EDITORIAL

ANENT THE LEVY LAW.

By DANIEL DE LEON

THE election law, which was passed by this year’s Legislature at Albany, which received its name from its chief sponsor in the Legislature, the Tammanyite Aaron J. Levy, and two of the provisions of which have just been declared unconstitutional by the Court of Appeals, a body mainly Republican, is a fruit from the tree of contemporaneous events that merits contemplation.

While, what is left of the Levy Law, now that the Court of Appeals knocked out two of its underpinnings, is, in important respects, no less objectionable than what was knocked out, and will, no doubt, if found necessary, follow suit, the purpose of the law may be gathered from the two provisions which the Court of Appeals placed the stamp of reprobation upon.

Tammany Hall, sharing the dull perceptions of its fellow ruling class political organizations, Republican as well as Democratic, is in no fear of Socialism. What Tammany Hall is in dread fear of is the effervescence of radical bourgeois elements against its particular and peculiar brand of political domination. The effervescence of these elements manifests itself periodically throughout the State, this city especially, in independent political uprisings, which frequently affiliate in some sort or other of fusion with the Republican party, and, not infrequently have knocked Tammany sky-high. To Tammany Hall, “Fusion” is the bane of its life. The objective of the Levy Law was to legislate Fusion out of existence. Obviously the purpose is unattainable without doing violence to the right of suffrage. The Court of Appeals says as much in its decision. The Court would not have overdrawn the facts had it pronounced the Levy Law a Tammany burglarious attempt to throttle the suffrage in the interest of Tammany.

There is nothing new in this. Yet the Levy Law is a legislative sandbag with a novel feature.
In June of this year, in the XIIIth article of the series “Father-Gassonianiana,” the essence, in form and purpose, of political Roman Catholicism was exposed. Its purpose was shown to be the establishment of medieval paternal despotism by a process of digging out the brains of the masses: its form was proved to be a body, which, though ruled by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, was non-sectarian in its composition, being made up, not of devout Roman Catholics and of Roman Catholics by profession only, “but also of Jews, of Protestants of all the ‘57 varieties,’ and of atheists of Roman Catholic, Jewish and Protestant extraction.” Tammany Hall in this city was cited as “a type of the modern Roman Catholic political body.”

The “Levy Law,” besides illustrating the point, also reveals the novel feature of up-to-date political Roman Catholic methods—the cloven hoof of medieval despotism, openly exposed to view in the Dark Ages as Roman Catholic, is now concealed, or attempted to be concealed, with the cloak of a Jewish name; in the present instance, with such a pronounced Jewish name as “Aaron Levy.”

Samuel Gompers, a Jew ostentatious, serving as figurehead under the shadow of which Father Peter E Dietz’s Militia of Christ is smuggled into the Labor Movement; Henry M. Goldfogle of the 9th New York Congress District and Adolf J. Sabath of the 5th of Illinois, ostentatiously Jewish, serving in the 60th Congress as leading decoys to raid the Treasury of the United States out of about $500,000 in order to “indemnify the Archbishop of Manila”; Aaron J. Levy, used as a “fense” by Tammany Hall;—these, and the many more instances which these will serve to recall to mind, at once attest to the non-sectarianism of the modern Roman Catholic political party in the country, and to the novel feature of the shifts with which that party seeks to cover up its tracks.