

# ***De Leon-Harriman Debate***

***The Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance***

***versus***

***The 'Pure and Simple' Trade Union***



***Published Online by  
Socialist Labor Party of America***

***[www.slp.org](http://www.slp.org)***

***May 2001***

THE  
**Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance**

versus the

**“Pure and Simple” Trade Union**

A Debate at the Grand Opera House, New Haven, Conn.,  
November 25, 1900, between

DANIEL DE LEON

Representing the Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance and  
the Socialist Labor Party, and

JOB HARRIMAN

Representing the “Pure and Simple” Trade Union and  
the Social Democratic Party

Stenographically reported by BENJAMIN F. KEINARD

(Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official website of the  
Socialist Labor Party of America)

**THE SOCIALIST TRADE & LABOR ALLIANCE**  
**VERSUS**  
**THE 'PURE AND SIMPLE' TRADE UNION.**

On taking the chair, Mr. Wm. E. Clegg, of Yale University, announced the subject and distribution of time as follows:

“The question is, ‘RESOLVED, THAT THE TACTICS OF THE SOCIALIST TRADE AND LABOR ALLIANCE AGAINST THE PURE AND SIMPLE TRADE UNION IS FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE WORKING CLASS AND FOR THE PROMOTION OF SOCIALISM IN AMERICA.’ The time of the debate will be divided as follows: for the presentation of their arguments the gentlemen will have thirty minutes each; for rebuttal, Mr. Daniel De Leon, of the Socialist Labor Party, will have twenty minutes, Mr. Job Harriman, of the Social Democratic Party, thirty minutes; Mr. De Leon closing the speech in a ten minute period. At five minutes before the expiration of the thirty and twenty minute periods one stroke of the gavel will signify that the gentlemen have five minutes to complete their periods. At the end of nine minutes, during the ten minute period one stroke of the gavel will be given. The first speaker of the evening will be Mr. Daniel De Leon.”

Mr. DE LEON then spoke for thirty minutes, as follows:

*Workingmen and Workingwomen of New Haven—*

The question that is to be presented here to-night is, in my opinion, a pivotal question—the Trade Union question—a question that is blocking the way to

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

progress, and the correct solution of which is essential to the interests of the working class and of the Socialist movement of the land. It is a question that has to be approached deliberately and calmly. I come not to “win a victory.” There is no such question here in my mind as to whether I or any one else wins a snap victory at this meeting. I propose to speak to you deliberately. It is a question of facts and close reasoning. It is a question the facts concerning which you will have to take home with you and consider there. It is not a question as to what man wins, but a question whether our common country shall win, and whether this vexed labor question can be at all solved.

The Trade Union policy of the Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance involves the Trade Union policy of the Socialists organized in the Socialist Labor Party. That policy was not evolved out of the inner consciousness of any one man or set of men. It is a policy that is based upon certain facts, certain historic facts, certain undeniable facts, and established upon conclusions that are not escapable from. In choosing these facts, I have been careful to take only such as are over and above dispute. Only children wrangle over facts; men agree upon them. Now, I do not suppose that this meeting has come here to witness a “washing of dirty linen,” with mutual criminations and recriminations. The facts I shall present to you are facts known to be facts, or, if they are not known to be such by my audience, my audience can easily verify them, because they are all taken from the official organs of the very organizations against whom we stand arrayed.

The first principle upon which the Socialists stand is this:

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

*That the permanent improvement of the working class, let alone their emancipation, is impossible, unless they obtain absolute control of the government and thereby turn this capitalist system into the Socialist Republic.*

That is a fundamental principle with us.

The second principle is this:

*The conquest of the public powers by the Socialist Labor Party is an impossibility over-night.* It will take at least four years from the time that the workingmen commence to march actually and intelligently towards their emancipation. It may take ten, it may take twenty years. In the meantime what shall be done? Something is wanted NOW. Some economic relief is demanded now. The political organization can only come into play once a year. In this State only once every two years. At any rate, it can only come into play occasionally. The workingmen need something else besides. They need an organization that may give some relief, however temporary. No intelligent physician will attend a serious sickness, overlooking entirely the palliatives that he might give his patient. However much an economic organization may give palliatives only, however entirely those things may be palliatives, they are something: it is a relief, and the workingmen need it, and need it badly. Now then, the only organization that can give that temporary relief is the economic organization: the Trade Union. Accordingly, the S.L.P. builds upon this second principle:

*That the Trade Union which can do good to the workingmen must be a Trade Union which has a certain central characteristic; it must recognize the class struggle between the capitalist class and the working class.*

The Trade Union that doesn't recognize that much, so

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

that its members may be kept from entanglements that the conflicting interests of their competing employers might bring them into, a Trade Union that doesn't recognize the class struggle, will find itself arrayed against other workingmen of different trades, sometimes of their own trade, according to the temporary interests of their employer. A workingmen's organization that is not class-conscious, a workingmen's organization that imagines that the interests of the capitalist class and the interests of the working class are one and the same—such an organization and such workingmen are simply appendages to the capitalist class, and will be drawn into the vortex of competing capitalist conflicts. [Applause.] Don't take away my time. That is the second principle. We must have an economic organization and we must have a political organization. We see in Germany a magnificent political movement, substantially a workingmen's movement, and yet the condition of the workingmen declines steadily. Why? Because there is no economic organization worth mentioning. In the United States we see a big, substantially big, Trade Union movement, and yet the condition of the workingmen goes down steadily. Why? Because here the political movement is insignificant. In France, where the political movement is strong and the Trade Union, intelligent Trade Union, is strong, there we can with justice say that large areas of the workingmen have been improved, while the struggle is going on. We need an economic organization, accordingly, that moves under the protecting guns of a labor political party.

Now then, arrived so far, the question is, Are there such Trade Unions in existence? If you want a thing and

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

you find something in the way that calls itself what you are looking for, you are not going to build one; you will try to get along with it, if possible. Working in this direction, the Socialists, organized in the Socialist Labor Party, came across a movement that was said to be a Trade Union movement. We came across organizations of workingmen. Now the present policy of the Socialists in the Socialist Labor Party is dictated by these two principles that I have just mentioned, plus the experience made with the existing Unions that we found; and right here a short sketch of those Unions will be necessary.

We found organizations of workingmen, but we found that they were marked with exactly the reverse of the central characteristic that was necessary for a workingmen's organization. *Instead of being class conscious, they built upon the principle of the brotherhood of the workingman and the capitalist.* As a result of that, they moved for higher wages, and right after that they gave up whatever they had gained. They were torn amidst themselves by the interests of the capitalist class. At that time these Trade Unions, guided by a natural instinct, and yet by an untutored instinct, moved in a peculiar way. The giant was blind. He struck in the air, and sometimes his blows fell upon individual capitalists. The capitalist class then proceeded to endeavor to control the Trade Union, and a struggle took place within the Unions. On the one side were the Socialists; the other the capitalists. Socialists and representatives of the capitalists found themselves within the Trade Unions, struggling each of them to get control of that organization—the Socialists trying to get control of that organization for the workingmen; the

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

representatives of the capitalists trying to get control of that organization for the capitalist class. The result of it was that the Socialists were beaten.

In that struggle, the Socialist movement being weak, the Socialists went under, and presently the Trade Union movement became in the country an engine of the capitalist, controlled by the capitalist through what Mark Hanna has justly called the “labor lieutenants” of the capitalist class. These men who are the officers of the Unions, and whom we have termed Labor Fakirs, or the Organized Scabbery of the Union—these labor fakirs, this Organized Scabbery, these labor lieutenants of the capitalists in the Unions have controlled the Union absolutely in the economic interests of the capitalist class, and obedient to the dictates of the capitalists.

We have seen for instance in New York, it is an open secret, that the recent trolley strike was a stock exchange strike, dictated by the magnates who wanted to force down the price of stock so as to buy in cheaply, and that strike was ordered by these men, and carried out by their labor lieutenants. We saw the strike of the miners in Pennsylvania ordered by the United Mine Workers against De Armitt, and the rank and file were forced into that battle and sacrificed as food for cannon, not obedient to the interests of the workingmen, but obedient to the interests of the capitalists, who gave the orders to their labor lieutenants, the labor fakirs in the Unions.

We saw more. We saw that every time the revolutionary pulse was felt within the Unions, and the rank and file wanted something, the capitalist influence was felt potent within the Union. Through his labor

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

lieutenants, the capitalist managed to still that pulse, and operating his labor lieutenants like lightning rods, he ran the revolutionary lightning into the ground. We have seen, for instance, when the miners of Alabama, wanting to wring better conditions from their employers, elected upon a revolutionary program their delegates to the convention, that the mine operators ordered their labor lieutenants, the Miners' Union's officers, to somehow or other annul those elections and start new elections; that this new order was carried out, and that another convention was thus chosen agreeable to the employers, instead of what it was at first. We have seen for instance that when miners at Hazleton felt indignant at being shot by the sheriffs of capitalism, it was again a lieutenant of labor, Mr. Fahy, whom the capitalists gave free tickets to reach the place, churches and halls to speak in, and who there addressed the men, saying that these employers were good men, that it was a mistake, that it was not meant, and that they should stop hating their employers, they should go back to work and forget the butcheries.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> As an additional illustration of how the Labor Lieutenants of capital sacrifice the economic interests, that the Union is supposed to be the special guardian of, and run into the ground or side-track, the efforts of the rank and file in the organization of the following instance may be cited:

In the textile trade in New England, the work of the Cahills of old, and the Whiteheads and Rosses to-day, lately reached its culmination in Fall River. The stirrings on the part of the workers against wage reductions in that city was run into the ground by a proposition that they start a co-operative factory! The Labor Lieutenants in the trade pushed the proposal: parsons, politicians, and "philanthropists," of course, joined. Thus the pulse of these ill-starred operatives for improved conditions was stilled with a delusion, for which, on top of it all, moneys were wheedled from these already sufficiently pauperized men for shares in the puny, sham co-operative concern, supposed to

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

I will not mention more illustrations. These will do. Such a Trade Union movement, whatever it was, was no longer a movement of the working class, any more than an army that consists of workingmen is a workingmen's army if it is manned and officered by the representatives of the capitalist class.

With that experience the Socialists said, something has to be done with these organizations, which are carrying the working men down to destruction, these organizations which are controlled by the lieutenants of the capitalist class, where every pulse of the revolutionary feeling among the rank and file is deadened, and where the men are made to move obedient to the interests and the dictates of the capitalists.

When we moved in that direction, we came across two theories. One set of men said to us: "Why, give it up; don't bother with the Union." These were usually the "intellectuals." They said: "The union is rotten; it is a vanishing thing." "No," said we, "it is not a vanishing thing; it is a rotten thing, but the skeleton remains." It is with these Unions, as with the seals in the Probyloff Islands. The seal-catchers don't go out in pursuit of the seals. They know that at certain seasons the seals gather of themselves at certain spots. At such seasons the hunters are ready at the given places, club in hand; and, when the seals turn up, hit them over the head and capture them. So with the Organized Scabbery that remains in control of these skeletons of Trade Unions. They wait for the season when the workingmen, moved by a revolutionary impulse, demand higher wages and

---

compete with the mammoth capitalist establishments in existence.

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

better times. Then come these labor lieutenants of the capitalist class, and, with their capitalists clubs, hit this revolutionary movement over the head, by leading it into the ground, like the lightning rod does the lightning. The theory of “dropping” the Union would not do.

The other theory suggested was: “Bore from within.” And we tried it. We went into the Unions and bored from within. We tried to teach the class struggle. One division, in which I was active myself, was in the K. of L. We struggled and we struggled with the labor lieutenants of the capitalists; it came to hand to hand encounters; finally, we landed on the outside.

While this was the experience or fate of one division of “Borers from Within,” the experience and fate of another division, the division that opposes us to-day, was this: By little and little their voices were extinguished. An illustration of that is found in the Progressive Union of Cigarmakers No. 90 of New York. It was said to be the Socialist Union par excellence in the land. It went into the International Union; it was going to bore from within. It was going to teach Socialism. By little and little there was less and less of its voice heard. To-day even within its own organization, Republican heelers are elected to represent it, and they dare not remove them. [Applause.] And as far as their national organ is concerned, not a voice is heard on the part of the “borers from within” against the economic and other outrages that are being committed.

“Boring from within” resolved itself accordingly, into this: either you must bore to a purpose, and then you land quickly on the outside; or you don’t land on the outside, but then you knuckle under, a silent supporter of the felonies committed by the labor lieutenants of

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

capitalism. Such was the experience.

In Wisconsin there was a strike of the wood-carvers in the McMillan shop. One of the henchmen of that shop clubbed one of the strikers and killed him. The revolutionary pulse was felt throughout the land. What became of it? One of the vice-presidents of the A.F. of L., the National Secretary of these very woodworkers, called the strikers together, and says:

*“Men, be cool, be calm; McMillan is a good employer, he is a kind man; forget what has happened.”*

This is of record in his own journal—cannot be denied.

See what happened with the boilermakers. There was in the Senate of the United States a bill for the eight-hour day supported by the A.F. of L. Senator Elkins kills that bill, speaks and votes against it.

*Thereupon, the boilermakers go about and make speeches for Elkins, calling him a good employer.*

Why?

*Because he had a ship subsidy bill that would throw some jobs into their hands. Obedient to Elkins’ dictation, that branch of the A.F. of L. stood up against the rest of them. For the sake of what they might get, or imagined they could get, they were willing to stand by the man who had killed this eight-hour day measure.*

This is also on record.

Take another instance. There is in New York a Union of the cabinet makers, a German organization, said to be a Socialist organization par excellence. It goes into the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, and it is barely in there, when articles begin to teem in that journal of theirs denouncing the Socialist movement, denouncing Socialism and throwing obloquy upon Karl Marx. Whenever I feel that I am calumniated, I think of those

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

articles. Why, they have not begun to say about me what they said about Marx in that journal. Did any one ever hear an answer, a protest to that from the “borers from within”? The journal is clear of that.

Take this other instance of the cigarmakers. *When their employers wanted a tariff reduction, they passed resolutions in the interest of their employers for a tariff reduction, and thereby put themselves diametrically opposed to the employees of those employers who needed rather a high tariff.*

While that was going on, did any one ever hear a single voice against that on the part of the “borers from within” in their journal?—Never!

“Boring from within” was but a blind for the theory of “dropping” the Union. “Boring from within” meant to throw up the sponge, sheathe the sword, and become a traitor to the working class. “Boring from within” meant that you had to keep quiet, and get the applause of the labor fakir, so that he might do what he wanted to.

Take two instances that are palpitating now in the United States. It is a well known fact that the Cuban cigarmakers get the highest wages among the cigarmakers. That fact is not agreeable to the employers. It is a well known fact that the employers have always endeavored to get those Cuban cigarmakers to join the International Union, so that while they would still be paying “union wages,” they would, in point of fact, pay the Cubans lower wages. A bloody conflict is now on in Tampa, Fla. With the connivance of the capitalists, the local branch of the International Union of Cigarmakers has fired shots into the Cuban organization of cigarmakers. That strike is obedient to the interests of the employers. Their labor lieutenants are managing it

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

so as to compel these men of the La Resistencia organization to come into the International Union, and when they get into the International Union, then the employers can pay them "union wages," and yet pay them less than they get now. Have you heard a single one of those who claim that "boring from within" is the right thing raise the voice of indignation against that crime against the workers, against that obsequious obedience to the dictates of the capitalists? I have not heard it.

Take the instance of the machinists. The machinists wanted shorter hours, and agitated for that. The employers finally found that they could not pretend not to hear, and said: "We grant you two hours a week,"—and thereupon posted notices whereby they take off five minutes here and ten minutes yonder, five minutes in this place and ten minutes in the other place, so that after all, out of the two hours alleged to be granted, fully one hour and a half are taken away, and you know what that means—that the other half hour has to go with them. But for the labor lieutenants in the International Machinists' Union that thing could not go on. The rank and file of the machinists would have discovered it. The capitalists needed these labor lieutenants to pull the wool over the eyes of the workingmen. The capitalists themselves could not do it, consequently they call upon the O'Connells and Warners and the rest of their labor lieutenants and officers of that Union, the Organized Scabbery of that Union, and these call meetings, and advise the men to accept the proposition as a "victory," claiming that "the two hours have been granted." In the midst of that what did the men who wanted to "bore from within" say? Not a word.

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

If they attempted to rise, the labor lieutenants and their sub-lieutenants would jump at them, would call them scabs, and they are afraid of being called names, so consequently they keep quiet.

Upon these facts and these principles, the Socialists organized in the Socialist Labor Party organized the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance. It said, these Unions cannot be ignored, nor can they be bored from within exclusively. They must be battered to pieces from without. The bulk of the workingmen are disorganized because they have made sad experience with these organizations that are controlled by the labor lieutenants of the capitalists. The unorganized men we try to organize into the Alliance, and with their aid try to reform those Unions, and bring them over. In the pursuit to this policy, of course, there is war. You cannot establish a national organization like the S.T. & L.A. and have the A.F. of L. and the K. of L., or what there is left of it, imagine that that means friendship. They immediately began to denounce, and the S.T. & L.A. has marched upon those forces, and its conduct, undeniable by any truthful or self-respecting man, has been this:

*It organizes the workingmen.* In any conflict between the workingman and the capitalist, (whether the workingman is within the Alliance or disorganized entirely on the outside, or organized in the pure and simple Union), if there is a real conflict, the Alliance stands by those men, regardless of the organization, as it has done in more than one instance.

*If, however, the conflict is a conflict between labor and capital in appearance only, where the workingmen are being used as food for cannon, obedient to some stock-jobbing enterprise, or where the labor fakirs are doing for*

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

*the employers what they cannot do for themselves in the Union, as now in the case of the machinists, then we of the S.T. & L.A. say that it would be a betrayal of the interests of the working class to keep quiet and get the applause, the friendship, or the approval of these labor lieutenants. Then say we, as we are saying in the case of this conflict in Tampa, as in this case of the machinists:*

“Workingmen, you are being cheated, you are being deceived by the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class!”

While we are doing that, of course we are being covered with calumnies. But this movement depends upon men, and not upon easily frightened children. As the sun will break through the darkest clouds, so will the correct course, the integrity, the purity of the Alliance shine across all the clouds of calumny that are being hurled against it. We organize the men, we combat these pure and simple organizations, and expect to make them surrender. Already one of them, the wagonmakers, came within eight or twelve votes of surrendering. Others may not surrender, and will have to be taken by storm. These pure and simple organizations are forts in the hands of the capitalist class, because these forts are held by the labor lieutenants of the capitalists. These forts must be captured; they cannot be wheedled into line for the working class.

There are just three theories with regard to the Trade Union. One theory is held by those who absolutely oppose the Socialist movement. They say the Union is quite enough. All the good that there is in the world, from bicycles up to star showers in the November midnight sky, everything is due to the Union. I have not spent any time with that theory. Should it be deemed necessary, I might take it up later.

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

The other theory is either “bore from within,” or “abandon the Union,” which means the same thing. I have shown you what it amounts to.

The third theory is that of the Alliance:

*That boring from within, with the labor fakir in possession, is a waste of time, and that the only way to do is to stand by the workingmen always; to organize them, enlighten them, and whenever a conflict breaks out in which their brothers are being fooled and used as food for cannon, to have the S.T. & L.A. throw itself in the midst of the fray, and sound the note of sense.*

In pursuit of this policy we have anxiously, I for one, looked for an argument against our position. To this day I have not heard one. All that I have heard is calumnious charges against the Alliance. In yielding the floor to my opponent, who, I understand, is to bring arguments, if he brings any they will be the first I have ever heard, and no one will listen to him more attentively than myself. [Great applause.]

Here the gavel fell.

Mr. HARRIMAN then spoke for thirty minutes, as follows:

Mr. HARRIMAN. The propositions that are laid down by the opposition are that the class struggle should be recognized by the Trade Union movement, and that political action should be its mode of procedure. Now, that is not the question before this audience for discussion. It is not a question of political action. All Socialists endorse independent political action on the part of the workingmen. The question before this audience to-day—and if I do not quote it correctly, I wish

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

the chairman would call my attention to it—is: “Resolved, that the tactics of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance against pure and simple Trade Unionism is for the benefit of the working class, and for the promotion of Socialism in America.” [Great Applause.] Never mind. That will not be credited to me, that time. Now it is not a question of opposing political action, but a question of opposing the tactics of the S.T. & L.A. against Trade Unionism. This is the proposition before us, and nothing else.

What are the tactics of the S.T. & L.A. against Trade Unionism? What are they? They were not told here tonight. We were told that political action is their tactics. Very well. That is not the tactics against Trade Unionism, for a man might be in favor of political action, and yet not oppose old line Trade Unionism. Not at all. He might endeavor to add political action to the tactics; not oppose Trade Unionism, but add that as another weapon of their warfare. What now, are the tactics? In Mr. De Leon’s paper of March 4th he says: “Of course the S.L.P. is opposed to the kind of Trade Unionism that is retailed over the Gompers’ counter.” [Laughter.] Now let us look just one moment further—“but fortunately for the working class there is another kind of Trade Unionism.” That is, he is opposed to it, or to pure and simple Trade Unionism,—he wants the other kind—he is opposed, not necessarily to the fakirs, but to Trade Unionism. All right. Let’s follow it up. I will go just one moment further, and before I do, I will mention —[applause]—after I come a little further—[applause]—will mention only one of the Unions to which he has referred. [Great Applause.]

In the national convention of the S.L.P. one of the

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

speakers made this remark in a discussion, in a page article—and another page article is filled with the same proposition and similar arguments. [Applause.] He says: “We ought not to attempt to keep in existence that thing which we are fighting to keep out of existence. No, we call upon the Socialists of the United States to get out of the pure and simple organizations, and to smash them to pieces.” Mark you, it is a “smash” of the old line Trade Unionism “to pieces.” [Laughter.] Now, those are the tactics against it—“to smash it to pieces.”<sup>2</sup>

Now let us see if their actions corroborate their words. Let us see if that is theory or practice. The gentleman has spoken of a number of Trade Unions—the coal miners in Pennsylvania, the miners in Tennessee, the woodworkers of Wisconsin, the furniture makers of New York, the cigarmakers of New York, and others. I will not go into all of them. I will take one. One is sufficient. I would be willing to go into all, and bring the facts

---

<sup>2</sup> The passage of the speech which Mr. Harriman here garbles is this:

Delegate DALTON. If it is true that the energy, the activity and the intelligence of the Socialist workingmen are used to build up and buttress up that which is a buttress of capitalism, then the Socialist Labor Party should say in words upon which there can be no mistake: ‘You must not accept any office, salaried or otherwise, in them. If you are forced by the conditions of your trade, if you are forced in order to get bread and butter, to join a pure and simple Trade Union, let that be as far as you go in unconscious disloyalty to your class. Do not attempt to keep in existence that thing which we are fighting to keep out of existence. Do not with your words and energy help them in any way.’ If that pure and simple Union would go to pieces without the aid of the Socialists, what does the Socialist do in there? This convention marks a forward step. It will say to the world: ‘The revolution has proceeded to this point where no longer shall we call upon our comrades to carry the revolutionary spirit into the pure and simple labor-fakir-led, rotten, decoy-duck organizations.’ No. We say: ‘We call upon the Socialists of the United States to get out of the pure and simple organizations and smash them to pieces.’ If you say to me that we will lose good Socialists, I say you had better lost them long ago.

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

concerning all. I would be willing to go into all if there were time to do it. One is enough. I will take the cigarmakers, for instance. [Laughter, applause and yells.] Hold on there. He says the facts concerning the Davis cigar factory are these: that Honestein<sup>3</sup> and Modest, both of the International Union, called the shop to a meeting and had the question of strike discussed, whereupon, by an overwhelming vote, the shop decided not to strike. First, the meeting was not called by Honestein. He was not present, and Mr. De Leon knows he was not present. He won't deny this. [Applause.] Furthermore, when, on the second meeting these men were present, there was no vote taken. Why was there no vote taken? The gentleman says, whenever hunger or needs or similar motives prompted the need, the gentlemen in the strike committee business would make a raid upon the workers in some cigar factory, ordering them out on strike. He never calumniates, does he? [Laughter and yells.] "The upshot was always the same. Initiation and other dues were scooped in, strike committee salaries were made and the workers were sold out."

Now, let us look at that just for a minute. First, the strike was called in order to sell the men out and rake in the dues. That was the purpose. The International Cigarmakers' constitution provides that no reduction of wages shall be permitted, unless the facts are submitted to the entire Union the country over, and when they get their assent, then that local Union or shop may accept the reduction, and not until then. He will not deny that

---

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Harriman doubtlessly means *Rosenstein*, though he actually said *Honestein*.

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

fact when he takes the platform after me. Mr. Davis, in his petition for an injunction against the Union, said that he was compelled to reduce the bill of prices—the wages—in order to continue his business. Then they submitted the matter to the Union, and the petition for a strike came back, and in those court papers, which I am sure Mr. De Leon knows of, Mr. Davis spoke of the strike permission given to them. He will not deny this. Now, since he was compelled to reduce the wages, according to his own allegation; since the men submitted the matter to the Unions, and since the Unions by a vote ordered the strike—I ask you, what becomes of the statement that they did it simply to sell out the strike and rake in dues? They were compelled to do it or they would have been expelled from the Union for not ordering the strike. And when the second meeting came up, they went in there and told those 200 men that there would be a strike because the shop had not the control over the lowering of wages; the entire craft was interested in the lowering of wages and that the Union at large had ordered the strike and they commanded them out. What happened? Two hundred men walked out and about thirty men went back to scab it. [Snickers.] The large majority came out. Now, Mr. De Leon says that they organized the shop from top to bottom.

Mr. DE LEON. I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. HARRIMAN. In your paper. Yes, of course. Yes. Yes. All right. [Laughter and applause.] It was lucky I had the paper. [Laughter.] He says that they organized it from top to bottom. Now, mark you, about twenty-five of them went back, and those twenty-five—a portion of them—were Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance men. A portion of them signed an affidavit and joined with

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

Davis asking the court to grant an injunction against the Union, and upon the affidavit of the Socialist Trade & Labor Alliance men and Mr. Davis jointly, they granted the injunction against the working class, the cigarmakers of New York. He will not deny that. He will not deny that.

Mr. DE LEON. Yes, I will.

Mr. HARRIMAN. He will not deny that. Furthermore, now, why I brought this case up is this: to show to you men that in this cigarmakers' strike, Mr. De Leon had united with Davis to scab it on the Union; they united with Davis in order to make the affidavit and get the injunction against the Union. Immediately he organized those scabs, they went back, and Mr. Davis alleges that they were willing to work for the reduction in wages, and in the injunction he alleges this, and they joined with him asking for the injunction. Immediately after the organization of this, the following advertisement appears in the papers.

*“Wanted, on handwork, jobs from \$9.25 to \$17. Pioneer Cigarmakers' Alliance of S.T. & L.A.”*

THE VOICE FROM A LEFT-HAND BOX. Mention the paper.

Mr. HARRIMAN (continuing). *“Samuel I. Davis, 520-522 East Eighty-first street.”*

THE VOICE AGAIN. Mention the paper! [Mr. Harriman pretends not to hear.]

THE VOICE AGAIN. Mention the paper! [Mr. Harriman hesitatingly examines the paper.]

Mr. HARRIMAN. It is the *New York Journal* of March 3. [Hisses.]

A VOICE. A capitalist paper! [Applause.]

Mr. HARRIMAN. Hold on there. It was your

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

advertisement. What does it mean? He said to you here this evening that whenever the working class whether in the S.T. & L.A. or not, whether unorganized or whether members of the old Unions, were in a struggle, that if they were justified, they united with those men in battle, and I say, here was a case where they were justified, because the Cigarmakers' Union, according to their constitution, called the strike. The vast majority walked out and the S.T. & L.A. with the minority, scabbed upon that Union and endeavored to break it. [Applause.] This—hold on—this is consistent. This is the effort first, on the part of Davis to lower wages; on the part of your friends to keep pace with your theory of smashing the Union in practice and in theory. The practice and the theory tally.

Now what is Trade Unionism? Is it fakirdom? Not a bit of it. There may be fakirs in it. You find those things, men, in every organization. How does Trade Unionism develop? 'Tis this. The capitalist endeavors to make money by employing the worker, and wages means that the capitalist pays the worker less than the worker produces. Now the less the capitalist pays the worker, the more easily he can gratify his desires by the energy he gets from him, from products that he gets from him. The higher the rate of wages the less the capitalist takes. But when the capitalist decreases the wages until there is so much pain that the working class cannot endure it any longer, they bunch together, and your Union is born. There is your Union. Now the struggle is on between the two organizations. The Union struggles to force its wages up with strike and boycott. Yes. That is pure and simple Trade Unionism. That is all. It has not yet progressed to political action, but the great mass

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

of men are within the organization struggling to raise the wages, to increase their material interests by the strike and boycott. All Socialists say this is not enough, but all Socialists say that so far as it goes, that is the only method in the capitalist system—so far, I say, as it goes. But when two great organizations, the working class on one hand, the capitalist class on the other, meet in their struggle, they represent great power, and where power develops there the opportunity to a greater or less degree for corruption develops; but, because some men come and fasten themselves upon a Union like a barnacle, they do not necessarily, that is, their actions are not necessarily a part of the Union, their actions are only brought to bear upon the Union, and it would be no more a part of Trade Unionism than Mr. De Leon's tactics toward them is a part of Socialism. [Applause.] Hold on, not a bit—so that it would be just as foolish to fight the Trade Union because of their few dishonest men as it would be to fight Socialism because of peculiar tactics. It is not a part of Trade Unionism. It is a part of the rogue's constitution of working his desires at the expense of his class—not a part of the principles of the movement at all. [Laughter.]

Now just watch it develop a little further. I say the great mass of the working class do not know that Socialism is; they are unacquainted with our philosophy, and that being true, and since Socialism or since Trade Unionism, is born by the lowering of wages or by economic pressure—if we were to wipe out every Trade Union on the face of the earth to-day, to-morrow your economic pressure would breed them again and develop them again. You cannot stop them. They are children of your system, born to stay as long as capitalism stays.

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

Now mark you; to fight them means what? They do not know what Socialism is, I say. They come there to benefit themselves, gather together to raise their wages. Being ignorant of your philosophy, the very moment you attack Trade Unions and say you are going to smash them to pieces, that moment you attack their means of gaining their livelihood, that is, their means of preserving and carrying on the fight against the capitalist class, their means of keeping their wages up, so far as they are able to keep them up—always, mark you this, I say, always necessarily with a downward tendency, and must be. Now, then, the moment you strike the thing that helps and guards them, the means by which they fight their great battle with the capitalist class, that moment they think you are their enemy, that moment you arouse their antagonism, that moment you inspire their hatred and you divide your men into two hostile camps, the Trade Union movement on the one side and your S.L.P. and S.T. & L.A. on the other, and there the workingmen fight like cats and dogs, while all their power is being sapped, fighting over the policy, fighting over a difference, merely because, not that they are dishonest, I say to you that the hundreds and thousands of men in the Trade Unions are not dishonest—that there are a few, yes, that there are a few in this movement, yes, but that doesn't condemn your movement because they are dishonest. [Applause.] Now, you see, all this divides them into two hostile camps. I do not have to tell you men that you are divided, that you are divided here to-night. You are fighting each other to-night, and you are all Socialists fighting over a difference in a Trade Union policy, and that is all. You are fighting to the end, and it is this policy that has

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

divided you.

Furthermore, it has divided their party themselves, for in 1898 the S.T. & L.A. split, and in 1899—[glancing at De Leon] don't look surprised.

Mr. DE LEON. I didn't look surprised.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Your memory is failing you. In 1899 the S.L.P. split—didn't look up surprised that time—and it split upon this policy, upon the policy the difference between the S.T. & L.A. policy against the Trade Union movement. We fought over it and we split on it. Why? Because we knew that to follow the policy meant to array the working class against Socialism by incorrect tactics. What did we do? We look at them and we say, the Social Democratic Party to-day, which to-day contains the majority of the S.L.P.—he will not say a majority, but I will say a large majority in the United States—but we split, our conventions about equal size, and we fought over this particular difference—we say to-day, that if you would enter the Unions with all your members—he says we did and we were weak when we were struggling for the control of the Union. Ah! Were you weak? Then you should have waited until you were strong. [Laughter.] How could you hope to gain the control of a Trade Union movement when you were weak and when the vast majority of the members of the Trade Union didn't know what you wanted. I say, we tell you you are making a mistake. Go into your Union; when a strike comes on, espouse the cause of the Union, take up the fight of the Union, make their interests your interests, and when you do, you will find that they will open their ears to every argument that promises a benefit and a means to further their ends. Then they will listen to your arguments on political action. You say, No,

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

no; we have tried. Well, I say, Yes, yes; we have tried it; and let me assure you we have tried it in dead earnest. I do not make this statement because I think they do not know it. Here are some facts.

I do not take my own literature. I always prefer to prove the case against the opposition by their own literature. [Laughter.] Here is a part of it. In their debate when this famous resolution was passed:

If any member of the S.L.P. accepts office in a pure and simple trade or labor organization, he shall be considered antagonistic to the S.L.P., and shall be expelled.

The S.L.P. and the S.T. & L.A. are identical in this wish. But—

If any officer of a pure and simple trade or labor organization applies for membership in the S.L.P., he shall be rejected.<sup>4</sup>

Here is a very interesting little statement here. Now this first is from Kuhn. Kuhn opposed that—their National Secretary—of the S.L.P. He says:

It has been my experience with a number of correspondents of mine who are organizers of Sections of the S.L.P., that they were at the same time officers of such unions.

I mean by that that it is possible to work form within,

---

<sup>4</sup> The resolution quoted by Mr. Harriman is as follows:

If any member of the Socialist Labor Party accepts office in a pure and simple trade or labor organization, he shall be considered antagonistic to the Socialist Labor Party, and shall be expelled. If any officer of a pure and simple trade or labor organization applies for membership in the Socialist Labor Party, he shall be rejected.

The resolution passed the convention by a vote of sixty-one votes against two, and has since been ratified by a referendum vote of the Socialist Labor Party.

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

that it is possible. Now, mark you—

Comrade Meyer, himself for a long time—

Author of the resolution I have just read—  
was an officer of such a Union.

It is possible, isn't it? [Laughter.]

Hammond, for instance, was for many years, I think, an officer in the Typographical local in Minneapolis;—

It is possible, isn't it?

another comrade, one of our best men in Brooklyn, a man, one of the most active men, was also a member—

Hem, hem [applause], hem [great applause], hem, a man, hem, hem, [great applause]—

and President of the Carpenters' Union in Brooklyn.<sup>5</sup>

Furthermore, let us take Teche's statement. I want to show you that it is possible.

As far as I am personally concerned,—

Teche says—one of the men who spoke in this National Convention—

---

<sup>5</sup> It is no wonder that Mr. Harriman "hemmed and hawed" when he came to the closing part of his quotation from Mr. Kuhn. That portion of National Secretary Kuhn's remarks "hemmed and hawed" over by Mr. Harriman is as follows:

"Another comrade, one of our best men in Brooklyn, a German, one of the most active men, Gleiforst, member and president of the Carpenters' Union in Brooklyn, has, together with a number of other Party men, kept the Kangaroos there down, the fighting sometimes leading to the raising of chars." He, indeed, was boring to a purpose.

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

I am heartily in favor of the sentiment spoken, but I believe, at the same time, there is such a thing as pulling the strings a little too tight, to run a little too fast, and I believe with Comrade Kuhn that circumstances alter cases in many instances. I will give you an instance in my own case. I have belonged to a Trade Union ever since I came to this country and belonged to the same in the old country, a small concern, only about, say, ninety men in the whole country left of us in the whole organization. Every officer belongs to our party,—

It is possible, isn't it? Old tried and true comrades, remarkable, isn't it. Can't bore from within, can you?—

and I can further point out that in percentage of members who are Socialists and collections made there is no organization in this country that can come up to it, especially if we take into consideration the wages we have been earning. If the resolution goes through, without further ado all of us must resign, and we flatter ourselves that we have elevated our Union. [Laughter.]

Here was a man who knew how. I will leave that one and go on to the next one, although it continues on that line. Well, I will go ahead.

At the same time to try to bring that organization into the S.T. & L.A. is impossible—

Couldn't do that—

although the majority of us are Socialists.

According to his own statement. Now, here comes another one, which is very important.

I believe if this motion goes through as it is before us, it will mean that those men who are to-day presidents, secretaries, and financial secretaries, whether they have any salary or not makes no difference,—

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

He says—all of them,—there are a whole lot of them around the country—it is possible—all of them—

it means that they will have to step out of their offices and take their places on the floor.

Now, mark you, here is the important point:

I believe it will be the best means of swinging the whole organization into the S.T. & L.A.

Do you not see that the arguments prove one thing above all others, that boring within is possible, and you can bore within and gain the confidence of the Union. The gentleman upon this platform cannot go to the Trade Union people of which he spoke, the Cigarmakers' Union in New York, because of their action and get any hearing whatever before the members there because of the action. I say to you men that the possibility of boring within is infinite in its scope. Because you work with the laborers in their struggles and in their strifes and when they are in their fight and the party backs them in their struggles, you open their ears not only to political action, but to the philosophy that lies behind the political action, behind the political action that is taught; and all over the country everywhere there are to-day Unions taking up the proposition of the collective ownership of the means of production. I can cite to you the Central Federation of Labor in New York, the Cleveland Central Labor Union constitution, and they both provide for the collective ownership and independent political action. Simply because those who have been patient and who have worked within have gained the confidence of the people, they have listened to them, and they have gained

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

an advantage by gaining a hearing before those men.

Now, the vast majority of people in the Trade Unions vote upon the laws of the Trade Union. They elect their men, they make their laws for the members by a popular vote, not by the vote of the officers, and I maintain that the wrong laws of the Trade Union organizations are due, in the matter of independent political action, to the ignorance of those members upon this point and not to their wilful dishonesty. If they are wilfully dishonest, en masse, you might as well give up the entire fight, for why should we argue with dishonest men? But if they are honest and do not know, then we can come in among them, espouse their cause, gain their confidence, and they will listen to our doctrines upon political action, independent political action, and by this means we will be able to induce them to add to the boycott and the strike the ballot as a further weapon to gain their ends, for with the ballot in their hands they are all-powerful. But, if you arouse antagonism, you cannot get the ballot in their hands.

I deny that the Unions are controlled by a few men. Take for instance the International Brotherhood of Engineers. Our friend told us three years ago that they were destroyed, wasted the substance of 49 years of existence. To-day after that struggle they are more powerful than ever before. Eighty-odd thousand members belong to them. They have a million and a half dollars in reserve fund, and it only shows that though they may have been temporarily crushed, yet the capitalist system will produce the Union again, and if they are not Socialists, if the Socialist propaganda has not reached them, it will simply make the same old Union over again, and all our fight is for nothing. [Great

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

applause and cheers.]

Here the gavel fell.

Mr. DE LEON then spoke as follows for twenty minutes:

Mr. DE LEON. I hope the intended insult upon your intellect has not escaped you. The arguments of the gentleman who has just consumed thirty minutes were partly devoted to statements I did not make at all, and that were no part of my argument. [Laughter and applause.] He had to put up a straw man of his own. I cannot blame him, as his case is pretty bad. [Laughter.] The other part of his answer was to try to foist upon you exceptions to prove the reverse of a rule. I did not say, as was falsely imputed to me, that the point was how to get the rank and file to vote. I did not cross the political line. I stated that as to the ideal, and then I went on to something else. He crossed the political line. I may have time, ten minutes, at the end to take that up. What I did say was that in the *economic struggle the aspirations of the workingmen were run into the ground by the labor lieutenants of capital*. All that he said about trying to give them the ballot had nothing to do with the case. We try to have the workingmen improve their condition NOW. I tried to make that clear enough, and I maintained and I argued that the condition of the workers could not be improved NOW, despite the labor fakir argument we have just heard. *Their condition cannot be improved as long as they are controlled by the labor lieutenants of capital; and I sated why: because every time these men proceed to do something on their own behalf, as in the case of the machinists to-day, the*

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

*labor lieutenants will see to it that they are deceived;* and he, venturesome though he was, did not dare to deny that these machinists are being deceived now, and that the alleged two hours granted to them is a swindle upon them, and that swindle is practiced upon them by the aid of the labor lieutenants of capital, and the press of the “borers from within.”

His other insult to you was to make out that I said that the rank and file were dishonest. Oh, what eloquence did we hear—regular pulpiteer eloquence on the subject. Clear enough I stated that the rank and file were earnest in their attempt to improve their condition, and they are surely honest in that desire. Who is there here who could have understood me otherwise, and that does not know that it could not possibly be imputed to me that I said that the rank and file were dishonest?

The other insult perpetrated upon you was to quote the speech of Comrade Teche, who has a little bit of a Union under entirely exceptional circumstances. He concealed the facts from you, and then gave you Teche’s speech, as though the status of his Union were a general thing, and he proceeded to quote some other exceptional instances on the point of officers. An intelligent man, a man who is not talking for a snap victory, a man who respects his cause, doesn’t build upon exceptions: he takes the rule. I quoted instances of not little, petty Unions like Teche’s organization. I quoted the woodworkers, of thousands of them; quoted the cigarmakers{,} of thousands of them; quoted the machinists, of thousands of them; quoted the boilermakers, of thousands of them—Unions of power, numerically, however slight their power to improve their condition, and that they were run into the ground by the

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

labor lieutenants of capital, as is happening now with the machinists.

Another insult to your intelligence. [Snickers from Kangaroos.] You will laugh the wrong side of your mouths one of these days. I have seen Democratic crowds of workingmen who laughed at me once. They don't laugh now. Another insult to your intelligence was to pretend to make an argument against my position that attacked the "boring from within;" and in what did that argument consist? In repeating charges started by our adversaries, and which I here want to say are a falsehood from beginning to end. I mean the Davis affair. But I want to grant, for the sake of argument, that the charge is true. What would you say of a man who stood before you and denied that Socialism was right, and instead of attacking the theory of Socialism were to quote Millerand who remains in the French cabinet, a Socialist in a cabinet that shoots workingmen;<sup>6</sup> or who

---

<sup>6</sup> Some months ago the capitalists who run the Republic of France got into trouble over the Dreyfus case. Frenchmen were greatly wrought up over the way in which Dreyfus was railroaded to prison. For a time there seemed to be danger of a popular uprising of the people. The situation was an appropriate one for the royalists, and they proceeded to agitate against the Republic and in favor of returning to the rule of a king. At this juncture the capitalists who desired to perpetuate the Republic threw a sop to the French Socialists by the appointment of Millerand, who up to that time had been regarded as one of the leaders of the French Socialist movement, to a position in the cabinet—he was made Minister of Commerce. To the surprise of the Socialist movement throughout the world, Millerand accepted. He thus became a part of the capitalist government of France. His action was immediately repudiated by all the class-conscious Socialists of France, who declared Millerand to be a traitor to the working class. Cumulative proof of his treachery was afforded some weeks later, when Millerand lost no time in paying the capitalist government for the job given him. There was a great shipping strike at Havre, one of the largest seaports of France. For a number of days several of the ocean liners had been tied up for lack of men to call

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

were to cite Mr. Harriman himself, whose organization in California applies for capitalist political jobs? [great applause, hisses]; or do, as a man I know of did on one occasion, quote some Socialist who beat his wife and say: "Is that Socialism? Then I don't want any of it." That sort of argument is an insult.

Even if what is charged did happen at Davis's, it would be a wrongful act; it could not overthrow a principle. But (and our stenographer is present) those "facts" I here nail as absolutely false from beginning to end. There was no International Union at Davis's; IT WAS AN OPEN SHOP. His men were called out by the labor lieutenants of capital. [Applause and hisses.] Ah, hiss all you like. His men were called out by two members of the Organized Scabbery. Knowing these worthies, they voted against going out. It was not, in such cases, necessary to take a vote of the whole International Union. The shop crew decided not to strike; consequently there was no strike in the shop. A few indeed, some of them, or many, went out under the threat of these labor lieutenants of capital that they would be "scabs"—so much the worse for their manliness. But the facts as they were presented here tonight are absolutely false.

*The People* was quoted. When I said "I didn't say that," my words were twisted into one of his tricks. I presumed the gentleman claimed that I used that in my argument. Whatever is in *The People* I stand by in every

---

them; and, behold, Millerand, true to his traitorous nature, detailed sailors from the French men-of-war anchored at Havre to coal the ships that were hung up, thus doing all that any capitalist could do to break the strike. He also condoned the shooting of workmen in Martinique and the Creusot works.

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

respect. But he didn't say anything after that to justify that quotation, and I wondered what it was going to be all about.

He claimed that I did not come to the theory of the Alliance. The theory of the Alliance is that the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class—based upon those illustrations that I have furnished you from the large Unions, not little, picayune, Teche Unions that he tried to make you believe by quotations amount to something—that these lieutenants of labor prevent the rank and file from doing anything in their own behalf. I showed the degradation of the working class and their economic decline, notwithstanding a large Trade Union movement. And I showed you how we did try to “bore from within,” and how that failed; and I proved that their “boring from within” amounts to nothing but a pretence. Their “boring from within” means to “talk” Socialism. Oh, yes, send a man to a pure and simple Trade Union to “talk” Socialism in the abstract; he is welcome; that adds prestige to the Organized Scabbery that runs the Union. But if a strike is started by the capitalists in that trade through their labor lieutenants, and you attempt to open your mouth and show the workmen that they are being betrayed, why, that is something else—that would not be the “talking” of “abstract Socialism,” that no one cares anything about, anymore. That hurts the Organized Scabbery. That is not tolerated. And the present “borers from within” “bore” by bowing in submission. We claim that it is the duty of the honest and energetic Socialists to call the attention of the masses to it every time they are being cheated. And we charge these “borers from within,” as we prove it now in the instance of the machinists, that in

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

their papers they say not a work against it, on the contrary they are whooping it up for the fakirs, as they did here to-night, claiming for an organization that it has millions of dollars when it has not got it; claiming for it to have 80,000 members, when it has not got it; claiming for it a victory, which is a fraud, and a snare, and a delusion to the workers. Of course, such “borers from within” can be heard; of course, they will get resolutions in their behalf; but the rank and file of the workingmen will continue declining, urged on in their decline by the conduct of these so-called Socialists. The attitude of the Alliance is that the duty of the Socialist is to be with the working class in all its working-class endeavors, and that it is the bounden duty of every Socialist to have his voice heard clear, loud, emphatic—notwithstanding all the lies uttered against him; notwithstanding all the calumnies that Scabbery may hurl at his head—that they utter clearly what is going on and teach the working people what it is they are being run into doing; how, in each one of these cases, the *working people are being used for food for cannon for the capitalist class.*

We are told that upon that line little progress can be made. Well, I believe so, too, comparatively little, but we do not believe in a progress that is deceptive. We do not believe in progress except progress that IS progress. We do not believe in being able to say “so and so many Unions have ‘endorsed’ us,” with over 50,000 members in New York, and coming out with a paltry seven or eight thousand votes. We do not believe [laughter and applause] that that is progress. On the contrary, we believe that whatever progress is made must be made be education.

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

I remember the time when the S.L.P. started its career on the political field. Among the very men who now denounce our Trade Union attitude were those who denounced us then for denouncing the Democratic and Republican parties “too severely.” We were “antagonizing the labor leaders!!” A political party was established, and yet they did not want to have any “trouble,” any “inconvenience.” So I look now over their journals from beginning to end, and the rascality of the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class can be seen, in all their journals, without exception, to go by unreprieved, uncondemned. Nay, worse; every time that the capitalist wants to run down the revolutionary pulse of the workingmen—run it into the ground, as in this case of the machinists, by telling hocus-pocus stories about bogus “victories,” thus repeating the language of the capitalist—every such time we find these “borers from within” acting as veritable hand-maids of these capitalists and of these labor lieutenants of capital.

The work may be slow; the work is arduous; but arduous, indeed, is the course of the Socialist movement. Arduous, indeed, is the course of the educator. The gentlemen, who talk and believe as Mr. Harriman, believe in an “education” that runs away from the people you ought to attack. They believe in an “education” that consists in whooping it up for the enemy. They believe in an “education” that helps the capitalist rivet ignorance upon the workingmen—that is the sort of “progress” that they believe in; that is the sort of “progress” or “education” that they advocate. Whereas the policy of the S.T. & L.A. is to go slow, gather these men in, hold up clear the principle. If a wrong is done to a Union, if the rank and file is being deceived, why, then, even if that

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

whole rank and file rises against you and denounces you, stand your ground; *stand it*—because the day will come when that rank and file will remember that *you* told them the truth; then, also, will they remember the men who “bored from within,” who acted as prostitutes for the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class. Then will you find progress; then will it come with rapid strides, for the real work will have been noted. Unless there is real work back of it, there is no progress worth mentioning.

For the rest, I can say that—unless some new argument is made; unless the gentleman has reserved for his next thirty minutes the real argument, that is to say, not the citing of exceptional cases, but arguments based upon general facts, to show how “boring from within” could make progress—I shall be able to withdraw from this debate, when it ends, satisfied that the cause of the S.T. & L.A. is the correct one. I have heard to-night identically what I have been hearing for the last four years. They first start with calumny upon calumny; one fellow invents it and the others recklessly repeat it. We mention the facts from their own journals; they shut their eyes to that. As to argument—they are remarkably silent.

The gentleman referred to a split in the S.T. & L.A. and I looked surprised; and he was surprised at my surprise. [Laughter.] I did not imagine that he would put his foot into that hole. Yes, there was a “split.” The Central Labor Federation, which he has quoted here like a sweet morsel, had a souvenir. In that souvenir it printed advertisements of the capitalist parties during a campaign—very much like the other papers, or some of them in New York, of the “borers from within.” Thereupon a noise was made against the man, Bohm,

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

who, as secretary of the Federation, had charge of the souvenir, and was also general secretary of the S.T. & L.A. To go into these facts is almost painful, for the reason that it is time spent in stating things that everybody should know by this time. The General Executive Board of the S.T. & L.A. held up Bohm. His excuse was that he knew nothing about it, that his partner did it—which was possible; an honest man may be deceived by a wicked partner. We waited and said to him: “If, indeed, your partner cheated you, then you must separate from your partner p. d. q.” We waited and waited, waited and waited. Then the Convention of the Alliance met, and I rose during that convention and asked him: “Are you still in partnership with that man?” At that convention, “borers from within” to-day, one man from Chicago, rose and objected to the question and Bohm refused to answer. Thereupon I voted “No” to his re-election as Secretary of the Alliance, he, together with his Central Labor Federation that backed him, having been branded there as really guilty of the crime of putting capitalist political advertisements in a labor publication; just as soon as he was branded, the *Volkszeitung* took him up with open arms, and the Central Labor Federation which they denounced before, suddenly became a pure thing that was “boring from within” to their heart’s content. The Alliance fired this Federation pack. That was the “split.” It was the split that takes place when you grab a rascal, and kick him out of the house. Of course, the rascal falls in with the other rascals where he belongs. [Great applause, hisses.]

I wish to dispose of another point. It is this: The claim that it was a great mistake on our part to start educating when we did and should have waited till we

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

were “strong in the Unions.” Of course, there is one thing that he omitted to state in his course of misrepresenting my argument. He omitted to state that we should “not have started in with insisting that the men should vote for the S.L.P.” That was not our line of work. What we wanted was to redeem them from capitalist influence on the economic field, so that they could have something right away. We should have waited till we were strong; that is, a man should wait till he can swim before he goes into the water. [Laughter.] Wait till all the men are converted to Socialism, then start to educate them!! [Laughter.] We went into those Unions and when the labor fakir came there with capitalist propositions, we rose and tried to teach the rank and file. The rank and file—not through dishonesty, indeed not—the rank and file could not take our views; didn’t dare to take our views, because in most of these Unions there is a system of blackmail and browbeating that the labor leaders exercise upon the men. For the sake of keeping their jobs, for the sake of not losing their sick and death benefit advantages, the men caved in; and when the labor fakir gave the signal, those men voted as the labor fakir dictated. Finally, when we were driving the labor fakir to the corner, the split came. The conscientious borers from within then landed on the outside, and have continued to bore from the outside, with the assistance of which alone can simultaneous boring from within be effective. On the other hand, those who say there, “preserving the full sympathy of these Unions,” what have they got to congratulate themselves with, except candy sticks, resolutions that mean nothing, resolutions for “collective ownership,” resolutions this way and that way?—while in the meantime, every practical attempt

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

on the part of the rank and file to improve itself continues to be run into the ground, the men divided among themselves, according as the capitalist interests of their various employers may dictate. [Great applause, hisses.]

Here the gavel fell.

Mr. HARRIMAN then spoke for thirty minutes, as follows:

Mr. HARRIMAN. I am surprised to hear the gentleman speak so frequently of being abused, so much of calumny, when he first takes up the Unions one after the other and says that the men active in those Unions are all in the pay of the capitalist class or under the influence of the capitalists. What is that but calumny? When he referred to the statements that I made on Cigarmakers' Union—and you will observe that he carefully steered clear of that Cigarmakers' Union case excepting he said the whole thing is false, the whole thing is a lie—then he said, referring to us, as giving ourselves as prostitutes to the capitalist class, in order to rivet their influence upon the Trade Union movement, and yet he is a man that doesn't believe in calumny. [Laughter.] What a clean, white tongue he has. I will try my hand a little. Let me show you. I will read to you here. I will not call him a liar. No, I will read to you something else and will let the facts talk a little.

Mr. Davis alleged that it was the purpose of the Union to raise the wages, that he was compelled to lower the price and that those that remained with him were willing to work for the lower price, and Mr. De Leon said in the paper of March 11, which I have here, that they

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

had a contract for two years—by the agreement there made, which holds for two years, the shop is to be an Alliance shop. Now Davis alleges in his affidavit for an injunction—which I have here, which Mr. De Leon says is false, and I will read a little to you—he says that the men working there willing to work for less and willing to work for lower wages, and that he paid an enormous sum for new workingmen, and asked that an injunction be granted against the Trade Unions, because they were keeping the men from coming to work, and the men belonging to the S.T. & L.A. said they were being kept away, interfered with as they came to work, and Mr. De Leon says he had a contract for two years. [Turning towards De Leon.] How much did you get for the job? [Great applause, yells, storm of hisses, a thrill of indignation goes through the audience.]

Mr. HARRIMAN (aside). I mean that.

I would not have called Mr. De Leon a liar had he not called me one first. This is only a fire at him from his own guns.

He first says, How will they dare stay on the floor of the Union if they are radical? How will they dare join the S.T. & L.A.? It is the same argument.

He says, We do not want to go in the water until we learn to swim. That is, he suggests that it is my statement. What I told them was to wait while they are in the water and they should have stayed there till they learned how to swim. [Laughter.]

He proposes to rivet upon the capitalist class—he said upon the working class—the influence of the capitalist class. When he finds Trade Unions in New York that will not listen to Socialism because they scab upon the Unions, will those Unions not give their support to the

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

very men who oppose Socialism, so long as the men themselves, the membership, do not understand Socialism? If you fight the Union, you do the very thing that rivets the matter, that rivets the power of the dishonest man upon the Union, because he gains his power by reason of their not understanding the Socialist philosophy. You must make them understand, or you will never make any headway, and because I say that, he speaks of a few little Unions. Then I brought this affidavit, which he says is a lie. I will refer to this Union. He says that I refer to a few little Unions that have no membership. I spoke of the Amalgamated Engineers. He says they are weak. I have here their journal; it comes monthly; and here it shows 82,000 members, and here is their official report [holding up a paper], showing \$1,500,000 in the treasury. He cannot deny it. Here are the facts. He may say it is a false statement of facts, but every year, and sometimes semi-annually, if there is a weak Union and there is a strong Union which has more than its pro rata, they have that money adjusted; they have an equalization method, and they put so much money in the treasuries, not in this country, but all over the world,<sup>7</sup> so that every Union has an equal amount per

---

<sup>7</sup> This passage: "they put so much money in the treasuries, not in this country, but all over the world," makes it certain that what Mr. Harriman has in mind is the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and that he has been all along quoting that organization in refutation of what Mr. De Leon said when he repeatedly touched upon the machinists. This blunder on the part of Mr. Harriman convicts him twice over of ignorance on his subject: ignorance on Trade Unions, and still more serious ignorance on the queer relations that exist among them. The elucidation of these two points will help to disentangle the tangle, into which Mr. Harriman's confusion of two distinct and rival pure and simple organizations must have thrown the reader's mind.

Mr. De Leon spoke of the present events among the machinists,

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

capita in its treasury at practically all times, and that equalization prevents a fraudulent statement of facts concerning their finances, for if they said more, then the Unions would draw upon them. I say to you that the accusations against those things, the methods of the Unions, is overdrawn.

---

together with their alleged victory of shorter hours. All this concerns, not the Amalgamate Society of Engineers, which has organizations all over the world, but the International Association of Machinists alone, called, for short, "International Machinists," which has no organizations all over the world; and the fact appears all the clearer from his referring to "the O'Connells and the Warners,"—O'Connell being the president and Warner another notorious officer of the International Machinists. So uninformed is Mr. Harriman on the technique of the Trade Unions, that neither the mentioning of the present machinists' troubles, nor the mentioning of two of their leading officers conveyed any information to him, and he went off at a tangent, talking of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, with only 1,700 members in this country, and getting, besides, all tangled up on that name also.

But, above all, is this confusion of the International Association of Machinists with the Amalgamated Society of Engineers significant in another and still more important aspect.

It so happens that these two organizations, both run by Organized Scabbery, are in each other's hair, taking each other's jobs and bandying the epithet "scab." It also happens that part of the purpose of the present conduct of the Organized Scabbery that rules the International Association of Machinists, is to strand the Amalgamated Society of Engineers in this country. Accordingly, when at the Arlington Hall, New York, mass meeting of November 15—called by the International Association to pull the wool over the eyes of the machinists by making them believe they had won a victory—members of the Alliance machinists demanded to be heard, and were howled at by the "borers from within," Mr. Isaac Cowen, the agent of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers in America, did all he could to secure them a hearing! This Cowen, who had come for reconnoitering purposes, knowing what the meeting portended to his own organization, did not dare to open his mouth and nail the Organized Scabbery of the International Machinists; but seeing the brave Alliance men, he, otherwise one of their traducers, picked up courage.

Mr. Harriman's ignorance of his subject matter, and reckless readiness to handle it, thus help to suggest fresh arguments against his clients.

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

Now, let me look at this. The purposes, furthermore, he speaks of the Union. We will start with the Cigarmakers' Union. He says everything I said was a lie, mark you, concerning this Cigarmakers' Union proposition. I told you that the Union could not declare a strike, unless—they could not avoid declaring a strike on occasions when the scale of wages was lowered, unless they got permission of the entire Union. If the wages went down, they must declare a strike, unless directed to the contrary by the union. Here is the constitution—and he denies it.

Should any local union desire to reduce its bill of prices wherein seventy-five or more members are involved, the officers of the union or unions shall submit a statement of the facts to the international president, giving the reasons why the bill should be reduced, which application and reasons shall be submitted by the international president to a vote of all the local unions.

Now it says:

But no strike for an increase of wages—

That is to say, no call—

shall be considered legal unless approved by a two-thirds majority of all the votes cast.

It is a lie, is it? Who has lied? [Turning to De Leon.] Take your own medicine. [Snickers from the Kangaroos.]

Here is another proposition. He says you cannot get upon the floor of the Unions and argue the case, because you would be dismissed. Here is a resolution of the Central Federated body which he is opposed to, because they left him and would not endorse his tactics, and

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

their proposition is this: They resolve in favor of the collective ownership by the people of all the means of production and distribution, of all the means of communication and transportation; that one-half and hour—or one hour and a half—be devoted to discuss economic, social and political questions the first meeting of each month in their central body. Here is your Union, here are the constitution and by-laws. Could give you dozens of them, if we only had time this evening to go through them all.

He says we had 50,000 parading with us, and still had a small vote, yet, with all the advantage the gentleman has had in the State of New York, holding the old name and all the agitation, yet we have cast as many votes as the Socialist Labor Party; they have come with us in a large part, and they were all honest a few years ago, are they all dishonest now? [Laughter.]

Let us go a little further. Let us take up this matter, the purposes of the Union. No. One. I will run through these so you will see that it was alleged by Mr. Davis himself. Davis says—here is the application for injunction [holds up paper]—that

the general purpose of the unincorporated association hereinbefore named—

The International Cigarmakers' Union—

are to advance the interest of their members, to reduce and keep down the number of hours per day they would be required to work, to enhance the price of wages, and to compel their employers to employ in their business only members of said association.

That is a wonderful change to make against a Trade

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

Union, isn't it?<sup>8</sup> Now let us go on and examine this matter as we go through, a little further.

On the first day of February, 1900, and for some time prior thereto, the plaintiffs, in the prosecution of such business, had in their employ about 125 cigarmakers and 20 packers, of nationalities other than Spanish or Cuban; about 25 cigarmakers of the Spanish or Cuban nationality, and about 25 strippers of all nationalities.

That makes over 200, you see.

Cigarmakers of Spanish or Cuban nationality constituted what plaintiffs termed their "Spanish" shop.

There was also a German shop, and they both came out. Only about twenty-five or thirty went back.

---

<sup>8</sup> Mr. Harriman could have thrown valuable light upon how the Organized Scabbery of the International Union interprets this clause of its own constitution, had he read, from among the rolls of affidavits that he flourished in his hand, the following passages from the affidavits with which two officers of the International Union opposed Davis's affidavit for an injunction.

Nathan Rosenstein, president of the Joint Advisory Board of the Union, closes his affidavit with this passage:

"Personally I have been on the best of terms with the plaintiffs and their representatives, frequently JOKING AND TWITTING EACH OTHER IN A GOOD-NATURED WAY ABOUT INCIDENTS OF THE STRIKE. Plaintiffs' superintendent, Levey, has several times during the strike taken dinner at my house and once the plaintiff, Frederick J. Davis, twitted me with not asking him too. I did so, and he came over and took dinner with me."

Albert Maroucek, secretary of the Joint Advisory Board, says in the course of his affidavit:

"I have no ill-will toward the plaintiffs and no desire to injure their business. On the contrary, I earnestly desire that their factory should be opened, and should be run to its full capacity at a profit to them, which would be the case if they would keep their written agreement with their employees, which is a most advantageous one for the plaintiffs, for the prices fixed thereby ARE BELOW THE ESTABLISHED UNION RATES WHICH PREVAIL IN OTHER FACTORIES."

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

On or about January 1, 1900, the people took stock and ascertained the condition of their business, and found that it was impossible to continue upon the basis of the prices fixed in the October agreement;—

Mark you that—made an *agreement with the Union*<sup>9</sup> in October. They broke the contract, they were in the act of breaking the contract when these men began to scab. When the S.T. & L.A. went in and organized that shop, they had broken the agreement of October, and it is in

---

<sup>9</sup> In order to make out that the Alliance “scabbed” it at Davis’s on the International Union, it was necessary for Mr. Harriman to refute the statement of Mr. De Leon that Davis’s was an “open” shop. It was necessary for Mr. Harriman to make out that Davis’s was an International Union shop, with an agreement or contract between Davis and the International Union, thus clothing the International Union with rights and duties there. Mr. Harriman undertakes that job, and how? He reads in a garbled way passages from Davis’s affidavit on the subject of an agreement, which Davis had entered into; and when Mr. Harriman reaches that point he says: “Mark you that—AN AGREEMENT WITH THE UNION.” Not a word, either read from or interpolated into the affidavit, shows that the agreement was with the International Union. Now, then, that agreement was made by Davis expressly with his workmen individually, and it expressly excludes all union intervention, International or otherwise. Here is a passage of that agreement pointedly saying so:

“That if one or more of our employees are being at any time coerced by others, in order to cause them against their own free will and judgement to join any one or certain labor unions, we shall consider that act as against our interests and not in accordance with the promise or understanding come to with the said our work people, and as a consequence the aforementioned list of prices shall thereupon cease to exist and be made null and void.”

Most significant, in this connection, is the fact that the said agreement forms part of the affidavit made by Rosenstein, the president of the Joint Advisory Board of the International Union, in opposing Davis’s affidavits applying for an injunction, and that the said Rosenstein affidavit was part of the rolls of paper from which Mr. Harriman was reading. All the affidavits are on file in the office of the county clerk.

In this passage the three-card monte game of Mr. Harriman reached its acme.

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

the affidavit. Here are the court papers—broken the agreement—

that thereupon the plaintiffs appealed to their said employees and informed them that it was impossible for them to continue in business upon the basis of the scale of wages fixed in said October, 1899, agreement, and informed them that the plaintiffs would be compelled to adopt the scale of wages in force prior to the strike of October, 1899;—

Said that they had to lower them, that was their own statement for it, the statement of Davis. All right—

that thereafter and on February 12, 1900, the employees of the plaintiffs employed in their said Spanish shop, although they had no cause for complaint as to the wages paid them, were induced or coerced by—

Hem—hem—

the International Union—

Hem—

to leave the employ of the plaintiffs.

Why? Let me look just a moment. Suppose that of the five or six cigar-making shops in this city, suppose a majority belonged to the S.T. & L.A. or to the Trade Unions, and one shop undertook to lower the wages, that shop would not be permitted to determine that, because the lowering of the wages interests the craft, and the craft handles it, and for that reason they made their application to the Union and were permitted to strike. Let us go on a little further here.

On or about Saturday, January 27, 1900, some of the cigarmakers belonging to the department known as our

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

German shop stated to my brother and myself that they heard—

Hem, hem—and—hem [applause]—

that they heard—

Hem—

they heard that an application for a strike in our factory had been filed with the Cigarmakers' International Union, and that our cigarmakers intended holding a meeting that day to consider the question whether they would strike or not.

Now, you see, the application is here, they would have to first ask for an application before they are permitted to reduce wages, and the application came, and the order to strike was made not by the committee, but by the International Union, and those men were compelled to order the strike.

I made no objection to the men attending the meeting—

What meeting? Now, mark you, in Mr. De Leon's paper, which he says is a man of straw, because, he says I stand up something to knock down. Why did I do this? Why did I take this stand and show the tactics of the S.T. & L.A. against Trade Unionism? Because he didn't, and that is the question, and not whatever he might desire to spring. [Applause.] I am not going to Paris to debate about America. We have any number of national questions. I am discussing the question of the tactics of the S.T. & L.A. against Trade Unionism and who is acting as an obstacle to the working class.—

the meeting—I made no objection to the men's attending the meeting,—

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

says Mr. Davis—

and learned subsequently that evening that the meeting had been held, and that the cigarmakers had decided not to strike.

That was before, mark you, that the men called the strike. This was the work of the shop, and in this shop where they voted, it was a shop meeting, not a union meeting, a meeting where detectives were placed in order to tell Mr. Davis who had voted for the strike and then he would discharge them, and then go on with his business opposed to the rules of the International Cigarmakers' Union. Let us see the evidence of that. It follows in the next page like this:

When our hands told me that the second meeting had been called, I requested them, and urged them, although some of them expressed themselves as unwilling to do so, to attend the meeting and vote freely upon the questions to be placed before them. I knew from statements that had been made to me by many of my employees, that they were satisfied to stand by the vote of the Saturday previous.

Hem, hem.

The workmen reported to me that they had been prevented from voting.

What did I tell you? Certainly; because it was not a shop proposition, and the application had ordered a strike and it was at this meeting that the men were prevented, and not the former meeting. He cannot deny that fact, here is the statement of it in the affidavit. Let us go further. It is getting a little interesting along here.

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

As to the manner in which the pending strike took place in my shop, I state that the Cigarmakers' International Union, as represented by the defendants, inaugurated said strike in such a manner as to cause my said firm great and unnecessary loss. In our business of cigarmaking, the wrappers of the cigars are cased each day for the next day's work, that is to say, that those wrappers are dipped in water, and because of this these wrappers will only keep for a few days.

Then he goes on and tells how many there were—long affidavit—and then states that the strike was brought on in order to damage them and keep a large number of workingmen out. Now I have shown that over two hundred struck, and he claims that they damaged the wrappers, and he made that one of the reasons why—and other damage—that the affidavit was made, for, as he says, they remained out and injured them to a large extent and to a large sum.

I will go a little further with this and see if we can't find something else. Let me see. Here is one of the most interesting of the points.

I was present at the next meeting of the hands—

The next meeting—

held the following Tuesday, and by orders of the committee representing the International Union we were ordered to strike against our will.

These are some of the men who went back, mark you.

I state that I have noticed men standing on the block in front of the factory premises all day, and for every day since the strike was ordered, and these men, the pickets, are still there. They interfere with us going to and from work, and we join in the request to the court that they be removed and prevented from interfering with us.

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

To that is appended a list of names, and in that list of names are S.T. & L.A. men. One of them is Mr. Mayers, who organized—and was the organizer, I believe, or an officer in—the Union, at least an active man in the Union. Among them were two, four, six, seven men who belonged to the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance.

VOICE FROM LEFT-HAND BOX. Read their names. [Harriman ignores the request and the voice repeats the question several times. Chairman threatens to have the individual put out. Finally Harriman continues.]

Mr. HARRIMAN. They have asked me to read the names. They are: Rappaport, Mayers, Ashkenazy, Liebholtz, Rappaport again, Rosenthal, Singer. Now, he may deny that these are S.T. & L.A. men—I do not know whether they are or not—but whether he does or not, he acknowledges that on the first of these days which I have read to you, he said in his paper here that the men returned to work. I have shown you that they didn't return to work. He says he didn't say it this evening. Ah, but he said it in his tactics against the Union. The Alliance took and organized the shop from top to bottom, and then he says a contract was made for two years; and this very day Mr. Davis is asking the Cigarmakers' Union, which, he says, is desired to go back to work and take their places; I have here a letter to the Cigarmakers' Union over his own signature saying:

We should like to have our old hands return to work, and are ready and willing to give all that may apply of such hands, either singly or in a body, employment. [Applause.]

There is his letter, written to the Cigarmakers' Union, showing that the Cigarmakers' Union was not crushed, even though these S.T. & L.A. men did, under the

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

guidance of some men in New York, walk in and take the places of the Union men who had been crowded out because their wages had been lowered, and because a capitalist institution had endeavored to break the contract that they had made a few months before. Why do I dwell upon this? Because Mr. De Leon said that everything I said concerning it was a lie. These statements that I have read from their affidavit are affidavits made by Mr. Davis with whom his own men joined in affidavits, in request to get an injunction against the Trade Union. And this is their theory in action! Their action is to crush the Trade Unions.

Now, the gentleman says that I referred to a few small Unions. Why? I took Teche's Union, his own Union, that they speak of in their paper. But the Amalgamated Engineers, why did I refer to them? Because it shows that even though you crush a Union, whether the capitalist class crushes it, or whether by your tactics you are able temporarily to cheat them out of a victory, by partly organizing it, the conditions will reproduce that Union. The conditions will reproduce that Union, and you will never be able to make any headway unless you espouse the cause of the Union, work in among them, gain their confidence, there to teach to them the power they have in the ballot, instead of first creating of them enemies and causing the rank and file to refuse to hear your doctrines concerning the philosophy of Socialism.

Now, before I close, when the gentleman tells you that he has proven so and so and so and so, you may remember whether he has proven so and so or not, and when he tells you that I have admitted this and have admitted that, you may know that I have not admitted

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

anything at all; not at all; that I make my own admissions; that when he tells you of some preacher oratory, you may tell him in your minds that has nothing to do with the issue. When he tells you about France, when he tells you of Millerand and other statements concerning a multitude of Unions we have no time to discuss here, ask him to discuss these papers for an injunction and why they went into the shop. [Applause.]

Remember that I admit nothing; remember that we must work with the working class and that we can only work with them by going into their battles, that we can only gain their confidence by espousing their cause, that we can only relieve the grip of those who are dishonest by educating the rank and file as to the problems of Socialism, and the measures to gain their end. I grant you, sir, that you will never learn to swim as long as you stay out of the water. [Laughter and applause.] And he confesses that he means to smash the Unions, hundreds of thousands of them, with a little bit of an Alliance. Now look. Is it best to smash the Trade Unions, and then go and gather up all the pieces when they are mad, and then convince them of Socialism, and then get them into the S.T. & L.A.? How much more could you go among them without making them mad, espouse their cause, convince them of Socialism, don't have to gather up the pieces, and cause them to take action along independent political lines. Have not the labor fakirs that he speaks of, if they are there—and some of them are there, just as they are in all organizations—wherever power concentrates, there corruption develops to a certain extent—get out of the Union, do you not give these men a new lease of life? Go in and educate your men, do you

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

not undermine those who are dishonest? It was different in our policy. That is what has divided us; that is what is dividing these men here to-night; that is what leaves him on one side and us on the other.

I call no names: we will let the facts do the talking; and ask the question why do you fight the Trade Unions except to smash them, and what are you to gain by smashing them, when you must get the men that are now in the Unions to get into Socialism before you can possibly inaugurate the Co-operative Commonwealth? You have got to get those very men. You are now fighting their organizations. If you can convince them at one time, you can convince them in their Union. I say the policy of the Social Democratic Party, as opposed to the policy of the S.L.P., is to go into the Trade Unions, work with them, and, mark you, add to the strike and the boycott independent political action; and I have shown to you that it is possible to do both by arguments taken from their own discussion, and by the constitutions of Trade Unions that I have pointed out to you. [Applause.]

Here the gravel fell.

Mr. De Leon then spoke for ten minutes, as follows:

Mr. DE LEON. Mr. Harriman asked why did he take up this cigarmakers' case. He took up the case of the cigarmakers for the simple reason that he has wanted to turn this debate, which is upon a question of principle, into a concrete case, coming here with "affidavits." He has taken up that case, because he has pursued the policy of trying to falsify a principle by taking up one concrete case, and since his principle is untenable, he

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

must hang on to that concrete case all he can. In trying to do that, even his concrete case, being false, breaks in his hands, as any man who has followed him closely must have observed. [Hisses.] He claimed that I pronounced false all that he said in connection with Davis's shop. I did not. All that was material I pronounced false or a fraud upon you. The duplicity of his argument can't have escaped you.

He said in one place when he first spoke, that the affidavit of Davis was backed up by Alliance men; after he read the names, he contradicted himself and said, "I do not know whether these are Alliance men or not;" and later again he repeated the false statement that Davis's affidavit was backed by Alliance men. He contradicted himself three times.

The whole point turns on this: The Davis shop was AN OPEN SHOP, (that affidavit shows nothing to the contrary). There can be contracts with men who are not members of a Union. The Davis shop was an open shop, that open shop was called out by two representatives of the International Union, and those of you who understand this point will comprehend that the whole argument which has been built upon the false insinuation that the shop was an International Union shop falls. As the shop was a non-union shop, or an open shop, the International Union had no control. It tried to get control by calling the shop out, and may or may not have applied for a strike allowance, for a strike permit, a strike license—I forget now what they call it. But you perceive the quibble. My opponent tried to make out, from the fact that a strike permit had been applied for at the International headquarters, that therefore the Davis shop was a Union shop. This is fraudulent reasoning

intended to deceive you.

That one thing, that many of them went out, notwithstanding they decided not to strike, is one of the misfortunes of the situation; the moment the Organized Scabbery says the work “scab,” every coward trembles in his boots. All that was read from this affidavit can only have the object to mix you up. The position is simply this: There was no Union organization there. It was not controlled by the International Union, and that was the claim he made all along, the point that he dishonestly tried to insinuate in your minds, and without which he has no case, even this Davis side-issue, with which he has tried to cover his rout on the real issue, the question of principles.

He has quoted the constitution of the International Union. What of it? That’s only some more dust. The Union constitution says all that; but all that applies only in case the shop is a Union shop. Davis’s shop was not a Union shop, so that all that argument falls again.

All such quotations have but one purpose, the dishonest one of twisting an argument awry, and running away from the question of the evening. The dishonesty is all the more glaring by the attempts to back it up by what we are told is an affidavit. What matters it what Davis, a capitalist, swore to in order to secure an injunction? I’m not surprised my opponent falls back on such “documents.” He is one of a crew, thirty-six of whom, in a vain attempt to steal the name of the Socialist Labor Party, SWORE to the truthfulness of an affidavit that was not in existence. [Hisses.] I should not have to insist upon the point, unless you are fools, which you do not look to be.

I charged him with having quoted little Unions,

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

whereupon he quotes the big “International Machinists” in rebuttal, and says what a big Union that is. You know very well that I said upon that subject that he quoted the little Union of Teche as an argument within our ranks, why our members should remain officers of pure and simple Unions. On the contrary, just the reverse of what he falsely said, I said that the Unions that I quoted were the large Unions, I named him the International Union which he himself quoted, as one of the large organizations; but, as I say, such petty tricks and such duplicity I should not have to go into very extensively.

He said that the Central Federation—that’s what he called it—split off because it could no longer endorse my tactics. Correct. Our tactics are that a labor paper must not have capitalist political advertisements in it; their tactics are different. And since the *New Yorker Volkszeitung* itself has had during campaigns advertisements of capitalist politicians, consequently the tactics of the Federation agreed exactly with the tactics of those who would “bore from within” and they made common cause. [Applause and hisses.]

I was asked how much I got for the “Davis job.” I noticed that our chairman was shocked. [Hisses.] I will not refer to that any further than to say that when a person takes up an argument the way that my opponent did, and then fixes himself on a long affidavit that can not be debated, let alone verified, in a large crowd, a document that a person would have to take home with him to study—when a person tries that game [hisses] I believe I should be justified to ask—not of him, such persons I cannot stoop to address—I believe I should be justified to ask: How much did he get from the Organized Scabbery of the International Union to help

## DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE

deceive the workers? [Great applause, hisses; De Leon steps forward and, pointing to a corner from whence the hisses came, continues.] Hiss away. I have faced worse crowds of fakirs. You cannot deter me. It is not to this meeting alone I am speaking. I am addressing to-night millions of workers. This debate is being taken down stenographically, and will be published in full. [Great applause.]

Some of the statements and arguments which the gentleman made are characteristic, inasmuch as they betray his absolute ignorance of the Labor Movement. Apart from his not even knowing the names of the organizations that he mentioned, he made this argument. He said: "Why, go into these Unions, then you can speak to the workingmen." Which means that outside of the Unions there are no workingmen; it can mean that, or nothing. Now outside of the Unions stand the overwhelming majority of the workingmen; and they do not propose to go into these organization run by the Organized Scabbery, because they have burned their fingers there enough. [Great applause.] *The organization of the future has to be built up out of the men who are now unorganized, and that is the overwhelming majority of the workingmen in the nation.* Of course, that he doesn't know. [Snickers.]

He says we want to smash the Unions with a little bit of an Alliance. That is like what the heelers and the politicians have told me: "You want to smash the large Republican and Democratic parties with a little bit of a Socialist Labor Party." [Laughter and applause.]

Finally he boasts of their "political success." When he quotes the late political campaign, he puts his foot into it badly. In the Sixteenth Assembly District of New York,

## *DE LEON-HARRIMAN DEBATE*

himself with the rest of them went there and carried on a most virulent campaign upon this very line of Trade Unionism against us, and the result of it was that, despite the unparalleled backing that they had of the capitalist press, their candidate for the presidency polled just about 200 votes, while ours polled over 800, [applause], and their candidate for the Assembly fell even below 200 votes, while I, whom they have done the honor of imputing all the virtues of this movement to, and assailed proportionately, polled over 1,500 votes. That is an endorsement, emphatic, too, of the S.T. & L.A. policy. [Great applause.]

This closed the debate. It was 10:30 p. m., and the chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

[A certain amount of liberty the stenographer was compelled to take in transcribing Mr. Harriman's two speeches. As Mr. Harriman is an illiterate man, a faithful transcription of his sentences would have made them look full of typographical errors. His grammatical mistakes were, accordingly, eliminated.]

*Typography by Local Alliance No. 1, S.T. & L.A.*