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DEDICATED.
Comrade Chairman, Comrades and Friends: We're so accustomed to the political speaker dressed in silk hat, Prince Albert coat, patent leather shoes and kid gloves; who uses a lot of words we don't understand, lays down a lot of propositions we can't comprehend—couldn't carry out if we did—I say we're so accustomed to that sort of thing that it may be something of a relief tonight to hear just a simple statement of fact, told in a simple way, by a man with so little to conceal that he doesn't have to be dignified. If I break any of the conventions of the platform, if I do not conform to all the set rules of political "speeches," please remember that it's because I've no favors to ask of you. I am not a candidate, don't want you to vote for me and sha'n't ask you to vote for anyone else. So I'm going to be perfectly natural.

Not long ago as my train drew into a small town my attention was attracted out the car window by a noise. Looking out I saw an old farmer beating a tin pan and yelling at the top of his voice—a lot of foolish, senseless stuff with absolutely no meaning. I thought he was crazy till I looked closely and saw him standing by a bee hive. Then I knew he wasn't crazy at all. You know why people keep bees, don't you? You farmers; you know why farmers keep bees. Why, so they can get their honey; so they can ROB them! Certainly! What's the sense of investing your money in enough lumber to build a bee hive unless you can rob the bees? There'd be no sense in that, would there? Of course not!

Now then, what's the sense of investing your money in a factory, a coal mine, stocks, bonds, a store—what's the sense of investing your money in anything unless you can—make a profit? You who are not Socialists call it profit when it applies to men and women, though you're perfectly willing to call it robbery in the case of the bees.
The only difference between you and us is that we bunch the two and call it all robbery. It's the same thing in both cases but you have two names for it while we have but one.

**Human Society and a Bee Hive.**

Tonight we're going to see how closely you, I, and the rest of us resemble a hive full of bees. Going to see if we're being ROBBED. We'll call things by their real names. Some of you folks are going to get hopping mad. That's foolish. You'll just have to get over it! You never were mad at any one in all your life, but you had to forget about it some time. It's a waste of energy. Let's try for an hour and a half, to forget that we're Republicans, Democrats, Progressives, Socialists or Prohibitionists. Let's just be folks gathered here to discuss matters, remembering that nothing hurts but the truth and that doesn't hurt unless it HITS. Now, if you get mad you'll know why.

These bees had really been robbed. You're all willing to admit that. They had worked out in the fields and stored up honey in the hive. Then at regular intervals this old farmer came, took all of the honey from the hive, put back barely enough for them to live on, consumed or sold the rest and gave the bees nothing in return. That's robbery. The honey he returned to the hive was the bees' wages; that was what they got for working. The honey he deliberately swiped is what the Socialist calls profit or surplus value.

On the day I mention the bees had begun to swarm. They had shot up into the air and the chances were that they'd change the system under which they were living from the hive system to the hollow tree system. Instead of continuing to store honey in a hive where this farmer could rob them of the major portion, they would probably have set up for themselves in a hollow tree where they could have ALL the honey they produced and not SOME of it. And this farmer was a mighty fine old man. He was a good citizen, voted the straight party ticket, paid his debts, went to church regularly and wouldn't tell a lie if the truth would serve as well. All his life he had been saying, and ACTUALLY BELIEVED, that he was keeping bees. But when he realized that they might leave his hive he suddenly decided that he wasn't keeping bees at all—THE BEES WERE KEEPING HIM! You see
there's a difference. So he got out his tin pan, beat it as hard as he could and yelled with all his might. He made so much noise he confused the bees, they forgot what they wanted to do and didn't change the system at all. Instead, they settled down right close. Then he picked them up and put them in another hive. I saw him do it. And of course you know what'll happen to those bees. Why, they'll be ROBBED again. This new hive was painted on the outside to look different from the others. But it was the same old hive system. When the bees swarm from there, every time they get to thinking for themselves, every time they make a break for liberty, if this farmer can be on hand to make enough noise and confuse them they can be robbed year after year, can't they? Surely. It all depends on the amount of noise.

Swarming Political Conventions.

Do you remember all the noise they made at that last Republican convention in Chicago? Lots of noise. And do you remember how they beat the tin pan forty-six times at the Baltimore convention before they'd tell us who was to be the Democratic king bee? And then as the excitement calmed down we saw what it was all about. Roosevelt came out with a Progressive hive and set it up close by. You know the American voter has begun to swarm. You, yourself, have been getting almighty tired of the way things are going. You've mentioned this to other people; you found that they, too, were thinking along the same lines. The politicians have noticed you talking and now they have it all fixed up for you. If you're tired of being robbed under a Democratic administration, and you dislike the idea of a return to being skinned under a Republican one, why now you can be "skun" under a Progressive administration. The new, Progressive, hive is painted on the outside to look slightly different from the other two, but it's the same old system.

If, at the next election, you'll just vote any one of their three tickets, go into any one of their three hives, they'll get your honey and your hide and tallow to boot. They're not overly anxious as to which hive you enter, either. We're going to see that clearly in a little bit.

Socialism in Fifteen Words.

I know that there are ten thousand Capitalist definitions of Socialism. I've heard that many myself and I
believe there are three or four that I haven't heard. Socialists have have just one definition but people who aren't Socialists don't know what Socialism is, so they have to guess at it. And no two of them guess alike. From all these different guesses come the various and conflicting definitions of Socialism. I've heard politicians say they'd just run their legs off trying to find a definition of Socialism and couldn't get it. Of course if they'd use their heads instead of their legs they'd succeed. But they don't. So I'm going to give you a tangible definition of Socialism in fifteen words. All of you can remember fifteen words. Briefly now, reduced to just what it is and what it is not, Socialism means this: PUBLIC (COLLECTIVE) OWNERSHIP OF THINGS PUBLICLY (COLLECTIVELY) USED AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF THINGS PRIVATELY USED. And that's all there is to it. Democratic management of industry would necessarily come about with collective ownership; that feature is really included in the definition but I state it separately to make it perfectly clear. At present we have profit, rent and interest BECAUSE the things collectively used are privately owned. But profit, rent and interest, which we'll take up in a little bit, are EFFECTS caused by the private ownership of things collectively used. If we collectively owned the things which we collectively use profit, rent and interest would disappear.

Now then, any book, any newspaper, any man saying that Socialism means anything BUT this—that it means divide up, anarchy, break up the home, free love, destroy religion, tear down the church—anything BUT the collective ownership of things collectively used and the private ownership of things privately used—such a book, newspaper or man is either innocently falsifying or deliberately lying. Either he doesn't know what he's talking about or DOES know what he's talking about and is purposely misstating the facts. In either case he's attempting to do to you exactly what the farmer was doing to the bees—he's trying to swarm you. Consciously or unconsciously he's making a lot of noise about something which does not concern the issue in an effort to confuse you and lead your mind away from the one fundamental point. Why, we say that the things collectively used should be collectively owned; and these rascals grab a tin pan and begin yelling, "break up the home." And we say that with the introduction of such a system the workers will receive the FULL
social value of their toil—not SOME of it but ALL of it. And again these scoundrels take a dish pan in one hand and a potato masher in the other and paw the air about “dividing up,” or some other nonsense. It’s utterly impossible to drag one of them on the platform to debate SOCIALISM—the collective ownership of things collectively used and the private ownership of things privately used. They refuse to face an audience unless they can swarm the auditors.

Issues, Real and Unreal.

Then you know we’ve a lot of issues. I happen to be a Pythian; over here’s a man who’s a Mason; there’s an Odd Fellow, there a Woodman—you know all the fraternal orders we have; and the various religious denominations; and the political differences; social and so forth. In campaign time we’re gravely informed that the Hon. So and So will address the voters on “the issues of the campaign.” I suppose if we could count them all we’d find that we’ve ten thousand issues too. And they’re all swarming tactics but two. There are but two real issues in all the world; they are RIGHT and WRONG. Everything in creation comes under one or the other of those heads. A thing is either RIGHT or it’s WRONG. I’m not talking about ethical right nor moral wrong but something a great deal bigger than either which I’ll define in a moment. But get clearly in mind that there are but two REAL issues in all of life and those two issues are right and wrong.

The Socialist differs with the Republican, Progressive and Democrat as to the RIGHT way in which to use the power of government. These three Capitalist parties frankly purpose using the government to further “business.” You Republicans won’t deny that. You so-called Progressives may take issue but not after you’ve re-read Roosevelt’s statements that what he considers “legitimate” business will flourish under “my policies.” Then recall his “My dear Harriman” letters, the Alton steal, the Tennessee Coal and Iron theft and similar robberies and you’ll see what he looks upon as “legitimate.” When Woodrow Wilson was announced victor in the Presidential contest he immediately gave out a press statement saying, “Business has nothing to fear.” He had nothing to say to the men and women who work—to the actual producers. The Socialist means to use the machinery of government for an altogether different purpose—to secure for the workers, brain
and brawn workers, the full social value of their labor through the collective ownership of the Trust and of the market—all things collectively used. There are the two positions. We contend that one of them is right and the other wrong. But I haven’t proved it yet.

A thing is either SO or it ISN’T so. There’s no such thing as a half truth. You try to tell one. Half of a statement you make may be the truth but the half that isn’t the truth is a blamed lie; isn’t it? And there’s no such thing as a half right or half wrong. Half of a thing may be right and half of it wrong; but the half that is right is WHOLLY RIGHT and the half that is wrong is ENTIRELY WRONG. And there’s NO middle ground. There’s no compromise between these two issues. Where they meet they come together sharply and there’s NOTHING between. It is utterly impossible for you or anyone else to take a position midway between right and wrong. You can’t DO it—not even on a Progressive, Bull Moose platform.

We Socialists contend for the right in this matter not because we’re a goody-goody class of people but because we know a question is never settled until it’s settled properly or, as we say, right. No question is settled until it’s settled right.

The slave-trading Yankees introduced a negro problem into Dixieland. In the course of time it was settled. But it wasn’t settled right. And they STILL have that problem.

Why Prohibition Doesn’t Prohibit.

And there used to be a whiskey problem throughout the United States. In many places it’s been settled. But it hasn’t been settled right. And they STILL have it. I go all over the nation and I see the whiskey problem settled by HIGH license—and by LOW license—and by NO license; by local option and state-wide prohibition; by dispensary systems and Mulet laws—all sorts and kinds of ways. And yet you and I both know there isn’t a village in the United States tonight where we can’t buy a drink. I’m going to tell you something, too: You’ll never, never, NEVER vote it out while there’s eight cents PROFIT in a ten-cent drink!

But you Republicans, you Democrats, you Progressives, you Prohibitionists particularly, tell us, please, how many bootleggers there’d be in the country if there were no
PROFIT in bootlegging whiskey? How many saloons with incandescent lights, plate glass mirrors and free lunch if there were no PROFIT in the legal sale of intoxicants? “The manufacture of the stuff must be stopped,” you Prohibitionists say. Sure enough. How many distilleries would operate tomorrow if the PROFIT were taken out of whiskey tonight?

You politicians are LYING. You don’t WANT to stop this thing. (I told you we were going to call things by their real names. There’s no need saying you rascals are “telling a story” ’cause you’re lying)! You know how to stop the whiskey business but you don’t WANT to stop it. So you swarm folks with your miserable little old tin pans of high license and low license, local option and so forth.

How are we to know what’s right and what’s wrong? By “right” I mean that which is safe, sound, fair and just. By “wrong” I mean that which is unsafe, unsound, unfair and unjust. The words “right” and “wrong” embrace all of the foregoing definitions and I use them in that sense, not in a moral or ethical way. If we can just reduce our plan of action in any case to the simple rule of right and wrong we’ll have brushed all the side issues away, with a clear track and a clean sweep ahead. But here enters a horde of lawyers, judges, politicians, preachers and newspapers saying that we, poor simple minded folks, can’t know what’s right and wrong so we must support them and they, in return, will tell us what to do and when to do it.

It’s perfectly true that what’s right at one time and in one instance is wrong at another time and in another instance. We have no “right” to break all the window panes in this hall; yet if fire broke out below and flames came through the door it would be perfectly “right” to leave by the windows and shatter the glass in so doing. You see the “right” or “wrong” of a proposition may change in the twinkling of an eye. And it’s perfectly true that conditions DO alter cases. Then how can we be sure as to what’s right and what’s wrong at all times and in ALL cases? There’s an infallible rule. One that’s ALWAYS safe. That is THE GREATEST GOOD TO THE GREATEST NUMBER. That’s ALWAYS right. It is NEVER wrong. It applies to any people, under any condition, at any time, in any corner of the earth’s surface. That thing which is to the greatest good of the greatest number is
ALWAYS right; that thing which is NOT to the greatest good of the greatest number is ALWAYS wrong.

**Why Tariff Reforms Do Not Reform.**

It is no longer to the greatest good of the greatest number that the things collectively used be privately owned. And every political party and every politician in the United States, the stand-pattest of the standpatters included, ADMIT that the private ownership of things collectively used is not right, but WRONG. And AGAIN you politicians are LYING. For you say you're trying to settle it by HIGH tariff—and LOW tariff; by interstate commerce commissions and Sherman anti-trust laws; by dissolution proceedings, supreme court decisions declaring for a “reasonable” profit, “strong commissions” and twenty-nine million dollar fines—that you have to hand back on a silver platter. This, too, can NEVER be settled while it's profitable to ROB folks; you political tricksters KNOW it and you don't WANT to settle it right—by taking the profit from it. So you've been swarming a nation with your tin pans, cow bells and noise engines. But—we serve notice on you NOW that you've swarmed US for the last time. We have more sense than bees. We know exactly what we want, we're making straight for it and all the side issues you scamps introduce can't confuse us. We're after the collective ownership of things collectively used—it's to the greatest good of the greatest number, therefore right—and we're going to GET it in spite of you and all the confusion you spread.

To say it all over again in brief: Socialism means the collective ownership of things collectively used and the private ownership of things privately used, which includes the democratic management of industry; there are but two issues in all the world—right and wrong; that thing which is to the greatest good of the greatest number is always right and that thing which is not to the greatest good of the greatest number is always wrong; it is not to the greatest good of the greatest number that the things collectively used be privately owned, therefore it is wrong; experience teaches that these things will be privately owned so long as private ownership of things collectively used is profitable; there is but one way to remove the profit and that is through collective ownership; only one political party wishes to put these things in the hands of the peo-
ple collectively and that is the Socialist Party; therefore the position of the Socialist Party is wholly and eternally RIGHT.

And you can't swarm us on any other so-called "issue."

Now then, folks, that's about all I have to say on Socialism. That's my speech. We'll take up some of the swarming tactics now and see how these people have been introducing side issues to distract our minds.

**Legality Does Not Make Right.**

"Socialists don't respect the law," they've said. "It's the law of the land—it's perfectly LEGAL for the things collectively used to be privately owned."

Well, we never did deny that. We just said it wasn't RIGHT. You get out of your head real quickly the idea that because a thing is LEGAL that it's RIGHT. That doesn't follow at all. Here's a good place for some of you lawyers and judges to get mad. Many things which are lawful are right; but many OTHER things which are legal are ENTIRELY wrong.

**Some Proofs.**

It used to be the law that you men could beat your wives provided the stick you used were no thicker than your thumb. It was the law. It was WRONG.

It is estimated that in the history of the world between six million and seven million women have been put to death for witchcraft. Many of them were burned at the stake. Every one of them was brought before a judge; many were given jury trials. The man who led them to the stake, the man who bound their hands behind them, the man who piled the fagots underneath and lighted the fire—all were officers of the LAW. The women were LEGALLY burned to death for witchcraft; it was WRONG. Jesus Christ was crucified entirely according to law. But a prejudiced judge said of Him: "I . . . found no fault in this man." And whether you view Him as the Son of God, a prophet or as an agitator for the carpenters' union of His day, His crucifixion was WRONG. But it was LEGAL.

Now then, while it is admittedly perfectly legal, wholly lawful for the things collectively used to be privately owned it does NOT follow that it is right. As a matter of fact it is eternally and indefensibly WRONG,
Then they’ll say, “Now look here: These Socialists have a beautiful dream. Oh yes, perhaps it would be better if we could collectively own all the things we collectively use, but it can’t be done. It just can’t be DONE. Why we’ve GOT to have private owners or folks would lose all their incentive. Of course these private owners reap a profit from their investments and, come to think of it, the people who do the actual work, brain and brawn, have to produce this profit in addition to enough to pay themselves and the running expenses of the business; but it just can’t be helped. We’ve GOT to have private owners to put their money into industry and make a profit off their employees or the people who work would lose their incentive.

What do you think of THAT?

The Mule and His Riders.

I knew a couple of mules who stood in a pasture one very warm day. One of them said to the other, “I wish I could go to town. I want a drink. The water in the pond is warm and stale and the water in the trough before the courthouse is cool and fresh. I wish I could go to town.”

“Why don’t you go?” asked the other. “Can’t you jump the fence?”

“Certainly! I’ve jumped the fence lots of times.”

“Don’t you know the road to town?”

“Of course I know the road to town. Didn’t you and I and all the mules in this township grade every inch of that road? Certainly, I know the road to town. I could BACK into town with my eyes shut.”

The other looked at him in amazement and exclaimed:

“See here, mule! if you can jump the fence and you know the road to town and you REALLY WANT A DRINK, why don’t you go and get it?”

“Oh, I can’t,” answered the first one, “cause you see there’s NOBODY TO RIDE ME!”

You and Your Riders.

Why that’s EXACTLY what you’ve said ever since you’ve been old enough to vote. You’ve said, “We, the workingclass, can do all the work of the world for private owners but we couldn’t possibly do it for ourselves.” You DO all the work of the world. Every man on this railroad, from president down to the lowest paid section “Jerry” is a hired man. Every one of them works for
wages. They do all the work of the road, executive and manual. They drive ALL the spikes, fire ALL the engines, sell ALL the tickets, run ALL the trains, keep ALL the books, issue ALL the orders, collect ALL the money, pay ALL the bills—and turn the profit to stockholders who do NONE of these things. You say they can do it nicely for private owners but couldn’t POSSIBLY do it for themselves. We’ve got to have somebody on our backs to dig spurs into our ribs and give us an incentive.

Aren’t we a wise people, though? Don’t we know a lot?

**Skinning Eels.**

Then they’ll say, “Aw, well, you’re USED to it. It’s always BEEN this way and it always WILL be this way. Your father worked himself to death and you’re going the same route. Don’t you see you’re USED to it? Besides you can’t change human nature and let well enough alone because you’re USED to it.”

I knew an old woman on the Atlantic coast who made her living skinning eels. She’d take these fish from the water, alive and vigorous, slit them under the gills with a knife, insert the blade under the skin and just RIP it off the quivering flesh. I stepped to her side one day and said:

“Granny, you shouldn’t do that. It’s cruelty to animals. You should wait till they die. It hurts them.”

She looked at me a moment, sniffed, and said:

“It don’t hurt ’em. I’ been doin’ this for thirty years. They’re USED to it.”

**Skinning People.**

You’ve been so systematically “skinned” all your lives that your politicians can come to you right now, tell you that you’re “used to it” AND MAKE YOU BELIEVE IT! That’s the funny part about this. THERE’S the place to laugh! You’re swarmed into voting for it, right now.

Lots of you folks don’t see what the Socialist sees. You can’t see a way out of this thing. But every one of you says there’s something wrong. There’s something the matter. And you don’t know what it is. Why, bless your hearts, they’re taking the HIDE off, that’s what’s the matter. And it HURTS, too. You’re not so all-fired used to it but it HURTS. That’s why you’re here tonight.
Now then, they’re taking the hide off in three ways; through profit, rent and interest. And we’re going to take up these three, examine them and see what they amount to. But remember this: Profit, rent and interest are EFFECTS caused by the private ownership of things collectively used; they would automatically disappear if we collectively owned the things which we collectively use.

Another thought: The man who takes profit, charges rent or exacts interest is not a bad man at all. He’s doing exactly what YOU’D do if you COULD. Socialism has no fight with the man, but with the system. The farmer who robbed the bees was not a wicked man. He merely played the system. Everybody did it who COULDN’T do it and nobody called it robbery. And since the bees made no complaint wouldn’t this old man have been a FOOL to work hard in the sun when he could live in comparative ease by “keeping bees?” YOU make no complaint at the polls; why SHOULDN’T they rob you? And again, if this farmer hadn’t robbed those particular bees more than likely somebody else would have taken the swarm and robbed them. He, alone, could not have changed the system had he wanted to. It is so with you. The exploiter who skins you through profit, rent and interest is a wise, wise man playing the system. The fault for the whole thing lies with YOU who permit the continuance of a system which allows a few men and women to live luxuriously off the earnings of many men and women.

Solomon On Capitalist Philosophy.

Before we delve into profit, rent and interest we want to see what authority, if any, we have for prying into a system so firmly established as Capitalism. Every preacher, every priest and every rabbi in town will tell you that Solomon was the wisest man who ever lived. Of all the men who ever drew the breath of life he was the most knowing. Even the Democrats admit that he knew more than Woodrow Wilson. Solomon said something about looking into profit, rent and interest. When you reach home tonight turn to the 28th chapter of Proverbs, written by Solomon, and to the 11th verse. I’m not talking religion, but wisdom. There’ll you find this wisest of all wise men saying:

"THE RICH MAN IS WISE IN HIS OWN CONCEIT BUT THE POOR THAT HATH UNDERSTANDING SEARCHETH HIM OUT."
What do you think of THAT? In the Bible! Profit, rent and interest are the conceits of the rich man. And Solomon says: “The rich man is wise in his own conceit but the poor that hath understanding”—doesn’t take his word for a solitary thing but—“searcheth him OUT.” And when this poor man gains ENOUGH understanding he becomes a Socialist, and then he “SMOKETH him out.” That’s what causes all the trouble.

**Profit and Surplus Value.**

You know if we collectively owned the things which we collectively use the people would employ themselves. Then they’d get the full social value of what they produced—ALL the honey and not SOME of it—and the people who did the work of the world, muscle work and brain work, would have the good things which they, themselves, produced; or they’d have the FULL VALUE of what they produced to exchange for things created by other people. And that’s just the way it is now, isn’t it? No? How many of you carpenters and bricklayers have built a $10,000 mansion for some one else while you and your family rented a $15 a month shack? And you brain workers: You clerks; you railroad clerks; how many stores and how many railroads do you OWN? All your lives have been spent in building up some great business and you don’t own the fractional part of a share of stock. You couldn’t buy a share to save your lives. You COULDN’T! Lots of you are in debt up to your ears. Of course you’re living too high, but we’ll get to that a little later on. For the present just remember that your lives have been spent in railroad “service.” Yet if, at this moment, they’d offer to sell the whole blamed road for fifteen cents you couldn’t make the first payment on a hand car.

And you farmers. You’re the prize rubes of the lot! You raise chickens and eggs. And what do you do with the big, fine, smooth, select eggs? You take them into town and give them to the banker’s wife, the factory owner’s wife, the wife of the department store owner and to the wives of the Capitalist class. Afterwards you go back to the farm, take the little eggs, the runty ones, those not good enough for market and give them to your OWN wives! Don’t you? Then you throw your arms around those women, kiss them and tell them you love them. Why, you old scoundrels, you don’t love your wives at all. If you loved them you’d TREAT them better. And this isn’t true
of eggs alone. It applies to MOST of the things you raise. I know lots of farmers who sell every drop of cream to the creamery and use butterine on their tables. You don't slaughter your fine beeves, you SELL them. And you don't buy back the choice cuts from the butcher, either. You can't AFFORD to. When you dig potatoes you save the large, smooth ones and sell the little ones, don't you? No you DON'T, you old rascals. You sell the BIG potatoes and make your wives and families live off the little ones—too small for market.

You factory workers: You make shoes. And you and your wives and your children never WORE a first-quality pair of shoes.

The very best of everything the working class produces it must pass on to the Capitalist class. The word "export" has come to mean something too good for the people who produced it, something so superior that it must be shipped away to some one who had no hand in creating it.

"Oh," but you say, "we HAVE to work on the good houses and rent the poor ones; operate stores and railroads for wages and own no stores and no rolling stock; sell the big eggs and the large potatoes; dispose of the cream and use butterine; make the good shoes and wear the cheap ones—we HAVE to do with "the leavin's" to save money needed for other things. OF COURSE you have to do it. That's just what I've been telling you for twenty-five minutes. The Capitalist system COMPELS you to do it. But I say this: If you hadn't been swarmed till your brains were as addled as those of a wall-eyed pelican you'd quit voting for a system which MAKES YOU DO THOSE THINGS.

Why People Are Poor.

Profit in commodities is the difference between what the Capitalist class gives in wages to have a thing produced and what you have to pay for THE SAME ARTICLE. You knew there was a difference, didn't you? If you go into a store and pay $4 for a hat which has really cost $2 to produce and place on the counter before you, you pay out half of your money for something that you don't get. You give away $2. Capitalism, the system for which you vote, takes two hundred cents away from you and gives nothing in return. (This is robbery in a bee hive but it's "profit" in human society. The Socialists can't
fool US, can they?) But that’s ONE of the ways they KEEP YOU POOR. Men and women, if in addition to the full social value of your labor you got one hundred cents worth of value for every dollar you put out you could never, never, NEVER go broke. Even if you spent the dollar for food which you consumed it would create one hundred cents worth of labor power. There could be no such thing as poverty if you got the full social value of your labor and received one hundred cents worth of commodities for each dollar you spent.

Test that. Tomorrow morning rake and scrape together all the money you can get your hands on. Then go to the bank and draw out what you have on deposit. That won’t take you long. Get it all together and walk into the postoffice. Patronize an institution which is run for the USE of the people and not for the PRIVATE PROFIT of a few owners, where you get one hundred cents worth of value for every dollar you spend. Don’t be afraid! Part with every penny to your name for postage stamps. YOU’LL GET ONE HUNDRED ONE-CENT STAMPS FOR YOUR DOLLAR. Then walk outside the postoffice, stand on the sidewalk, count your stamps and see how much POORER you’ll be than before you went in. You can’t go broke buying postage stamps. Oh, of course you can USE them; you can get the VALUE out of them and then your dollar will be gone. But you will have received one hundred cents worth of service—value—for your dollar. The mere fact of having BOUGHT them couldn’t make you five cents poorer if you purchased a million dollars worth.

But you go into any other business institution in town, make any purchase from five cents to five hundred dollars, come out of the store with the goods in your hand—and YOU’RE POORER than when you went in. Aren’t you? The suit of clothes you’re wearing right now is a case in point. The minute you told the clerk you’d take it you were POORER than the second before. Weren’t you? Before you got the fractional part of a cent’s wear out of it—the mere fact that you BOUGHT it, under a Capitalist system, made you POORER. The merchant who sold the clothes admits it. He says, “Yes sir, this suit cost me $14; the price to YOU is $22.50. I HAVE to make that profit to stay in business. And he DOES have to. He has to add the manufacturer’s and jobber’s profit to his own and in addition must pay rent, interest, clerk hire,
taxes, advertising and a thousand and one incidental expenses of which you know nothing. He has to COMPETE, too, with six other clothing merchants. And THEY are all doing the same thing. Yet there’s no more sense in having six clothing stores in this town than there would be in having six postoffices. And here’s the joke: YOU have to PAY this profit on everything you use to keep the Capitalist, competitive system going when ONE big, thoroughly equipped, clothing store would serve a community of this size far cheaper and far BETTER than the six do.

We’re going to see after while how the principle of the postage stamp can be applied to pork chops, calico, suspenders and EVERYTHING we use. Going to see how we can get one hundred cents worth of value for every dollar we spend whether it’s for postage stamps or for shoes.

But the foregoing is PROFIT, one of the EFFECTS of the present system, one of the conceits of the rich man.

Rent.

Then there’s rent. Ground rent comes about through the private ownership of land. You’ve been swarmed for years by being told that Socialism will take your farm away. You’ve been told that so many times you’ve rather come to believe that you have a farm to lose, havn’t you? Honor bright, now, aren’t you just a little bit afraid that Socialism will rob you of your magnificent farm—that you do NOT own? Lots of you folks live up stairs and haven’t even a backyard. Most of you farmers work rented or mortgaged land.

Your Farm and Socialism.

But let’s suppose that every one of you has a big, fine farm, entirely out of debt. Let’s have a GOOD pipe dream while we’re about it. Your individual farm is something that you PRIVATELY use. Under Socialism it would be YOURS, PRIVATELY, so long as you wanted to USE it. The Socialist platform demands “The collective ownership of land wherever practicable.” And all the sheriffs between here and Kingdomcome couldn’t take your farm away from you if you wanted to USE it. Socialism would give you the only secure title to land the world has ever
KNOWN; that is a USE title. Every one of you folks know of from one to twenty men who have lost their farms under Capitalism. And yet you let these rascals swarm you by saying Socialism will take away the farmer’s land.

When I was in Texas, not long ago, some people pointed out to me a strip of land, owned by a Mr. Swenson, in which they said there were fourteen hundred sections. I said, “You mean fourteen hundred acres.” They said, “No, we mean one thousand, four hundred square miles, 896,000 acres, of land owned by this one man.” He didn’t create the land. He has done absolutely NOTHING to give it value. He just has a fence AROUND it and a title TO it. He doesn’t even live on that land; he lives in New Yawk. He doesn’t use that land and HE’LL ALLOW NO ONE ELSE TO USE IT UNLESS THEY “COME ACROSS” TO HIM. At this moment, in this audience, there are people who would, if they could, move onto that land and go to producing something—really adding to the wealth of the world. But they can’t DO it except by paying tribute to this man. He doesn’t use the land himself and he won’t let YOU use it until you make your peace with his private purse. Now THAT’S the kind of farm Socialism will take away from folks, “the collective ownership of land wherever practicable.” Just how it can be done we’ll take up later. But neither Mr. Swenson nor any one else has a RIGHT to hold land which he cannot or WILL NOT use while many other people, who have no land, are capable, anxious and willing to make that land productive. The present program is not to the greatest good of the greatest number. Never mind the legality of it. It’s got to GO because it isn’t RIGHT. But here’s the point: If Mr. Swenson were up here in my place tonight he’d tell you to be mighty careful of Socialism or you’d all lose your farms. He wouldn’t be studying about YOUR farm—which for most of you exists in your minds, only—but about that fourteen hundred sections of HIS.

A Socialist Juryman.

A Socialist agitator, tells how he was once drawn on for jury service. The case they had was that of a man who was to be dispossessed. He couldn’t pay the rent on the farm he occupied and now he was to be put off the land by law. When the twelve reached the jury room the Socialist turned to the others and said:
"When you eleven men are ready to come to my way of thinking, wake me up. But don't bother me till you'll accept my verdict. I want to hang this man."

"You're crazy," they said.
"Not at all," answered the agitator.
"The man's committed no capital crime," they retorted.
"You can't hang a man because he's unable to pay rent."
"I'll hang the man or I'll hang the jury," he replied.
They began to argue with him and he stopped them, saying:
"Now see here, let's get this case well in mind. This man has no land of his own, has he?"
"No."
"And somebody else owns all of the land."
"Yes."
"And he's over here on Mr. A's land where he can't pay the rent."
"Yes."
"Let's suppose we dispossess him. Where's he going? He can't stay up in the air like a bird, can he?"
"No."
"Certainly not! So if we put him off A's land he'll have to get on B's tract. And he couldn't pay the rent to A, so of course he can't pay it to B. Next term of court his case will be up here again and some other jury will have to put him off B's place. THEN where'll he go? Why, he'll have to locate on C's land. And he couldn't pay the rent to A and B, so quite naturally he'll be unable to pay it to C. Then some other jury will have to dispossess him again and ————. Don't you see, men, each term of court this case will come up. Every time the man's dispossessed it will do him no good and it'll put the county to a lot of needless expense. Let's be sensible about the matter, hang the man and close the case.

Interest.

Then there's the matter of interest. Interest is a fine thing, you know, and the Socialists are all crazy for wanting to do away with interest. To draw interest we must first accumulate money and as there are certain well de-
fined rules for acquiring wealth we'll take a peep at them tonight.

**Old Proverb Up-to-date.**

We know that society can be roughly divided into two classes—the class which MAKES and the class which TAKES; the class which labors and the class which performs no labor; the class which works for a living and the class which OWNS things and has other people working for it. Practically every man you know automatically falls into one or the other of these classes: either he's a man who works for a living or he's a man who does not HAVE to work because other people WORK FOR HIM through his ownership of land, machinery or some form of capital. And so we've been swarmed with a pretty little jingle which goes:

> Early to bed and early to rise,  
> Makes a man healthy, wealthy and wise.

But they neglected to tell us WHICH MAN!

If you'll work hard all day so that at night you're dead tired and will go early to bed, get up early in the morning and do the whole thing over again—if you'll just keep that up day after day and year after year, that will make your employer healthy, wealthy and WISE. It makes YOU humpbacked and bowlegged! And you KNOW it. All you need do to prove that is to take one good look in the mirror. It is perfectly true, under Capitalism, that

> Early to bed and early to rise,  
> Makes a MAN healthy, wealthy and wise.

But WHICH MAN? Your kind of man or the other kind of man? Here's a better version which is neither untrue nor misleading:

> Early to bed and early to rise—  
> And you'll meet no prominent people.

**How to Live On Our Incomes.**

Another way to acquire wealth is to stick to one job; be good to the boss; don't join a labor union for that requires dues and you're liable to be called out on strike. And don't LIVE too high. Here, now, is where you clerks and others should pay close attention. You LIVE too high.
The high cost of living has absolutely nothing to do with your predicament. It's not "the high cost of living" but "the cost of living HIGH." That's your trouble. This is a solemn fact: I know working men, men who labor for wages, who are actually trying to put silks on THEIR wives and satins on THEIR daughters and laces—REAL lace—on the womenfolk of their households. And I want to tell you working men YOU'RE TRYING TO LIVE TOO HIGH. Such things are far, far too good for your class. YOU QUIT IT. Gingham is plenty good enough for your wife; and imitation lace wears longer than the genuine article anyhow. You mustn't waste your money on things which will not WEAR.

That's the men. You women are just as bad. We eat too much. Oh, we DO. We eat too much and too good quality. You women cook it and put it on the table. And you shouldn't do it. You're making the living too high. Here's a full page Beef Trust advertisement in the SATURDAY EVENING POST telling workingclass women how to use the cheaper cuts and leftovers. Says EVERYBODY wants the tender meat and there are not enough CHOICE cuts to go 'round. Therefore the working class should learn to use the TOUGH parts. Beautiful thought, isn't it? Isn't it nice to have a Capitalist class always looking out for our interests? You know they do it for OUR good and with never a thought for themselves. If you, and I, and the rest of the workingclass would just be content to live on female swine bosom, round steak and chuck, and on Sundays a choice cut off the horns and leave the porterhouse, the tenderloin and the rib roasts for the Capitalist class—wouldn't—that—he—n-i-c-e! Wouldn't it, though? Wouldn't it be DEE-lightful?

Another Way.

Well we won't DO it. You mind that! We—will—not—do—it. We produce ALL the wealth of the world and WE, OURSELVES, are going to have the good things WE create. WE'RE going to have the creamery butter and the big potatoes. And WE'RE going to live in the good houses WE build. WE'RE going to eat the fat beeves. And OUR wives and OUR daughters are going to wear the fine fabrics WE produce. You knaves may rant and howl "anarchy" till you're black in the face. Your days
of swarming us are over. We know exactly what we're entitled to and WE'RE—GOING—TO—HAVE—IT. It is not necessary that ANYONE live on the husks; but if somebody HAS to live cheaply it's going to be those of you who do no useful work. YOU live more cheaply a while and see how you like it. We're through!

But now if we'll do all these things and save our money, after while we'll have a surplus, we can put it in the bank, it'll begin to draw interest and WE'LL be Capitalists. Of course we won't be BIG Capitalists; we'll be LITTLE Capitalists. But we'll be the genuine, blown-in-the-bottle article on a small scale and can sit back and watch our money grow. Any banker will tell you how money grows. What we have on deposit will begin to draw interest.

You know figures don't lie—but liars do figure. Because of this only about one-tenth of one per cent of the people understand interest—and THEY won't tell. I wonder how many of you have ever really STUDIED interest. I don't mean the interest tables you found in the grammar-school arithmetic. Nor do I mean the advertisements the banker puts in the paper. I mean how many of you have ever really tried to fathom the thing for yourselves—have "searched out" this prize conceit of the rich man.

"Searching Out" Interest.

Now let's see: If you put a hundred dollars on time deposit in one of your local banks how much interest will they pay you? Somebody tell me please; I don't know.

Voice—"Four per cent."

Four per cent. All right. Now suppose your neighbor goes to the bank and borrows that hundred dollars. What is the very LEAST per cent interest they'll charge him?

Voice—"Eight."

Eight per cent. All right. Now then, the bank pays four per cent interest for money and charges eight per cent interest, what per cent does the bank make?

Voice—"Four per cent."

Four per cent. Well, that's a real nice little partnership arrangement, isn't it? You make four per cent and the bank makes four per cent—on YOUR money. There's
this difference, though: You have to wait a year for your four per cent and the bank gets its four per cent immediately the loan is made—but the banker's a smart man and deserves extra consideration. The arrangement must be all right. You vote for it.

But let's see: Suppose you put ONE dollar in the bank and drew out TWO dollars; what per cent would you be getting?

Voice—"One hundred per cent."

That's right; one hundred per cent. You'd get back just DOUBLE what you put in and that's one hundred per cent. Here now, is where we cease to "search out" and begin to "smoke out." Notice the difference:

"Smoking Out" Interest.

In this loan of one hundred dollars the bank has no one hundred dollars invested. That's YOUR hundred dollars—not the bank's. All that the bank invests is the FOUR dollars which it agrees to pay you at the end of a year. (Only once in a thousand times does it really invest that; your money is loaned before the end of a year. But we're giving the Capitalist banking system all the better of this. The bank obligates itself to pay you four dollars interest at the end of a year—provided the bank doesn't fail—and we're assuming that it really invests that amount). The bank invests FOUR dollars and it gets back EIGHT dollars. That's just DOUBLE what the bank invests. That's ONE HUNDRED PER CENT and not four per cent at all.

You're a GREAT Capitalist, aren't you? You're a four per cent Capitalist while the banker's a one hundred per cent Capitalist. And—you—vote—for—the—same—system—the—banker—does. What do you think of THAT? You two are partners—real, genuine Capitalist partners. Ask any banker.

What We Vote For.

Suppose I came to you and said, "Jim, let's you and I go into business. We'll be partners. For every hundred dollars you put into the business I'll put in four dollars. And when it comes time to divide the profits you take four per cent on your investment and I'll take one hundred
per cent on mine. Honestly now, if you did that, with your eyes wide open—don’t you think you should be bored for the simples? I do. And if, now that you understand interest, if you deliberately continue to vote for a system which gives you FOUR PER CENT and another man ONE HUNDRED PER CENT—on YOUR money—won’t it PROVE that you’ve been swarmed till there’s something wrong with your head?

The banker is not allowed to keep all of this one hundred per cent. Other forces prey on him exactly as he preys on you. But I’m pointing out YOUR relation to the banker and showing why he supports politicians who tell you Socialists are crazy for wanting to abolish interest.

**A Banker’s Challenge.**

A banker came to me after a meeting, one day, and said, “Mr. Creel, you should be in the penitentiary for what you say about the banking system and interest.”

“Isn’t it the truth?” I asked. “Don’t you get one hundred per cent and the depositors four per cent?”

“The way you figure I do—”

“Isn’t that the WAY to figure?”

“Not exactly.”

“It’s either right or it’s wrong. Isn’t per cent figured on the amount invested? In this loan hasn’t the depositor one hundred dollars invested and hasn’t the bank but four dollars invested?”

“Yes, but you failed to tell your audience what the banker has to DO to earn his one hundred per cent. You left your hearers with the impression that all he did was, to sit in an easy chair, smoke black cigars, cock his feet on a mahogany desk and let the money roll into his lap. You neglected to tell of the bank’s bookkeeping department; of the profitable investments it must make; of the money invested in vaults, buildings, etc. You didn’t tell your audience what the banker had to DO to get that one hundred per cent.”

“Mr. Banker Man,” I replied, “I DID forget that. And I forgot something else. I forgot to tell my audience what the DEPOSITOR had to do to get the hundred dollars! But I promise you I sha’n’t forget again.”

“I’m going to make good on that promise right now.
For YOU to accumulate a hundred dollars that will bring you four per cent interest you have to work hard; you have to bend your back and twist your muscles or chase columns of figures and scheme after scheme through your brain. And for most of you it means that you and your family must be deprived of ALL the luxuries of life and too frequently of the necessities. YOU have to do THIS to get four per cent. And the banker has to hire some one to keep books and to re-loan YOUR money for HIM to get one hundred per cent.

These three, profit, rent and interest, are creatures of the system you're swarmed into carrying on your backs. And I want to tell you that your backs are mighty soft riding. Your muscles and your hearts are HARD but your backs and your HEADS are SOFT. You see I'm not a REAL politician or I'd tell you what SMART people you are; how glad I am to address this “large and intelligent audience.” I'll never tell you that while you go your present gait. I don't HAVE to. I'm not trying to swarm you into doing something that you WOULDN'T do if I told you the truth. In all candor I say to you that the politician who calls you a “large and intelligent audience” is telling a “large and intelligent LIE.” You're NOT intelligent and he KNOWS it. If you WERE intelligent you'd throw him and his gang off your backs. You'd not submit to being skinned year after year.

What Happened the Eels.

That brings us back to the eels. You remember the old woman. She went to thinking. She wasn't concerned about how much the fish were hurt but it occurred to her that, as she was skinning a new one each time, in the course of years the lake might be fished out, the eels would be gone and she'd be out of a job. So she schemed to keep a plentiful supply at hand.

That's nothing new. For years Theodore Roosevelt has thundered to the women of the working class, “Have plenty of children; lots of children.” Why? So there'll be a plentiful supply—an over supply—who'll have to do the work for Roosevelt and his class.

At a Fourth of July celebration in Bogalusa, La., a sawmill town, Superintendent Sullivan of the Great Southern Lumber Co., made a patriotic address to the working
people of the camp. Among other insults he handed them this one: “Some of you working people should move to the outskirts of Bogalusa, take up little pieces of ground, and go to RAISING CHICKENS AND BABIES.” That’s perfectly clear, isn’t it? Chickens for the market and babies for the Timber Trust.

The old fisher woman evolved much the same plan. As she didn’t use the bodies of the eels, just the skins, it occurred to her that by throwing the bodies back into the water, maybe they’d live, they’d grow new hides—and she’d get to skin them again. So she tried it. And sure enough the fool things lived! They grew new hides. She caught them time after time with the same old bait, skinned ‘em time, time and again—until they DID get used to it! Mind you it HURT—just as it hurts you—every time the hide was ripped off. But they got USED to the PROCESS—not to the hurt. They got SO used to it that they no longer waited to be caught on the hook. When they’d see the old woman at work on the shore they’d just swim up to the top of the water and wiggle there waiting for her to pick them out.

That’s EXACTLY what lots of you are planning to do next election. You’re figuring on voting THEIR ticket when you know before hand that it means four more years of skinning. And they’re not going to waste any BAiT on you, either. They’ve skinned you so many times you’re USED to—the process, not to the hurt, and they don’t HAVE to give you bait. They used to bait the hook with two dollars. Now you try to get the two dollars and they’ll put you in jail for it. Some of you know that from experience.

But we submit to all these things because we’re “used” to it.

**Capitalism And The Laundry.**

I want to show you HOW used we are to the process. Suppose a great, big, lazy hulk of a man who wouldn’t work for a living moved into town and married a girl you’d known all her life. She was nothing to you more than a former schoolmate; but a sweet, lovable girl of whom you knew nothing but good. And suppose, after the marriage, this lazy duffer still refused to go to work and bought a wash tub and wash board and went among the neighbors
soliciting washing for his wife to do. You know what
YOU'D do. A number of you would form a committee,
call on that man and tell him that unless he quit that sort
of thing you'd run him out of town. You wouldn't stand
for it. The idea of a brute of a man living off the earn-
ings of a woman! Shame on him! And if he belonged
to a church in town they'd throw him out. They wouldn't
have such a man in the congregation. And they'd be
RIGHT.

But if this man had just HALF sense, after you'd told
him what he MUST do, he'd go down town; he'd buy TEN
wash tubs; he'd purchase TEN wash boards; he'd rent a
store room, hire TEN women and start a laundry. Are
you so USED to it that that makes no impression? Don't
you see that this man would be a SCOUNDREL living off
the earnings of ONE woman and a BUSINESS MAN liv-
ing off the earnings of TEN women?

And you wouldn't throw him out of church. You'd
make him a deacon! And you wouldn't run him out of
town at all. You'd make him president of the commercial
club!

You'd be up in arms against this fellow for living off
the earnings of a girl who was nothing more to you than
a good friend, a girl whom you'd known since childhood.
But if YOUR OWN SISTER were one of the TEN women
off whom he lived you'd say, "Yep, Sal's got a good job
at the laundry." Wouldn't you?

Socialism And Religion.

Another way they swarm folks is by saying that Social-
ism is opposed to religion and will destroy the church. I'm
going to hit this vicious lie just one smash. And I'm going
to hit it so hard it will make some of you wince. But re-
member it's only the TRUTH that hurts.

Let's come down to brass tacks at once and have it
over with. Socialism has absolutely nothing to do with
either church or religion. Socialism is the collective own-
ership of things collectively used and the private owner-
ship of things privately used. What you or I believe in
the realm of religion is a PRIVATE matter. The Social-
ist platform and every honest authority on Socialism af-
firms this over and over again. But let's suppose for a
minute that the howl of a certain class of paid pulpit orators
of Capitalism is correct and that Socialism really seeks to destroy the church. Mind you, this is not the truth but we’re just SUPPOSING that it IS so. If you’ll look up the sixteenth chapter of Matthew and the eighteenth verse you’ll find Jesus saying:

And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

The verb “prevail” means “to overcome.” Jesus, therefore, said that not even the gates of hell COULD overcome or destroy his church. And every time any one of you preachers, or priests, or laymen says that Socialism or anything else CAN destroy the church you’re calling Jesus Christ a liar. Don’t dodge! Come up to the mark and face it. There’s no such thing as a half-truth. Either Socialism CAN destroy the church—falsely assuming that it wishes to—or it CANNOT destroy the church. If it CAN destroy the church Jesus Christ is a liar. If it CANNOT destroy the church you have been misled and mis-taught by liars. If Jesus was telling the truth the church enemies of Socialism are NOT telling the truth. You have the two statements before you. Take your choice.

Socialism And “Nigger Equality.”

The demagogue south of the Mason and Dixon line rants about Socialism and “nigger equality.” He claims that through the introduction of Socialism negroes and whites would live on terms of social equality and that they would intermarry. Like everything else urged against Socialism, which does not pertain to the collective ownership of things collectively used and the private ownership of things privately used, this is rot. As for present conditions in Dixieland I here and now offer a reward of $50 for any yellow negro brought me for whom I cannot find a Democratic or Carpetbagger daddy. (Capitalist papers please copy.) And if you want to know what a Progressive-Republican-Democratic combination can bring about read PROSTITUTION FOR PROFIT in which I photographically reproduce a license used to legalize the wedding of the Republican mayor of Chicago to a negro woman. Of course you’ve seen nothing of this in the papers. Progressive papers won’t publish it because the mayor was personally vouched for by Theodore Roosevelt. Democratic papers won’t publish it because Chicago is the greatest Democratic stronghold
in the United States outside of New York City; it was Democrats who elected a Republican on Roosevelt's recommendation. Republican papers won't publish it because—because—oh, just because! Southern Socialists, particularly, should have the photographic copy of this license to plant squarely between the eyes of hypocrites who say Socialism will bring about "nigger equality." Democrats need it that they may see the sort of political bedfellows they have at Chicago. Republicans and Progressives yearn for it that they may become acquainted with their kinfolks.

But now to return to the real matter under discussion: Let's call all of the things collectively used and privately owned—the coal mines, gas wells, railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, oil wells, the great factories, etc.—let's call all of them trusts. They are not all trusts but let that name signify something collectively used and privately owned under a competitive system.

There are no good trusts and there are no bad trusts. All trusts are good for the people on the inside of them and all trusts are bad for the people on the outside of them. It depends altogether whether the trust puts money IN your pocket in the form of dividends or takes money FROM your pocket in the form of private profit as to it being a GOOD thing or a BAD thing for YOU.

Political Parties and Trusts.

There are three positions on the trust and we'll analyze them as we proceed. Two of them seek to curb or to destroy the trust that free competition may again be introduced.

The Republican and Progressive position is to CONTROL the trust. We've had more than sixty years of government control of trusts and you all know how the government's succeeding with the job.

The Democratic position is to DESTROY the trust. Even if this could be done—which it cannot—it would be foolish for the trust CAN and DOES produce much CHEAPER and much BETTER than the individual method. But it's mostly the folks on the inside who benefit from it. Therefore the Democratic party wants to "smash 'em up."

So the three big Capitalist parties say they want to
control or destroy the trusts that competition may reign supreme. Competition, you know, is a splendid thing. It’s the “life of trade,” keeps the quality up and the price down—and we just MUST have it.

Practical Competition.

Did you ever see a man who votes one of these three tickets driving a team of horses? You know he votes for, and is swarmed until he really believes in, competition. Yet when he drives a team he has both horses hitched to the same end of the wagon and they’re co-operatively pulling the load. That’s the wrong way for such voters to hitch up. What they should do, to be consistent, is to hitch one horse to the front of the wagon and one to the hind end, whip them both and make them compete.

Why not? That’s the way you vote. Seriously, you’re doing one of two things in the wrong way; you’re hitching up wrong or you’re voting wrong. You’re letting your horses pull their loads on a co-operative plan and you’re dragging yours on a competitive basis. Both of them cannot be right; one of them must be wrong. Which is it? Talk it over with the first blind mule you meet. He can tell you.

You business men would fire, without a moment’s hesitation, any teamster in your employ who made as big a fool of himself hitching up as you do when you vote.

The next time the hogs break out of the pen and you farmers call the family to help drive them back, go about it in a sensible way. Don’t all form a ring and co-operatively run them into the pen. Let each one take after an individual porker and see which can drive his hog in first. Of course you’ll ruin a fifty-acre crop while you’re doing it but think of all the good old competition you’ll introduce. Think of the incentive you’ll develop—in yourselves and in the hogs.

And next spring, don’t you old-party farmers co-operate with your crops. Just let the corn and the weeds compete. That’s the way to develop strong, healthy corn! It gives it an incentive to grow. Competition is the life of corn.
The Socialist position is to OWN the trust.
Here, now, are the three positions:
Republican and Progressive, CONTROL the trust.
Democratic, DESTROY the trust.
Socialist, OWN the trust.

"How are you going to DO these things?" sneers the politician deprived of his tin pan. "How can you get hold of the things collectively used and privately owned?"

There are three good ways that we know of. The Socialist party is committed to none of them. A better way than any of them may be found. But we know that these things can be taken over by any one of the following plans. (Some of these illustrations are my own and some are those of my colleague, Oscar Ameringer, published in his splendid booklet, "Socialism, What It Is and How To Get It"):

Confiscating Trusts.

One way is through direct confiscation. You mustn't shy at that word "confiscation." Maybe you've been swarmed on that, too. Maybe you don't know what the word really means. Ameringer gives the only genuine definition of "confiscation." He says it means to "swipe something." To steal it. To take something that doesn't belong to you. That's confiscation. These things CAN be confiscated.

Confiscation would be nothing new to the people of the United States. It was the Republican Yankees, you remember, who CONFISCATED the negro slaves of the south. They swiped them. They loosed chained property which didn't belong to them.

And nearly everywhere I go in the solid, Democratic south I find that the Democrats have CONFISCATED the saloon business. They've swiped it. They have deliberately voted out, and thereby destroyed, millions of dollars worth of property that didn't belong to them.

So, as Ameringer aptly says, if ever the people of the United States decide to confiscate anything the job will have to be turned over to you Republicans and Democrats. For YOU know how to do it and WE don't. WE'VE never stolen anything and YOU have.

But here's a comforting thought: When the people,
collectively, decide to do a thing of this sort they don't call it stealing. Gracious no! That raiding party for stealing negroes was a "great war for humanity." And this plan of stealing the saloon business is being preached from the pulpit of every church in town, ISN'T IT? And they don't call it stealing at all. Why? Because when a line of procedure is for the greatest good of the greatest number that very fact makes it RIGHT. As a matter of fact the negroes were not stolen—they were liberated. And the saloon business has not been stolen—certain territory has merely "gone dry." So if the people decide to confiscate the trusts they'll give it an altogether different name and let you Republicans and Democrats do it. Then we know it will be done with neatness and dispatch for you have experience.

Collectively Owned Business Versus Privately Owned.

Another way in which these things can be taken over is through the operation of collectively owned businesses. The railroad which serves your town has to run at this expense: It must pay operating expenses—wages, etc.—depreciation of rolling stock and machinery, taxes and dividends on privately owned stock. The people collectively can put a line right beside it and THIS line would have to run at this expense: It would have to pay operating expenses—wages, etc.—depreciation of rolling stock and machinery, its share of the governmental expense, which we'll call taxes—but it would have NO DIVIDENDS to pay on privately owned stock. The result would be that the collectively owned line could, and would, carry freight and passengers so much cheaper than the privately owned line could POSSIBLY do that it would soon have all the business. Then the other line would have to go out of business or reduce its tariff to the actual cost of doing business—and that's all we want; to quit paying out our money for something that we don't get.

"But," says the politician, "this, too, amounts to virtual confiscation. It's thievery. The Capitalists would resist it and the people generally would never stoop to such dishonest methods. To attempt that program would bring about civil war."

Indeed! Let's see what's happening right now and so quietly that we scarcely know it's going on.

In 1913 we established a limited parcel post. The
ALMOST IMMEDIATE effect was a fall from the 1909 high-water mark in express stock. Adams Express dropped from $250 a share to $205; American Express from $300 to $185; United States Express from $111 a share to $100 a share. This was a general shrinkage, decrease, falling off, CONFISCATION of 25 per cent of the saleable properties of these companies. Their total capitalization is about $100,000,000. Twenty-five per cent of that is $25,000,000 ALREADY eliminated. Like the stock of EVERY collectively used but privately owned monopoly the inflated value of express stock begins and ends with the companies’ ability to MAKE the people pay excessive rates. As the parcel post is extended, as the government rate is lowered, as the PUBLICLY OWNED express company, the parcel post, forces its way farther and farther into the field of the PRIVATELY OWNED concerns, their stocks will continue to shrink; their business will fall off and off until they’ll have to go OUT of business or reduce their tariffs to meet the government schedule—the actual cost of carrying express matter. In time you’ll see a wild scramble of the express companies to “sell out” to the government. And you’ll see a vast private monopoly put out of business solely through the governmental operation of a hitherto privately owned business.

Buying the Trusts.

Another way in which these things can be taken over is by direct purchase; by buying them outright and paying for them with coin of the realm.

“Where’ll you get the money to buy them?” asks our persistent friend. Sure enough! Where’ll we get the money?

Where do Capitalists get THEIR money? Any banker will tell you that all the real money in the United States is in the hands of the small depositor. This is true. Then suppose your local railroad wants to build a half million dollar branch; where do they get the money? They go to New York City, to the American Bank Note Company where they have some bonds printed. These bonds are pretty. They are tinted a delicate green and decorated with scrolls, arches, ferns, seashells and all sorts of pretty pictures. It costs $10 to print a million dollars worth of them. Then they take THEIR bonds to the bank where YOUR money is on deposit. You, individually, haven’t
much but you, collectively, have all there is. This, then, is the process:

They leave THEIR BONDS as security for YOUR MONEY, which they take. Then with YOUR MONEY—they hire YOU—to build THEM a railroad. And after YOU build it THEY OWN IT, they charge you fare to ride on it and make you pay freight to have your goods hauled over it.

We are not only performing all the labor but we’re FINANCING every bit of industry in the United States today. If we can build railroads and finance railroads for somebody else, why in the name of common sense can’t we build railroads and finance railroads for OURSELVES? We can! And it makes no difference how many people shout that we’ve got to have somebody on our backs to ride us, that’s a LIE. We need NO ONE on our backs. Indeed, we can do these things BETTER for ourselves, alone, than we can while carrying the added weight of a set of riders.

**Acquiring Trusts by Bond Issues.**

Let’s take a concrete case: The United States Steel Corporation is capitalized at approximately fifteen hundred millions of dollars. On that capitalization it turns an annual profit of approximately three hundred millions of dollars. Every five years this trust pays for itself out of the profit it makes. We’ll suppose, now, that Socialism is voted in and Uncle Sam decides to take over the Steel Trust by bond issue.

First he’d have fifteen hundred million dollars worth of bonds printed. This wouldn’t cost much and they’d serve the purpose JUST AS THEY DID WHEN HE ISSUED BONDS TO BUILD THE PANAMA CANAL. With the bonds in his hand he’d stroll over to J. Pierpont Morgan’s office, knock at the door and enter.

"Hello, Uncle Sam," would be Morgan’s greeting, "what can I do for you?"

"John," Uncle Sam would reply, "I’ve decided to take over the United States Steel Corporation and I’ve brought over fifteen hundred million dollars in bonds to give you for the business."

"What?" Morgan would yell.

"I say I’ve decided to take over the United States Steel
Corporation and I've brought over fifteen hundred million dollars in bonds to give you for the business."

"Boy!" I can hear Morgan calling, "bring some ice water—quick! Uncle Sam's been walking out in the sun and there's something wrong with his head."

"No, John, there's nothing wrong with my head. Fact is it's rather cleared up since last election. I know what I'm doing, have a lot on hand this morning and want to finish early so I can go to the ball game. Let's get to business."

"Now look here, Sam, you don't suppose for a minute that I and other Steel Trust stockholders will sell the United States Steel Corporation! What? After all the trouble we've had? the officials we've bribed? that Tennessee Coal and Iron steal we got Roosevelt to put through for us? Do you think we did that for fun? Quit your fooling. The United States Steel Corporation is not for sale. Sit down and have a cigar. You're playing jokes in your old age."

The Right of Eminent Domain.

"John, I'm not joking," Uncle Sam remarks. "The boys have told me to take over the Steel Trust and I'm going to do it. Of course if you WON'T sell——. By the way, John, do you remember that time you wanted to run one of your railroads across the corner of a farmer's land and he didn't want you to? Don't you remember? You came to me about it. I grabbed that farmer by the nape of the neck and the seat of the pants, hustled him into court and MADE him sell to you. Remember? I pulled a law on him known as 'The Right of Eminent Domain.' I said it was to the greatest good of the greatest number that he be MADE to sell to you, John, and I FORCED him to part with his land."

"Sam, what are you driving at?"

"Oh, nothing special, John, except that that law's still on the statute books. The Socialist Attorney General called my attention to it just before I came over."

"Do you mean to say that this United States government has degenerated into a national jimmy for a set of crooks. I'm amazed that a man of your standing in the community would lower himself to aid such tactics and—."

"Easy, John, easy! You know I'm a right peart old
man when my dander's up. You mustn't call names like that. This 'Right of Eminent Domain' is a fine law. Don't you remember how tickled you were with it when it got you all those rights of way for your roads? It's a poor rule that won't work both ways, John. This one works both ways—it's coming back now—that proves it a good rule."

"Personally, I can stand it. But there's Carnegie, and Schwab, and Cory, and Rockefeller and all the other poor widow and orphan stockholders. I can't believe that even a Socialist government will take the very bread from their mouths. This is awful. Oh, for the good old days when a man's investment was safe!"

"Whose investment, John? Your investment in stocks and bonds or the farmer's investment in land?"

"And you're really going to make us sell?"

"Yep."

"And nothing will change your mind?"

"Nope."

"Do you think that's right?"

"Didn't you? 'The greatest good to the greatest number,' remember. Your corporation counsel pleaded that so eloquently when he wanted a right of way."

"Oh well, Sam, I was only fooling, anyway. We're perfectly willing to sell—to you. We'll take inventory right away and see what the business is really worth. I don't know what the Steel Trust will invoice buildings, mines, stocks, bonds and good will but it'll run close to five billion dollars. You can have it for about that figure. But we want you to understand, Sam, that this is being done as a personal favor to you. We wouldn't sell to any one else for double that amount."

"I get the business, then, for five billion dollars just because you're fond of me?"

"Certainly."

"You like me pretty well, don't you, Morgan?"

"Why yes, Sam, I do like you. All my family likes you, too. They're always saying something nice about you. And Sam, it's the funniest thing, but down to our house we've got a dog and every time your name is mentioned he—he—he'll wag his tail."

"I'm right glad you like me so well, Morgan, but the
Steel Trust is capitalized, water and all, at fifteen hundred millions; what makes you think it's worth close to five billion dollars?"

"A stockholders' meeting has been called for tomorrow to issue more stock; we'll issue enough to bring it up to an even five billion. Of course, Sam, you don't have to take the business if you don't want to pay the price. Five billion dollars is our figure."

**Squeezing Out Watered Stocks.**

"John, you're just set on making me remember all about that farmer, ain't you? I recollect now that when he found he HAD to sell he suddenly decided his land was worth $200 an acre and not $50 an acre as he formerly valued it. And John, if you'll look at the stub in your check book you'll find you didn't pay him $200 an acre. I wouldn't let him charge you that amount. I, the court, set what I considered a fair valuation on that land and THAT'S the figure at which he sold. I MADE him sell and I made him sell at MY figure.

"Now then, unless we can do business RIGHT NOW, before the ball game, that's EXACTLY what I'm going to do with you. I'll yank this same law, 'The Right of Eminent Domain,' and you'll HAVE to sell at MY figure. Better take the bonds, Morgan."

You see we need make no new laws and we need change no laws—just see that existing laws apply to rich men as, in the past, they've been MADE to apply to poor men.

We'll assume, now, that Uncle Sam has come into possession of the United States Steel Corporation for which he has given fifteen hundred million dollars in bonds. The first thing he'd do would be to safeguard the lives of the workers, shorten the hours of labor, raise the wages to a good living rate and generally look after the well-being of the people who actually produce steel. Under collective ownership the steel workers themselves would be Uncle Sam in the steel business and they'd naturally prefer these conditions to fat dividends and monkey dinners for former private owners.

**Retiring the Bonds.**

But suppose Uncle Sam DIDN'T do this right away.
Let's take Socialism at its worst and Capitalism at its best, compare the two in that unfair light and see which you prefer. Uncle Sam COULD leave the wages just as they were before the transfer; the hours of labor exactly the same; the price of steel just as before. Under those unchanged conditions the Steel Trust which paid private owners three hundred millions of dollars a year in profits would pay Uncle Sam three hundred millions of dollars a year in profits. At the end of the first year he could take his three hundred millions and buy back from Morgan one-fifth of the bonds. That's exactly what Morgan would have gotten from the industry anyway. At the end of the second year Uncle Sam could, WITH THE PROFITS FROM THE BUSINESS, retire another fifth of the bonds. He could continue this each year for five years, giving Steel Trust stockholders, the poor widows and innocent orphans included, EXACTLY what they'd have gotten from the private ownership of the business. But at the end of five years that thing STOPS. The way your politicians have you swarmed into voting that thing will go on for time and eternity and you, and your children and your children's children will pay the bill year after year, decade after decade, century after century.

At the end of the sixth year there'd be no more bonds to retire. THEN Uncle Sam could raise the wages, shorten the hours of labor, reduce the price of steel to its actual cost of production, conduct the business for the USE of the people and not for the private profit of a few owners, we'd get one hundred cents worth of value for every dollar we spent, the principle of the postage stamp would apply, we'd ALL be on the inside and the Steel Trust would be a good thing for all of us. Wouldn't it?

Every industry in the United States can be taken over in the same way. And there need be no interruption to business, no bloodshed and no church steeples need be knocked over to do it, either.

"But the government can't conduct business," screams the frantic politician.

Can't it, though? CAN'T the government successfully conduct business? Just last month you read that some railroad had gone into the hands of a receiver. You read of such things from two to a dozen times a year. Who is the receiver? The United States government. It takes hold of a railroad in a run-down, worn-out, dilapidated con-
dition; it begins to operate it. It builds it up into a sound, healthy, money-making concern and THEN hands it back to the private owners. You KNOW this is so. Then do you believe the silly twaddle that the government can do this for private owners but couldn’t possibly do it for ALL the people? Do you think, with the mule, that there MUST be riders?

The Postoffice Graft.

“Yes, but look at the postoffice,” sneers the Republican-Progressive-Democratic-Prohibitionist stand-patter. “It’s the greatest collectively owned institution in the country and the biggest graft in America.”

ABSOLUTELY TRUE. But mark this: There is no graft where one department of the postoffice deals with another department. When your local postoffice orders $1,000 worth of stamps from Washington it receives EXACTLY $1,000 worth. It does NOT receive $900 worth and a charge for $1,000. And every stamp’s the genuine article, too. There is no adulteration. That is true of ALL departments of the postoffice.

And there’s no graft where the postoffice deals with the people. The Harvester Trust cannot buy stamps one cent cheaper than YOU can. If it purchased a million dollars worth at a time it wouldn’t get a two-cent rebate on the whole lot. There is no graft where the postoffice deals with the people.

But when this collectively owned institution deals with a privately owned concern THERE enters tremendous graft. The railroads, for instance, which own the express companies, charge the postoffice nine cents a pound for carrying first class mail matter; they charge the express companies one-half cent a pound for carrying the SAME class of matter. The privately-owned railroads charge the collectively owned postoffice seventeen times MORE than they charge the privately owned express companies for the same service.

There are a number of ways to go about stopping this. I’ll outline two. One of them is a wrong way which will APPARENTLY stop the graft on the people; the other is a right way which WILL stop it.
How to Stop It.

One way is to sell the postoffice to the railroads. Then the railroads won't graft on themselves. Another way is for the government to take over the railroads. Then the government won't graft on itself. You need not be told which of these two is to the greatest good of the greatest number; which is the RIGHT and ONLY way in which the matter can be SETTLED. For, like everything else, this question can NEVER be settled until it's settled RIGHT.

In conclusion let me say that you'll soon be called upon to vote again. As usual a number of candidates and a whole swarm of "issues" will be placed before you. But the men in the saddle will not be greatly concerned as to whom you vote for so long as it's one of their three candidates. If a Democrat is returned they will continue to own most of the things collectively used. If a Republican is the successful nominee they will still own the things upon which we depend for our very lives and we'll HAVE to pay tribute to them each hour of every day. If a Progressive goes to the White House they will, as before, own the oil wells, the coal mines, the packing plants, the railroads and the things which we collectively use.

That is one side. But if you seem about to put a Socialist in the White House THEN the men in the saddle will be GREATLY concerned. For with a Socialist President and Congress the ownership of things collectively used will pass from private to collective hands. That will mean that the present owners will have to get off our backs. They don't want to give up their seats and I don't blame them.

An Appeal to Your Head.

The issues of right and wrong are squarely before you. You can't dodge them even if you wish to and ninety per cent of the people do not wish to. But the next time you mark a ballot you're going to CONSCIOUSLY, and with your eyes open, vote FOR the greatest good to the greatest number or you're going to CONSCIOUSLY and with your eyes open, vote AGAINST the greatest good to the greatest number. You're going to vote RIGHT or you're going to vote WRONG. THERE IS NO MIDDLE GROUND. Books, newspapers, orators, politicians to the
contrary notwithstanding, THERE IS NO COMPROMISE between right and wrong. And it is eternally true that there can be NO PEACE between an exploited working class, conscious of the fact that it is being robbed, and Capitalism, the system which exploits that working class. The fight is on in dead earnest. One of the two must conquer.

I’m not going to tell you how to vote. That wasn’t my purpose in coming here. The men and women who arranged this meeting knew beforehand that I wouldn’t make an appeal for votes. But I’m going to entreat you with all the force at my command to “search out” the conceit of the rich man; to read, study and DO YOUR OWN THINKING. No harm can come to you through thinking. Anything which will not stand the keen searchlight of mental analysis is a FRAUD. Don’t take your thoughts ready-made from me nor from anyone else. Learn for yourselves. Cut to the bone. Don’t be swarmed by side issues. You can KNOW what is right and what is wrong. And once you KNOW there’ll be no question as to how you’ll vote.

I thank you.
SORROWS OF CUPID.

Eight years ago Kate Richards O'Hare wrote a little 64-page booklet, "WHAT HAPPENED TO DAN"—when the great edition was exhausted the book was expanded into 112 pages and called "The Sorrows of Cupid"; when time would permit, Mrs. O'Hare continued the work of enlarging and improving this beautiful work until now it is a fine large volume of many chapters. It covers the entire case of capitalism from the point of most intense human interest. Love,—marriage,—home,—babies, all the sweet and tender thoughts that this gifted writer has expressed in her many written articles are gathered here: a book that every wife and mother, every husband and father, every lover and maiden should have by them. Life will be sweeter and richer for you when you have read "The Sorrows of Cupid."

WORKERS IN AMERICAN HISTORY.

James Oneal of Terre Haute, Ind., spent seven years of study and research to write a book, "The Workers in American History," telling for the first time the history of the American toiling masses, from the days of Columbus until the Mexican War. This is a wonderful book.
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