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INTRODUCTION.

Before the Great War the word Socialism was heard and seen only from time to time. When it was used by the non-Socialist press and by non-Socialist speakers, it was used either as a term of contempt or reproach. Occasionally a public character like Theodore Roosevelt would flare up in an attack upon Socialism and Socialists; occasionally the popular newspapers would write a feature story damning the Socialist propaganda in strong language or with faint praise. Then came the war, and for the first time the great mass of Americans heard of the Socialist internationalist theories. The war progressed—and with it advanced Socialism in all the belligerent countries. Newspapers devoted almost as much space to the doings of German, French, English and Russian Socialists as they did to the doings of navies and armies. Every succeeding day of the war gave increased prominence and importance to the Socialists. England went through a series of Cabinet crises, and from each the Labor Party emerged with increased strength. France had one Cabinet after another, and in each new Cabinet there were Socialists, until the Socialists voluntarily withdrew. Even Germany was twice forced into a change of chancellors because of Socialist opposition. And in Russia the Socialists have brought about the downfall of the most vicious autocracy in the world. The Czar was overthrown. The middle
class, the bankers and business men, had their chance to rule Russia, and failed.

Then people who had never shown any interest in Socialism began to ask questions. They wanted to know something about this theory which was apparently conquering the world through a war. For a student it was not difficult to find out all he wanted to know about Socialism, its aims and its ideals. But it was harder for the busy man who had neither the time nor the inclination to master a lot of technical names and definitions in order to find out what Socialism is. It is for the busy man—the busy workingman and his busy wife—that this pamphlet is designed. It will be the writer's aim to state simply and clearly the essential points in the Socialist doctrine, and just as clearly what Socialism is not.

D. P. B.
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WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

It is often said that there are as many different kinds of Socialism as there are Socialists. Others who like to be funny at our expense talk about "the fifty-seven varieties" of Socialism. As a matter of fact, though, Socialism can be defined in a single sentence. This sentence, it is true, is not easy to understand. It must be explained and proved. The commonly accepted definition of Socialism is:

"Collective ownership and democratic management of the socially necessary means of production and distribution of wealth."

What Is Wealth?

The definition of Socialism speaks of the production and distribution of wealth. In order to understand Socialism, then, we must understand what wealth is. Most people think wealth is money. But money itself is not wealth at all. Wealth is food, shelter and clothing, ships and buildings, books and education, trips to Europe, etc. It is impossible to mention all the different kinds of wealth. It is enough to say that wealth is everything that people need and use.

Everything we eat and wear is wealth. The pen I use, and the paper I write on, are wealth. The only difference between the rich man and the poor man is that the first has more wealth (not money alone, but more goods) than the second.
Where Did Wealth Come From?

Wealth does not make itself. The food we eat, the clothing we wear, the houses we live in, have to be produced. Production means making, or creating. Did you ever live in a house that was not built? Did you ever wear cloth that was not woven? The house and the cloth are wealth. The building of the house and the weaving of the cloth are the methods of producing that wealth. All wealth must be produced.

Every kind of production is a complicated thing. Suppose you live near the sea, and suppose again that you go out to catch a few fish for dinner. The fish would be wealth. The catching of the fish would be production. That sounds simple, doesn't it? But it is not so simple as it sounds.

To catch the fish you must have a boat and oars. You must have a line, hook and sinker, or a net. All these things have helped you to produce the fish that you want to eat. They, too, have helped in the production of wealth. Before you eat the fish you must cook them. For this you need a fire, pots and pans and a knife and fork. All these things helped you in the production of wealth. So even a very simple production of wealth, like the catching and cooking of a few fish, is complicated. Remember that the boat, the line, the hook, the net, and all the other things you used had to be produced themselves before you could produce the fish from the sea.

If you will look back to our definition of Socialism, you will find that it mentions the "production of wealth." All wealth, it now appears, must be produced. We have seen how difficult it is to produce even so simple a thing as a fish dinner. The production of other things is much more difficult. The paper I write on, for example, was made from wood pulp. The process of making the paper was about as follows:
SOCIALISM

1. The tree was cut down by an axe.
2. The tree was stripped of its leaves and branches and carted to the mill.
3. The tree was crushed to pulp.
4. The pulp was soaked.
5. The pulp was rolled.
6. The wet paper was spread out to dry.
7. The paper was cut and packed.
8. The paper was transported to the market and sold.

There are, roughly speaking, eight steps in the making of paper. But to make the paper we had to use food, clothing, houses, steel axes, leather belts, electricity, engines, railroads, coal, twine, and a million other things, all of which had to be produced.

It is impossible for one man working alone to-day to produce anything that is worth while. Even when a man catches fish he is helped by the men who made his boat, his line, his hook, his sinker, his net. When a man makes paper he is helped by the men who made the axe, mined the coal, and ran the railroad. We therefore say that production of wealth is no longer individual (if it ever was individual); it is collective and social. In other words, it is impossible to know what men helped in making anything; so we say that all men helped. While this is not true, of course, of any one article of wealth, it is true of wealth as a whole. Wealth is a collective product—that is, it is the product of all who work. Production is a collective process—that is, all who work at anything take part in the production of everything. It is hard, of course, for the coal miner to see what he has done to produce a suit of clothes, yet without the coal he mines, the engine that ran the sewing machine could not have worked. And without the suit of clothes the miner could not have taken out the coal. So the tailor helped in producing coal. That is what we mean when we say that production is social instead of individual.
Production has been social for a long time. But the ownership of the machinery, the tools, the buildings, and the raw materials which are needed in production is individual. It is true that the coal miner and the tailor help each other in their respective tasks of production, but the coal miner does not own the mine, nor does the tailor own the machine on which he works. For the last hundred and fifty years production has been on so large a scale that it gradually became impossible for the laborer to own his tools. As long as all labor was hand labor, the worker did own the things he needed for production. To-day most labor is machine labor. Machines are often too expensive for the average workingman to own. What happens next is that richer men buy machines and employ laborers to run them. These employers of labor, whom we call Capitalists, look upon the whole of the product as their property. They pay a portion of it as wages to the men and women who work for them, and keep the rest. The part which they keep is divided among them. Some of it goes to the landowner, some to the banker, and some to the owner of the machines. None of it has been earned by these men. All of it is profit, made by labor, and taken by the owners of Land and Capital.

Production, we have seen, is a social process. One man alone cannot produce anything of much value. And yet this social process of production is carried on, not for the benefit of all the people, but for the profit of a few individuals. Capitalists continue in business only so long as they can make Profits.

What Is Profit?

Where did the Capitalist’s Profit come from? Labor built the machine, labor mined the metal from which it was made, labor mined the coal which runs the machine. Labor runs the machine itself; labor produced the raw material which the machine turns into finished goods. The owner of the machine, the Capitalist, then takes the
product. Suppose that this is worth $100,000. Of this he has had to pay out about $30,000 for material, the keeping of his machines, and rent; he gives about $35,000 to his laborers in wages. The other $35,000 he keeps. Who made this $35,000 worth of goods? Did the Capitalist? Or did the laborer?

In every industry the same condition exists. Wealth is made from raw materials by labor. To make labor easier, machines have been invented. But it must be remembered that labor made the machines. To make our discussion simpler, we will call the raw material, like wood, coal, iron, cotton, and so forth, by the one name, "Land"; we will call labor by its own name, and the machine we will call "Capital." It becomes plain to everyone, then, that to make anything from a toothpick to a submarine, we need Land, Labor and Capital.

To-day the Land is held by private owners, who collect profits even if they do no work. They collect profits only because they own the Land.

To-day Capital, or the factory, is owned by private owners. These men collect profits from the product of their machines. They did not make their machines; Labor made all of them. Yet the owners of the machines continue to collect profit only because they own them.

There is only one source of profit. That source is the product made by Labor. To make the product, Land is necessary. But is the landlord necessary? To make the product, machinery is necessary. But is the owner of the machine necessary?

Are the Capitalists Entitled to Profits?

The Landlord says he is entitled to profit because he owns his land. Let us see if his title to the land is really good!

America has been known to the white man for a little more than four hundred years. Before that the land of
America belonged to the Indian. Did we white men buy the land from the Indian, or did we take it from him by fraud and force?

To-day we buy land, or inherit it from our fathers. Where did they get it? They, too, got it by purchase or inheritance. But if we go far enough back we generally come to some royal grant by a king of Spain, or a king of England, or a king of France! And by what right did these kings give away land that did not belong to them?

All land titles to-day in America rest upon conquest and fraud. All land held in America, or, for that matter in Europe, to-day is held because it was taken from its previous owners by force. But there is nothing to prove that the previous owners had any right to the land they held. For all we know, the Indians may have stolen it from some one else. We do know that the history of Europe is the story of one land robbery after another.

To-day we are far enough advanced to understand that conquest gives no good title to anything. We do not believe that might makes right. We do not permit the thief and the robber to keep his loot, when we are lucky enough to catch him. If we are to be logical in our reasoning, we must admit that all land titles, resting upon fraud or conquest, are no good.

But we have seen that land owners base their claim to profit on the fact that they own the land. If, as has been shown, their claim that they own the land is not good; if, as we have shown, they really do not own the land at all, because it was in the beginning taken by force and fraud, then what becomes of their rights to the profit made from the land?

It must be understood, at this point, that we do not claim that a man who works upon his own farm is not entitled to the product of the farm. He is entitled to this product because he has himself worked to make it. We only claim that a landlord is not entitled to any share of any product which he did not make. Ownership of
land is no reason at all for claiming a share of the product of the land.

Another person who claims a profit is the owner of the factories and machines, whom we call the Capitalist. This man also claims that he should have a share of the product in the shape of profit, because he owns the tools with which other men may work. Yet by what right does he own these factories and machines? His claims are very like the claims of the landlord. He may claim (1) that he made the factory; (2) that he inherited it; (3) that he purchased it. The first claim cannot be true. A machine is never the product of the work of a single man. To prove this, let us consider these facts:

Most machines contain wheels. The wheel is so old, that no man knows who discovered it. Machines are run by power of some sort. Steam power, electricity, gasoline, have all been invented or discovered by a series of scientists. So when the machine is completed and ready to be used, it is the product of countless men. Not even its inventor can claim that he alone made it. And everybody knows that the inventor very seldom owns the very machine he invents. He generally sells it to some Capitalist. So the first claim of the Capitalist, that he should get a profit because he made the machine, is not a good one.

His second claim is that he inherited the factory and machine, or, what comes to the same thing, that he inherited the money with which he purchased these things. Now we leave it to the common sense of our readers to dispose of this claim. If I inherit a factory, I am in no way responsible for the existence of that factory. And I do not see why I should be entitled to the returns from the factory.

There is no good reason why a man should start out in life with a great advantage over another, simply because his father has money to leave to him. The only time when the world owes any man a living is when that
man does some useful work. Inheriting money is not useful work.

The third claim is that the Capitalist purchased the machine and factories from which he draws his profits. To make this claim good, he must first prove that he had a right to the money which he used. He may possess the money through theft, in which case he is not entitled to possession. He may have inherited the money, and we have already shown that inheritance is not a good title to ownership. He may have worked for the money and saved it up.

But every one knows that no workingman can ever save enough out of his wages to buy a really large-factory. Factories of even moderate size cost several hundred thousand dollars. A laborer working for eighteen or twenty, or even twenty-five dollars a week must work for at least three years before he saves a thousand dollars. He can increase this during that time only if he invests it. In other words, he can increase it only if he adds to it profits made up out of the labor of other workers. So when a man purchases factories and machines, he must have gathered the money with which he buys from other sources than his own labor. Since a man is really entitled only to that which he makes himself, the average Capitalist never was entitled to the money with which he buys machines and tools.

In fact, most of the money now used in production in the form of machines comes from the land. Since private land ownership rests on force and fraud, possession of this money also rests on force and fraud.

The Capitalist often claims that he should take a share of the profits because (1) he has risked his capital, and should get something for "taking a chance"; (2) because he has saved money, and is entitled to enjoy the product of his thrift; and (3) because he, the Capitalist, has used "superior brains" in the making of wealth.

The first claim, which the Capitalist calls "wages of risk," would be good if the Capitalist could prove that
“risking his capital” added anything to the value of the product. But labor, and labor only, can create value. No amount of risking of capital can do so. It is true that the individual Capitalist takes the chance of losing his money. But what he loses somebody else gets. The factory goes right on working, even while it changes hands. The Capitalist who takes a chance with his money is a gambler. Gambling is not a useful occupation. Gambling creates no wealth. Why, then, should gambling be rewarded with Profit?

In the last paragraph we said that what one capitalist loses another gets. Capital never loses. One Capitalist or the other always takes profit. It is important that workingmen should understand this when they hear their employers talking about the risks they take. It is not of the least importance to workingmen whether one man or another is their employer.

Besides, the Capitalist really takes very few risks. The ones who take the real risks with their money are those laborers who try to become capitalists, for of those who fail ninety-five per cent. have less than $5,000 capital.

It is almost impossible, because of this fact, for a laborer to be anything else but a laborer all his life. The real Capitalist, on the other hand, takes great care of his money, and never invests a cent without being reasonably sure that he will get it back with Profit!

The second claim, that of wages of thrift, has already been discussed. A man is entitled to what he saves, but he is not entitled to use his savings to make profits out of others. Thrift is useful, but it does not add anything to the value of the product. It does preserve products from being uselessly destroyed. The one who has his products should use them. But has he the right to the products made by other men? We cannot see how the fact that one man saves, gives him the right to the labor of another man.

If a Capitalist superintends his own factory, he is to that extent a laborer. If he works, and has a certain
amount of ability, he produces value. But he is not entitled to Profit because of any "superior brains." Salary is one thing; profit an entirely different thing. Many a Capitalist who manages his own concern is entitled to wages for his labor. He is never entitled to profits.

But most Capitalists never risk anything, never save anything, and never superintend anything. They simply own—everything. A Capitalist may be an idiot or an infant—the Capitalist may be a criminal or an invalid. No matter what the Capitalist is, Profits go on. By what right do Capitalists such as these claim profits? Simply by the right of ownership.

We find, then, that the claims by which the Capitalist takes a profit are not fair claims at all.

They all rest on ownership, and we have shown that the Capitalist has no real claim on ownership, except one—and that claim is force and fraud. By force the Capitalist and the Landlord took the land. By fraud the Capitalist has taken and continues to take a part of the product which labor and labor alone creates. And out of these Profits which he takes, year after year, his ownership grows. And as it grows, the Profits grow larger.

Now let us look at this whole matter in another way. Let us admit, for a moment, that the titles of the landlord and of the Capitalist are good. Let us admit, for the sake of argument, that they really own the land and the necessary machines. Do they, by that fact, add anything to the value of the product? Take, for instance, a coal mine. Does Mr. Rockefeller add a single cent to the value of a ton of coal by the fact that he owns the Colorado mines? The coal would be there whether he owned the mines or not. Labor could take the coal out of the mines whether Mr. Rockefeller existed or not. The value of that coal has been created entirely by labor. Ownership has added nothing to that value; then why should ownership be paid a profit?

After putting all these things before you, it must be
clear to you that there can be only one answer to the question with which this chapter begins. Most emphatically, the Capitalists are not entitled to Profits.

Profit Is Robbery.

Labor, as we have shown, produces all wealth. Labor receives in return only a small part of what it has produced. Out of the remainder comes the profit of the Landlord and the Capitalist. Yet this remainder, which Labor does not get, is wages that were never paid.

If a man agrees to pay you wages, and then does not, you go to court and collect. But what about the wages you earned, which the Landlord and Capitalist never agreed to give you? In what court can you collect them?

Mr. Workingman, you have been cheated. You have been fooled into selling your labor for less than what it is really worth. It is really worth the whole of the product. But you could not know this, so you agreed to take less.

The man who buys an article from you for ten cents, when he knows it is worth a dollar, is taking advantage of your ignorance, isn't he? The man who buys from you your labor for three dollars a day, when it is worth six, is imposing on you in the same way. Yet all Capitalists, good and bad, large and small, are doing this all the time. They are reaping Profits out of this bargain in which workingmen are defrauded. Profits can come only out of wages that were never paid. Therefore, all Profit is Robbery.

There are mines, forests, land, farms, factories, railroads, etc., that people must use in order to live. All these things can be made useful only through labor. Yet on each of these things stands a man, who says "I own this. Pay me a price because I own it." He adds nothing to the wealth of the world, he only owns the things that the world must have. Shall we permit these men to hold us up forever?
The Share of Labor

A few pages back we said that three things were needed for the making of any product: (1) Raw material; (2) machinery, and (3) Labor; or, in other words, Land, Labor and Capital. We have studied Land and Capital. Now let us look at Labor for a few moments.

Labor is the most important of these three things. Without Labor, the Land would be useless, and the best machine would never run. We have shown before that all the useful wealth in the world was made by Labor. Now what does Labor get for all its work?

The money that Labor receives is called wages. The amount of wages changes from time to time, and is different in different trades and in different cities. But one thing is always sure: Wages never equal the full value of the product of Labor.

Wages are always the lowest amount that the employer can compel his workingmen to take. Mr. J. P. Morgan was once asked whether he thought that ten dollars a week was enough for a longshoreman with a family. (This was in 1915.) Mr. Morgan answered that if the man took ten dollars a week, and if ten dollars a week was all he could get, then it was enough. There we have the whole story of wages in a nutshell.

Wages are never more than just enough to buy food and clothing and pay rent. Even in the best of times the laborer can save little or nothing. Most people are only a week or two ahead of starvation. When wages are high, prices are high, too, and wages are never enough to cover more than living expenses. In fact, prices go up first, and wages follow. And they follow slowly.

Wages are higher in trades where there is a strong union than in trades where there is no union, or where the union is weak. This goes to prove that wages are the smallest amount that the employer can compel the worker to take. Where there is a union, the worker cannot be so easily compelled to take a small wage.
Yet, though wages go up a little now and then, they never go as high as the full value of the product. They cannot. If they did, there would be no profit for the employer. And if there were no profit, the employer would close his factory doors.

The wages of Labor are much lower than most people think. Before the war the average wage in this country was $13.75 per week. The war has increased this very much, but it has increased prices so much more that the workingman is hardly better off than he was before.

The Result of It All

The effect of all these things can be found in many unexpected places. In the first place, this democracy of ours is in real danger from within, because the wealth of the nation is in the hands of a few people.

According to Government figures, 2 per cent. of the people own 60 per cent. of all the country's wealth; 8 per cent. of the people own 35 per cent. of the wealth, while 90 per cent. of the people own the remaining 5 per cent. of the wealth. This is really a dangerous condition, because wealth means power; and a democratic country which should be based on equality of power, cannot afford to leave so much power in the hands of two out of every hundred people. In the end, if this continues, the 98 per cent. will be the slaves of the 2 per cent.

Already this has come to pass in some cases. In many places all over this country the workers are no better than slaves. In many trades there is only one employer, and if for any reason a worker displeases this employer he can get no job. This means he must starve, or work in some other trade. So workers are very careful not to offend their bosses. What is this but slavery?

The workers in the West Virginia coal mines, in the Michigan copper mines, in the Colorado coal and iron mines, were shot down because they dared to ask for
better wages. Tom Mooney may be hanged because he displeased the powerful Capitalists of California.

The other side of the picture shows the poverty of the workers. It is the greatest disgrace to a world that calls itself civilized that those who make civilization possible live in poverty and degradation. The homes of the working class are poor and insanitary. They live crowded together, so that good air is impossible. They eat poor food, and not enough of it. They are often unemployed, because when they have produced too much, the factories close down.

The workers are unable to send their children through school. Without an education, a child must become an unskilled laborer. And so the misery of one generation is passed on to the next. The working class, without education, can never rise.

There is a great deal of sickness among the workers. Many occupations bring special diseases with them. Many workers are hurt and killed in accidents which could have been prevented. They die young of strain and undernourishment. They get consumption because of hard work in unsanitary shops, and because they sleep in badly ventilated rooms.

The women of the working class often work at machines up to the day their children are born, and they return to the machines the next week. Is it remarkable that they grow old quickly, and that their children are weak and pale?

There is no relief from the terrible monotony of the worker's life. In the industry of two hundred years ago there was some pleasure in work, because a man could see the finished product of his labor. He could be proud of his skill and craftsmanship. To-day each worker performs the same operation many times a day. He often does not know whether his final product will go into an automobile or into an aeroplane. He finds no joy in his work.
After working at this monotony for ten hours he goes home so tired that he has no strength for anything but sleep. And so the life of the workingman goes on, without vacations, and without relief except during a strike or when he is laid off.

Then he has other difficulties to face. During periods of forced or voluntary unemployment it is a terrible struggle to keep the family together. In fact, often the family cannot be kept together. The Profit System has broken many workingmen’s homes. In the West there are a million men who can never have homes. They go from the lumber camps to the mines, from the mines to the wheat fields, from the wheat fields back to the lumber camps. Year after year they go the same round, because they must find work, and they are needed in these places. They have no homes, and can never have any.

Migratory life, and bad working conditions lead to drunkenness. Drink is not a cause of poverty—drink is a result of the Profit System. If the evils of Drink are ever to be removed, the Profit System must go first.

Men who have no homes, fill the houses of prostitution. They create a demand which is supplied out of the ranks of underpaid women workers. The evils of prostitution are very old. It is perhaps too much to say that they will ever be removed completely. But this much is sure, that prostitution as a business can be removed, if once the Profit System is killed.

The Middle Class

Between the Capitalist and the wage-laborer there is a class of people who are both Capitalists and workingmen. Storekeepers, agents, merchants, and professionals do not think of themselves as workingmen, and therefore often do not sympathize with them in their struggles.

This class is being squeezed out of existence. The coming of the big trusts has driven many small storekeepers out of business. Cigar stores have had to sell
out to the United Cigar Stores Co., grocers to the A. & P. Stores, druggists to the Liggett combination. What has become of these men who were formerly independent?

Either they are working as managers for the companies that drove them out of business, or they are still working in their own stores making less than a manager's salary.

Farmers are being squeezed by the Harvester Trust and by the railroads. More than half the farms in the country are worked by tenant-farmers, who have a hard time making a living.

The middle-class is disappearing. Some of its members become Capitalists, but most of them join the working-class. As long as there is a middle-class it is used by the Capitalist as a protection from the attacks of the Socialists. The greater part of the conservative and unprogressive vote comes from the middle-class, whose little property is in no danger at all from Socialism.

As we have explained repeatedly, we want collective ownership only of that property which is socially necessary for production and distribution. The middle-class has very little of such property. Most of its possessions are personal.

Sooner or later a great proportion of the middle-class must realize that its future lies with Labor, and not with Capital. Sooner or later its members must realize that they too, are working-people. Teachers and doctors, dentists and accountants often do not understand this truth. Yet let them try to live for any length of time without working, and the force of the argument will strike them.

It is very likely that this booklet will be read by many members of the middle-class. Let them examine the story of the past few years in their own lives. Then let them consider carefully whether they will continue to support that Capitalism that is crushing them, or whether
they will throw in their lot with Labor. They must make this choice sooner or later.

**Then What is to be Done?**

We have now explained how wealth is produced. We have shown that Labor creates the whole product, but gets back only a part in the form of wages. We have shown that the Capitalist takes a large share of the product in form of Profit simply because he owns the land and the machine. We have shown that he is not entitled to any return because his titles to land and machines and money are no good, and because ownership adds nothing to the value of the product.

We have further shown the bad conditions that arise out of the present system of private ownership of the land and machines that are socially necessary to produce wealth. Now what is to be done?

If you refer to the definition of Socialism you will find that it calls for the collective ownership and democratic management of the socially necessary means of production.

These means are the land and the machines. Let us consider first the land. We have seen that the present titles to land are not good. Land is needed so that people may live. It is a socially necessary means of producing wealth. It should be the property of no single individual, but rather the property of all the people.

Capital, by which we mean machinery, is also a necessary social means of producing wealth. Yet what is a machine? Is it not the product of Labor? Is it not made from iron and copper and zinc and the metals taken from the soil? It is a social product. It is made up of the labor of many people. No one man can say he made it. Why should one man own it? The machine, the factory, the railroad should be the property of all.

Now the question may be asked. "What good would be accomplished if all the people owned the land and the
necessary machines?" This much good would result, that no profit would be exacted. The whole of the product would belong to the whole people, to be divided as the people see fit. No individual would then claim a profit, simply because of ownership. It must be remembered that "owning" a thing never increased the value of anything.

It is impossible to foretell what methods would be used to distribute wealth under Socialism. Some hold that there will be an equality of wages for all sorts of work; others believe that wages will be unequal, because men of different kinds do different kinds of work. People who hold this view point out, however, that the whole value of the product would go to the laborer, and that no one would take a profit.

There is still a third possible way of distributing wealth. Today we have public parks, public schools, public libraries and other public institutions. We use these things, not according to what we pay, but according to what we need. If one man has five children, and another has only one, both men have an equal right to send all their children to the public school, no matter what tax they pay, or whether they pay any tax at all. One man borrows six books every week from the public library, while his neighbor never goes near that place. Yet the man who borrows and the man who does not borrow equally support the library. Now, says this group of Socialists, why can we not get food, shelter and clothing in the same way in which we use the public parks, schools and libraries? Let each man work to the best of his ability, and let each man have what he needs.

It makes little difference which of these plans we advocate. The only important thing for us to do is to get rid of the Profit System, and thus any form of collective ownership will do. If you need proof of this, please remember that the city and the state take no profit for running schools, libraries and parks.

With the introduction of collective ownership, that is,
ownership by all the people, the chief distinction between the classes must pass away. There can then be no very rich, and there will certainly be no very poor people.

Most of the evils of poverty, which we have described before, must disappear when poverty itself disappears. Democracy will be safe, when its life is no longer threatened by the existence of large wealth held in the hands of a few.

Education will be more wide-spread. Health will be better. In every way this world will be a better place to live in.

No other method can ever accomplish these things. Charity can help poor people, but it can never end poverty itself. Besides, self-respecting workingmen do not want charity.

Profit-sharing is a blind. It is an admission that the workers make the profits, and that the bosses, by giving up part of their loot, are trying to keep the rest. The bonus-system is the same as profit-sharing.

Efficiency systems, and welfare systems, and all other systems invented by employers to keep workingmen "contented" are all of them attempts to keep Socialism away. They have all been tried, and they have all failed. They fail because they do not touch the root of the evil—Profits.

The National Civic Federation hopes to keep Socialism away by promoting a "better understanding" between Capital and Labor. But a "better understanding" will not fill the empty stomachs of our children, nor pay the growing costs of living. The only better understanding that will ever cure things, is an understanding of the System by which the Capitalist makes his profits. That, to be sure, will lead to a cure through Socialism.

How Will We Get Collective Ownership?

We have now explained the definition of Socialism. The next question that we must answer is "How are we
going to take away from the Capitalist the socially necessary means of production?"

This is a most important point. Several answers have been suggested. One method would be to buy up the property of the Capitalist, another would be to take it by putting such heavy taxes on it that the present owner will be forced to give it up, while the third method would be for the people as a whole to go into business to compete with the present Capitalists.

The first method would be entirely too expensive. There are some Socialists, however, who favor this method because of the injustice that might be done by any other plan. They do not realize that if we purchase Land and Capital from their present owners, that these owners will still retain certain property rights, and will continue to draw profit. This will be no solution of the trouble.

There does not seem to be any injustice in taking from a person that which he does not own. The state is doing it all the time. We take from the thief his stolen goods. We even take from the purchaser of stolen goods, the property he has bought. The present owners' titles to Land and Capital are good in the courts, but they are not good before the bar of public opinion. Whenever the state decides to take over the socially necessary property of the present owners, it can do so. There is even a perfectly legal ground for so doing. The state may at any time take any property it needs. This is the well established principle of "eminent domain."

Perhaps the best way of transferring private property to social ownership, would be by inheritance and transfer taxes of 100%. It would take only a single generation, thirty years or so, to transfer the bulk of all socially necessary property to the people by this method. Then by passing laws preventing anyone from entering into business in competition with the people, the whole system of private ownership would be abolished.
The third method suggested has already been started. In New York City the Board of Aldermen appropriated $300,000 for municipal trading. This means that the City of New York will buy and sell in competition with private retailers. Carry this only a step further, and the city will manufacture in competition with private manufacturers, and build houses in competition with private builders, and in the end run them out of business.

There really is no difficulty in transferring private property to social ownership if once the people decide to do it. To get them to make this decision is the hardest part of the job.

**Shall a Man Own No Property?**

Many workingmen have small bank accounts. A few own their homes. All have more or less property in the way of furniture. Does Socialism expect them to give all this up? Emphatically no. The definition of Socialism refers only to that property which is a means of production. The house you may own, your savings, your furniture are yours.

No man, however, has the right to own such property as will make him a master of other men. No man is good enough to enslave other men. No man's service to the world is great enough to entitle him to control the lives of others.

Personal property may be private. Social property should not be private.

**How To Get Rid Of Poverty**

Let us now review the aims and purposes of Socialism. All that has been said in these pages was intended only to provide the necessary information to enable the non-Socialist to understand the definition of Socialism.

The whole argument can be summed up as follows:
1. There is much poverty and suffering among the workers today.

2. Poverty exists because the owner of the machine and of land takes a profit out of the product of Labor.

3. To get rid of poverty we must get rid of private ownership of the tools of production and distribution.

4. The only way to get rid of this private ownership, is to turn the tools of production and distribution (that is, the land and the machines) over to all the people.

5. This can be done only through Socialism, which is defined as "collective ownership and democratic management of the means of production and distribution of wealth!"

6. The Socialist Party is the only important party in America working for Socialism.

7. Therefore, if you wish to remove poverty, and everybody wishes to do this, you must help the Socialist movement.

Why Should We Be Satisfied With This Alone?

There is some Socialism in our cities already. Public schools are to be found in every large city. Yet about one hundred years ago only those could get an education who could pay for it. There is Socialism in our educational system.

Years ago only those could use parks who owned them, and only the rich could own them. Today most large cities have big and beautiful public parks which the people may use as they see fit. There is Socialism in the collective ownership of parks.

We have public libraries from which any one may borrow books for a certain period of time. Abraham Lincoln, you remember, had only two books in his youth. That was because in Lincoln's day only those had books.
who could buy them. There is Socialism in our public libraries.

The public fire department is a beautiful example of unselfish social service. It is too bad that we cannot take as good care of our lives as we do of our property.

There is Socialism in the health department and the department of street cleaning.

Does any one dream of making a profit out of those things? What would we do to the people who should suggest that we destroy our public schools, sell our parks for building lots, and send the fire companies only on payment of a fee?

The city distributes water at cost. In some cities water is sold for a profit by private companies. Which system do you like better? Why can't the city distribute electricity and gas as it distributes water? It would be just as easy.

Private insurance companies sell insurance for about $20 or $30 per thousand. The government insures soldiers, whose risk of death is much greater than that taken by the average civilian, for $8 a thousand. This is done because the government wants no profit.

Why should we stop there? Why should not the city, state and nation own everything that the public needs? Why can't the city bake bread and sell it at cost? Put up dwellings and rent them at cost? Run street railroads at cost? Why not?

What Shall We Do To-day?

What shall we do today? Shall we simply work for the future, and suffer in silence? There are some who say that this is the right thing to do. We Socialists do not believe this to be right. While we have our eyes fixed on our future goal, we still know that there are
many things that we must do now. To meet the problems of today we advocate the following program:

1. Reduction of the number of hours of work.
2. Increase of wages.
3. Insurance against sickness, accident and old age.
4. Pensions for widows and mothers.
5. Political reforms like the initiative, referendum and recall, to give to the worker a greater share in the government of the State.
6. Public help for the unemployed.
7. Recognition of unions in all industries.
8. Abolition of child labor.
9. Education of all children up to the age of twenty-one.

Our platforms from time to time have more or less than this. The public expression of what the Socialists wish to accomplish changes according to the changing issues of the day. For example, in New York State we always had a demand for Woman Suffrage, but since women were granted the vote in 1917, this demand is no longer necessary.

The reader must be careful not to make the mistake made by many people. The program outlined above is intended only to remove the very worst of the hardships caused by the Profit System. It can never by itself remove them. This program could be carried out to the last demand, without bringing Socialism. In fact when Socialists in 1848 printed their first program of demands in the Communist Manifesto, they demanded things which have since been carried into effect in many countries. These demands are meant for the time and place only. In the end Socialism demands one thing and one thing only, and that is the end of the Profit System by ending private ownership of the socially necessary means of production and distribution.
Very often, indeed, the Socialist Party demands are taken by other political parties. Knowing that these demands will be popular, Democrats and Republicans make use of them. They then come before the people with the claim that they are "friends of Labor," as much as are the Socialists.

Let us see if that is the case.

What Is a Political Party?

The Republican and Democratic Parties claim that there are differences between them. While both claim to represent the whole people, they say that they differ on certain principles. It is very difficult to see what these principles are. So far as national politics go the Republican Party seems to believe in a high tariff while the Democratic Party seems to believe in a low tariff. Yet today, with a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President the tariff is not much different than it was under a Republican President and a Republican Congress.

They claim to differ on the question of state and national rights. The Democratic Party says it stands for greater state's rights, and smaller national rights. The Republican Party, on the other hand, claims to desire greater national and smaller state's rights. On this issue the Civil War was fought. But the Peace of Appomattox Court House was signed 53 years ago, and today a Democratic administration has done more to break down state power and increase national power in six years, than the Republicans did in fifty.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that these differences between the two great parties are real differences, it must be plain to you, Mr. Reader, that these differences don't concern you. Then where do the two old parties stand on the issues that we have raised, the issues of profit, the issues of Labor against Capital?
The platforms of the old parties generally have some statement about "supporting the just claims of Labor." But they do not attack Profits, they do not attack Private Ownership of Land and Capital. Theodore Roosevelt said in the Republican State Convention at Saratoga, July, 1918, that the investor was entitled to a profit as a reward for his industry. An attack on Profits will cause both old parties to arise at once to defend the Profit System. Now we ask you, Mr. Workingman, to figure this thing out. How can a party support both the Profit System and Labor? Profit taking, as we have shown, is a systematic robbery of the worker. How can a party be both for the Capitalist and the Laborer? Isn't it perfectly plain that this is impossible? And isn't it also perfectly plain that a political party that claims to represent both sides is making a dishonest claim? Yet both the Republican and Democratic Parties make this claim. They say they are for all the people. We claim that such a thing is impossible.

What is a political party? In every country there are people who are interested in different things. Some men want certain laws, others want other laws. The laws that are good for some men's business undertakings will kill other enterprises. To work for the laws that they want people form political parties.

Political parties are groups of men who work for certain interests.

Parties will work for the interests of those who form them, and of those who pay their bills. Sometimes the laws that men want are laws of great reforms. Such parties as the Free Soilers and the Socialists were founded to work for such laws. Other parties work for laws that are selfish, or work to keep others from changing selfish laws. The Republican and Democratic Parties are of this sort.

The Republican Party, judging from its words and acts, is the party of the big Capitalist. It counts in its ranks the richest men in the country, the largest em-
ployers of labor. These men pay its huge campaign funds. Whom will the elected officials of the Republican party serve? Will they serve the people? What do they owe to the people? Will they not rather serve the interests of those who help them in their elections? We do not say that the Republicans are dishonest. We mean to say only, that since the party supports and is supported by the big Capitalists, it is only natural that the representatives of that party will work for the interests of the Capitalist, and not for the interest of the Laborer.

The Democratic Party is the party of the dying middle-class. The small store-keeper, the small Capitalist, the professional man, the small farmer, have interests opposed to those of the big Capitalist. To serve these interests, the Democratic Party exists today. By word and act the Democratic Party supports these interests. Are these interests yours, Mr. Reader? Does it make any difference to the Laborer whether Profit is taken from his labor by a big or by a small Capitalist?

Once the Democratic Party had a real reason for existence. One hundred years ago or more, it stood for political democracy against the aristocratic ideals of the Federalist Party.

Once the Republican Party had a real reason for existence. Sixty years ago it stood against Slavery. Political democracy has been established, and the slaves have been freed. But the Democratic and Republican Parties, now with no reason for existence, go right on. Today they both serve the same masters.

To prove this we need remember only these facts: In 1910 the Socialists carried the city of Milwaukee. In 1912 the Democrats and Republicans combined against the Socialists. In 1911 the Socialists carried the city of Schenectady. In 1913, the Democrats and Republicans in that city combined against the Socialists. In 1916 the Socialists of Brooklyn elected Assemblymen from two districts. In 1917 the Democrats and Republicans of
those districts combined against the Socialists. In 1917 the Socialists in New York City polled nearly 150,000 votes. According to these figures they would surely carry four Congressional Districts if there were three candidates in the field. To prevent this the Republicans and Democrats have combined against the Socialists in these districts. In all the Assembly Districts in New York and Bronx counties which the Socialists carried in 1917, the Republicans and Democrats fused in 1918. Isn't that proof enough that there is no real difference between the Democrats and Republicans?

And yet there is a difference. There is a difference of personalities. Every political campaign between the Democrats and Republicans is a campaign between men, not principles. The virtues and faults of men become the leading issues of the day.

There is, however, one party that is different from both the Republican and the Democratic Parties. This party is also based on the interests of a class of people, and it is honest enough to say so.

This party, the Socialist Party, is based on the interests of the working-class which makes up 90% of our population. It fights for these interests. It sends its legislators to pass laws only for the interest of Labor. It is supported only by the contributions of Laborers.

The Socialist Party is frankly a class party. It makes no pretense of representing the interests of the whole people. It makes no appeal on the personalities of its candidates, nor does it campaign against other candidates because of their personalities. It fights the Profit System, and bases all its campaigns on that issue.

The Socialist Party is the only political party organized democratically. Anyone who subscribes to the principles of Socialism may become a member. Each member pays dues. Out of these dues, and out of voluntary contributions from sympathisers, the campaign expenses
of the party are paid. The Socialist Party does not depend for its funds upon the money of the Capitalists.

The dues-paying members are the party. They directly nominate their candidates. They remove them if they are not pleased. They control them before and after election. The committees of the party are also elected by the members by direct vote.

In all the world there is no organization so democratic as the Socialist Party. There are in the ranks no "leaders" or "bosses" as in other parties. Men whose names are known all over, like Morris Hillquit, must answer to the membership for all their activities, as must any official or representative of the Socialist Party.

As we have said before, it is the Socialist Party chiefly that tries to bring about collective ownership today.

Is Not Public Ownership the Same as Collective Ownership?

At this point the man who thinks and reads may ask, "Is not the Democratic Party through the President and through Congress today bringing about public ownership of railroads and telegraph lines?"

Yes, the Democratic administration is bringing about a certain kind of public ownership. The fact that in time of great national need, like the present, the system of private ownership has been found to be of little value is a proof that the Socialists have been right. Yet the system of public ownership that has been introduced is not at all the kind of collective ownership that we Socialists want.

In the first place the present system is really only public control. The government runs the roads, collects fares and freight rates and pays the expenses. But the real owners, that is, the owners of the railroad stock and bonds, are guaranteed a certain profit even if the railroads earn less than this guaranteed rate. The Profit
System goes right on. The government admits that the owner does no work, that in fact even if he tried he could not run the roads properly. And yet it promises to pay to the owners profits. You know where these profits come from. You know that if the holders of railroad stock and bonds get the profit, the laborer cannot get what he makes. Therefore the present system of railroad ownership by the government is not the Socialist collective ownership!

What is true of the railroads is true of the telegraphs and of every thing the Democratic administration touches.

The Socialist Party alone stands for the kind of collective ownership that would wipe out profit-taking.

Besides, the present government has promised to return the railroads to their former owners after the war. The Socialist plan is to take the railroads and all other necessary property away from the present owners forever. Why should this property ever go back to them?

What Socialists Have Done

The Socialist Party is very young. Yet in its short existence it has governed several large cities like Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Berkeley, Schenectady and Butte. In all cases the Socialists have given effective and clean administrations. They have not been tied up with business interests and they have not tried to govern so that the tax-rate might be low. But they have not in any case introduced Socialism! And why?

Because it is not enough to govern a city. If Socialism is to be brought into existence, whole states must be won, and a great many laws must be changed. It is in the State Legislatures that you can best study what Socialists have done.

Socialists have been elected to the Legislatures of many states, and everywhere they have introduced in
the form of bills part or all of the program we have given before. It is impossible to review here all the legislation advanced by the Socialists. Let us limit ourselves, therefore, to the work of the Socialist delegations in the Legislatures of Wisconsin and New York, and to the more than remarkable record made by the Socialist aldermen of New York City.

In Wisconsin there has been a considerable group of Socialist legislators for some time. At present there are 10 of them. Since they were at no time in the majority, it is of course natural that only a few of their measures became laws. Most of the laws which they suggested, and which passed, were minor matters of salary regulation. The one important, and really Socialist law, was one giving cities the right to sell ice and fuel.

It is in the legislation introduced and not passed that we find what Socialist legislators really stand for. If they were in the majority in both houses, this is what they would do. We ask you whether or not it is important for Labor that laws such as these should be passed.

1. A resolution calling on Congress to buy or take the coal mines.
2. A bill providing for the eight-hour day.
3. A bill prohibiting the use of the injunction in Labor disputes.
4. A bill providing one day’s rest in each week for every wage-worker.
5. A bill providing for the furnishing of lunches to school children at cost.
6. A bill to regulate fees charged by employment agencies.
7. A bill to increase the tax on excessive incomes.
8. A bill to increase the tax on large inheritances.
9. A resolution providing for home rule for cities.
10. A resolution empowering the State to establish public enterprises of any nature whatsoever.

11. A bill providing for old age pensions.

12. A bill providing for social insurance.

13. A bill to license private detectives.

14. A resolution calling for the initiative and referendum.

15. A resolution calling on Congress to acquire the railroads.

16. A bill providing for municipal ownership of public utilities.

None of the laws here listed passed. Why did they fail? Are they against the interests of the public? Or are they for the public interest and against the interests of Capitalists?

Who killed these laws? Republicans and Democrats! Why were these laws killed? Because Democrats and Republicans together work for the business man, and against the laboring man.

The Socialist delegation in the New York State Legislature is much younger than the Wisconsin group. In 1916 the Socialists had one member, in 1917, two, and in 1918, ten members of the lower house. The work of the Socialist legislators has been of a two-fold character—first to introduce Socialist measures in the form of bills, and in the second place to block the passage of anti-Labor and pro-Capitalist bills. The Socialists have introduced among others, the following measures:

1. A bill to abolish the "third degree."

2. A bill to provide pensions for widows, and deserted mothers.

3. A bill to abolish capital punishment.

4. A bill to prevent the use of private gunmen.
5. A bill abolishing the state constabulary.
6. A bill to provide a free university.
7. An act to guarantee freedom of speech.
8. An act submitting the question of prohibition to a referendum vote.
9. A bill providing for the initiative and referendum.
10. A bill providing for compulsory insurance to cover old age, unemployment, death, sickness and accident.
11. A bill to prevent the use of the militia in industrial disputes.
12. A bill providing for the eight-hour day in all industries.
13. A bill preventing night work for bakers.
15. A bill preventing children under 16 from working.
16. A bill limiting woman's labor to 54 hours a week.
17. A bill empowering cities to own and control public utilities.
18. A bill appropriating twenty million dollars for the manufacture, purchase and sale of necessaries at cost to the people.
19. A bill giving the State control over the production and distribution of the necessaries of life.
20. A law compelling employers advertising for labor during strikes, to state that fact in the advertisement.

This program as you will notice also carries into effect the Socialist program as outlined before. That it did not pass was due to the fact that the Republicans and Democrats, always ready to serve their Capitalist masters, were not ready to back a worker's program.
On the contrary, under the cover of "patriotism" they made every effort to break down the labor laws which have been built up by hard work over a long period of years. Attacks were made by the Republicans and Democrats on the laws concerning the labor of women and children, on the laws limiting the hours of labor, and the fire safe-guard laws. The Socialists fought these attacks with all their might, and succeeded in holding many of them off. The great work of the Socialists in saving the remnants of labor laws from the attacks of the Capitalists has brought them many friends among the labor unionists.

The Board of Aldermen of New York City has almost no power. The city is governed by the Board of Estimate. The Board of Aldermen used to meet for an hour or two, once a week, discuss unimportant measures, and then adjourn. When in 1917, seven Socialists were elected to the Board, the Board suddenly became important. Its doings filled the newspapers. It suddenly found that it had power to do certain things, and under the pressure of the Socialist members certain things were done.

The Socialist minority introduced among others the following resolutions and ordinances:

1. Ten resolutions and ordinances providing for municipal trading in food, fuel and ice.

2. An ordinance providing for a Bureau of School Lunches under the Board of Education.

3. An ordinance providing for a Bureau of Oral Hygiene (Dentistry) under the Board of Health.

4. A resolution giving the Board of Alderman more power to control the Budget. (The Budget is a list of expenses of the city. It is made up every year by the Board of Estimate. It is very important that the people should control the Budget. Today they have no control
over it. This resolution would have given the people, through the Board of Aldermen, such control.)

5. An ordinance providing for a minimum wage of $1,200 per year for all city employes.

6. A resolution petitioning Congress to pass laws putting an end to rent profiteering.

7. An ordinance including the employes of the Departments of Water, Gas and Electricity, Parks, Docks, and Plant and Structures in the provision giving free medical service to those injured in the service of the city.

Here again we have a program of legislation that would directly benefit the people if it were put into effect. The Socialist Aldermen had remarkable success. They succeeded in passing both number 6 and number 7 of the above program. In addition several of their resolutions and ordinances were copied by the Democrats, who were in control of the Board, and passed as Democratic measures.

The work of Socialist legislators, and Socialist administrations is important, not so much for what has been done as for what they would have done if they had had more power. Ten Socialist Assemblymen have very little power against 140 Republicans and Democrats. Seven Socialist Aldermen can wake up that sleepy body, but they really have little power compared to fifty-one Democrats and fifteen Republicans. The real importance of the work of Socialists so far has been to show the world what Socialists intend to do. And this the Socialists at Madison, Wisconsin; Albany, New York; and in New York City have done very well. They have given to the world a program of progressive laws. What have the Democrats and Republicans done to meet these issues? They have blocked and obstructed, and when they could no longer obstruct, they have stolen our measures.

Do you see now why you should throw your strength to the Socialist Party? Do you see now that the Social-
ists exist only as the servants of Labor, while the other parties exist as the servants of Capital?

Your Share of the Task

All that has been said so far is about Socialism as a theory. In order for Socialism to benefit the world, it must be put into practice. In order to put it into practice, there has arisen all over the world the International Socialist movement. In this country that movement is represented chiefly by the Socialist Party. The Socialist Party works in season and out, to bring before the workers the message carried in this pamphlet. By the spoken word passed from man to man in the shop, by speeches and lectures, by leaflets, pamphlets and newspapers it seeks to awaken the worker to an understanding of his poverty.

If what we have said in these few pages appeals to you, make it your business to find out something about the Socialist Party. If you agree in the main with what we have said here, you are a Socialist. If you do so agree, you owe it to yourself to help in the work of making this world a better place for our children. The Socialist movement, the Socialist Party, needs the activity and support of all who work with hand and brain to make the wealth of the world.

Do not allow the enemies of Socialism to mislead you. You will be told that Socialism is against religion. Just think back about what we have said. Have we, until now, mentioned religion? We have put before you the whole of our aim and purpose. Have we said one word attacking religion? Have we not, on the contrary, outlined a program of betterment which, if carried out, would make more room for any real religion? To-day religion is a thing for Sundays, not to be practised during the rest of the week. The business man who should try to put into practice the teachings of his religion would very soon have to give up his business. If, on the con-
trary, we remove from industry the whole idea of cut-throat competition, real religion would have its first chance in the world's history to develop.

You will be told that Socialism means "dividing up." The man with ten dollars and the man with one dollar will put their money together and divide the eleven dollars fifty-fifty. Now of course, if you have understood what we have written, you will know that this is all nonsense. We have "dividing-up" now. The Capitalist who takes Profit out of the product of Labor is dividing-up with the Laborer who made the Product. It is the Laborer who supplies everything, and the Capitalist who supplies nothing. Yet they "divide up." Now the whole purpose of Socialism is to end the game of "dividing up."

You will be told that Socialism will break up the home. Recall what we said about the million migratory workers of the West. Think about the homes smashed up because the supporter of the home was killed in an accident that might have been avoided if there had been proper safeguards. Think of the homes that are broken up because mothers must go out to help in earning a living for the family. It is the Profit System that is breaking up the home. Socialism is going to rebuild the home on a sound foundation. Socialism is going to make it possible for the worker to have a home.

You will be told that Socialism will destroy the incentive to work. It is true that Socialism will destroy the profit incentive. But even under Socialism it will be necessary to work in order to live. Life can be supported only by producing wealth. Wealth can be produced only by labor. So in order to live, people must work. Nothing can ever remove the incentive for work. Besides, what incentive has the worker to-day? Do you call ten hours a day, six days a week, for a small wage, an incentive? Don't you think that six hours work with a return equalling the full value of the product, would be a bigger incentive? And this would be possible under Socialism. And then suppose you recall what we said about the
monotony of work. Don’t you think that it would be a great incentive to know what you are making, to see the finished article? This would be possible under Socialism.

You will be told many foolish and stupid things about Socialism. It is impossible to foretell here what you may be told. But no matter what it is, we ask you, before you believe what an anti-Socialist tells you, to find out what a Socialist has to say about it. Turn back in the pages of this pamphlet, look up other Socialist pamphlets, and in every case you will find your question answered.

CONCLUSION

The world is changing before our eyes. It will never be quite the same as it was before 1914. The only question is, Shall it be better or worse? If you are not awake every moment of the time, Mr. Workingman, it may very well be worse. If you permit yourself to be deceived by slanders and lies about Socialism and Socialists, about Labor and the Labor movement, it may well happen that the next few years will be the darkest in the history of the world. Triumphant wealth will crush you and your unions out of existence; your wages and labor standards will go down with a crash.

Do you doubt these things? Then please think of these facts:

There are several million soldiers in the army to-day. When the war is over these men will come back, looking for jobs. Where will they find the jobs they need? Will there not be thousands, hundreds of thousands, of unemployed?

There are several million women filling the jobs that those in the armies used to hold. When the soldiers come back, what will those women do? Will they give up their jobs without a word? Suppose they don’t want
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to give up their jobs? Won’t this make the unemployment worse?

And what happens when there are more men than jobs? Wages come down, and hard times follow.

There is only one hope for Labor in the days to come. That hope lies in Socialism. Socialism alone sees the breakers ahead and gets ready to meet them. While Republicans and Democrats call each other liars and thieves, and hide their weaknesses under the cover of “patriotism,” the Socialist party prepares for the future.

If you are awake to the meaning of events, there is hope that the world will be better instead of worse. Every loyal workingman owes it to himself, to his family, and to his class to work for a better world. There never was an opportunity like the present for throwing off the wage-slavery under which we live.

Let us put an end to the Profit System and all that it stands for. Let us put an end to private ownership of Land and Capital, and become our own masters. Let us at last decide to give real democracy a chance.

We can do this if we stand together. We can do this quietly and peacefully if we understand just how the Profit System makes slaves of us. All that is necessary is that the working-class should use the political power that lies in its hands. The workers can win in any election in which they unite their strength. The working class has too long allowed itself to be divided on race lines, and on religious issues. Let us forget our differences and remember that we have one common opponent—Capitalism. If once the working class unites, Capitalism will crumble, as the throne of the Czar of Russia crumbled.

Let us unite, then, this year, and next year, and forever until the world is free. Our goal is clear before us. There is but one hope for a world torn by a war which it is unable to end—and that hope is Socialism.
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