EDITORIAL

SUPERFLUOUS WORDS.

By DANIEL DE LEON

THE platform of the Roosevelt party has a plank for publicity upon “scales of wages”; also for publicity upon “accidents and disease arising from employment”; also for the enactment of “workingmen’s compensation laws”; also for “fixing the minimum pay in the various industries”; also for “workingmen’s old age pensions.”

The plank numbers 200 words and more—193 words and more too many.

Why beat the devil around the stump with “provisions for a scale of wages,” with “publicity of accidents” or “disease” and of other sufferings contracted through “employment”; why frame long sentences on “compensation” and on “minimum wage”? It all could be said—at least the substance thereof—in the much shorter sentence: “We uphold the system of wage slavery.”

Did the colonists in 1776 pledge themselves to a “scale of taxation without representation”? Or did they make it a plank in their demands that publicity be given to every case of “imprisonment and death brought on through vassalage to the British Crown”? Or were they pre-occupied with issues of “compensation” and a “maximum tax”? Not in the least. Their purpose being the ending of the system of vassalage they said so in just nine words—“we are and of right ought to be free.” Having said that, all else was implied.

The “Progressive,” or “Bull Moose,” or “T.R.” (Theodore Rex) party was more wordy. Why? As a rule where many words are used to say what fewer words could say just as well, if not better, the purpose is to conceal, not express; to hide, not proclaim; to obscure, not clarify, the situation.

The conclusion can not be escaped that the “progressiveness” of the Progressive party means “stuck-fastness” in the ruts of prevailing economic conditions; that there is no “progressiveness” about the concern—unless the rule of the Big Stick be
“progress,” on the theory that all is “progress” that differs from the present.