FIRST EDITORIAL

If Quay, Why Not Roosevelt?

By DANIEL DE LEON

The claim that is just now being put forth that Roosevelt, the Republican candidate for Governor in New York, is certain, whatever his short-comings in other respects, to make an incorruptible magistrate, and, therefore, to give the people of this State a pure government, because he is a wealthy man, reads oddly by the light of the exposures that are being made at this very time of Quay, the Republican United States Senator from Pennsylvania.

Quay is now under indictment for using State funds to speculate with. Even if no other act of corruption were laid at his door, that one will suffice. Is Quay a poor man? No; he is a rich man; richer than Roosevelt several times over. If the possession of wealth by Matthew Stanley Quay did not keep him from corrupt practices, and did not secure to the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a pure government, but just the reverse, by what process of reasoning can Roosevelt’s wealth be expected to guarantee purity?

Indeed, the theory that wealth is a guarantee of honesty is a heels-over-head theory; it is based upon a fallacy that the capitalist class knowingly cultivates, and that others take on trust. The fallacy is that large wealth is a reward of honesty. Now, the fact is just the reverse. Under the capitalist system, large wealth is unacquirable except by dishonesty. Large wealth represents to-day the some times high-handed, other times sneaky, always criminal fruit of capitalist confiscation. The large wealth in the possession of our “400” is made up of wealth produced by the working class, and stolen from it by the capitalist class under the system of legalized robbery, known as capitalism. It is the crystallized marrow, fibre and life-blood of the workers, sponged up from them by the idle class. Can such evidence of a corrupt soul in the past and present be anything but a guarantee of more corruption in the future?

But it is not only the source of the large wealth, found in the possession of the capitalist class, that points towards future corruption and not towards future purity. There is in the very mechanism of the capitalist system that which renders impurity
the dominant law with the capitalist class. Only recently we quoted three instances in a row in which bigger capitalist concerns—run by élites—has swindled smaller ones: the former had availed themselves of the machinery of capitalist society to plunder the latter. The identical economic law, that enables the capitalist to fleece the capital-less (the working class), underlies the whole capitalist systems, enabling the bigger holder to confiscate the property of his brother capitalist of smaller holdings. As a result of that, the capitalists—being such in various degrees—are themselves continually at one anothers’ throats; and, continually are plotting, planning, intriguing against one another. Dishonest practices in private life blossom forth from such ground as naturally and spontaneously as fungi on cesspools; translated into public life dishonesty re-appears as corrupt practices.

So it is with Quay, why should it be otherwise with Roosevelt, or with any other capitalist, Republican or Democrat?

The higher the plum-tree, the riper
the plum:
The richer the cobbler, the blacker
his thumb.