EDITORIAL

PROHIBITIONISM AS ENTERING-WEDGE.

By DANIEL DE LEON

HITHERTO Prohibitionism seemed good only to illustrate several correct Socialist principles of economics by means of the absurd economic principles that the Prohibition Movement advanced. Some recent events, culminating with the action of the Tennessee lower House in passing a drastic Prohibition bill over the Governor’s veto, have afforded Prohibitionism the opportunity to prove that it is good for some other purposes besides helping to demonstrate by contrast, the soundness of a number of Socialist economic tenets. Prohibitionism now steps forward in no less valuable a capacity than that of furnishing the “thin edge” to the wedge of Social Revolution advocated by Socialism.

The Tennessee incident has caused the “Liquor Interests” to assume the language of Capital. “Property is destroyed”; “disaster is inflicted upon business”; “millions of property are rendered valueless”; “old established houses are ruined”; etc.; etc.;—of course, to their owners. These are the complaints now made by the “Liquor Interests.” These are the identical charges that Capital prefers against Socialism. In sight of the language of the “Liquor Interests” Prohibition answers calmly, coolly, deliberately, unconcernedly, even in inspired strains: “We care not! Your property, your houses, your millions are used against the public interest. As such you are a nuisance and must go!” Well answered.

Prohibitionism thereby is mightily pushing forward a Socialist principle that Socialism has nailed to its masthead—“Life is more precious than property.”

Let the public ear only get accustomed to the theory now advanced by Prohibitionism, to wit, that all argument regarding the injury to “private property” that would result from a certain Movement is irrelevant, and that the real question is, “Does the said property work good or evil?”—let that principle be well advertised, and it will strike root, and with its root it will remove nine-tenths of the objection
that Socialism will disable the present holders of capital from utilizing their property.

It matters not how large “investments” may be. If they work injury to the commonwealth—away with them.

Prohibitionism is familiarizing the public ear with a sound revolutionary principle. Who would have thought it!
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