

EDITORIAL

## REVOLUTION IN THE SENATE.

By DANIEL DE LEON

**A** PASSAGE at arms, with the term “Revolution” as the shuttlecock, that took place in the Senate on August 5 between two Democratic Senators—the Administration Senator Robert Latham Owen of Oklahoma, in charge of the Currency bill, and Senator Gilbert M. Hitchcock of Nebraska who opposes the bill—is instructive at once of the looseness with which the term is used and the lack of moral courage among politicians.

Senator Hitchcock derided the Currency bill as “revolutionary”; Senator Owen resentfully resorted to all available parliamentary manoeuvres to disprove the imputation of “revolutionary.”

Hitchcock was right—and so was Owen.

If by “revolutionary” is meant a process that dethrones a lordling, then the Currency bill is revolutionary. High Finance occupies today the throne in the witenagemote of the Lords of Capital. From its throne High Finance can and does distribute favors upon, or at will withhold them from, its fellow Lords. According as it bestows or withholds favors, High Finance raises its fellows up the steps of the throne, raising them even to the rank of Princes, or it keeps them down, and, not infrequently, even pushes them out of the august “presence.” The Currency bill contemplates the democratizing of my Lords among themselves. None is to enjoy pre-eminence. All are to be at a par, in so far as the decoration of Credit is concerned. The right to decorate is to be exercised by the joint representatives of them all—the Administration. So far as my Lords are concerned among themselves, there is revolution for you.

If, however, by “revolutionary” a process is meant that dethrones a Class, then the Currency bill is conservatism itself. The Lords Class is left in its lordly preroga-

tives over the Serf Class, modern proletariat. The bill gives no thought to these. So far as the bill is concerned, the proletariat might as well not be in existence. Except that “No proletarian Serfs, no capitalist Lords,” there is nothing in the bill from which to infer that there is a proletariat, and that the same constitutes the large majority of the population. Throw down one Lord and set up another, or “level” lordship in such way that all are seated upon the throne simultaneously and at once, the Class essence of things remains, and of revolution there is not a shadow.

“Court cabals” are not “revolutions,” though they frequently look like revolutions to those who are interested in and affected by them, especially the sufferers.

To Senator Hitchcock the Currency bill is wickedly “revolutionary”: he voices the trepidations of High Finance;—hence, he yells “Revolution!

To Senator Owen also is the Currency bill “revolutionary,” but beneficently so: he voices the expectations of the lesser Lords; hence, he counter yells ““Revolution”? Nonsense!”

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official website of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded January 2016

[slpns@slp.org](mailto:slpns@slp.org)