EDITORIAL

CONGRESSIONAL TRIFLERS.

By DANIEL DE LEON

"B" OURGEOIS superficiality,” so often brought home to the capitalist class by Marx, is rapidly deserving the name of bourgeois triviality.

Here, for instance, we have a Federal Constitution, which presents the aspect of knee-pants and jacket made for a seven-year-old, ripped and torn in the endeavor to fit the more developed size of a lad, and yet the political representatives of the bourgeois in Congress assembled, Democrats and Republicans, agreeing to a constitutional amendment that looks, not even to patching of the out-grown garment, but is triviality personified.

That Congress should shut its eyes to the archaic institution of the two-chamber system of Legislature, and never think of proposing an amendment to abolish the Senate—that is legitimate enough. Two dykes offer greater security against floods than one. The capitalist political State being constructed upon the principle of dyke-like resisting popular movements, there would be greater danger of a popular flood breaking through the dyke of one chamber than through the dykes of two. It is legitimate to see the capitalist worship at the shrine of a Senate-and-House system.

Likewise, and for the same reason, is it legitimate for the capitalist to make no effort to abolish the anomaly presented by the date of a Congressional election, and the date of the newly elected Congress's meeting. As things are to-day, a House of Representatives, elected one November, does not meet until a year after the following first Monday in December. A popular, or opposition wave might, as has happened more than once, unseat at the November hustings four-fifths of the incumbents in the House and replace them with men pledged to opposite policies; and yet, not unless the President call a special session of Congress, the newly elected House can not meet until thirteen months after being elected. A casual
observer might call such a system clumsy, bizarre, even absurd. It is none of these. Such a system is eminently qualified for its special mission. It checks the on-run against “things as they are.” No reason why the bourgeois should want that changed. Every reason why he should want it perpetuated.

Similarly with more than one other feature of the Constitution. The bourgeois can not be called superficial when his pundits praise such “imperfections.”

Nevertheless a large number of imperfections, however much doted upon, are apt to blend into one, conveying a general idea of imperfection that even the bourgeois can not deny. Unable to deny, he must show a readiness to improve things. In the endeavor to escape the imputation of being a moss-back our bourgeois becomes a trifler. How much of a trifler may be judged from the conduct of Congress in deciding upon an amendment to the Constitution to change the date of inaugurating future Presidents from March 4, when blizzards may interfere with the pageant, to the last Thursday in April, when the pageant is not likely to be molested.

With the garb of the Nation calling through every rip for a new suit of clothes, at least for a patch to patch up the rip, Congress solemnly sets in motion the whole machinery of the amendment procedure to pin a rosette on the rags.
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