

EDITORIAL

## HOMOGENEOUS AMERICA.

By DANIEL DE LEON

**A**LMOST every traveler from Europe imagines he compliments the United States by pronouncing the country “the instance of popular individualism,” as contrasted with the European feature of “military uniformity.” What is still odder, our people accept the statement as a praise.

The boots are on exactly the opposite feet.

There is no country so uniform; none in which the “charm of eccentricities” is so conspicuously absent; no Nation so homogeneous as the United States. And the fact is all the more conspicuous seeing the vast domain over which the Nation’s peoples and institutions are spread. Of this exceptional and admirable fact the recent presidential campaign affords a proof most conclusive.

The feature of the campaign was the feud within the Republican party. How would the bolting of the Roosevelt element affect the nominee of the Chicago convention?

Opinion seemed to differ widely.

Some believed that the Bull Moose ticket would prove so fascinating to the stream of Discontent which had set towards the Democratic party that, what with that, and what with the portion of the Republican party that the Colonel would wrench from its old moorings, he would sweep the land.

The extreme opposite opinion was that of the Colonel’s enemies. According to them, he neither would draw away from the Democracy, nor receive any support worth the while from Republican deserters. According to this theory, the Colonel’s election figures were to expose him to ridicule.

Between the two extreme views there were a number of others.

Fully a month before the National election day, the Vermont State election took place—the State election in a State with virtually no national influence. If, indeed,

the characteristic of the country were “local individuality,” then the Vermont September returns would be no indication of the way the Nation was to go. Nothing short of the final national returns would settle the issue. It was otherwise. The national result was to be read in advance with statistical precision in the Vermont September figures:—the breaking in two of the Republican hosts, and the triumphant slipping in between them of the Democracy. The homogeneity, or, as others love to call homogeneity, the “military uniformity” of the American population was signally attested.

The fact is one to be applauded.

Indeed America is singularly free of that feudal physiognomy of “separatism” that still distinguishes Europe as a whole, and every European country within its own borders.

While the men of Kent can hardly understand the Yorkshireman; while sharp dialectic differences distinguish the people of Catalonia from those of Andalusia in Spain; the people of one Swiss canton from those of another; the people of Saxony from those of Bavaria; and so forth—in the United States the speech is ONE from one distant confine to the other. The “military uniformity” of speech seems to carry with it a “military uniformity” in all else that is ethnic—a fact that transpires most luminously in the uniformity of the Nation’s parliamentary practice, while the parliamentary practices of Europe are {as} many as its languages, and almost as many as its dialects.

And well for America that her people, despite the incidentally perturbing cause of immigration, are “militarily uniform.” Separatism, “individualism,” local idiosyncrasy—these be charming earmarks of feudal times and feudal requirements. Homogeneousness is a practical force that makes for directness of motion, in that the force makes for unity of organization

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official website of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded May 2014

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