The personal rights of the individual are minimized in proportion to the total number of inhabitants in any given community. Thus the rights of all of the people in the United States are One Hundred Million times as great as the rights of any one person.

-Extract from Lecture.
FELLOW WORKERS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

There are some fundamental principles of justice upon which all honest people must agree.

Every sincere person will coincide with me in maintaining that any movement which endeavors to secure for the greatest number of the people the greatest amount of good is perfectly just and worthy.

To accomplish this desired end we are sadly divided on tactics. Some of us vote the Republican ticket, some the Democratic ticket and others the Socialist ticket. Instinctively we hope for the same results—namely, prosperity, plenty and opportunity for ourselves and families, our neighbors and our people. We vote the ticket and support the political party that we believe will bring these blessings.

Now, the most of us here tonight are working people and our interests are identical. What is good for one, in a general way, is good for all. Yet this man on my left votes the Republican ticket, the one over here on my right the Democratic ticket, while I vote the Socialist ticket. No doubt one of us is nearer right than the other two, and the party which the right one supports will undoubtedly bring more prosperity, plenty and opportunity to a majority of the people than the parties the other two are supporting.

I am very strong in the belief that if we three, assuming that we are the whole working class, can only get together and support the Socialist ticket, it will be to the best interest of ourselves and humanity.

My object tonight is to reason with you if possible, convince you I am right in my position. If I am able to
accomplish this purpose and persuade you that Socialism will be, not only to your economic interest, but to the economic interest of the rest of the workers, you'll come to our side and not only vote with us but you will fight with us and do all in your power to overthrow the present system of industry and establish Socialism as early as possible. You'll join the upwards of forty million workers who are marching under the red banner of international Socialism in all the lands where the masses suffer under the lash of industrial servitude.

I know you'll do this because I know first that your actions are very largely determined by the things which are to your economic interest, and second, that you are naturally kind hearted and are prone to wish your fellow man an abundance of prosperity and happiness providing you are assured it will in no way endanger the abundance of yourself and your children.

Economic Determinism is a law that in the present system very largely influences the actions of not only the individual, but of institutions, governments and civilizations.

For illustration, why did any of you migrate to this locality where coal digging is the principal industry? Surely not because you liked the place, with its squalid shacks, dirty streets, disagreeable and dangerous occupation and its lamentable advantages for your children. I know why you came, and so do you. It was because you at least hoped to secure a better job with larger wages and more substantial guarantee that by your labor you would be able to supply the table with bread and meat, clothing for the little ones and shelter against the north wind. If I were in a position to promise you a better job then you now have, every mother's son would quit here in the morning and go with me. And then if next week some other party would offer
you more money, shorter hours and steadier work, you
would quit me and take your hopeful departure.

The struggle to provide yourself, wife and children
with better food, warmer and finer clothing, more house
room and improved opportunities would be the governing
influence of your action. (Economic Determinism.)

I have known ministers of the gospel who received a
"call" to go and preach at another church. But I must say
that I have never known one to receive a "call" to take
another pulpit, and who voluntarily went, if there was a re-
duction in the salary he was to receive. Understand I am
not condemning the divine for accepting an increase, but I
would have him carefully analyze the "call" and see if it
didn't emanate from a hollow feeling down near the region
of his pocketbook, rather than from above. (Economic
Determinism.)

A few years ago I was lecturing in east Texas and
happened to be booked for a certain town in which there
had been a very heated local campaign on the question of
"wet" and "dry." Every business man in the town had
signed a petition enthusiastically endorsing the OPEN
SALOON. These business men, without an exception,
were also leading members of the various churches in the
community. I should have qualified the statement that
ALL of the business men were in favor of the open saloon.
There were FIVE business houses in which the proprie-
tors, clerks and every person directly or indirectly con-
ected with them, were violently and "righteously" op-
posed to the infamous and demoralizing effects the open,
licensed saloon had on the community. And what five
business houses do you suppose it was stood out in such a
virtuous attitude? ("THE DRUGGISTS.") (Answer
from a man in the rear of the house). Of course. Is there
one here who couldn't have instantly named the drug-
gists? It should also be plain to every one why the drug-
gists took this position. They all had government licenses to sell liquor and the open saloons were strong competitors in the business. These drug store proprietors quite naturally desired to monopolize the booze trade of the city.

The clothiers, shoe dealers, hardware merchants, grocers and other business houses of that nature, no doubt believed that the open saloons would stimulate business activity, put more money into circulation and make times more prosperous. It was not a question of "good" druggist and "bad" merchant, or vice versa. The coloring of the glasses through which these men looked at the saloon question was determined by their economic interests. (Economic Determinism.)

Inform me to what extent a person is financially or economically interested in any question or issue and I will, with a rare exception here and there, unerringly tell you whether he is for or against that question and approximately the extent of his activity in supporting or fighting it.

Thus we find the underlying cause of the attitude of the business men in the Texas town on the question of "wet" and "dry." Could you guess, do you think, which side of the question the saloon and liquor men were sided with?

At the session of the Kansas legislature just closed that body labored for days in the effort to draft a very conservative and nominal Minimum Wage Law for girls and women in factories and department stores. The Good Government Club, composed of over 600 splendid women in the state, worked night and day for the passage of the bill. They recognized in it a degree of protection, conducive to virtue and pure womanhood, for the girl who was forced out into the world and compelled to work for the miserable department store and factory wages. A committee from this woman's club called upon the officials of the Young Woman's Christian Association of Topeka for
the purpose of soliciting the co-operation of that organization and also secure some valuable data relative to wages paid to working girls and the general condition surrounding female labor in the state which was in the possession of the Y. W. C. A.

Surprising as it may seem to some, co-operation or assistance in any form in securing this much needed and desirable legislation was absolutely refused. The Y. W. C. A. officials excused their position by the cowardly subterfuge that they were not interested in politics or legislation. That their organization interested itself only in the spiritual welfare of working girls.

The cat, however, jumped out of the bag and stripped naked the sordid influence that dominated this association. It happened when one of the officials inadvertently remarked that even if they desired to co-operate with the Good Government Club it would be very poor policy, inasmuch as the leading financial contributors to their Y. W. C. A. were employers of female labor who owned department stores and factories, and were, quite naturally, opposed to the Minimum Wage Law.

Is there one here who is not capable of seeing the economic determinism in that palpably bought-and-paid-for attitude of the Topeka Y. W. C. A.?

Factory and department store owners are opposed to legislation that will force them to pay more wages to their employees. You would no doubt also be opposed if you were an employer of labor. I am not so sure that I wouldn't myself. The employees are in favor of legislation that will grant them more pay and shorter hours. You are and so am I, since we are wage workers.

Railroad stockholders are opposed to reductions in passenger and freight rates. The people who ride on the trains and ship freight over the railroads are in favor of as much reduction as can be secured.
The man who owns houses is in favor of high rents. The men who live in rented houses are in favor of low rents.

The mother and children who suffer poverty and abuse because of a drunken husband and father are in favor of prohibition. The saloon keeper, who makes a profit on the sale of the whiskey and other liquors the drunkard purchases, is opposed to prohibition. (Economic Determinism.)

Look into your own life and into the life of your neighbor. You will be able to see this universal law at work swaying and moulding your own and his opinions on questions pertaining to your personal lives, the life and position of institutions with which you are connected and the government and age in which you live. In the mad struggle for bread and the efforts to secure the future for our loved ones, none are wholly able to escape this influence.

THE CHURCH AND THE ANTAGONISTIC POLICY OF THE MINISTRY TO SOCIALISM

is a subject of much discussion and speculation on the part of many who have not had the opportunity or inclination to study the question from cause to effect.

Trace the history of the church and the ministry back through the days of feudalistic Europe and it will be observed that this same law of economic determinism has been one of the strongest factors in moulding its policy and the utterances of the clergy and priesthood.

"They who pay the fiddler usually select the tune, and the tune shall be rendered in such manner that it will tickle the ears of those who pay."

In feudal days who was it supported the church and paid the clergy? The serfs were taxed and robbed to a state of most pitiable poverty by the feudal lords for their enrichment and the support of the church. The serfs and the common people were taught and counciled by the priest-
hood to be obedient and subservient to the wishes of the lords of the manor. To be satisfied and contented with their lot here on earth, even though it was trying and hard to bear; that God was only testing their forbearance and patience that their souls might be acceptable in heaven. In this way only, they were taught, could they hope to escape eternal hellfire. And no man will ever be able to even wildly estimate the influence that awful threat has had on the development of the world.

In the days of chattel slavery we find that the ministry, with few exceptions, was preaching that the institution was ordained of God and must prevail forever. "Slaves must be humble and meek," the good book was interpreted to say. Servants were reminded that they should not protest or rise up in anger against their masters if they hoped for eternal salvation. Sentiments of this nature could be heard from practically every orthodox pulpit.

In America when the traffic in human flesh was legal, up to a few years before the civil war, the church was almost a unit in support of that infamous trade.

The reason for this position should be plain to every thinking person. The attitude of those who were financially supporting the church and the clergy must, of economic necessity, be the attitude of the supported. The slaves had nothing with which to maintain the church. The supporters of the institution of chattel slavery would contribute to the preacher and his church only so long as their economic interests were undisturbed. Let a minister dare to attack the system upon which the slave owner thrived and immediately that slave owner would withdraw his very necessary financial patronage.

To illustrate beyond the shadow of doubt how completely the church was dominated by the slave power up to a few years before the war, let me read from a quotation of James Birney's, who wrote in 1842 concerning the gen-
eral conference of the Methodist church held in Cincinnati in the year 1836. Mr. Birney says:

“In 1836 the General Conference of the Methodist Church met in May, in Cincinnati, a town of 46,000 inhabitants and in the free State of Ohio. An anti-slavery society had been formed there a year or two before. A meeting of the society was appointed for the evening of the 10th of May, to which the abolitionists attending the conference were invited.” (The Rev. Mr. Lovejoy, who was afterwards slain by a mob in defending his press at Alton, Ill., was present at the meeting). “Of those who attended, two made remarks suitable to the occasion. On the 13th of May Rev. S. G. Roszell presented in the conference the following preamble and resolutions:

“WHEREAS, Great excitement has pervaded the country on the subject of modern abolitionism, which is reported to have been increased in this city recently by the unjustifiable conduct of two members of the General Conference lecturing upon and in favor of that agitating topic; and

“WHEREAS, Such a course on the part of any of its members is calculated to bring upon this body the suspicion and distrust of the community and misrepresent its sentiments in regard to the point at issue; and

“WHEREAS, In this aspect of the case, a due regard for its own character, as well as a just concern for the interests of the church confided to its care, demand a full, decided, unequivocal expression of the views of the General Conference in the premises; therefore

“Be it Resolved, By the delegates of the annual conference, that they disapprove, in the most unqualified sense, the conduct of the two members of the General Conference who are reported to have lectured in this city upon and in favor of modern abolitionism.

“Resolved, By the delegates of the annual conference, that they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism, and wholly disclaim any right, wish or intention to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slave-holding states of this union.”

The vote of the conference, on the resolutions I have just read, stood 122 for the adoption to 11 against. And
this in the free State of Ohio at a General Conference of the Methodist church, composed at that time of over 700,-

000 members.

The man or woman who dared, in that turbulent time, to criticise this action of the Methodist conference was branded as an infidel and a heretic by the pimps and paid retainers of the slave power, even as I will be branded as an infidel and an assailer of religion by every supporter of capitalism who hears me state these truths.

But whether these abolitionists were infidels and heretics or not, their work brought forth good fruit. They suffered every form of abuse, indignity, and many of them even death, but their cause ultimately triumphed. Before it was accomplished, however, the whole structure of the church and even the government itself was shaken to their very foundations.

In the year 1844, only eight years after the conference to which I have just referred, the Methodist church was split wide open upon the rock of chattel slavery at its general conference in Boston. When this split occurred there was established a North Methodist church and a South Methodist church, and the Mason and Dixon line divided the two.

The South Methodist church with its ministry was lined up solidly under the banner of chattel slavery. On the other hand, the North Methodist church was either neutral on the question or openly in favor of abolitionism.

The preachers of the South church were paid and sustained by the supporters of the slave system and in return the iniquitous traffic in negro slaves was ardently defended from every southern pulpit. The chattel who toiled in a master's field and slept in a slave's bed, was herded into a slave church and there taught the soul-destroying doctrine of resignation and obedience to his bodily owner. He was cowed and controlled by the damnable dogma that God had
branded him with a black mark and consigned him to this humiliating and degrading condition of slavery. To even aspire to something better on this earth meant eternal hell-fire to his simple and undeveloped mind.

It was not that the northern ministry and church were any better or any worse than the southern ministry and church, or vice versa.

It was a question of the economic interest that surrounded the church and its ministry. The tongue of every southern pastor was tied with a log chain, so to speak. Not one of them would have dared to preach any other kind of a message. To have done so would have meant tar and feathers and perhaps death. At the very least every dollar of financial support would have been withdrawn and the church wrecked upon the rock of financial bankruptcy.

In the north conditions were different. The church was controlled and financed by the rising young capitalist class which recognized in the institution of chattel slavery a grave menace to their expanding supremacy. Hence the church of the north was enabled to take a stand, to some considerable extent, at least, against the slave power.

The Methodist church was no different from the other established churches of the time. Its history is paralleled by the history of all of the others. That I happen to be familiar with the data on this particular denomination is my only reason for citing you to its history.

I trust I have made my case sufficiently plain. I don't want a single person in this audience to misunderstand my motive in analyzing these matters. Surely you understand that the church, being economically dependent on the feudal lord and the slave master, was compelled because of this dependency to defend and support the systems as they existed. The demand was: "Support us and our institutions or perish," and right valiantly did the churches and priesthood support them.
Some of you are perhaps saying that even though my indictment is true regarding the attitude of the church in feudal and slavery days, it is not true today. Of course it is not true that the church is supporting feudalism or slavery in our present civilization. From what source, please, would it receive financial assistance if it should attempt the defense of these antiquated systems?

Through the irreversible laws of evolution the world has slowly and painfully made its way up through the weary ages of the past towards light and freedom. The pioneers in the world of thought are today fighting the present system of industry—Capitalism. And never in human history has there been any established order that fought with more weapons or with more determination to maintain itself than will the Capitalist system. It is the final stand of industrial tyranny. From fortress to fortress the intelligent discontent of the people has forced existing order after existing order. Today the feudal baron and the slave owner, masquerading as captains of industry, are fighting to the death on the very edge of their last citadel.

The exploited and dispossessed working class is organizing all over the world. Class lines are being distinctly drawn between exploiter and exploited. Capitalism is organized and is re-intrenching in every direction for the final inevitable conflict, the skirmishing of which is now in open progress. Solidified and buttressed to the support of the prevailing capitalist system can be found the courts, the armies and navies, every branch of the governmental powers and THE CHURCH.

Who pays the operating expenses of the present day orthodox church? Answer that question yourself and see if you cannot understand the cause of the churches' and ministers' opposition to Socialism. For a minister of the gospel, preaching in a church that is financially supported by beneficiaries of the system, to openly espouse the cause
of the workers, who are the exploited victims, means for that man early removal and dishonor.

In the days of anti-slavery agitation hundreds of earnest men in the pulpits of the country were summarily dismissed for preaching and crying aloud against the infamous traffic in human flesh. Today there are hundreds of ministers who have had the courage to preach and cry aloud against the infamous profit system and the traffic in men, women and children of the working class, and they have been summarily dismissed and branded as heretics, agitators and infidels.

Again, "They who pay the fiddler insist on selecting the tune, and the tune must be rendered in such a manner that it will tickle the ears of those who pay."

The average retained capitalist minister leads in the Lord’s Prayer, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done IN EARTH AS IT IS IN HEAVEN." And then they tell us to be satisfied with our humble position in life, as this is only a short sojourn in which to prepare for a place in Glory. Instead of preaching and fighting and working to make "THE EARTH" as we have been taught "IT IS IN HEAVEN," they solemnly open their bibles and endeavor to prove by their scriptures that our poverty and rags and hunger are just as God intended should be our condition. They interpret from God’s word that "We must have the poor with us always."

I want here and now to brand as my enemy and as the enemy of my class any man or woman or doctrine that counsels us to be contented and satisfied with our lot here on earth while we are being exploited and robbed out of four-fifths of the product of our toil, with the result that the many live in want, or the fear of want, while the few, who glean the benefits of the exploitation, revel in excessive luxury.

He who admonishes us to keep our eyes on the stars
while some one is picking our pockets and our children are crying for bread is not our friend, but a subtle and traducing foe.

I realize that my discussion of this question will be misinterpreted by a few honest people and misconstrued and distorted intentionally by some others. But on the whole, I believe that the most of you will be honest with yourselves and with me. You will understand that in this argument I am not assailing religion or the teachings of the Man of Galilee, but only pointing out the corrupting influence of the present system on even the most sacred of our institutions.

Two thousand years ago The Christ lashed the money changers out of the temple. He preached a doctrine fearlessly against the existing order of the time and as a consequence paid the penalty on the Cross of Calvary. He was branded as an infidel and a heretic, as a dissenter and a preacher of the gospel of discontent. He was guilty in the eyes of those who stoned Him and heaped vile epithets at His defenseless head and later crucified Him. The early Abolitionist was reviled, persecuted and even killed for his efforts to see slavery abolished. He was denounced from pulpit and press as a despised “nigger lover,” as an anarchist who wanted to destroy the government, an infidel and a heretic. We find the same element, that nailed The Christ to the Cross and assassinated Lovejoy, in our present day society. It is shrieking aloud against the Socialists, branding them as “free lovers,” “anarchists,” “infidels” and every other thing that is generally considered loathsome and repulsive.

In spite of it all Christianity thrived and grew apace, the Abolitionist was victorious, and today we Socialists move serenely on with the gratifying knowledge that our work is in scientific harmony with the forces of evolution
and is based upon the fundamental principles of right and justice.

We are firm in the belief that no power on this earth can successfully check our march to ultimate victory. If there was no other force at work but the economic necessity of the people, that alone would eventually force the change from Capitalism, with its nightmare, to Socialism, with what some sneeringly call "its beautiful dream."

Eliminating the ethical, the sentimental and the spiritual significance from my discourse tonight and constructing my argument entirely upon the economic base, I am sure that I will be able to convince you that it will be to our mutual interest if we all get together and fight for the demands of Socialism.

Could I have received some supernatural assistance just before the recent election and had the power to pledge to all the workers in the nation a literal distribution of all the wealth, to "divide it all up," as we have been charged with wanting to do, by which arrangement every family would have received approximately $7,500 worth of property, ninety per cent of the working class would have joined hands with us and assisted in ushering in Socialism. The extravagant promise of $7,500 for each would have effectually deadened your conscientious scruples regarding the injustice of dispossessing Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Morgan and others who now possess modern industry. (Economic determinism). You never did own $7,500 worth of wealth and never will in this system. One here and there, possibly, may be an exception, but they have been and will be few and far apart.

In this connection, friends, please permit me to digress briefly from my subject and answer that stale and idiotic objection to Socialism. If, by some miraculous power this division of property could be accomplished, what railroad would you like to have? What particular portion of the Steel Trust would you prefer, and what would you do with it after it was yours?
How would we go about it to divide up the railroads, and telegraph lines, the steel industry, the coal mines, the post office and all of the other means of production and distribution?

Who said the Socialists wanted to divide up? There never was an authorized Socialist who advanced such an idea; never a bona fide Socialist periodical that proposed such a thing, and it has never been even remotely suggested in any official declaration of the Socialist Party.

In the first place such a proposition is an utter impossibility and no one knows it better than the Socialist. Who then has been systematically circulating this imbecile avowal? Not the Socialists, that is sure, but the enemies of Socialism, and a lot of you Mutts who haven’t anything to divide but an old pair of suspenders, have been, with parrot-like idiocy, repeating what these enemies knew, in your servile imitating, you would repeat.

The next person who suggests to any one of you that the Socialists want to “divide up,” ask him which brick he will want out of the County High School building when the Socialists carry your country?

The County buildings in Crawford County, Kansas, are still intact. The Socialists carried this county at the 1912 election but as yet have not “divided up” the court house.

LABOR PRODUCES ALL WEALTH.

At this time permit me to call your attention to a principle of scientific economics. Labor of brain and brawn, applied to natural resources, produces all wealth. There isn’t a professor of economics in any college or university on earth that will for a moment attempt to refute that economic truth. Give the thought a place in your mind and let it remain there. Reason from that base and see if your eyes will not open.

To impress this truth indelibly on your mind let us consider the mansion that stands on the hill or avenue. It is worth, let us say, two million dollars, and has another two million dollars worth of furnishings on the interior.

The designs of this mansion are drawn in the brain of an
architect. Physical labor drove every nail, placed every prop and column, did all the paper hanging, painting, frescoeing, wood work, plastering; placed every fixture, every rug and every latch on the doors; did all of the excavating and beautifying of the lawns and the gardens—in fact, did all the work, both brain and physical, in connection with this manor-house. But labor does not live in the place that it alone has erected. Labor lives in a hovel down on the other side of the railroad yards that it also created and usually pays rent or tribute to the man who lives in the mansion for the privilege of occupying the shack.

During the Congressional investigation of the striking mill hands at Lawrence, Mass., last winter, it was learned that in one mill, where three hundred children were employed in the manufacture of woolen underclothing, only three of them had a woolen garment on their thinly clad, shivering little bodies.

Labor produces everything. Houses, food, clothing, conveyances; necessities of all kinds and all of the luxuries, and yet has practically nothing. This truth is plainly evident on every hand. All you need do is open your eyes and look around. Who is it works the hardest and the longest hours; suffers the most hardships and poverty; is continuously worried and harassed in regard to what the future months and years have to offer to wife and babies. Answer it yourself.

The worker functions in every activity of industrial life and in the production of all of the wealth. The chief function of the capitalist owner is to absorb the greater share of labor's production, spend his summers in the coolest climes, and his winters in the warmth and sunshine of Southern California or Florida. He usually endeavors to return home in time to vote one of the tickets of his class along with a majority of his pilfered victims from the ranks of labor.

What do you suppose would happen if tomorrow every bond-holding and interest-drawing capitalist should pack his wardrobe and in his yacht sail to the farthest isle of the
resounding sea, never to return? If labor were properly orga-
nized on the political and industrial field such an event would
scarcely make a ripple on the surface of modern industry.

On the other hand, if labor should all quit work suddenly,
what do you suppose would happen? If continued it is surely
evident to all that the world would soon starve to death.

Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, who some years ago attracted to
himself considerable attention with a book, entitled, "What
would Jesus Do?" has recently written an article for one of the
popular magazines, entitled, "The Great Catastrophe of
1913." In this article he assumes that every worker on
earth is suddenly stricken with arm and hand paralysis.
Ministers, authors, singers, brokers, lawyers, actors, polit-
ticians, financiers and society leaders are not afflicted. Al-
though the malady lasted only one week, civilization was at
a standstill and the world was on the verge of absolute
starvation. Sheldon only points out in this article that which
every one knows would happen if such a catastrophe should
smite the working class.

Although everything that is eaten, the clothes that are
worn, coal that it burned, lumber that is used and all wealth
that is produced is the creature of labor, another element in our
society has the great bulk of it in its possession.

It is conservatively estimated that EIGHTY PER CENT
of the people, within which per cent all of the creators of wealth
are numbered, own and control less than TWENTY PER
CENT of their own products. On the other hand TWENTY
PER CENT of the people, who produce nothing, have in their
possession more than EIGHTY PER CENT of the wealth.

U. S. Census statistics estimate that the average worker
in mine, mill, factory and on the farm produces approximately
$2,500 worth of wealth per annum and receives back in the
form of wages and as proceeds from the farm products approxi-
mately $500 per annum. The difference of $2,000 goes into the
hands of the TWENTY PER CENT, made up of non-producers.

Would it not be to your economic interest, fellow workers, to receive for your labor, the full product of your toil? That is what Socialism offers.

We contend that to the producer of wealth should go the full equivalent for labor performed, less the maintenance of government. This can only be secured when the people in their collective capacity take over and operate for themselves those things upon which they must depend for their livelihood.

Of course we have been taught for ages that capital was entitled to consideration. Those who benefit by the capitalist system of production evidently believe that those who now control capital are entitled to very much the higher consideration. The siren song that is continuously dinned into our ears of the sacredness of private property and the rights of the present holders, as well as a comparison of the actual conditions of the laborer and the capitalist, would certainly so indicate.

There are some who can't understand how we would ever get along without the individual capitalist. The mystery to me is how we have managed to tolerate and get along with him as long as we have.

I think the story of an ocean wreck that happened once upon a time may illustrate clearly this point: A vessel was wrecked in mid-ocean, the boats were lowered and the rescued ones consisted of 100 laborers and one banker with a chest of gold. After drifting for several days the boats landed on a beautiful and fertile island which was uninhabited. The versatile banker at once proposed that they establish a modern twentieth century civilization among themselves. He, with his gold, would pay the men $1.00 per day for their labor power and all work for him. They foolishly considered the plan a wise one and at once begun the building of houses, the plowing of ground and the putting in of crops, the digging of coal, the manufacture of clothing, furniture, dishes, etc., which they
turned over to the banker, who in turn paid them the stipulated
$1.00 per day wage agreed upon. A few years rolled by and
the workers took an inventory of their condition. It was de-
cidedly noticeable that the banker and his family lived in the
best houses, dressed in the finest clothing, partook of the
choicest food and enjoyed the most leisure. The hundred
workers then began to protest and complain and at last or-
ganized themselves into a union. They visited the capitalist
employer of their labor power and placed before him their
demands. Said they: We recognize the rights of capital
and the consideration that you, the possessor of it, are en-
titled to receive. However, we work hard and long hours
and receive very little pay. We want our wages raised
from $1.00 per day to $1.50 per day, our hours of labor re-
duced from ten to eight and recognition of our union. The
capitalist refused to settle on these terms, but agreed to
arbitrate. So they arbitrated and at last settled the trouble
on a basis which gave the workers $1.25 per day for nine
hours work.

The workers were happy in securing this increase and went
contentedly back to their labors. They soon saw, however,
that conditions were not materially bettered and again they
demanded and again got an increase. This went on year after
year and they discovered that every time the capitalist granted
them increased pay and shorter hours the rent on the houses
in which they lived was raised in proportion, food supplies
cost more and the price of clothing and coal went up. Their
union was not bringing material results. What was the differ-
ence whether they received ten cents per day or ten dollars
per day if it took it all to live. The capitalist could charge
them, for the necessities of life, all they made anyway.

A careful study of their civilization revealed the fact that
the laws were made in the interest of the banker, the political
government with its small army of police force was behind
him and the church was counseling them to complacently reconcile themselves to little earthly irregularities in order to fit themselves for the future life. If they were poor they were admonished not to complain. Life on this earth was only an instant considerately granted them by the Heavenly Father for submissive preparation to dwell in His House forever. They should devote spare time to studying their music that they would be able to sing with credit His praises in eternity.

They were told that God, in His infinite wisdom, had placed the lands, the coal mines and all of the industries into the hands of the rich capitalist, who was to be the "goat" and go to hell for the sole purpose of giving them the blessed opportunity of salvation. Was it not written that "it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven."

These men, however, decided to take a chance and enjoy a little heaven on earth since the opportunity afforded. They didn't believe that God Almighty would be unforgiving if they did manage to secure enough to eat, clothes to wear and houses in which to live. So they migrated to an adjacent island upon rafts they hurriedly constructed. Here they built beautiful homes for themselves, manufactured clothing and wore it and produced food which they consumed. In fact, they owned collectively the island and all it contained and none received tribute from another's labor. The story relates that they were happy ever afterwards.

And by the way, what became of the banker? He sat on his money chest and starved to death.

Some probably think the illustration overdrawn. It is not. On the island was conducted a miniature civilization. Our condition as workers is paralleled by the condition of the ship-wrecked islanders. There was an abundance for ten times the number on either of the islands with affairs sanely administered. There is an abundance for ten
times the population on the earth if the people would only exercise the same intelligence in providing for themselves that they now do in supplying the few with more than they have any possible use for.

Every country is simply a great island and there have been a thousand shipwrecks instead of only one. I wonder if we will ever wake up? If we could only do so we would all have an abundance. An equal opportunity would be given to all of the children of men to produce wealth and enjoy the fruits thereof. The question of the economic condition of the people would be solved and each would have unhampered privilege of developing the spiritual, moral and intellectual side of his nature.

If we Socialists can only impress on the minds of the people the fact, as stated before, that all wealth is produced by the mental and physical energy of labor, and that upon labor alone rests the responsibility of all industrial activity, they will instinctively begin to feel the extent of their own and their children's wrongs.

Capitalist courts, laws, institutions, governments and spokesmen are all used in defense of the rights of private property. The children in school are taught from the very beginning the rudiments of commercialism. A child's mind, in the formative stage, is susceptible to every suggestion. Capitalist environment on every hand tends to shape and mold the young intellect in the conservative groove of orthodox commercialism.

For example, the young student is first taught, in the study of mathematics, the principles of rent, interest and profit. The first lessons usually consist of problems similar to the following: If Johnnie's papa buys a horse for $50.00 and sells it for $75.00, how much PROFIT does he make? Problems which tend to view capitalism from the other side of the question are carefully avoided. No orthodox arithmetic even suggests a problem like this: "If Johnnie's
THE RIGHTS OF THE MASSES

papa works a day and produces $10.00 worth of wealth and receives back in the form of wages $2.00, HOW MUCH IS HE ROBBED OF?"

Here's a little boy on this front seat, perhaps seven years of age. This boy is naturally a Socialist. Every boy and every girl of seven is naturally a Socialist. Let us see. Suppose, young man, that you take yourself out into the woods and with your hatchet cut some tree branches, and with these and some sticks and grass and mud you build a little house. You have it equipped with a crude door, a hole through the roof in which you have inserted an old stove pipe joint thrown away by your mother, and perhaps you have divided it into two rooms by a partition. Now, there is another boy over here who had nothing to do with the building of this house. He doesn't even see it until after you have completed your work. Which one of you is entitled to possession, you or the boy who had nothing to do with the work of construction. (The boy promptly answered that he should have the house). Of course, there is no question about the ownership in this boy's mind. He instinctively knows that the builder should be the possessor. But there are some of you gentlemen in this audience who believe this other boy should own the house. At least that is the way you vote.

Now again, young man, suppose that all of these men here on this floor in front of me build a railroad. Some of them go into the forest and with axes chop down the gigantic oak and pine trees. These they hew into ties and saw into lumber. Some others erect great steel mills and mould railroad irons; others survey and grade the tracks, and others place the ties and rails, drive every spike, build every depot, every bridge, every car and every engine. In fact, these men do all of the work in connection with this imaginary railroad. That little bunch up there in the gallery have not turned a hand in rounding out this great
achievement. Now, who is entitled to ownership, the ones up in the gallery, who had nothing to do with the building, or these on this floor, who did everything? (The boy promptly answered that the railroad should belong to those who built it). No question on that score, is there? (Answer, "No, sir.") Of course, little man, you mustn't be surprised that some of these grown ups out here believe that the road should belong to that little bunch up there in the gallery. At least that is the way they vote. They have been to school where the ethics of capitalist society have been thoroughly hammered into their craniums.

The people have a very confused idea of just what Socialism is or what it proposes to do. The rich man, trained and environed in the commercialized atmosphere of the day, is quite naturally opposed to any movement that proposes to divest him of his abnormal power. On the other hand the working man, already divested of personal power or influence by the system, and realizing that any change that will benefit the whole people will also benefit him, is ready for Socialism as soon as he understands what it has to offer.

A man remarked this evening, at the hotel where I am stopping, that he didn't know as he was particularly opposed to Socialism, except the plan of Socialists to confiscate that which belonged to the rich.

If that gentleman happens to be present I want to disabuse his mind of the idea that we Socialists have the least desire to confiscate anything that belongs to the rich. We have no desire to take what belongs to them. Neither do we want them to have anything that belongs to us, the people.

The rich now have practically all of the wealth in their possession. Where and how they get it? Labor produced it all. No part of it was produced by the present owners. Is it not quite evident that a very few people have very much that the many created? Capitalist ethics maintain that the present arrangement is all right and that the few are entitled to what
they have. Also that the many are deserving of only their present condition with its poverty, misery and awful uncertainty. The Socialists, in behalf of the people, deny the right of the few to hold in their possession the necessities of life, and are unswerving in their determination to wrest from the hands of these twentieth century pirates the industries upon which the whole of society must depend for existence.

The first aim is the establishment of a real democracy. It will then be in the hands of the people to determine what method of procedure they will take to acquire possession.

Some Socialists insist that the capitalist will be paid for his railroads, mines, mills and factories. Others openly advocate confiscation. Good arguments are advanced from both viewpoints, although both agree that ultimately it will be determined by a vote of the people.

The advocates of purchasing the industries maintain that it will be cheaper for society, as a whole, than to forcibly take them. They illustrate their position by the awful cost in human life and money expended in the civil war and contend that it would have been infinitely cheaper to have purchased the slaves outright and then given them freedom. No doubt this is good argument, but the question arises, would the south have been willing to forever abandon slavery even if the government had purchased their property. It was the system of chattel slavery that menaced. The north was opposed to slavery and when a majority of the people at the ballot box expressed this opposition in the election of Abraham Lincoln, the south refused to abide by the will of the majority and that awful war resulted.

The advocates of confiscation hold that as all wealth has been created by labor, that labor is entitled to its production without remuneration to the ones now in possession. When a majority of the people vote for Socialism it is self evident that they are in favor of the people as a whole owning and operating the industries of the nation.

Since the people have created everything of value does it
not morally belong to the people? Because a few have had
possession and use for their personal benefit, of the wealth
produced by all, does that necessarily justify their holding of
it continued? Is not the word “confiscation” a misnomer? If
one of you men here tonight should steal my overcoat and two
or three years hence I found your son wearing it, you would
surely not call it “confiscation” if I reclaimed my property?

However, we have on our present statute books laws that
will answer the purpose of Socialism very well in taking over
industry. For instance you own a farm. It is clear of all in-
cumbrance. Taxes are all paid and the abstract and deed pro-
claim you the rightful and sole owner. You put up signs on
every corner: “KEEP OUT—NO TRESPASSING!” Some
evening you return from town and find a couple of men with
instruments sighting directly across your land. They are draw-
ing lines and setting stakes. You rush to where they are and
peremptorily order them to vacate your premises. They reply
that they are surveying a right-of-way for a railroad that pro-
poses building through that section. You insist that so long
as you own it no railroad will be built through your farm. The
surveyors calmly advise you that your wishes in the matter
are of no consequence. The railroad is going through and
incidentally your barn is directly in its path and must be moved.
You bluster and storm and threaten, but the railroad is built
through and you move your barn or they tear it down.

The law of EMINENT DOMAIN has been applied to
you and your farm. This law recognizes the rights of so-
ciety as of paramount importance to your individual rights.
It gives to the state or nation the right to APPROPRIATE
the property of its citizens for public uses and benefits.

The rights of the individual, regardless of how sacred
they may be considered, should always be subservient to the
rights of society. In fact what might be termed the RIGHTS
of an individual, are not RIGHTS in any sense if they menace
the welfare and best interests of a majority of the people.
Your leading business man, or minister, or doctor in this town, regardless of how good and kindhearted and considerate he may be for the welfare of others, is heartlessly stripped of every vestige of personal liberty or rights if he menaces the welfare or health of the community. Suppose he contracts some terrible contagious disease—the black plague, leprosy or small-pox. To banish him to a leper colony or a pest house means absolute ruin for him and his family. Past service to the community, personal rights, charitableness—all are considered of minor importance. The welfare of the community is in danger and there is no hesitation on your part. He must go even though it means death to him and degradation and unrecoverable ruin to his family.

The personal rights of the individual are minimized in proportion to the total number of inhabitants in any given community. Thus the rights of all the people in the United States are one hundred million times as great as the rights of any one person.

Socialists recognize the justice of this principle and insist that the welfare of the people, the greatest good to the greatest number, will be furthered when all of the people own and operate collectively the national industries. Once we can induce the masses to investigate the justice and saneness of our position we are firm in our conviction that they will flock to our standard.

Nature has been lavish in her supply of all the necessities and all of the luxuries, and just a small degree of common sense exercised by the people in the distribution would give to every man, woman and child more than they could possibly use or need.

Our overtaxed sense of justice to the privileged few will be exploded and annihilated and in its stead will come the larger and wider interpretation of justice to the many who have shivered in the wintry blasts of industrial poverty throughout
the long weary ages of human history. The qualms of conscience which some of us may honestly feel and that have been so skillfully and seductively cultivated in the public mind by the professors, lawyers, ministers, politicians and tutors of the sacredness of private property and the virtues of commercial capitalism, will be supplanted by shame and righteous self-condemnation at our own stupidity and social indifference.

Once the moral consciousness of the masses is aroused to the enormity of the present system, with all that pertains to it, and it will not be a question of how will this change be brought about, so much as how can it be accomplished in the shortest possible time.

When society takes this next inevitable step the world will then appreciate the real meaning of freedom. And take it we will or science is a lie, the theory of evolution is an imbecility and the idea of the human race progressing upward is an aberration in which the world is hopelessly wallowing.

Listen, you skeptics who imagine Socialism will never triumph. In 1848 the nucleus of the present International Socialist movement was organized in England and was known as "The International." From that day to this Socialism has never lost strength at a national election in any civilized country on the globe. It has steadily and surely marched onward and upward for all these years in spite of the ridicule, the misrepresentation, the lies and persecution, until today it stands out clearly head and shoulders above every movement of a political or economic nature that has ever agitated the various countries of the earth. Its strength is today numbered in the tens of millions. It has more than one hundred thousand elected officials, eleven million votes and more than thirty million loyal devoted partisans who can be found in every land where human rights are abused.

They say in Germany that the movement there is not like the Socialism of other countries. In France and England it is
argued by the conservative supporters of the existing order that the Socialism of other countries is different from the Socialism at home. We are told in America that the Socialism of Germany and other European countries is more like the Progressive, or Bull Moose party. That American Socialism is too radical and extreme and not at all in harmony with the world Socialist movement.

Incorporated in every Socialist platform in the world can be found the same fundamental principles. The party of the United States has a bona fide affiliation with the International Socialist Party, and every three years we send our delegates to the International Congress with credentials authorizing them to participate in the deliberations of that body.

Statements of this kind are used for the sole purpose of misleading the masses. When the people realize the magnitude and strength of the Socialist movement they will begin to investigate its merits. And to investigate means ultimate indorsement of the principles and affiliation with its party. Ninety-nine per cent of the working people will be Socialists when they understand it thoroughly. The interests know this and so long as they are able to keep you prejudiced, and bullet proof against studying its philosophy, they will be able to continue waxing fat at the expense of your stupidity.

SUMMING UP.

Socialism stands for three fundamental principles. Collective ownership of public utilities. To the producer of wealth the full social value of his labor. To each and every person equal opportunities and advantages. Would the carrying out of this program work a hardship on any of you, I wonder? If society owned all of the public industries and guaranteed every worker a job at at least $2,000 per year, with hours of work reduced in proportion to the number of people employed, with educational advantages for your children, wholesome surroundings for your family, opportunity to travel and see the
world, would it tend to make you less religious, neglectful of your family, change your future nature for the worse, kill your incentive to progress, curb your individuality, or demoralize the equilibrium of your moral and spiritual nature?

These are the dangers capitalist spokesmen point out with menacing warning.

Analyze the economic interests of those who are so bitterly against Socialism and its program. The power and influence and superabundance in which they now arrogantly indulge would be taken from them. The enormous wealth which they have so skillfully extracted from the efforts of others would be restored to THE PEOPLE, its proper and legitimate owners. Then the advantages which the unjust and plundered wealth gives to its present possessors would be removed and they would have an equal opportunity with the rest of society to win, on their merits, the love and respect of the world.

In our present system of society it is, of course, to their interests to fence themselves into positions of security by class legislation; use every subterfuge and sophistry they are capable of mustering to keep themselves in their positions of security and power. They have the ability, given them by great wealth, to employ the wisest and brainiest lawyers, teachers and preachers, to make laws, teach and preach in their interests. That they have been and are using these, with every other force at their command, is clearly evident to every thinking person. How long it will continue depends entirely upon the working class and its ability to analyze the simple laws of economic determinism.

We have within our power the timely opportunity to wrest from the hands of the capitalist class every office from dog catcher to president if we will but exercise intelligence enough to stand together.

Let the bankers, merchants, employers of labor and other capitalists support their class tickets. It is decidedly natural
that they should. Let the working class vote for and support their class ticket. Failure to do so is decidedly unnatural.

Any political party that fails to demand for the producer of wealth the full equivalent, is bound to be controlled by believers in the capitalist system, and is therefore a capitalist party.

The Socialist party is the only party that has ever come out openly in defense of the rights of labor; that recognizes the underlying laws of human activity and proposes to continue the fight to its final culmination along the economic lines which have molded and developed the races through the ages of the past from civilization to civilization.

So far as you and I and the rest of the workers are concerned it doesn't make any difference whether the Republican or Democratic party is in power, the best we can expect from either is the worst of it. Whether in a Democratic state or a Republican state, with a Democratic president or a Republican president, has there ever been a single instance that the courts, the militia, the police and every power of administration has not been used in the defense of the capitalist interests and against the workers?

On the other hand designate a single instance where a Socialist has been in office or authority that he has not used his power in the interests of the workers? There has never to my knowledge been a Republican or Democrat mayor of a city who issued an order such as did Mayor Lewis Duncan, the Socialist of Butte, Montana, during the late machinists' strike on the Harriman railway systems. He ordered his chief of police to arrest as a vagrant, and order him to move on outside of that jurisdiction or go on the rock pile, every strike breaker that came to the city, whether singly or in train load lots.

In the city of Milwaukee a strike happened on the street car lines, during the Socialist administration, and the demands of the strikers were granted and they put back to work in a
few hours. The police force and city administration were used to give the strikers, at least, an equal opportunity with the employers.

Immediately following the change of the city administration from Socialist to capitalist control, these same men went out on another strike and the following day they returned to their work, whipped and beaten into submission. The police force and city administration were promptly mustered to the side of the employers and against the strikers.

The Socialist party is a workingman's party. Organized, controlled, financed and morally supported by the working class.

If you are a capitalist and make your living by exploiting other men and women, your logical place is in a capitalist party. If you are a working man or woman and make your living by honest labor your logical place is in the ranks of the Socialist party.

It is your duty, not only to vote the ticket, but to join the organized party and assist in its propaganda and management. You have a Socialist local in your community. Attend its meetings and inquire into the party work. Its sessions are always open to the public, which is cordially invited to attend. Without organization the workers can never hope to conquer. It is through the party that constitutions and platforms are drafted and adopted, education and agitation carried on, literature distributed, speakers secured, candidates for all offices selected and campaigns so vigorously conducted.

The Socialist party now has approximately one hundred and fifty thousand (150,000) dues-paying members in the United States and is increasing year after year. The dues are from ten to twenty-five cents per month. Five cents goes to the state office, five to the national office and the balance remains in your local treasury.

Again, "the man who pays the fiddler usually selects the tune." Capitalists contribute to capitalist party campaign funds, and they insist upon moulding the policy of the political parties
they financially support. The working class pays every dollar of Socialist campaign funds, and the working class has and will mould the policy of the party it financially supports. (Economic determinism.)

In closing let me appeal to you to organize both upon the political field in the Socialist party, and upon the industrial field into a gigantic union where the interests of one workingman will be the concern of every other workingman. If you now belong to a craft union, as I do myself, labor incessantly towards every form of industrialism. Fight every policy that has a tendency to divide you on this important field. The more craft unions you are divided into the weaker will be each craft and the more easily crushed by the unified action of your industrial enemies. The fewer unions with the larger membership betokens more strength.

Solidarity is the watchword of every Socialist. The more solidarity labor can show, both politically and industrially, the more strength it can muster.

Let each of us go from this meeting with a renewed determination to concentrate our lives more devotedly to the work of doing all that lies within our limited power to usher in that happy day when economic misery and uncertainty will be wiped out root and branch, never to curse this beautiful and bountiful earth again.

In that day women and men will be equal; tender girls will not be forced into prostitution for bread, and children will be given to the play ground and the schools instead of industrial slave pens. Human beings will not be compelled, because of economic necessity, to lie, dupe, ensnare and rob their brothers. No man's hand will be raised against another and for the first time in human history the people of the world will have the beautiful opportunity to practice willingly and gladly the precepts of the Man of Galilee and "do unto others as we would like to have them do unto us."
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