EDITORIAL

NAGGERS SQUELCHED.

By DANIEL DE LEON

Sir Thomas Lipton is expending $15,000 a month on the crews he needs for his oncoming race to lift the America’s cup; and all together he has spent $1,000,000 in wages. The picture of these crews is published on the front pages of the yellow journals. It is not impossible that the identical picture has done duty before in some other capacity. But let us give these journals credit for their truthfulness, for once. Say the picture is authentic. The 135 tars there photographed are a healthy looking lot of workingmen, well fed, well clad and spirited. And yet there are people on both sides of the Ocean who malign Sir Thomas as a grinder of the faces of the poor!

Let’s all be fair, though the heavens fall. True it is that Sir Thomas’ female employees in his shops and factories in England receive wages that can not keep body and soul together in decency. True it is that these girls have prayed, and were squelched for their pains. Likewise is it true that the surplus wealth thus extorted from these working people goes to raise and feed the enormous wealth of Sir Thomas, said to amount to an income of $7.50 a minute. He who demands fairness in behalf of his own views must start with showing fairness towards the views of others. Demanding fairness in behalf of Sir Thomas, we must, accordingly, set the example of fairness ourselves in behalf of the opinions of those who hold Sir Thomas to be a raw-boned capitalist brigand. It is true that in his shops he fleeces his wealth producers. Admitted.

But is a man’s life to be judged by one single act? Are not all his other acts to be taken together? Has, of a sudden, the proverb, “A fair exchange is no robbery” lost its time-honored weight? Surely not. The fleecing of the shop girls by Sir Thomas must be considered jointly with his bounteousness towards his yachting employees. These receive over $110 a month, with traveling expenses and incidental sight-seeings thrown in, and not discounted.

A goodly chunk of what Sir Thomas takes from one set of employees, he bestows
upon another. He may be robbing Peter, grant that; but he does so only to pay Paul. And is Paul, perchance, less of an Apostle than Peter? Who would be so dastardly as to introduce distinctions in the ranks of the working class? Long live Sir Thomas; Liptonism forever, and perish the nagging faultfinder!

In the mirror here set up, let those see their own features who may; and let them correspondingly howl.