

EDITORIAL

## TITUS IN THE “CONFIDENCE” ROLE.

By DANIEL DE LEON

**T**HE Caldwell, Ida., *Socialist* of the 20th instant has a signed article by Hermon F. Titus that is redolent of the rottenness that attaches—to Titus. It is said a straw breaks the camel’s back. This is an instance in which a hogshead of dirt, self-inflicted, should break the back of Titus and Titusism, and leave both buried too deep for resurrection.

The Titus article in question is entitled “Compromise in Idaho.” It affects to uncover a deep-laid plot to cause the Socialist party candidate for Judge in the Seventh Judicial District of Idaho—the District in which Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone are to be tried—to withdraw from the contest, and thereby afford a chance of election to the Democratic nominee, a supposed friend, against his Republican adversary, a noted foe of the wrongly imprisoned men. Titus steps forward before the foot-lights, throws upon himself a dozen bouquets as a man of



HERMON F. TITUS  
(1852–19??)

such sturdy integrity, abnegation and devotion to principle that, rather than yield to the principle of “No Compromise! No Political Trading!” he will tell “the truth,” whatever the consequences to Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, or to the other members of his party—all of whom, Socialist candidate, the notorious David C. Coates in the Northern part of the State included, he implicates in the conspiracy against “Principle.”

Titus argues that if the plan to cause Wilkie, the Socialist party candidate, to withdraw in favor of Bryan, the Democratic candidate, goes through, then, if the latter “were elected by combined Democratic, Socialist and disgruntled Republican votes,” the very fact “would disqualify him from ever trying the case” of Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone. The insincerity of this argument is demonstrated by Titus himself when he lets out of the bag the cat that he himself was intriguing with the

Democratic party for it to withdraw its judicial nominee in favor of the candidate of the Socialist party! If, the Socialist party candidate Wilkie being withdrawn, the election of the Democrat Bryan "by combined Democratic, Socialist and disgruntled Republican votes" would be a hollow victory, and "disqualify Bryan from ever trying the case," in what manner, the Democratic candidate Bryan being withdrawn, would the election of Wilkie by the identical "combined Democratic, Socialist and disgruntled Republican votes" constitute a solid victory, and enable Wilkie to try the case? If to deal and dicker with the Socialist party to withdraw its candidate in favor of the candidate of a capitalist party is to "compromise, trade and fuse," as indeed it is, by what process of reasoning can the charge be escaped that to deal and dicker with a capitalist party to withdraw its candidate in favor of the candidate of the Socialist party is not likewise to "compromise, trade and fuse"? If Mr. Titus had a hand in the one pie, as he admits he had, WHY does that political purist suddenly indignante at those who have a hand in the other pie?

The answer is obvious. That is happening to Titus that ever happens to such folks—their own corruption forces them to blab. The Titus revelations are probably true in essentials. They tally too well with the conduct of the Socialist party machine everywhere else in the land to be false. The party of the Morris Eichmanns in New Jersey, of the scores of Eichmanns in Massachusetts and elsewhere; the party that, in this very campaign in this State, has its Ninth Congress District candidate Hillquit toasted and boosted by such avowed Hearstites as Edward H. Markham; the party machine that in Idaho itself, and this very year, turned down the workingman Vincent St. John as candidate for Governor, and set up instead a gentleman more satisfactory, being less radical, to the middle class element at the throttle;—such a party machine is too notoriously a nest of corrupt politicians not to indulge in political dickers of the Titus revelations. But be the Titus revelations true or false, the one person they positively convict, being convicted out of his own mouth, is himself. The one thought they suggest is that of a disappointed corruptionist, peaching upon others of his party whose superior "cleverness" has left, or threatens to leave him, out in the cold.

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

Uploaded May 2009

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