EDITORIAL

AND NOW IT IS THE JUDGES.

By DANIEL DE LEON

TWO things have recently been repeatedly stated in these columns. One was that the large number of recent investigations—national, State and local—which have resulted in convicting our leading “Pillars of Society” of utter worthlessness is a symptom of the times, an evidence of the widespreadness of capitalist corruption, a precursor of social collapse. The other was that the “holier than thou” attitude, struck by the as yet uninvestigated capitalist concerns or officials, is a posture that these would have to abandon the moment the searchlight were to be turned upon them. The identical corruption, the identical worthlessness, revealed in the investigated ones, would be revealed in the ones not yet investigated. Was this slander! Now listen to Jerome.

At the dinner of the City Club, given on November 28th, Jerome, the District Attorney elect, said: “As a lawyer I have been brought up to venerate the judiciary, but with very few exceptions, I have not only no veneration for the Judges of the Supreme Court of this Department, but not even respect for them.” And Austen G. Fox, a lawyer of standing, confirmed these words by following them up with the statement: “There are but few Judges on the bench here to whom I would have applied for an order to re-open the ballot boxes and have a recount, although the path of the court in the matter is as plain as anything that has ever been written on the statute books of the country.”

Suppose as searching an investigation of the judiciary were instituted! Suppose their decisions were to be ransacked as are the books and doings of the McCurdys, the Armours and the Senators Mitchell! Would there be handkerchiefs enough in the country to keep the fetid smell from the nostrils of the Nation?

Government reflects the economic status of the governors. The economic status of our governors is capitalism, or, to incarnate that, McCurdyism, Schiffism,
Armourism. What the latter is, even the dullest has now an inkling of. What else can the former be but what William Travers Jerome has but partially and yet quite sufficiently disclosed?