EDITORIAL

SHADOWS CAST AHEAD.

By DANIEL DE LEON

SIMULTANEOUS with the declaration made by the counsel of the Interborough-Metropolitan Company of New York City that the dissolution suit, instituted against it by a Chicago stockholder, “is absolutely without merit” on the ground that the Company is operated wholly within one State, came the demonstration at the Pennsylvania dinner, where the centralization of powers speech made by Secretary of State Elihu Root was coldly received, while the opposition speech by Justice John Hay Brown of Pennsylvania, interpreted as an extreme State’s Rights speech, was applauded to the echo by the assembled capitalist magnates. Closely on top of both occurrences came the feudal mummery, performed last Thursday at the “Archeiscopal palace” of Archbishop Farley in this city, where, to the tune of “State’s Rights,” given point to by the remark “Is not the time coming again when we may have to look about us and find whether we have men of heroic mold who will meet the question?”, an ex-Confederate officer was knighted a Knight Commander of the Papal Order of St. Gregory.

France, England and Spain are the three countries in which the feudal system ran most clearly through its course. In each of these countries the feudal lords “Knelt grubs and rose butterflies,” preliminarily to a period of acknowledged vassalage to the King or over-lord, the representative of centralized power. In each of the three countries a period supervened when the bloody conflict between lords and Crown resulted in the almost complete abasement of the latter. Finally, in each of the three the Crown triumphed in the end, and established its absolute supremacy, preparatorily to ultimate surrender to the bourgeois or capitalist class.

The capitalist class bear close resemblance with their feudal predecessors; the central Government with the feudal Crown. The Civil War, in a way, settled the issue. The capitalist “Crown” prevailed. Was the issue settled for good and all
preparatorily to the day when the capitalist “Crown” was, in turn, to surrender to the Working Class, and the Socialist Republic was to supplant the Capitalist State? Or do the signs of the times portend a repetition of the conflict, when the capitalist lords will again try conclusions with the capitalist “Crown”?

The posture of the element represented by Elihu Root, of that represented by the counsel of the Interborough-Metropolitan Company and of the assembled capitalist lords at the Pennsylvania dinner, besides the element represented by the performers in Archbishop Farley’s palace, portends quite clearly a near-at-hand clash, and also the nature thereof, between the capitalist interests of the land. Only good can come therefrom to the approaching Social Revolution.