The Proletariat

AND

DOWN WITH THE SOCIALISTS.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1898.

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY,
147 EAST 23rd STREET.
Labor News Company,

PROPERTY OF THE

SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY,

147 East 23rd Street.

NEW YORK CITY.

THE COMPLETEST COLLECTION

OF

SOCIALIST LITERATURE

Address Orders and Remittances to

LABOR NEWS COMPANY,

147 East 23rd Street, New York City
THE PROLETARIAT.

(Adapted for THE NEW YORK PEOPLE from K. Kautsky.)

---

I.

EFFECT OF MACHINERY.

In all countries in which the capitalist system of production prevails, especially in such countries as the United States where capitalism has reached the point of production on a large scale, we find the population divided mainly into two classes: first, the capitalists, who possess the means of production—tools, machinery, land, etc., but who take no part in production itself; and secondly, the wage-workers, the proletariat, who possess nothing but their labor power, on the sale of which they live, and whose labor alone brings forth the whole wealth of the land.

Capitalists need a large supply of proletarians; originally, in other countries and in ages gone by, forcible methods were resorted to, to furnish this requisite supply. To-day, however, in the United States especially, such methods are no longer needed. The superior power of capitalist production on a large scale over small production is to-day sufficient, without doing open violence to the law or to private property, but on the contrary, with the very assistance of these, year in year out to strip of all property a sufficient number of small farmers.
and industrialists, who are then thrown upon the streets, who merge with the mass of the proletariat, and who thereby satisfy the ever increasing capitalist demand for more human flesh.

That the number of the proletariat is steadily on the increase in this country is such a palpable fact that even they no longer attempt to deny it, who would make us believe that society to-day rests upon the same basis that it did a hundred years ago, and who try to paint in rosy colors the picture of the small producer. Indeed, a revolution has taken place in the make-up of society, the same as it has in the system of production. The capitalist form of production has overthrown all others and become the dominant one in the field of industry; similarly wage-labor is to-day the dominant form of labor; a hundred years ago the farming peasantry took the first place; later, the small city industrialists; to-day it is the wage-earner or proletariat.

In all civilized countries the proletarians are to-day the largest class; it is their condition and modes of thought that control those of all the other subdivisions of labor. This state of things implies a complete revolution in the condition and thought of the bulk of the population. The conditions of the proletariat differ radically from those of all other former categories of labor. The small farmer, the artisan, the small producers generally, were, namely, the owners of the product of their labor by reason of their ownership of the means of production; contrariwise, the product of the labor of the proletarian does not belong to him, it belongs to the capitalist, to the purchaser of his labor-power, to the owner of the requisite instruments of production. True enough the proletariat is paid therefor by the capitalists, but the value of his wages is far below that of his product.

When the capitalist in industry—and let it be here said, once for all, that, at the present stage of development in production, agriculture is as much an industry as any other—purchases the only commodity which the proletarian can offer for sale, to wit, his labor power, he does so for the only purpose of utilizing it in a profitable way. The more the workingman produces, the larger the value of his product. If the capitalist were to work his hands only long enough to produce the worth of the wages he pays them, he would clear no profits. But however willing the capitalist is to pose as the benefactor of suffering humanity, his capital cries for "profits" and finds in him a willing listener. The longer the time is extended during which the workmen labor in the service of the capitalists, over and above the time needed to cover their wages, the larger is the value of their product, the larger is the surplus over and above the capitalist outlay in wages, and the larger is the quantity of exploitation to which these workmen are subjected. This exploitation or fleecing of labor finds a limit only in the powers of endurance of the working people and in the resistance which they may be able to offer to their exploiters.

In capitalist production, the capitalist and the wage-worker are not active together as the employer and the employed used to be in previous industrial epochs. The capitalist soon develops into, and remains essentially, a merchant. His activity, in so far as he may be at all active, limits itself, like that of the merchant, to the operations of the market. His labors consist in purchasing as cheaply as possible the raw material, labor power and other essentials, and to
turn around and sell the finished products as dearly as possibly. Upon the field of production itself he does nothing except to secure the largest quantity of labor from the workmen for the least possible amount of wages, and thereby to squeeze out of them the largest possible quantity of surplus values. With regard to his workmen he is not a fellow-worker; he is only a driver, an exploiter. The longer they work, the better off he is; he is not tired out if the hours of labor are unduly extended; he does not perish if the method of production becomes a murderous one. Of all former ruling classes the capitalist is the most reckless of the life and safety of his operatives. Extension of the hours of work, abolition of holidays, introduction of night labor, damp or overheated factories filled with poisonous gases, such as the "improvements" which the capitalist mode of production has introduced for the benefit of the working class.

The introduction of machinery increases still further the danger to life and limb for the workingman. The machine system fetters him to a monster that moves perpetually with a gigantic power and with insane speed. Only the closest, never flagging attention can protect the workingman, attached to such a machine, from being seized and broken by it. Protective measures cost money; the capitalist does not introduce them unless he is forced thereto. Economy being the much vaunted virtue of the capitalist, he is constrained by it to save room and to squeeze as much machinery as possible into the workshop. What cares he that the limbs of his workingmen are thereby endangered? Workingmen are cheap, but large airy workshops are dear.

There is still another respect in which the capitalist application of machinery lowers the condition of the working class. It is this: The tool of the former mechanic was cheap; it was subject to few changes that would render it useless; otherwise with the machine; in the first place it costs money, much money; in the second place, if, through improvements in the system it becomes useless, or if it is not used to its full capacity, it will bring loss instead of profit to the capitalist; again, the machine is worn out not only through use but also through idleness; furthermore, the introduction of science into production, the result of which is the machine itself, causes constant new discoveries and inventions to take the place of older ones, and renders constantly, now this, then that sort of machine, and often whole factories at once, unable to compete with the improved ones before they have been used up to their full extent; owing to these constant changes, every machine is in constant danger of being made useless before it is used up; this is sufficient ground for the capitalist to utilize his machine as quickly as possible from the moment he puts it in operation; in other words, the capitalist application of the system of machinery is a particular spur that drives the capitalist to extend the hours of labor as much as possible, to carry on production without interruption, to introduce the system of night and day shifts, and, accordingly, to rear the unwholesome system of night work into a permanent system.

At the time the system of machinery began to develop, some ideologists declared the golden age was at hand: the machine was to release the workingman and render him a free man. In the hands of the capitalist however, the machine has become the most powerful lever towards making heavier the load of
labor, borne by the proletariat, and to aggravate his servitude into an unbearable condition.

But it is not only with regard to the hours of work that the condition of the wage-worker and proletariat has suffered with the introduction of machinery. It suffered also with regard to his wages. The proletarian, the workman of today, does not eat at the table of the capitalist; he does not live in the same house. However wretched his home may be; however miserable his food, nay, even though he may famish, the well-being of the capitalist is not disturbed by the sickening sight. The words Wages and Starvation used to be opposites; the free workingman could formerly starve only when he had no work; whoever worked earned Wages, he had enough to eat, Starvation was not his lot. The unenviable distinction was reserved for the capitalist system of production to reconcile these two opposites—Wages and Starvation—and to raise Starvation—Wages into a permanent institution, yea, into a prop of the present social system.

II.
Wages.

Wages can never rise so high as to make it impossible for the capitalist to carry on his business and live; under such circumstances, it would be more profitable for the capitalist to give up his business. Consequently, the wages of the workingman can never rise high enough to equal the value of his product. They must always be below that, so as to leave a surplus; it is only the prospect of a surplus that moves the capitalist to purchase labor-power. It is therefore evident that in the capitalist social system the wages of the workmen can never rise high enough to put an end to the exploitation of labor.

This surplus, which the capitalist class appropriates, is larger than is usually imagined. It covers not only the “profits” of the manufacturer but many other items that are usually credited to the costs of production and exchange. It covers, for instance, rent, interest on loans, salaries, merchant’s profits, taxes, etc. All these have to be covered with the surplus, or the excess of the value of the product over the wages of the workingman. It is evident that this surplus must be a considerable one if a concern is to “pay”; the exploitation of the workingman must be great, even where the wages are high. It is clear that the wages of the workingman cannot rise high enough to be even approximately equal to the value of his product. The capitalist wages system means, under all circumstances, the thorough exploitation of the working class. It is impossible to abolish this exploitation without abolishing the system itself.

But wages rarely reach the highest point which they might even under these circumstances; more often they are found to be nearer to the lowest possible point. This point is reached when the wages do not even supply the workman with his barest necessities; when the workingman not only starves but starves rapidly, all work is at end.

The wages swing between these two extremes; they are found to be lower
the lower the necessities of the workman, the larger the supply of labor in the labor market, and the slighter the capacity of the workingman for resistance.

In general, wages must be high enough to keep the workingman in a condition to work, or, to speak more accurately, they must be high enough to secure to the capitalist the measure of labor-power which he needs. In other words, wages must be high enough, not only to keep the workingman in a condition to work, but also in a condition to produce children who may be able to replace them. It follows that the industrial development has a tendency that is most pleasing to the capitalist, to wit, to lower the necessities of the workingman in order that his wages may be lower in proportion.

There was a time when skill and strength were requisites for a workingman. The period of apprenticeship was then long, the cost of his training considerable. Now, however, the progress made in the division of labor and the system of machinery render skill and strength in production more and more superfluous; they make it possible to substitute unskilled and cheap workman for skilled ones; and consequently, to substitute weak women and even children in the place of men. Already in the early ages of manufactury this tendency is perceptible; but not until machinery is introduced into production does the wholesale exploitation commence of women and children of tender age—an exploitation of the most helpless among the helpless, who are made a prey of shocking maltreatment and abuse. Thus machinery develops a new and wonderful quality in the hands of the capitalist.

Originally, the wage-worker, who was not a member of the family of his employer, had to earn wages high enough to defray not only his own expenses but those of his family in order to enable him to propagate himself and to bequeath his labor power to others. Without this process on his part, the heirs of the capitalists would find no proletarians ready made for exploitation.

When, however, the wife, and, from early infancy, the children of the working-man are able to take care of themselves, then the wages of the male working-man can be safely reduced to the level of his own personal needs without the risk of stopping the supply of fresh labor power.

Over and above this, the labor of women and children affords the additional advantage that these offer less resistance than men; and their introduction into the ranks of the workers increases wonderfully the quantity of labor that is offered for sale in the market.

Accordingly, the labor of women and children does not only lower the necessities of the workingman but it also diminishes his capacity for resistance in that it overstocks the labor market: owing to both these circumstances it lowers the wages of the workingman.

III

Dissolution of the Proletarian Family.

The labor of woman in productive pursuits betokens the total destruction of the family life of the workingman, without substituting for it a higher form of family relationship. The capitalist system of production does not yet generally destroy the single household of the workingman, but robs it of all its bright,
and leaves only its dark sides. The activity of woman to-day in industrial pursuits does not mean to her freedom from household duties; it means to her an increase of her former burdens by a new one. But we cannot serve two masters. The household of the workingman suffers whenever his wife must help to earn the daily bread. What present society puts in the place of the individual household and family which it destroys, are miserable substitutes: soup-houses and day nurseries, where the offals of the physical and mental sustenance of the rich are cast to the lower classes.

Socialists are charged with an intent to abolish the family. We do know that every system of production has had a special form of household, to which corresponds a special system of family relationship. We do not consider the existing form of the family the highest possible nor the last utterance upon the subject; and we do expect that a new and improved social system may yet develop a new and higher form of family relationship. But to hold this view is a very different thing from striving to dissolve all family bonds. They who do destroy the family bonds—who not only mean to but who in fact do destroy them right under our own eyes—they are, not the Socialists, but the capitalists themselves. Many a slave-holder has before this torn husband from wife, and parents from grown-up children; but the capitalists have improved upon the abominations of slavery: they tear the suckling from the breast of its mother, and compel her to intrust it to strangers' hands. And yet a society in which hundreds of thousands of such instances are of daily occurrence, a society whose luminaries promote "benevolent" institutions for the purpose of making easy the separation of the mothers from their babes, such a society has the effrontery to accuse the Socialists of contemplating the abolition of the family simply because they, basing their opinion upon the fact that the "family" has ever been one of the reflexes of the system of production, foresee that further changes in that system must also result in more a pernicious system of family relationship.

IV.

Prostitution.

Hand in hand with the accusation on the subject of the family bonds goes the accusation that Socialists aim at a community of wives. This charge is as false as the other. Socialists, on the contrary, maintain that just the reverse of a community in wives, and of all sexual oppression and license, to wit, ideal love, will be the foundation of matrimonial connections in a Socialist Commonwealth, and that pure love can only prevail in such a social system. What, on the other hand, do we see to-day?

The irrational system of modern production tears the sexes apart. It builds up she-towns in New England and he-towns in the mining districts of Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio and the further West, thereby directly promoting and inciting prostitution as a natural and inevitable result. Furthermore, helpless women, forced to earn their living in the factories, shops and mines, fall a prey to capitalist cupidity; the capitalist takes advantage of their inexperience, offers them wages too slight for their support, and hints at, or even brazenly refers them to,
prostitution as a means of supplementing their income. Everywhere, the increase of female labor in industry is accompanied by an increase of prostitution. In the modern State, where Christianity is preached and piouness is at a premium, many a "thriving" branch of industry is found whose working women are paid so poorly that they would be compelled to starve unless they prostituted themselves; and wonderful to say, in such instances the capitalist will ever be heard to protest that these small wages are indispensable to enable him to compete successfully in the market, and to maintain his establishment in a "thriving" condition.

Prostitution is as old as the contrast between rich and poor. At one time, however, prostitutes constituted a middle class between beggars and thieves; they were then an article of luxury, which society indulged in, but the loss of which would in no way have endangered its existence. To-day, however, it is no longer the females of the slums alone, but working women who are compelled to sell their bodies for money. This latter sale is no longer simply a matter of luxury, it has become one of the foundations upon which production is carried on. Under the capitalistic system of production, prostitution becomes a pillar of society. What the defenders of this social system falsely charge Socialists with, is the very thing they are guilty of themselves: Community of wives is a feature of capitalism. Indeed such deep roots has this system of community of wives cast in modern society that its representatives agree in declaring prostitution to be a necessary thing. They cannot understand that the abolition of the proletariat implies the abolition of prostitution. So deep are they sunk in intellectual stagnation that they cannot conceive a social system without community of wives.

But be it noted, community of wives has ever been an invention of the upper layers of society, never of the proletariat. The community of wives is one of the modes of exploiting the proletariat; it is not Socialism; it is the exact opposite of Socialism.

V.

The Industrial Reserve Army.

We have seen that the introduction of female and child-labor in industry is one of the most powerful means whereby the capitalists reduce the wages of workingmen. There is however another means, which, periodically, is just as powerful, to wit, the introduction of workingmen from neighborhoods that are backward, and whose population has slight wants, but whose labor-power has not yet been unnerved by the factory system. The development of production upon a large scale, of machinery, namely, makes possible not only the employment of such untrained workmen in the place of trained ones, but also their cheap and prompt transportation to the place where they are wanted. Hand in hand with the development of production goes the system of transportation; colossal production corresponds with colossal transportation not of merchandise only, but of persons also. Steamships and railroads, these much-vaulted pillars of civilization, not only carry guns, liquor and syphilis to barbarians, but they
also bring the barbarians to us, and with them their barbarism. The flow of agricultural laborers into the cities is becoming ever stronger; and from ever further regions are the swarms of those drawing nearer who have less wants, are more patient, and offer less resistance. Slovacs, Swedes and Italians emigrate to Germany; Germans, Belgians, Italians emigrate to France; Slovacs, Germans, Indians, Irishmen, Swedes, emigrate to England; Slovacs, Russians, Armenians, Swedes, Italians, Irish, English and Chinese emigrate to the United States—all of them bearing down upon wages in each place. All these foreign workingmen are partly expropriated people, small farmers and producers, whom the capitalist system of production has ruined, driven on the street, and deprived, not only of a home, but also of a country. Socialism is often charged by the Philistines with lack of patriotism; look at these swarms of emigrants; what is it but capitalism that has expatriated these wretches, and inflicted upon them the bane of exile?

Through the expropriation of the small farmers and producers, through the importation from distant lands of large masses of labor, through the development of woman and child-labor, through the shortening of the time necessary to acquire a trade, through all these means the capitalist system of production is enabled to increase stupendously the quantity of labor-forces that are at its disposal. And side by side with this goes a steady increase in the productivity of human labor as the result of the uninterrupted progress in technical arts.

Simultaneously with these tendencies, the machine steadily tends to displace workingmen and render them superfluous. Every machine saves labor-power: unless it did that it would be useless. In every branch of industry—and be it well remembered, agriculture is to-day an industry and is identically affected—the transition from hand to machine labor is accompanied with the greatest amount of suffering to the workingmen who are affected by it, who, whether they be mechanics or handicraftsmen, or whether they be farm hands, engaged in ploughing, reaping or picking cotton, are made superfluous by the machine and are thrown out upon the streets and roadsides. It was this effect of machinery that the workingmen felt first. Numerous riots during the first years of this century, and not infrequent occurrences to-day, attest the quantity of suffering which the transition from hand to machine labor, or the introduction of improved machinery, inflicts upon the working class, and the despair to which they are thereby driven. The introduction of machinery, as well as its subsequent improvement, is every time beneful to the workingmen whom it affects; true enough under certain conditions, other workmen may gain thereby, such workingmen, for instance, as may be employed in the manufacture of the machine itself; but, in the first place, these happy ones are to-day always much fewer than those who suffer; and in the second place, it may well be doubted whether a consciousness of this fact could go far to console the starving ones.

Every new machine causes either as much to be produced as before with fewer workmen, or, to produce a larger quantity of articles with no increase in the number of workmen. It follows therefrom that, if in a country the number of workmen employed does not decrease with the development of the system of machinery, then the market must be extended in proportion to the increased productivity of these workmen. Seeing, however, that the economic development increases the productivity of labor at the same time that it increases in a greater
degree the quantity of disposable labor, it follows that, in order to prevent enforced idleness among the workmen, the market must be extended at a much more rapid pace than the pace at which the productivity of labor is increased by the machine. Such a rapid extension of the market has however, rarely occurred under the rule of capitalist production. It follows that enforced idleness is a permanent phenomenon under the capitalist system of production, and is inseparable from it. Even in the best of times, when the market suddenly undergoes a considerable extension and business is briskest, production is not able to furnish work to all the unemployed; during bad times, however, when business is at a standstill, their number rises to fabulous figures. In fact the unemployed constitute quite an army—the industrial reserve army, as Marx called it; it is an army of labor forces that stands ever ready, at the disposal of the capitalist; an army out of which he can draw his reserves whenever the industrial campaign grows hot.

To the capitalist, this reserve army is invaluable. It places in his hands a powerful weapon with which to curb and subject the army of the employed. After excessive work on the part of some has produced lack of work for others, then the idleness of these is used as a means to keep up and even increase the excessive work of the former. And yet there are people who will deny that matters are to-day arranged at their best!

Although the size of the industrial reserve army rises and falls with the ups and downs of business, nevertheless, on the whole, it shows a steady tendency to increase. This is inevitable. The technical development moves on at an ever increasing pace, and steadily increases its fields of operations, while on the other hand the extension of the markets is hemmed in by natural bounds.

What then, is the full significance of lack of work? It signifies not only want and misery to the unemployed, not only intensified vassalage and exploitation to the employed; it signifies, furthermore, uncertainty of livelihood to the whole working class.

Whatever hardships former modes of exploitation inflicted upon the exploited, one boon they left them: the certainty of a livelihood. The sustenance of the serf and the slave was assured at least so long as the life of the master himself was assured. Only when the master perished was the existence of his dependents in peril. Whatever amount of misery and death broke out over the people under former systems of production, such visitations were never the result of production itself, they were the result of a disturbance of production, brought on by failures of crop, droughts, floods, eruptions of hostile armies, etc., etc.

To-day, the existence of the exploiter and the exploited are not bound up in each other. At any moment the workman can be thrown upon the street with wife and children, and be given over to starvation, without the exploiter, whom he has made rich, being the worse for it.

To-day, the misery of enforced idleness is only in very exceptional instances the result of a disturbance in production through influences from without; enforced idleness among the workingmen is but a necessary result of the development of the present system of production. To-day, just the reverse happens of what happened under former systems of production. To-day, such disturbances in production rather improve the opportunities for work than otherwise; war, with all its devastating influences, has for its result an immediate increase in the demand for labor.
Under our former system of production, the income of the worker was in proportion to his industry. Laziness ruined him, and finally threw him out of work. To-day, on the contrary, lack of work is greater the more and the longer the workman toils: he brings enforced idleness upon himself by his own toil. Among the many homely adages, which originated during the system of small production, and which capitalist large production has reversed, the following is one: "The industry of the laborer builds up his house;" likewise has the maxim, so often upon the lips of the Philistines, that "whoever will work will find bread" been turned into a lie.

To-day the possession of strength to labor is, to the workingman, as unreliable a shield against want and misery as property itself is to the small producer: as the spectre of bankruptcy casts its shadow across the path of the small farmer and small industrialist, so does the spectre of "out of work" darken that of the wage-worker. Of all the ills that attend the present system of production, the most trying, the most aggravating, that which harrows men's souls deepest, and which pulls by the roots every instinct of conservatism, is the permanent uncertainty of a livelihood. This eternal uncertainty of one's own condition undermines one's hope in the certainty of life, and all his interest in its preservation.

Excessive work, lack of work, the dissolution of the family—these are the gifts which the capitalist system of production carries to the proletariat at the same time that it causes that class to swell from day to day, and its condition to spread perceptibly, more and more, over the whole population.
VI.

The Steady Increase of the Proletariat — Mercantile and Educated Proletariat.

It is not only through the extension of large production that the capitalist system causes the condition of the proletariat to become more and more that of the whole population. It brings this about also through the circumstance that the condition of the wage-worker, engaged in large production, strikes the keynote for the condition of wage-workers in all other branches. The conditions under which the latter work and live are revolutionized; the advantages, which they may have had over those employed in capitalist industry, are turned into so many disadvantages under the influence of the latter. To illustrate, in those localities where mechanics still work for, and board and lodge with, the master mechanic, the poor board and lodging which the wage-worker, employed in a capitalist industry, can afford become a pretext for the master mechanic to reduce both the board and the comforts of lodging which his workmen enjoyed. Again, formerly the long period requisite for apprenticeship was a means to prevent the overstocking of a trade; to-day, the system of apprenticeship, conducted under the guise of benevolence in many of our large cities, and called Trades Schools, notably in New York and Pittsburgh, is one of the most effective means to overrun many a trade with cheap labor, and to knock the bread from the mouths of the adult laborers. In this respect also, as in so many others, those institutions, which, under the system of small production, were sensible and beneficent, have, under the influence of the capitalist system, become either nonsensical or hurtful.

There is another, and very extensive, domain on which the capitalist system of large production exercises its influence of turning the population into proletarians—the domain of commerce. The large stores have begun to bear, and are now bearing heavily upon the small ones. The number of small stores does not, therefore, necessarily diminish. On the contrary, it increases. The small store is the last refuge of the bankrupt small producer. Were the small stores actually crowded out, the ground would be wholly taken from under the feet of the small traders; they would then be fortieth thrust below the class of the proletariat—into the slums; they would be turned into beggars, vagabonds and candidates for the penitentiary! Such in fact is, to a great extent, the evolution of the small trader.

But it is not in the reduction of the number of small stores, it is in the debasement of their character that the influence of large production manifests itself in commerce. The small trader deals in ever worse and cheaper goods; the tribe of the huckster grows; and the streets and roads are overrun with peddlers, itinerant venders and hucksters of all manner of worthless articles: of spoiled fruit, decayed vegetables, etc., etc., sold under false pretences with all sorts of fraudulent devices, such as deceptive measures and weights. Thus the livelihood of the independent small trader becomes ever more precarious, more proletarian-like, while, steadily and at the same time, in the large stores, the number of employees goes up—genuine proletarians, without prospect of ever becoming independent. Woman and child labor, with their accompaniment of prostitution; excessive work; lack of work;
starvation-wages;—all the symptoms of large production appear also in increasing quantity in the domain of commerce. Steadily the condition of the employees in this department approaches that of the proletarians in the department of production. The only difference perceptible between the two is that the former preserve the appearances of a better living, which require sacrifices unknown to the industrial proletarians.

There is still a third category of proletarianism that has gone far on the road of its complete development: the educated proletarians. Education has become a special trade under our present system. The measure of knowledge has increased greatly, and grows daily. Capitalist society and the capitalist State are ever more in need of men of knowledge and ability to conduct their business, in order to bring the forces of nature under their power, be it for purposes of production or of destruction, or to enable them to expend in luxuriant living their increasing profits. Now then, it is not only the hardworking small farmer, mechanic, or the proletarians in general, who have no time to devote themselves to science and art; the merchant, the manufacturer, the banker, the stock-jobber, the landlord class—all of these are in the same fix. Their whole time is taken up either with their work, or with their "business" and pleasures, as the case may be. In modern society, it is not, as it used to be under previous social orders, the exploiters themselves, or at least a class of them, who nurse the arts and sciences. The present exploiters, our ruling class, leave these pursuits to a special class, whom they keep in hire. Under this system, education becomes a merchandise.

A hundred years ago or so, this commodity was rare. There were few schools; study was accompanied with considerable expense. So long as small production could support the worker, he stuck to it; only special gifts of nature or favorable circumstances would cause the sons of these to dedicate themselves to the arts and sciences. Incredible, or unlikely, as it may look at first blush, even in so new a country as the United States, the demand for physicians, teachers, artists, etc., etc., was, for quite a long number of years, supplied almost entirely by this limited class and its descendants.

So long as this condition of things lasted, the merchandise education commanded a high price. Its possession procured, at least to those who applied it to practical ends, lawyers, for instance, physicians, professors, etc., quite comfortable livings; not infrequently it also brought fame and honor. The artist, the poet, the philosopher, were, in monarchical countries, the companions of royalty; in our republic they were persons of unquestioned distinction. The aristocracy of intellect felt itself superior to the aristocracy of birth or of money. The only care of such was the development of their intellect. Hence it happened that people of culture could be, and often were, idealists. This circumstance explains the appearance, in the forties, of that galaxy of men and women, who took up in this country the idealist philosophy of Fourier, resulting in the communistic tidal wave that swept over the land at that season. These aristocrats of education and culture stood above the other classes and their material aspirations and antagonisms. Education meant power, happiness and worthiness. The conclusion seemed inevitable, that, in order to make all men happy and worthy, in order to banish all class antagonisms, all poverty, all wickedness and mean-
ness out of the world; nothing else was needed than to spread education and culture.

Since those days the development of higher education has made immense progress. The number of institutions of learning increased wonderfully, and, in a still larger degree, the number of pupils. In the meantime, the bottom was knocked out of small production. The small property-holder knows to-day no other way of keeping his sons from sinking into the proletariat but by sending them to college; and he does this if his means will at all allow. But, furthermore, he must consider the future, not of his sons only, but of his daughters also. The rapid development in the division of labor is steadily encroaching upon the household; it is converting one household duty after another into a special industry, and steadily diminishing household work. Weaving, sewing to a great extent, knitting, baking and many other occupations, that at one time filled up the round of household duties, have been either wholly or substantially withdrawn from the sphere of house-keeping. More than fifty years ago, the "store close" of which Artemus Ward loved to make frequent mention, began, in this country, to compete with and supplant the homespun; and similarly, many another home-made staple was extinguished, and its production absorbed by specialized industries. As a result of all this, matrimony, where the wife is to be housekeeper only, is becoming more and more a matter of luxury. But it so happens that the small property-holder and producer is, at the same time sinking steadily, and steadily becoming poorer; ever more and more he loses the means to indulge in luxuries. In consequence of this, the number of spinsters grows apace, and ever larger is the number of those families in which mother and daughter must work for a living. Accordingly, woman labor does not only increase in the domains of both large and small production and commerce, it also spreads in other directions in government offices, on the telegraph, telephone, railroads, banks, in office clerkships—book-keeping, typewriting, stenography—and in the sphere of the arts and sciences. However loudly prejudices and personal interests may rebel against it, woman labor presses itself forward more and more upon the various professional pursuits. It is not vanity, nor opportunity, nor pride, but the force of the economic development that drives woman to labor in these as well as in other departments of human activity. In those countries and those localities of the United States where the men have succeeded in excluding the competition of women from those branches of intellectual pursuits which are still organized upon the old guild principle, the latter press with all the greater force upon those pursuits that are not so organized, like writing, painting, music, etc.

The result of this whole development is that the number of educated people has increased enormously. Nevertheless, the beneficial results, which the idealists expected from an increase of education, have not followed. So long as education is a merchandise, its extension is tantamount to an increase in the quantity of that merchandise, consequently, to the falling of its price, and the decline of the condition of those who possess it. The number of educated people has grown to such an extent that it more than suffices for the wants of the capitalists and of the capitalist State. The labor market of educated labor is to-day as overstocked as that of manual labor. To-day, it is no longer the manual workers alone who
have their reserve army of the unemployed, and are afflicted with lack of work; the educated workers also have their reserve army of idleness, and among them also lack of work has taken up its permanent quarters. Those who strain for a public office experience the difficulty of obtaining it by reason of the crowd; those others who seek employment elsewhere experience the extremes of idleness and excessive work the same as the manual workers, and just the same as these they are the victims of wage-slavery.

The condition of the educated workers deteriorates visibly; formerly, people spoke of the "aristocracy of the intellect," to-day we speak of the "intellectual" or "educated" proletariat; the time is near when the bulk of these proletarians will be distinguishable from the others only by their concurr. Most of these still imagine they are something better than the manual proletarians; they fancy themselves members of the ruling class; but this attitude distinguishes itself in nothing from that of the lackeys, who, behind the backs of their masters, put on airs of lordship. These "educated proletarians" have ceased to be the intellectual leaders of the capitalist class; they are to-day, to the capitalist and to capitalist institutions, what "bruisers" and "gougers" are to low taverns. Scheming and plotting are their leading pursuits; their first thought is not the development of their intellectual goods but the sale of these; their principal method of getting along is the prostitution of their own individuality. The same as with the small producers, they are dazzled by a few brilliant prizes in the lottery of life, they shut their eyes to the numberless blanks in the wheel, and barter away body and soul for the merest chance of drawing such a prize. The barter and sale of one's convictions and a marriage for money, these are, in the eyes of the majority of our educated proletarians two means, as natural as they are necessary, "to make one's fortune." Into such creatures has the capitalist system of production turned our idealists, inventors, thinkers, and dreamers!

Still, the supply of this class grows so rapidly that there is little to be made out of education, even though one throw his own individuality into the bargain. The decline of the bulk of educated people into the class of the proletariat can no longer be checked.

Whether this development will result in a movement of the educated people to join the battling proletariat in mass, and not, as hitherto, singly, is uncertain. This, however, is certain: the fact that the educated people are being turned into proletarians has closed to the class of the proletariat the only gate that was still open, and through which its members might, by dint of their own unaided efforts, have been able to escape into the class above.

It is out of all question that the wage worker can become a capitalist, at least not in the ordinary run of events. Sensible people do not consider the chances of earning a prize in the Louisiana lottery, or of one's falling heir to the wealth of some unknown relative, when they deal with the condition of the working class. Under certain particularly favorable circumstances it did formerly happen, here and there, that a workman succeeded by dint of great privations to save up enough wherewith to start a little industry of his own, or set up a little retail shop, or give his son a chance to study and become something "better" than his father. It was always ridiculous to hold out such possibilities to the workmen as the means of improving their condition. In the ordinary
course of events the workingman may thank his stars if he is at all able, during good times, to lay by enough not to remain empty-handed when work becomes slack. To-day however, to hold out such possibilities to the workman is more ridiculous than ever. The economic development does not only make saving, on the part of the workingman, more and more difficult, if at all possible, but it also renders it utterly impossible, even though he may be able to save up something, to therewith pull himself or his children out of the class of the proletariat. To invest his little savings in some small independent industry, were for him to fly from the frying pan into the fire; ten to one, he will be flung back to his previous condition, with the bitter experience that the small producer can no longer keep his head above water—an experience which he will have purchased with the loss of his hard earned savings.

Still more difficult than the transition into the class of the small producer, indeed, utterly hopeless is the attempt on the part of the proletarian to give his son a chance to study. But let it be accepted, for the sake of argument, that such an attempt has been successful; of what use will a college education be to the son of the proletarian, who, being without funds and without influence, cannot wait for a good chance to sell his knowledge, in these days when thousands of lawyers, doctors, engineers and all manner of professional men are going about hungry?

To-day, whichever way the proletarian may turn, he finds awaiting him the same proletarian conditions of life and of toil; those conditions pervade society more and more; in all countries the bulk of the population has sunk to the level of the proletarian; to the individual proletarian all prospect has vanished of ever being able, by his own efforts, to pull himself out of the quagmire into which the present system of production has pushed him. The forecast of James Madison, made sixty-five years ago, that, owing to our competitive social system, the bulk of our people would ere long have lost, not only all property, but even the hope or the prospect of acquiring any, has been verified to the letter.

The individual proletarian can accomplish his own redemption only with the redemption of his whole class. That consummation cannot, however, be reached without the collective ownership by the people of their instruments of production, i. e. by the Co-operative Commonwealth.

At every previous social revolution, or be it evolution, class superseded class. Thus the theocratic class superseded the patriarchic; the feudal superseded the theocratic; and, in our own days the capitalist superseded the feudal. In each instance a class below upset the class above, emancipated itself by subjugating others, and introduced a new form of human exploitation.

To rear, on the contrary, the Co-operative Commonwealth; to abolish all class antagonisms by abolishing the last of the systems of human exploitation; to redeem itself, and, alone of all classes in the social evolution of the human species, to accomplish its own redemption together with that of the whole, not at the expense of any portion, of mankind—that is the historic mission of the Proletariat; that is the noble aim that swells with pride the breast, and sweetens the present bitterness of the lot, of every Proletarian, who is conscious of his class's distinction, and the obligation it imposes upon him.
DOWN WITH THE SOCIALISTS!

By William Bracke.

"Down with the Socialists!" This cry has been often raised; not improbably you have heard it before now, dear reader; possibly you have joined in it yourself, or at least it may have hung upon your lips—so general is the belief that Socialism and wickedness are identical. I can well imagine your transport of indignation at the deed of the fiend Norocross, who, in the insane pursuit of his own selfish ends, was ready to sacrifice the lives of scores of human beings; I can imagine your readiness to tear him to pieces, to impale him as a horrible example, to bury him alive, to consign him to the flames, or to wreak any other act of vengeance upon him. No punishment inflicted upon so reckless a criminal would seem excessive. Now, then, are not the Socialists criminals of the same stripe with Norocross? Are we not told they propose to do away with everything that is sacred—property, wedlock, the family? Have they not been charged with arson and murder? Are they not, at bottom, more damnable even than a Norocross? Is it not their purpose to inflict their pestiferous ideas upon the whole of humanity, while Norocross’s deed could at worst destroy the lives of one or two hundred people only?

These and such like thoughts have probably some time crossed your mind, dear reader; and if you yourself did not think so, some neighbor of yours, someone or other whom you have met, has certainly felt this way and given vent to his feelings.

If, indeed, you have ever indulged in such thoughts and have put to yourself the honest question, "What, after all, do I actually know about the Socialists?" you must have admitted to yourself that your knowledge on the subject was next to nothing; that you have been influenced, not so much by a clear knowledge of the wickedness of the aims of Socialists, as by an ill-defined prejudice against them. But an intelligent man must know what he does; he must be able to account to himself for his acts; when he hates and persecutes others he must be certain that his conduct is just. No good and intell...
gent man will be willing to hate and persecute people whose aims are sensible and whose motive is justice.

Let us, then, dear reader, look into these Socialists, and ascertain what it is they want. At the close of our investigation you may then with a clear conscience and deliberately, either set your face against all Socialist aspirations with redoubled force should you have become convinced of their wickedness; or, should you have discovered that their aims are good and just, add your efforts to theirs. Whosoever you may be, dear reader, I wish to believe that you are not inclined to hug wrong and reject right.

"The Socialists want to divide," so we are told with positiveness. People will have it that the Socialists want to plunder every one who owns property; that they will then divide up this plunder equally among all; and that, as soon as inequality in property shall have again asserted itself, a new division will be undertaken, and so on. Above all, we are told, are money and land to be the subject of division.

Now, pray tell me, dear reader, have you ever met any one who actually proposes such a plan? Never! Such a person you can not have met; there is none such. Such a plan of a general division would be the craziest the human brain ever conceived. To whom would a railroad, for instance be allotted? Who is to receive the rails, who is to receive the locomotive, who is to receive a coach or car? As everyone would be entitled to as much as any one else there would be no method of equal distribution other than to smash up every thing, and let one man carry off the spokes of a wheel, another the splinter of a door, a third a coupling-pin, a fourth a section of the boiler, and so forth. Such things, assuredly, are not thought of even in a lunatic asylum.

As to a division of the money and soil of the country, the thing does not, at first blush, seem so ridiculous; no physical impossibility stands in its way; and, accordingly, the charge may have a color of truth. But let us see.

In the first place, the money and soil of a country, constitute only a part of the total wealth, while the money alone is a very small fraction thereof. Even if Socialists did contemplate the division of these, the charge that they want to divide all property would fall, and would have to be limited to the smaller portion of the nation’s wealth. But even this amended charge will prove upon closer inspection, as essentially silly as the other.

In the second place, with regard to the soil, there would have to be as many barns and homesteads, or factories and other improvements as there are allotments of land; each proprietor would have to be equipped with all the means requisite to cultivate the soil or produce upon it; without these the land itself would be of no use whatever to him. To understand this, while keeping in mind the necessity of production upon a large scale, is to understand the utter futility of a division of the land. History has taught that such a procedure can bring no help. During the great French Revolution of 1789—a revolution initiated and carried through by the class that has now become dominant, namely the capitalist class—it was believed that the French agriculturists could be made happy by dividing among them the large landed estates. And what was the result? The French farmers are so poor to-day that millions of them live in hovels that hardly deserve the name of houses. And are our own American small farmers, who constitute the bulk of our farming population, much better off? Only the large bonanza farm or plantation proprietors thrive; as to the small farmer, despite the advantages of a young country, his labors are often more arduous than those of any one else; he is
driven to work himself to a bone to keep his property free from debt, and even then he
does not usually succeed. His distress comes from the circumstance that, under existing
economic conditions, agriculture can not be carried on profitably unless large tracts of
land are worked with the most improved agricultural machinery. What agricultural
land is now experiencing, urban, or land used for industrial purposes, has long ago ex-
perienced. Capitalism has invaded the fields as it has the cities. The day of small pro-
duction is gone by never to return, only production upon a large scale, carried on co-
operatively and impelled by powerful machinery, can be successful. This is a fact of which
none more than the Socialists are penetrated, and which they preach at all times. The
division of the land would, accordingly imply the division of forces. Socialists stand for
just the reverse.

Again, with regard to the division of money, an anecdote, invented years ago for the
purpose of ridiculing the aspirations of the people, may be here quoted with contrary
effect. The yarn is that a rich New York banker was once accosted by two workingmen
with these words: "Sir, you are a rich man; we want to divide with you!" The banker
was no wise disconcerted, but calmly pulling out his purse said: "With all my heart;
the thing can be done on the spot; it needs no complicated arithmetic; I am worth
fifty millions"—great glee on the countenances of the would-be dividers—"there are to-
day fifty million inhabitants in the United States; each one is, accordingly entitled to
$1 from me; here is your share," saying which he handed the two workingmen $1 a
piece, and walked off smiling in his sleeves, while the two fellows stood looking at each
other with long faces.

This anecdote is a boomerang. The charge that the Socialists would divide the land,
investigation shows to be a lie of the whole cloth; the charge that they would divide
even so divisible a thing as money is self-evidently ridiculous. The whole charge about
"division" is a fabrication to deceive the people; it is an insult to the intelligence of our
masses. But this insult will be resented. People can not long be fooled with nursery
tales and bugaboo stories. They can not fail to realize that the increasing numbers of
Socialists can not be animated by insane objects. There are crazy people enough in the
world, but the 18,000 citizens who cast last November their ballot for the candidates of
the Socialist Labor Party, in the State of New York, and the 23,000 who voted for the
Socialist Presidential ticket last year in the States of New York, Massachusetts, Con-
necticut, New Jersey and Pennsylvania cannot possibly be all crazy! Behind and at
the bottom of such a movement there must be something else than insanity.

If you attend the public meetings held by the Sections of the Socialist Labor Party,
if you look into their papers, their literature, all their publications you will arrive at the
conviction that Socialists, so far from proposing the introduction, aim at the abolition
of "division." This may sound strange to you; yet it is the fact.

The Socialists hold that it is now, under the present system, that "division" is in
full bloom; and they furthermore hold that "division" is now carried on in the most
unjust manner imaginable. Think only of all the savings and other banks, and the life
insurance companies that have "failed," as the term goes, during the last ten years down
to date, almost every one of whose officers are not only well-to-do to-day, but leading
men in the commonwealth, enjoying the highest reputation; think of the tens of
thousands of bankruptcies that are registered every year, a large percentage, if not a
majority, of which are fraudulent, and by means of which a high-way robbery sort of
"division" is practised upon other peoples' property. But it is by no means the
Socialists who first discovered the secret that "division" is practised to-day and in most
unjust manner at that. The fact is attested even by people who rank among the adversaries of Socialism. You have surely heard of an Englishman named John Stuart Mill; he is considered one of the greatest intellects among the foes of Socialism, and his class has heralded his fame everywhere. Now, then, this great political economist of the capitalist class has this to say upon the subject:

"As we now witness, the proceeds of labor are being distributed in almost inverse proportion to labor so that the largest shares thereof fall to the lot of those who never work at all, the next largest is harvested by those whose labor is nominal only, and so downwards, the reward of labor shrinking in the same proportion as labor becomes harder and more disagreeable, until the most exhausting and repulsive kind of labor cannot count with certainty on earning the most indispensable support of life."

This sounds shocking; nevertheless if you look around, if you draw upon your own experience, do you not, dear reader, find the statement confirmed? Those into whose laps new riches flow day by day, those who can tumble from one enjoyment into another have not, probably, done during their whole lives a single stroke of useful work; without themselves working, they sponged up the fruits of the labors of others. On the other hand, look at those who eat their daily bread in the sweat of their brows; look at the workingman—at him who is constrained to work for wages. If he is skilled, diligent and strong and withal is not left in the lurch by bad luck, he may possibly succeed in laying by a few savings; the large majority of the wage workers, do not, however, despite all their skill, industry and strength, succeed in doing even that little; when they breathe the last breath they are as poor as they were on the first day they started in to work; and how many are not those who, despite all their industry are unable to shield themselves and their families from hunger! Just go, dear reader, among the weavers of New England; the coal and iron miners of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Washington; the cigarmakers and all other manufacturing hands in all our large cities; look, in fact, into every corner of our country; what will you see?—industrious human beings, men, women and children, working, if they at all have a chance to work, at starvation wages during inhumanly long hours. Do they ever get the full proceeds of their labor?—No, never!—Do they ever get one half thereof?—Hardly ever!—Do they get enough for their almost ceaseless, hard work, to live as man should live?—In very exceptional cases only! Look at the clerks, salesmen and saleswomen in our groceries, dry goods and other shops, who must be decently and even neatly clad and can rarely sit down, and enjoy a regular meal, at wages that can scarcely keep body and soul together! Look at our car-drivers and conductors who are engaged for 10 hours a day in all sorts of weather and in very responsible occupations at scanty wages. Look at our agricultural laborers whose wages, according to the United States Census, amount to little more than $200 a year without boarding and lodging, but to much less with full board—and to about half as much all over the South! Look at our tenement house cigarmakers, tailors and shoemakers who in company with their wives and one or more children are huddled together in miserable dens, at work for 14, 16, 18 hours a day at wages that are a disgrace to civilization.

Such is the case with the wage workers; how is it with the small independent producer—the self-employing mechanic, small trader, manufacturer and farmer? As to the self-employing mechanic, you will not find him, dear reader, except in off corners in the country, he is not even a vanishing element of our population, as the other small self-producers are, he may be said to have vanished already. What is it that struck him? The same cyclone in which our small traders, manufacturers and farmers are now struggling desperately for existence, the inevitable concentration of the machinery of
production with its accompaniment of large production. The trials and hardships of the self-employing mechanic of twenty years ago, are to-day the trials and hardships of all our "small people"—traders, manufacturers and farmers; and the fate in store for these is the same that overtook the small self-employing mechanic—they are all about to be stripped of their property, and to be hurled into the proletariat or wage-working class. Here and there one of them may by reason of extraordinary good luck, or by dint of extraordinary resource, swing himself up into the class of the large producers and escape wage-slavery, i.e., become himself a great driver and exploiter of wage-slaves. To-day none can successfully wage the competitive battle who has not at his disposal large means, large capital, large machinery of production. The small trader is driven more and more to the wall by the large emporiums; the small farmer wears himself out in his endeavors to compete with the large farmer who can place farm products upon the market much more cheaply than the small fellow because he produces more amply, thanks to the largeness of the tracts he operates and the gigantic machinery that he works with; both the small trader and the small farmer fall thereupon into the hands of the usurer who finishes them up, and the end of the song, or rather tragedy, is that they forfeit their property to the bigger fellow under whom they then apply for jobs as wage workers.

This, dear reader, is the situation all around. The industrious portion of our population, accumulates no property, and is even a prey to want and worry. All the wealth they produce falls to those who never work, or whose work is too trivial to be taken into consideration. For the industrious, starvation; for the idle, wealth! This is the sort of "division" that goes on to-day! Would you say that this is as it should be, dear reader? Certainly not!

Sometime ago the British Government ordered an inquiry into the share of the whole product of the British people that fell to those who did work and the share that fell to those who did not work. What do you imagine, dear reader, was the result? The investigation showed that those few who perform no manner of work took more than one half of the whole product, while the British working people did not receive as much as one half of the whole product, i.e., of the fruits of their own labor!

But do you imagine that matters lie differently here with us in the United States? If you do, dismiss the thought. The figures of our last two censuses, together with those of all subsequent statistical publications bearing upon the matter, show that three-fourths of the proceeds of the nation's labor stick to the fingers of the capitalist class, the class that does not labor, or that, if it at all exerts itself, does so in gambling speculations, in criminal conspiracies, whereby one set of its members tries to defraud the other and the whole public, or to debauch the public officers; the workers, those who really and actually produce the nation's wealth, get barely one-fourth of their own toil back in the shape of wages!

Can you, dear reader, sanction such a state of things? No, never! No one, whose heart is not wrongly placed, could sanction that. However one may curse the Socialists, he must be admitted to be right upon this point. This unequal distribution of the nation's wealth cannot continue, nor can the system last that lays a premium upon idleness and punishes industry. Such a system must go. It is wrongful, hence it must be changed! No Socialist opposes private property for labor performed, as they are frequently charged with doing; on the contrary, Socialists demand that such property be kept from the clutches of those people only who do nothing and yet take the lion's share of the property produced by others away from its rightful owners. Socialists
WAR AGAINST EVERY FORM OF PRIVATE OWNERSHIP THAT IS BASED UPON IDLENESS, AND AT THE SAME TIME THEY STRIVE TO SECURE TO THOSE WHO DO PERFORM USEFUL SERVICES, TO THOSE WHO DO WORK, THE FULL RETURN OF THEIR TOIL.

"But," you might ask, "is not the suspicion justified that Socialists carry their ideas too far?" You might think that, to be sure, it were a fine thing, if it could be possible, to free those who do toil from hunger and want, and to compel those, who hitherto have not worked to do their share; you might say such a state of things were, indeed, desirable, but you might add: "does it not look as though the Socialists are the enemies of all property; is not everyone who has acquired property, including those who have done so painfully, threatened in their possession by the Socialists? Are not Socialists Communists?"

Such apprehensions are very serious; they require careful consideration.

Before we now go any further, dear reader, we must be perfectly clear upon two terms: first, Communism and second, Property.

It is remarkable how people love to quarrel over terms upon whose meaning they are not agreed. People seem to like to get excited, not over the real meaning of a subject of contention, but over matters that have nothing to do with the case; at times this circumstance has wonderful results. Only think of the persecutions carried on against the early Christians, or, in this country, against the Abolitionists, not by reason of what these people actually represented, but by reason of the slanders uttered against them. The idle class of property-grabbers have set about such a mass of lies about Communism that most people cannot think of the word without connecting it with an arch-infamous scoundrel. Accordingly, it is difficult for one to declare himself a Communist without being prejudged on the spot. There are people, who, when they but hear the word, can hear no more, can see no more, cannot reason no more—they are wholly bereft of all senses and cry out anathema! It not infrequently happens to-day that the words: "You are a Socialist?" or "You are a Communist!" are fired at a man with the expectation of an annihilating him; these words are in such cases expected to conjure up all possible social prejudices, and these prejudices being the strongest there are, far stronger than even the religious ones, it becomes a very difficult thing to arrive at a clear understanding upon questions such as these.

But you, dear reader, who have followed me so far, will not now dismiss me with an anathema, but will be minded to seek calmly and sensibly for an answer to the question, WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

If we open our eyes and look around in the world, we will find many useful institutions which redound to the benefit of many, or of all people. In one place we will see people associating for the purpose of saving shipwrecked sailors, yonder the community is seen building a school-house, or the State is found rearing a post-office. In everyday life people think only of themselves, but in such instances as I have just cited people are found to combine to promote a common end. Experience has shown that they fare excellently thereby. Whoever will but stop to think, must admit that his own wellbeing is greatly promoted by such institutions. Where would mankind be without the roads and the school-houses (however defective these are)—all of which were built in common? How painfully would we not feel the absence of insurance companies, which, tho' hampered by their private character, still carry their public features sufficiently marked, and whose effect is to remove from the shoulders of the individual the burden that might ruin him, and to cause it to be distributed over many so as to make it light and insignificant? There are scores upon scores of other instances in point that could be men-
tioned, but the instances cited will suffice. All these institutions are bits of Communism. Communism is but the principle of common interests.

In everyday life, each one seeks his own benefit, even though it be at the expense of others; naked, cold, ugly egotism is there uppermost. The large spinning and weaving factories have reduced thousands upon thousands of small spinners and weavers to beggary. Does anyone stop at the thought that hundreds of industrious, happy and honest people are made wretched by that one factory? Does any one to-day stop at the thought that the large shoe factories destroy the living of many shoemakers? Does the usurer stop to consider the fate of the victims of his greed? No! No such thoughts ever deter the individual; and I am very much of the opinion that he, who, in his business, would seriously have a regard for his fellow men, would not to-day escape popular laughter. Egotism rules. Each looks out for himself, and cares nothing whether he thereby injures others. The modern motto is: “What need I concern myself about others so long as I fare well!”

But notwithstanding the rule of egotism, the common interests of men assert themselves with irresistible force. In ever increasing instances do they draw together for a common purpose; ever larger is the number of associations; ever wider and deeper becomes the activity of the State and the Municipality. Who, in years gone by would have suspected the existence of the numberless associations that exist to-day for the promotion of all manner of common interests? Who would have thought of such an institution as our modern Post Office with its wonderful machinery; who would have conceived of our public wharves, markets, street lamps, sewers, aqueducts, fire engines, public parks and baths, institutions for the poor, the blind, the deaf and dumb, the insane! All these institutions have their roots in Communism. In each of these instances the common interests asserted themselves, often they had to fight their way through, and won only after a hard struggle with rampant egotism.

The protection of common interests for the benefit of all becomes more and more a leading purpose. However people may curse communism, still they march in its path. In one domain after another do common interests prevail; the much despised and jeered thought of Communism moves proudly on its triumphant march, pervading an ever increasing portion of humankind.

Whoever declares himself an enemy of Communism, thereby pronounces himself an enemy of common interests, an enemy of humanity. Whoever would destroy Communism, let him begin by destroying the public roads and the public schools, let him first destroy the public parks and promenades, the water-works, the cities, and other government buildings, the court-houses, asylums, hospitals—only in that way could he destroy Communism.

Communism cannot be destroyed, it rests, like egotism, in the very nature of man. Everyone can realize this. We are now in the very midst of Communism, and every sail is set to push us further and further upon that path. Indeed, better times will dawn upon mankind when the common interests of all will be the standard to guide all our relations, when egotism will be checked; and when the well-being of all will be the aim of all. To-day it is “perfectly in order” to have a rich speculator in corn hire whole railroad trains so as to prevent corn from reaching the places where it is wanted; then people will be compelled to pay him the high prices he demands or starve, then will he be able to take advantage of the misfortune of others and thereby swell his riches; to-day it is “perfectly in order” to see the proprietor of goods—clothing or food—deliberately destroy a portion thereof so as to raise prices immeasurably and make large profits;
to-day it is "perfectly in order" to do all these things, nevertheless everyone will admit that such egotism is hurtful to all, and a time is bound to come when man will put the interests of all above such manifestations of egotism. All will be better for it, with the possible exception of only those who have been living in luxury at the expense of humanity.

But furthermore, here of all other countries, we have seen the proof that communism is just the reverse of the villainous thing it is claimed to be. A number of communistic sects and settlements have sprung up here. We have had and have yet, the Communistic Colonies of the Shakers, of the Economists or Rappites, of the Fourierists, of the Perfectionists of the Cabetists or Icarians, and several others. Now, whatever charges may have been preferred against them and proven, one charge could never be proven, or even uttered with the slightest show of reason, the charge that they robbed other people that they were thieves, or pilferers, or persons bent upon profligacy and crimes, or tyrants and enemies of liberty. Their members all earned their daily bread by the sweat of their brow. They never molested their neighbors, but kept peace with them; they were made up of good citizens and of creators of wealth by their own efforts. No crimes were ever charged against them, nor were disorders and crimes tolerated in their midst. They did not interfere with the property, liberty or progress of the community of men.

This is the testimony of history. Must it, then, not be conceded that there is something in the very principle of Communism which is ennobling, which prevents its followers from becoming a burden to society, which tends to create peace and good will among mankind?

We do not deny that most or, perhaps, all of these communistic societies had or have an inherent weakness which renders them shortlived and in some respects unsuccessful. Nobody can be better aware of the shortcomings of these institutions than modern Communists or Socialists themselves. The chief reason why small communistic societies cannot prosper, is to be found in the very fact that they are small from the outset, devoid of sufficient means of expansion, undertaken by men of narrow ideas in the midst of a capitalistic world that ridicules and shuns them. Modern Communists or Socialists have ceased to hope for a realization of their principles on such a small scale, especially now-a-days, when all production is profitable only when carried out on the largest possible scale. If they cannot prevail upon mankind to change their present mode of life into a universal communism, they will not attempt the realization of their ideas. They are no fools.

At this point, I imagine I hear you, dear reader, break in saying: "That is all right; I have nothing against all that; in the name of all that is dear to me, I am a Communist, in the sense you have described the word; but I am not talking of that sort of Communism; I am thinking of a very different one; the Communism that Socialists would introduce is the Communism of property; I don't mean to say that Socialists want to "divide up"; you have shown me that that is pure nonsense; but they want to abolish property; that is what I object to."

Well, dear reader, let us look into this also, as to whether the Socialists want to abolish property; you will find this charge as false and ridiculous as the others we have already disposed of in the course of this talk.
What is Property? That which is owned. Very well. But where on earth have Socialists ever warred against that which is owned by John Doe or Richard Roe? Is there a single Socialist publication—pamphlet, journal or work—in which the right of ownership by individuals is attacked? There is none such.

Early writers, ideologues, social reformers of olden days, usually styled Utopians, men who imagined society could be transformed by "prescription," may have prated about the abolition of private property. But the upholders of Modern Socialism never. Their study of history and political sciences has proved to them the great truth that mankind develops according to its own innate laws, and that it must be reformed by the self-created miseries of society which will work out their own relief by becoming intolerable. The form of society together with the ideas of what is to be private property, have changed from age to age, according as they ceased to be tenable, when the progress of inventions and discoveries suggested new and better processes of production. The latter has of late turned out so enormously productive that under an equal distribution of all its products everybody would be able to satisfy all his reasonable wants with four or six hours work a day—always provided that all able-bodied persons were really working. Now they must work ten, twelve or more hours a day, partly because so many do not work at all, others waste a great deal of what is produced, and still others do not allow those willing to work usefully to do so. Thus it comes to pass that a majority are poor while the world abounds with a surplus of goods of most kinds, and that the much-vaunted national wealth constitutes on the contrary a national poverty almost everywhere. This kind of economy is just now creating such evils as to work its own speedy abolition.

It is a fact that in all revolutions of the present century the workingmen wrote on the doors of the rich the words: "Sacred is property!" and that they executed with summary popular justice every thief caught in the act; and it is a significant fact that when, in the French Revolution of 1848, these words: "Sacred is Property" were written over the doors of Rothschild in Paris he fled immediately. It is a fact that never was crime against property so rare as during the short periods when the revolutionary classes were in the ascendency and had it all their own way. There can be no better proof than this that the working class is revolutionary, not as against individuals and their property, but as against institutions and superannuated laws only. A correct instinct tells them that individuals are powerless to benefit or to harm society, except in so far as they uphold pernicious laws, which must be abolished before justice can be expected to prevail. The Socialists especially are, by the writings of their party, thoroughly imbued with this idea. They demand that the laws be changed which permit riches in private hands to bear new riches without labor. The character of capital, to procreate new riches by taxing the unpaid labor of others, is the real point against which the attacks of Socialists are directed. The fruits of past, dead labor rob present labor, which does not own the means of production, of its best share of proceeds—this is what Socialists war against.

The only right to private property which can be justified with any semblance of reason and consistency, is founded on individual labor. What my own labor produces, or its equivalent, that, and that alone am I justly entitled to call my own. On the contrary, whatever I have not produced or acquired as an equivalent of the product of my labor ought not to be my property. How has the present private property in part of the proceeds of the labor of other people come into existence? It originated by brutal force, first in the shape of slave labor enforced by conquerors upon the vanquished, later in
the shape of feudal labor, upheld by the force of arms of the great landowners, and still later till now in the shape of wages labor, upheld by wicked laws. With the same eternal right which abolished slave and feudal labor, when it became a hindrance to development and progress, wages labor will be abolished. All three kinds of forcible appropriation of the fruit of foreign labor are robbery; none of them can be justified. And as each of these systems of robbery is based on the private ownership of all the means of production, it is evident, that all the means of production ought to be the common property of all forluse and not for private profit.

Everyone who is not sick or a cripple can and should work. He who will not work assuredly has no right to appropriate and enjoy the product of the industrious masses.

Some attempt to justify this appropriation of the wealth of others, this grabbing which they call "profits," with the claim that quite often the capitalist loses his capital in an undertaking, that, in other words, he runs a great "risk." This plea does not concern Labor. The plea arises solely from the circumstance that the capitalists are constantly at war with one another—they compete with one another. Each pushes production upon his own hook regardless of the demand there may be for his goods. But further more, the capitalist class, the capitalist as a class, runs no risk whatever their wealth only grows it never lessens. But above all it must be clearly and firmly stated that the working class is the one that runs its risk, and very great ones at that. When times are bad, wages go down, and many workers are thrown out of work, and the condition of the whole working class becomes a pitiful one. Nor is this all; there are more men, women and children killed and injured for life every year in our railroad service, in our factories, mines and shops than there were killed and hurt during all the 4 years of our late bloody civil war. And is all this exposure to want, all this injury to life and limb no risk?

The question now comes, How is all this to be changed?

This point should be made clear above and before all: There is not here any question of a sudden change to be accomplished on one day, but of a gradual development, that is forced along imperatively by natural causes. In sight of this development Socialists take the following position:

Until recently the middle or small self-employing class constituted the basis of the State and of Society. With the introduction of machinery, large production stepped up both in industry and agriculture. The effect thereof was to push the middle class down from the status of self-employers into that of the wage-workers, and at the same time to draw the wage-workers together in large numbers. The middle or small self-employing class began to be stripped of its property, and with the loss of its property it lost the certainty of its livelihood, this process of expropriating the middle class proceeds with increased rapidity; the independence of the mechanic is already gone, while the independence of the small trader or farmer becomes daily more and more a thing of the past. Through this process of weeding out the middle class and increasing the size of the working class or proletariat, our people are divided ever more sharply into two camps—the camp of the rich and the camp of the poor, while simultaneously thereby the number of the rich diminishes and the amount of the wealth held by each of these assumes more colossal proportions. This process is bound to reach a terminus. At a certain point of the process the masses of the working class are bound to realize the direness of their position, and are bound to search for a remedy. At that point—unless our country should experience the fate of the Roman empire, and go down with a crash after having become the toy and foot-ball of a succession of tyrants—Socialism is bound to assert it-
self and save civilization. Then will labor become common and will be organized in a
planful manner. And seeing that, to this end, the existing machinery of production of
the nation—the land and the capital, i. e., machinery, tools, factories, etc.—are requisite,
they will be used by the people. It is not only the Common Law of the land, it is a
basic principle of all civilized lands that, to use the words of our own venerated Benja-
min Franklin, “private property is the creature of society, and is subject to the calls of
that society, whenever its necessities shall require it, even to the last farthing.” On that
day the present holders of that requisite machinery of production may recognize the
superior value of Socialism, willingly submit to the people’s wish, and quietly surrender
to the nation the property they had sponged up among themselves; or it may happen
that, they will rebel, as the Southern slave holders rebelled, and, turning to use the in-
struments of repression now in their hands, will resort to violence. On that day, how-
ever, the Socialist Labor Party will be in power, and the rebels, who would stand up
against the will of the people and oppose the new social order, would simply be crushed
as a giant would crush a nut-shell.

In the new social order—the Socialist or Co-operative Commonwealth—labor would
be organized throughout upon a planful system as it already is in the large factories, on
the bonanza farm, or in the civil branches of the Government. All wasteful, useless
labor would thereby drop out, and the useful labor of all be immensely more productive.
Everyone would then feel constrained by his physical necessity to work, but then every-
one would also find leisure for recreation and for culture. Then will there be neither
civil strife, nor war between nation and nation. All of us would then co-operate com-
monistically in the promotion of our common wellbeing; all would find in co-operative
labor their highest individual interest.

The corner-stone of the ideal social system is COMMUNISM IN THE MACHINERY OF
PRODUCTION, i. e., Communism in all the things requisite for the production and dis-
tribution of wealth, together with all such institutions that should be public, as for
instance schools, theaters, gardens, museums, etc. On the other hand, everything that
is the subject of personal use and consumption will be left sacred to the individual.

Such a plan in detail is but a forecast of the future. No one could state with cer-
tainty whether matters will or will not take just such a development. But this con-
sideration is of little moment. The only thing of importance is that the central thought
of the Socialist Labor Party be the correct one. When the English engineer Stevenson,
some 70 years ago, undertook to build the first railroad, it is quite certain he did not
have in his mind a picture of the locomotives, the rails, the signals, etc., accurately as
we know them to-day. Nevertheless, his central thought was correct, and, being so,
it has conquered the world. So with the Socialist Labor Party. Its central thought,
COMMUNISM, as herein defined, is sound, and it also is bound to conquer the world.
This central thought is naught else but the common interest of mankind. It is an in-
justice that the masses should toil on the verge of starvation to the end that a few, who
do no manner of useful work, should lead a life filled with all manner of enjoyment. No
thinking man will dare deny that with a planful organization of labor, and a general
obligation to work, the condition of mankind would be improved so immensurably that
the masses will at last enter upon a period of existence when they will be leading a life
worthy of human beings'.

Just look and see what advantages are offered by the planful organization of labor
in any branch of industry. How, for instance, were it possible to send a letter from
New York to San Francisco for 2 cents, and within the whole Postal Union for 5 cents,
if in each State or country the Post Office were a private undertaking like our factories, mines, railroads, etc., are to-day? But for the Communist institution of the Post Office, an institution that is planfully arranged and conducted for the benefit of all, such a thing were impossible! There are, to be sure, many defects still connected with our Post Office; but all of these arise from the present social system, they are not inherent in the Communist idea. The higher officials draw large salaries with little work, while the lower employes receive low wages with much more labor. But this feature of our present postal system could be easily avoided; it is not a feature of Socialism; it is a remnant of the existing system of injustice.

Similar advantages could be derived by similar methods in all other domains of human activity. Just think of the spectacle offered by so many of our railroad lines. Owing to their private character, the planless system upon which they are run, and the wastefulness that characterizes them, not a few of them are bankrupt and must be put in the hands of a receiver, to be conducted under public surveillance! If all the railroads of the land belonged to our people, and were operated collectively by them, the advantages offered by the Post Office would be offered by a Transportation or Railroad Office also.

I need not multiply examples. There must be a good deal more in the Socialist Labor Party than many people imagine. The people, in their collective capacity, are assuming right and left functions that once were "vested" in private individuals.

It is this programme of the Socialist Labor Party, to place in the collective hands of the whole people, not the railroads only, but all means of production, communication and transportation, that has drawn upon it the slander of its being the foe of all private property, and of its being arrayed against the property of the small holders. The contrary is the truth. It is not the Socialist Labor Party that would plunder the small holder; this is done by the large capitalist; it is the inevitable result of excessive property by the few. With irresistible force does large capital draw to itself all smaller holdings. And yet it is these very capitalists, these people, who have their nets stretched out for the purpose of catching and drawing to themselves the smaller shares of property held by their less wealthy fellow beings, it is these people who have the effrontery to preach to the small holder that the Socialists threaten his property! What a lie! Socialists simply point to the method whereby, sooner or later, after the small holders shall have been wholly stripped of their property by the large ones, the masses will institute juster conditions. The method, then to be adopted is nothing but the planful organization of labor; it is the expropriation of those who until then had expropriated the masses; it is the Communist method of ownership and operation of all instruments of production.

Indeed, the expropriation of the small holders were a useless thing on the part of the Socialists. Such is only a bugaboo with which the large thieves try to frighten the small holders. The Socialists are the real friends of the small holder because theirs is the only political party of the working class. On the other hand it is the large proprietors who are truly the foes of the small holder, and they remain so until they have swallowed up his little havings.

Nothing is further removed from the thoughts of the Socialist Labor Party than to abolish property. What it does announce is that—not suddenly, or over night, but gradually—the time is approaching when the working class will assert its right to the fruits of its own labor against those who live upon the labor of others. The capitalist conception of property will then merge into the conception of property entertained by
be working class. There is, accordingly, nowhere any thought of abolishing property, and none but the idle class will find fault with such a transition. The development of mankind towards ever greater perfection will not pause before such a system of property-holding as may be in vogue at any given period. If those who profit by a special system of property-holding that may be in vogue at a given time, should demand that human development stand still, they would simply hold the language of insanity. The system of ownership is ever changing. It adapts itself steadily to the higher degree of human development. He who would compare our present system of property-holding with those that prevailed in antiquity or the Middle Ages (chattel slavery, serfdom, robber barons, etc.) must admit that the change is an improvement. Nevertheless, with all the improvement, injustice still prevails today; and it is the removal of this hitherto perennial injustice that the impending change contemplates, and it expects thereby to be able to lead mankind onward to higher degrees of perfection. Together with the wage system and the rule of Capitalism, the last remnants of old time slavery are bound to go down. Men will then face one another as free and equal beings, they will then actually respect one another and promote their mutual interests. No longer will the working people be deprived of the enjoyment of their property, and then everyone who works will have at his command a larger quantity of the things necessary for feeding, clothing, housing, resting and cultivating himself.

Who, knowing this, would dare to say the Socialists are wrong! The small farmers and traders, whom it is attempted to frighten most, should, and with the time will be, the last ones to claim the Socialists are wrong. The American farmer has a deep seated sense of justice; and it is on the farms that one can see clearest the beneficial effect of the transformations in the system of property-holding. Would not our farmers find themselves in a worse condition than to-day if the olden days system of serfdom still prevailed, and they were not free men cultivating their own land? The former grew through the ages as the system of property-holding progressed, and his own final emancipation is now dependent upon the further change that is now impending.

Again I hear you say, "that is all true, but Socialists want to introduce the community of wives; I have heard this from many sources; the very thought is horrible!"

Upon this head I must repeat what I said upon others: "You have drawn your information, not from Socialist literature, but from the slanders retailed by the capitalist organs." You have been made to believe that Socialists desire to establish a social system whereby every man shall have a hurt ever woman. A horrible thought, indeed! But will you stop to put this question to yourself: "Is it possible that a movement that has set its face against the slavery of the wage system, could earnestly favor so disgraceful a system of slavery as that?" The thing is at least improbable. But if you look closer you will find this to be as contemptible a slander as the one about "division."

What Socialists hold upon the subject is that the intercourse between man and woman is purified and sanctified by mutual love. But how is it to-day? How often are man and woman, to-day, actually brought together by love? How often is not "Money" or some such "consideration" the connecting link? To realize the frightful extent to which this has gone one need but glance over our society funny papers, or read the verses of John Godfrey Saxe—the late Brooklyn poet—whose poem on "Matrimony" has for its refrain the pun "Matter of Money!" How often the relations between man
and wife, founded upon such impure principles, go to wreck after the wedding. the thick and amusty records of our present divorce proceedings give some inkling. In face of all this Socialists hold that morals would be higher if money or similar considerations ceased to be the basis of wedlock. Is this thought immoral? While it is sought to paint the Socialists as beasts, it is they who seek to dethrone Mammon and Lust and place Love upon the throne it alone is entitled to. Wherever Love draws two beings together their union is holy; where no Love is there can be none but an immoral union. The position of the Socialists on this subject is identical with that of the greatest thinkers and seers the world has produced.

Hence it happens that there are no greater foes to Prostitution than the Socialists. Prostitution is one of the blackest blotches of modern society. It is a direct product of the capitalist system, and it has become one of its pillars. But the time, whose advent Socialists promote, is bound to come when neither will want any longer be there to drive girls into prostitution, nor will Gold wield its present power of blasting the bloom of youth.

Look about! Is not the family life of the working class an unhappy one? And whence does that come? If the father and the mother must be out all day at work and return late home, exhausted with the day’s toil, it is hard for the pleasure of being together to find expression. And what about the poor little ones? The whole day they are left to themselves, and in the evening can they expect kindness from parents whose nerves are unstrung by a day’s hard toil? There can be no question of a proper training under such conditions; they nip in the bud the love between parents and children; and they breed a class of criminals at which society reverts horror—horror at the product of its own malaessance.

Nevertheless, it is among this working class and Socialists that the family relations are preserved in greatest purity. And yet there will be found people who dare to charge them with an intent to destroy the family! If the family life of the working class is destroyed, as we have seen, who is to blame? Surely not the Socialists! If the rich man—at the cost of his own family life—procures a mistress, if his gold enriches the keepers of houses of prostitution, no sane man will lay the blame upon the Socialists. To-day, immorality raises its brazen front, coddled by the lewdness of the idle rich. It is the mission of the working proletariat to pull humanity out of this ditch.

And in this respect also will the Socialist programme bring help so soon as the working class shall be protected in its property; so soon as none who could and would work need suffer want, just so soon will mutual affection only draw man and woman together; Love will no longer be for sale; mistresses and prostitutes will vanish. The real fault found with Socialists is that they war against concubinage, against prostitution, against the community of wives that prevails to-day.

You see, accordingly, that in the matter of wedlock and property, Socialism is just the reverse of what its enemies pretend, and that these are the very ones who uphold the crimes they would roll upon our shoulders. Upon these two questions of Property and Wedlock our position is clear. But before you decide, dear reader, to throw your lot and your labor with them let me first clear up one more point.

If the Socialists had nothing to offer the toiling, suffering masses but the consolation that at some later period, when the present conditions shall have become wholly unbearable, the Socialist principle will bring help, they would have little to offer. The people have been long enough consoled with promises of a “hereafter” when all suffering will be at end, and they have become justly suspicious of all such promises.
demand deeds not words; they want to enjoy their redemption now and on earth. Now, then, the Socialist Labor Party alone points the way to practical results. It points to the ballot box; it shows how along that path immediate help can come, because the ruling class will pull in its horns in proportion as it reads from the election returns that the working people are leaving the old parties, and are treading upon the path that leads straight to ultimate emancipation. It shows to the working class that their emancipation awaits upon their own action, and urges upon them the use of their ballot to free themselves from capitalist exploitation.
BADM TIMES, THEIR CAUSE AND CURE.

Fellow Workers, Read, Think and Act!

Machinery sleeps or rests where it works. It needs no boarding house, no beer or cigars; it doesn't ride a bicycle or read a newspaper. It goes to no church, theatre or other place of amusement. It buys neither books, shoes, clothes, hats, furniture nor carpets, but it makes all of these. It has no use for the butcher, baker, grocer, barber, shoebill or florist. It eats neither candy nor ice cream. Yet it throws millions of people out of employment, reduces the wages of those working, and thus deprives all wage-workers of the ability to obtain what they need and drives hundreds to commit suicide. Thousands are annually killed by it. It keeps the toiling millions in a state of chronic starvation and will continue to do so just so long as it is owned and used for private gain. The only remedy is the public ownership and use, for the benefit of all, of land, mines, forests and all available forces of nature, railroads, canals, telegraphs, telephones and all means of production, transportation and distribution, as advocated by the Socialist Labor Party. For this party every workingman should vote at the coming election and at once and for all time put an end to this present system of injustice and starvation.

Think of it! Men shooting themselves and exclaiming as they die, "No work! No work!" Men begging for work and their wives and children starving in this land of plenty. People starving because there is too much food! Naked, because there is too much clothing! Homeless, because there are too many houses! All this in a land where men have the power in their own hands to change this present system of plunder, injustice and starvation to one of peace, justice, plenty and happiness by establishing the CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH, not by gun, bayonet or bomb; but by the peaceful, powerful BALLOT.

To oppose SOCIALISM is to oppose justice, peace, prosperity and happiness, for SOCIALISM means all that is good, honorable and just.

What Socialists Want.

Every human being to be well housed, clothed, fed and educated.
The adoption of a social and industrial system that will put an end to profit, interest, rent and all forms of usury.
Land, water, machinery, all the means of production and distribution, and all the available forces of nature to be owned by and operated for the benefit of the whole people.
The gradual elimination, and finally the abolition, of all useless and unproductive toil.
The work day to be as short as the needs of the people will permit—about four hours a day, if possible.
Every person of suitable age, and physical and mental ability, must work or starve. "He that will not work shall not eat."

No Child Labor.

Every one to receive the full value of his or her labor.
A higher standard of living, and a higher plane of morals as a result, thus securing enjoyment for all.
These reforms to be achieved by agitation, education, organization and the intelligent exercise of the BALLOT!
The above is a brief summary of the measures to be accomplished to secure the establishment of the CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH.
The most important thing is to vote for the ticket of the Socialist Labor Party. If you do not, then cease to prate about hard times. They are the natural result of the iniquitous, miserable, social and industrial system under which you live. Do not whine, beg or threaten. VOTE! Vote it out of existence.
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