EDITORIAL

TAFT=BERGER; BERGER=TAFT.

By DANIEL DE LEON

DEAF-AND-BLIND talking back to a blind-and-deaf”—such is the characterization that fits the Milwaukee Social Democratic partyman Victor L. Berger’s answer to Taft’s Jackson, Mich., wail about Socialism.

The blind Taft sees no fundamental difference between the issue that confronted the generation of Lincoln, and the issue that confronts his own generation, the flames of which issue he feels singeing his coat-tails; the blind Berger sees no fundamental difference between the remedy proposed by Henry Clay for solving the Slavery Question, by the Government’s buying the slaves, and his proposed remedy for solving the Social Question by the Government’s buying the Trusts.

The deaf Taft has not heard the first note of political economy to the effect that what Lower-Capital insurrects against in Top-Capitalism, is the very existence of Top-Capitalism, that in itself being considered the “abuse,” because it is that that renders the life of Lower-Capital a burden unto itself, hence, no “regulation” of abuse will satisfy; the deaf Berger has not heard the lesson of political economy which teaches that, where Money can buy, Money is an institution which confers certain powers upon its holder, hence, if the Trusts are bought, the Trust magnates become the holders of an institution that confers upon them the power to live without work, upon the work of others,—in other words, confers upon them Ruling Class powers, which, in turn, invest them with a new lease of usurpatory life, enabling them to prolong indefinitely an existence born of economic power of master over subject. The billions paid will answer the practical purpose of bonds upon the Nation.

The blind Taft sees Socialism in insurgentism; the blind Berger sees in a
Nation, Governmentally bonded over to a Plutocracy, Socialism.

The deaf Taft never heard the class-cry of protest from Lower-Capitalism, writhing under the affront of legislation, ostensible in behalf of Lower Capitalism, yet rendered futile, null, void and of no effect by the force of Top-Capital’s economic power; the deaf Berger never heard the class-cry of distress from the employes of the Trusts now run by the Political Government—the Post Office; the Army and Navy, with their horror-striking instances of desertion, risked at the risk of life itself; the municipal plants, run “cheaply” at the expense of the workers’ bone and marrow; the Navy Yards, operated by a Labor that is reduced to the status of menials, etc., etc. In other words, the deaf Berger never heard the thunder notes of the warning that Political Government Ownership intensifieth, destroyeth not, Class masterhood and Class subjection.

The blind Taft fails to see the lesson written on the scrolls of history that a great Historic Issue cannot be taffied off the stage; the mind’s-eye of the blind-as-a-bat Berger is impervious to the rays of the fact that, if a Henry Clay failed to conjure away, with the dodge of the purchase of the slaves, the great Historic Issue involved in the feudalism that lingered in Chattel Slavery, a Berger but howls in the Wilderness with his three-card-monte legerdemain of the Governments’ buying the Trusts as the solution of the great and culminating issue of all the Ages—the Abolition of Class Rule.

The deaf Taft cannot detect in the language he now holds the identical leit-motif of the language held by the Copperhead and the Bourbon Democrats of antebellum days—superstitious reverence for The Past; the deaf-as-a-post mind’s ear of Berger cannot catch in his Henry Clay phraseology the cadence of the vapidity of Henry-Clayic physical and mental weak-kneedness.

No wonder. The deaf-and-blind Taft, the blind-and-deaf Berger have one mental root in common—BOURGEOISDOM.