and 24 of last year, when, you being present, I appeared before it. This issue of the 8th intensifies the offense by supplementing the previous presentation of events with some more matter of the same defective nature, and states that "all members of the G.E.B., except Katz," which would mean yourself included, "agree that the minutes are complete and detailed sufficiently to assure a thorough understanding of all transactions," etc.

Considering all the circumstances in the case, the erroneous presentation in the two *Bulletins* are more serious than mere errors would otherwise make them. The erroneous presentations strike a note that is not only foreign to Industrial Unionism,

but hostile thereto; indeed, a note that tends to switch Industrial Unionism from the plane of CIVILIZED ORGANIZATION to the plane of UNCIVILIZED DISORGANIZATION, implied in and inseparable from pure and simple physical force with the Orchards and McParlands waiting for us at the other end of the line.

In view of this fact I am not in a position to know whether I can accept or must decline an invitation from you, a member of the G.E.B., to address a body of workingmen on "Industrial Unionism," before I know from you whether you are correctly reported as endorsing as correct the report in the *Bulletin* of the 1st, whether you endorse Trautmann's utterances in the *Bulletin* of the 8th, or whether you repudiate the same.

I presume you are in possession of the two *Bulletins* in question. I need not detail the serious errors they contain. It will be enough for me to summarize what actually occurred, in order to make clear to you my contention as to whither Trautmann's report tends, and, with the *Bulletins* in your hands, you will be able to note the errors they contain on this head.

Certain recent letters I had received from Otto Justh, Trautmann's clerk at I.W.W. headquarters; certain recent official utterances by Trautmann; and certain acts by James Connolly, the organizer, or whatever his office is called, of the New York Industrial Council, seeming to me intimately connected, and my disliking the methods, which I find so prevalent, of "buzzing" with individuals, I decided, rather than to have private talks with individual members of the Board, to address the Board jointly. I so notified Katz and Trautmann, and on December 23 I was summoned by telephone. When I arrived at the New York Headquarters, I found Fischer, the then secretary of the Industrial Council, seated on the outside before the door. He informed me the Board was in executive session; I told him I was summoned by the Board; he announced me, and I went in, he following and now taking his seat on the inside. He was told the Board was in executive session, and withdrew, and soon thereupon I was given the floor.

I started saying that I would not appear before the Board, on the matter that brought me before it, if I did not feel certain that every member of the Board was satisfied that my face was set like flint against any attempt to either turn the I.W.W. into a political party, or entangling it in the existing rivalries of political parties, seeing that, only in the measure that the I.W.W. kept its skirts clear, would it reach that vigorous development that would enable it to reflect its own political expression. The Board nodded acceptance of my statement as to myself, and Trautmann spoke up: that was my known attitude, he declared. I proceeded to explain that I considered that preliminary statement by me necessary, because the acts I had to complain about were to a great extent acts that were at variance with the posture of the I.W.W. regarding political parties, and that it was my experience that people who injected politics, religion, etc., where none should be injected, were usually the first to set up the cry

against "politics," "religion," etc., when their wrongful acts were hauled up. My complaint was against the conduct of I.W.W. officials, and their employees, who were injuring the I.W.W. by making I.W.W. headquarters a center for political machinations.

I took up Connolly first. Trautmann reports that "this chain of evidence dealt largely with the domination of the Catholic Church over affairs in the labor movement." This is incorrect. That portion of my chain of evidence was the smallest. On that head I said hardly more than I said in my introduction of Bebel's *Woman*, and in the article in *The People* of April 3, 1904, in the former of which I refer to the "Catholic Church machine," and in the second of which I oppose Connolly's attempt to inject the religious question into the S.L.P., the Catholic "religion," and the Catholic "political machine" being two distinct things, the henchmen of the latter of which, it is a notorious fact, are active in both the Labor and the Capitalist movement—facts too notorious to need "dealing largely upon," there being more numerous other matter to consider. I did deal with that as a link in the evidence against Connolly that he sought, with injury to the movement in America, to inject into it the religious question. What I did "largely deal with" was CONNOLLY'S PRESENT CONDUCT IN THE I.W.W.

I charged him with using the stationery of the Industrial Council of New York, letter heads and envelopes, for slanderous correspondence against the S.L.P.; and I laid the incriminating document before the Board—a document that was characterfully furnished to me by the addressee, Francis J. Boyle, of Boston, Mass., as evidence of Connolly's misconduct in the I.W.W.—a document that presented the I.W.W. in the light of meddling with the internal political affairs of the S.L.P.—a document, moreover, that acquired a special significance when I took up the Otto Justh letter.

I charged him with having thrown cold water upon the strike that Katz was managing in Lancaster, Pa., by his, Connolly's, presuming, in the capacity of I.W.W. organizer or whatever his title is at the Industrial Council, to discredit, with some of the Lancaster strikers who came to New York, the action of Katz, a G.E.B. member, in ordering the strike, with the result that the men returned to Lancaster and caused the breaking up of the strike. My witness was Katz, who was present. Connolly subsequently tried to prove the falsity of Katz's version by producing Campbell, the then janitor of the New York I.W.W. headquarters, as his witness. Campbell testified that he knew nothing, one way or another, and was surprised Connolly called upon him to corroborate Connolly, and said so to the Board. The common sense of the law of evidence establishes that if a man sets up a witness to corroborate him, and the witness knows nothing, then the corroboration is the other way.

I charged Connolly with using the *Industrial Bulletin* to befuddle the workers with false economics, and to slander a valuable I.W.W. contingent, the S.T. & L.A. element in the ranks of the I.W.W. I proved my charge by submitting the *Industrial Bulletin* of last October 26, in which Connolly advanced the theory that "prices INVARIABLY go

up first," and wages climb up afterwards, and by submitting the statistical report of prices and wages, proving that prices went up during, before and after the rise in wages. I exposed the misrepresentation of the S.T. & L.A. in that article, and argued that the whole performance was harmful to the clarification of the workers' mind on their economic condition, and on the history of their movement.

With this fresh record of Connolly's in the I.W.W. as a basis, I proceeded to argue that when a man's present record is in line with his past record, then his present record throws light upon the past, and the past illumines the present, and then that past becomes legitimate matter of inquiry. I then, before taking up Connolly's past record, warned the Board that I could not be charged with bringing in politics in uncovering Connolly's past record, first, because the document from Boyle demonstrated that it was Connolly who led the way on that course and it was necessary to follow him up there; secondly, because character is not a matter of this or that organization. If a man had one gangrened foot in one place, the other foot, in another place, could not be healthy. Connolly's tracks were marked with wreck and ruin. The political party he was associated with in Ireland, where he was until three years ago, has ceased to be; his paper there had died; documentarily he was proved in the 1904 Convention of the S.L.P. to have deceived the Party when he induced the Party to have him come here on an agitation tour, his claim being that he wanted to have someone in Great Britain who had been in America, and could thereby put a spoke into the cock-and-bull stories retailed there by the British fakirs who visited America, and yet, immediately after his tour at the Party's expense, he moved over here; that no sooner was he here than he sought to inject the religious question into the Party and was now seeking to inject the racial question into the movement; that, entrusted by the New Jersey S.L.P. with the office of National Committeeman, in 1907, and by the N.E.C. with the office of Sub-Committeeman, he sought to sandbag the Party by a slanderous report about the N.E.C. at the New Jersey Convention of February, 1907, on account of which the New Jersey S.L.P. deposed him from the N.E.C. and the N.E.C. removed him from its Sub-Committee. Such a career, supplemented by the man's present conduct in the I.W.W., I claimed justified the conclusion that whosoever's interests such a man was pursuing those interests were not the interests of the working class.

I was virtually at the end of this part of my argument when Cole, who had stepped out for a moment, came back all ablaze, objecting to the "continuance of Star Chamber proceedings." I objected to the term "Star Chamber," seeing that the term meant the trying and sentencing of a man behind his back, whereas what I was doing was to present certain facts upon which the Board was, at its discretion, to act or not to act. The term "Star Chamber" was then dropped and objection was raised to an "executive session." As far as I was concerned, I was perfectly willing to have the whole world present, but the theoretical argument against "executive session," in which Trautmann

suddenly became loudest, sounded childish to me. For one thing the Board had been all along in "executive session;" for another, if the listening to charges behind closed doors was an undemocratic act, then the reading of a letter containing anything in the nature of charges would also have to be undemocratic, and whoever was referred to in a letter would also have to be present. At any rate, it was decided that Connolly was to be summoned to be present the next morning before I should proceed on that matter. The doors were opened, a number of people came in, and I proceeded with what I had to say. As an evidence that the objections against hearing charges in the absence of the man charged were not seriously meant, neither Trautmann nor any of the previous objectors objected to the charges that I proceeded to make against Otto Justh, then in Chicago: If it is "Star Chamber" to prefer charges against one man on the ground of his not being present, then it must also be "Star Chamber" to do the identical thing against another man. The distance of the man involved cuts no figure. "Star Chamber" is "Star Chamber."

I then proceeded with Otto Justh, Trautmann's employee at headquarters, and read a letter which he sent me via the National Secretary of the S.L.P., in an I.W.W. envelope. The significance of the letter lay in that Justh was doing with I.W.W. stationery just what Connolly was doing here. Justh took up the cudgels for Connolly, put his hands into internal S.L.P. affairs, used to that end information which he gathered at I.W.W. headquarters, and outrageously lied about me in the matter, as all the G.E.B. men present admitted, and even Trautmann did not deny. It was a flagrant case of an I.W.W. employee, this time from the National Headquarters, meddling with what the I.W.W. must be kept free from. The attitude struck by Trautmann at this point, compelled me to read to the Board the copy in full of the letter which I wrote to him, bringing to his knowledge the letter of Justh and complaining with him about some of his own utterances in a recent report to the G.E.B., where he himself, in lock-step with Otto Justh, meddled in political matters by taking up the cudgels for an S.P. organizer, who is not even a member of the I.W.W., against the S.L.P. member Markley, of Youngstown, O., who wrote an article in *The People* against the said S.P. organizer, and by calling such an act of Markley's "A MISREPRESENTATION OF I.W.W. AFFAIRS." I am not a little puzzled at what Trautmann now says on this head under his "Point 5 and 6" in the *Bulletin* of the 8th, which does me gross injustice. That was not the language he held before the Board. He did not deny my statement that he ADMITTED to me by letter that his language on that subject was open to exception, and that he promised to correct it in the very next *Bulletin*, and that he had failed to do so down to the day when I appeared before the Board. Instead of keeping his word he now comes out with his incorrect "Points 5 and 6." All that he did before the Board was to harp upon the wrongfulness of Markley's announcing in *The People* that a meeting would be held in Youngstown with Haywood as a speaker, and that such an announcement was harmful to the I.W.W. because it was nonsense to expect

Haywood there. You will remember that every time he repeated that charge I asked him in what way Markley's bogus announcement in *The People* of a meeting in Youngstown, with Haywood as a speaker, was more harmful to the I.W.W. than Connolly's announcement in the *Bulletin* of a public meeting in New York, saying that "St. John will be positively there," when it was even absurder to expect the wounded St. John to turn up here. You will find that report in the *Bulletin* of last December 21.<sup>3</sup> Had Trautmann held before the Board the language that he now holds in his "Points 5 and 6," I would have been able to correct him on the spot by producing his own letter, which I had in the bundle of my documents.

The next morning, with Connolly present, I went over the ground concerning him.

These are not isolated events. They are consecutive and connected. The presentation made by Trautmann is so defective and misleading, the trend of events points so obviously to his policy of ostentatiously knocking the S.L.P., and of standing by those who do, that I conclude the man is headed on a tack that flies in the face of the unquestionably sound position embodied in the Trades Union resolution offered by Heslewood and myself at the Stuttgart Congress, to the effect that while pure and simple politicianism debauches and sells out the Labor Movement, pure and simple physical forcism attracts and breeds the agent provocateur who would assassinate the Labor Movement.

In view of all this I must repeat in closing what I have stated in starting—I am not in a position to know whether I can accept or must decline an invitation from you, a member of the G.E.B., to address a body of workingmen on "Industrial Unionism" before I know from you whether you are correctly reported in the *Bulletin* as endorsing as correct, at least in their essentials, the presentation by Trautmann in the *Bulletins* of the 1st and 8th instant.

Fraternally,  
D. De Leon.

Yates' answer is as follows:

New Bedford, Mass., Feb. 16, '08.

Mr. D. De Leon,  
Fellow Worker:

Your special delivery letter of Feb. 9th duly to hand and contents carefully noted. I am somewhat pained to think that you have made a visit to New Bedford conditional on my attitude in regard to the correctness or otherwise of the minutes of the G.E.B. recently held in New York and published in the *Bulletin* of Feb. 1. As I said in my

---

<sup>3</sup> ["Notes from New York," *Industrial Union Bulletin*, December 21, 1907, pg. 4. Although the article is not signed, Connolly's authorship is established by its having been written to correct an error in a signed article printed under the same rubric in the *Bulletin* of December 14.—R.B.]



letter to you in the first place I wrote under instructions from local No. 157 as secretary of the local, and whatever my opinions are in the matter of the aforesaid minutes should not in my estimation stand in the way of your addressing a meeting of wage workers here on Industrial Unionism.

I did not favor the publication of the Connolly affair, and Trautmann's answer to Katz in Point 4 is totally misleading.

I hope to see in next week's *Bulletin* my version of the controversy.<sup>4</sup> If you wish you may postpone your decision till then.

Yours for Industrial Freedom,  
Wm. Yates.

There are other documents that would throw some side-lights upon this affair. They are not needed—AT PRESENT. They take in other matters. To publish them now would mainly complicate the present issue. Their publication shall be withheld by me until the matters they deal with more particularly shall have reached fuller, or more obvious maturity. In the meantime, by referring to the *Bulletin* of Feb. 8, you will notice that Trautmann's "Point 4," referred to by Yates as "totally misleading," is the passage in which Trautmann claimed that "all members of the G.E.B., except Katz, agree that the minutes are complete and detailed sufficiently to assure a thorough understanding of all transactions," etc.

All that now remains to be answered of your letter are your questions whether I was "instructed to use those tactics by the S.L.P.," and whether I am "backed by the S.L.P." My answer is—I have been instructed to act in this matter, and am backed by the S.L.P. no more than you have been instructed or are backed by the S.P. to write to me. Like yourself—whom I remember pleurably in connection with my recent visit to Butte—I have acted in this matter upon my own motion, uninstructed and unbacked by anyone. The only difference between your conduct in addressing me, and mine in addressing the G.E.B. of the I.W.W., is that you, an I.W.W. and S.P. man, fill no official office in the S.P., while I, also an I.W.W. man, fill in the S.L.P. the office of Editor of *The People*, and appeared before the G.E.B. in a double capacity—in the capacity of an I.W.W. man and in that of the Editor of a paper which Trautmann's employe wrongfully assailed, and which was simultaneously wrongfully assailed by Trautmann on two occasions. In my instance, the two capacities merged into one, seeing that both the paper under my charge and the I.W.W. stand upon the principle that every switch must be kept locked that may threaten to derail the I.W.W., as the conduct of Otto Justh and Trautmann threatened to do—the former by gratuitously meddling in behalf of Connolly in the internal concerns of the S.L.P., the latter by pronouncing an attack upon a "Socialist

---

<sup>4</sup> [To be appended.—R.B.]

Party organizer" to be "a misrepresentation of I.W.W. affairs," and charging *The People* with publishing such "misrepresentations of the I.W.W.," and both of them operating along these lines at the same time that the same Connolly was using I.W.W. stationery, through his office in the I.W.W., to disseminate slanders regarding internal S.L.P. affairs.

Fraternally,  
Daniel De Leon.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded December 2009

[slpns@slp.org](mailto:slpns@slp.org)