EDITORIAL

TAFT'S ELECTION.

By DANIEL DE LEON

GIVEN the sad and backward condition of things, the working class, and, together with them, that middle class that is being ground to dust into the camp of the proletariat, stood before the alternative of Taft or Bryan. One or the other was bound to befall—in either case a calamity.

The election of Bryan would mean a temporary arrest of that rapid progress of the capitalist disease that is marked with the wholesale confiscations of the property of small holders through cleverly engineered crises, along with the intensification of the exploitation of the proletariat. The election of Bryan would arrest the development only temporarily. The law of capitalism, to which Bryan renders cult as well as Taft, would soon break through all his quack restraining schemes. In the meantime, though suffering might be eased for some, the body social would continue in the feverish condition of a patient whom the malady threatens with death through inability to develop.—A calamitous condition.

On the other hand, the election of Taft would mean an acceleration of the capitalist disease. As far as that goes, such a consummation is beneficial. It is big with the promise of a shortening of the agony, and the safe reaching of that critical point when capitalist breakdown would be ready to be supplanted by the Socialist Republic. Nevertheless, due to the existing state of things, the election of Taft would mean encouragement to the upper plutocrats of the capitalist class. Such encouragement, and the deeds that such encouragement warrant one to expect, may have as fatal an effect as the arresting of the progress of the disease that would follow the election of Bryan. The plutocracy of the land already is reckless in their conduct. The encouragement they would receive from Taft’s election would multiply their reckless disregard of even the forms of decency a thousand-fold. Already we have seen stupendous scandals accompanied with a brazenness that is appalling.
Taft’s election would be construed as a proof that the spring of the people’s energy to protest, however blindly, was broken. What a crew with 500 per cent. profit in sight, through the perpetration of the high-handed frauds that blindly entrusted power enable them to perpetrate, will dare do, history is full of, and social science is eloquent upon. Taft’s election would give encouragement to plutocratic malfeasance, with all that that implies.

Before this dire alternative the Nation has stood during the campaign that closed yesterday. Which was worse? It was a Hobson’s choice of calamity. The calamity reads “Taft.”

Whether such an ominous sign of the times will materialize in the full calamity that it portends, or whether the calamity will be conjured away, depends upon whether or not the phenomenon so often recorded in history will be repeated in our times—whether what has come to be known as the “Social Fragment” will rise in power, and speedily enough, and assume the reins of events.

The “Social Fragment” of our times is the SOCIALIST.