EDITORIAL

CAPITALISM A MONARCHY.

By DANIEL DE LEON

The opposition encountered by the plan to tack an inheritance tax to the Tariff Bill was quite enough from the start to draw attention, by the debate which it provoked, to the sociologic fact that the Capitalist Class has evolved into a monarchic class. Providentially the President has taken the lead in the opposition, and thereby brought the fact into all the stronger relief.

The heredity of royalty is not taxable. An individual might wade through slaughter into the possession of a throne. However the possession was come by, the right to transmit, and to transmit unabridged, was inherent in possession. There is only one recognized method to interfere with the right—it is revolution, either a revolution that goes to the very root of the weed, and pulls it out, and casts it aside, and sets up a republic instead; or a revolution that pulls up a particular weed and itself plants another, expecting that the newly planted weed will learn from experience and not grow too rank; or a still tamer revolution of keeping the offending weed, but circumscribing his powers for mischief. In any event a revolution it is. Royalty ever saw to it that the supreme power of hereditary transmission required nothing short of a revolution to trim it.

It is no figure of speech that Socialists indulge in when they claim that the modern capitalist is a monarch, the scepter to tyrannize having passed from royalty to Capital. The ownership of the necessaries whereby to earn a living is a power so obviously tyrannical that the parallel is exact. The opposition, to all plans whereby the right of unrestricted hereditary transmission of such power is to be affected, illuminates the parallel.

The illumination of the parallel, between the Monarch and the Capitalist Class in this particular, is of prime practical effect. It disposes of the tinkering of reform. The Monarch and the Capitalist Class being generically the same, it follows that,
seeing that only a revolution can ever bring redress with the former, no reform, but only revolution is applicable to the latter. Furthermore, seeing that it will take a revolution anyhow to meet the occasion, who would be so wasteful as to wield the sledge hammer of Revolution for a mere reform, instead of wielding it for final and all-time settlement of Class Rule?