Let's drive the liars into a corner.

Let's silence the slanderers of the poor.

Let's arm with arguments twenty-five million WAGE-EARNERS against twenty-five thousand MILLIONAIRES.

Let's wipe every cringing human toad and intellectual prostitute off the map of debate—Whenever they dare raise their heads to slander the workers.

Let's stimulate every worker to stand erect, proud and defiant in the presence of even the mightiest of the millionaires and of the most distinguished of the educated stool-pigeons now serving plutocracy.

First of all—let us utterly destroy the damnable sneers of the snobs at the brains of the working class. That is what this booklet is for.
You Millionaires:

You plunderers! You profiteers—ready to rape the republic for power, place and plunder! You strutting slanderers of the poor!

We are on your trail, gentlemen, and we intend to smoke you out and force you and your intellectual prostitutes to admit that you lie; that you peddle and promote a cruel slander against the working class when you explain your great fortunes and the poverty of the poor.

In one year, 1916, this country produced seven thousand nine hundred and twenty-five times as many millionaires as were produced during the first thirty years of our national history.

In the first thirty years of our national history this country produced one millionaire. But in the one year 1916 this country produced 7,925 millionaires, as the Federal Government Income Tax Reports show, and as even the plutocratic New York Times editorially admitted, December 5, 1917. At the close of 1916 there were 22,696 of you millionaires in this country, and at present, February, 1919, there are, probably 25,000 of you millionaires in this country, and one of you is a billionaire. Our splendid republic is swiftly becoming a plutocracy.

From now on you strutting, sneering snobs (and your cringing toads) must more diligently than ever before explain by what means you acquire these enormous fortunes. And your old, usual explanation of getting your vast fortunes simply by means of "superior brains," won't go much longer. This booklet, The Slander of the Toilers, is to be read and re-read in hundreds of thousands of homes, factories mines, labor halls and schools—till many millions of American workers can use the five arguments of this booklet to silence your slanders and smash your pompous, shallow and cunning claim to "superior brains."
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CHAPTER IV

"The Workers Haven't Brains Enough;" or, "Rewards Are in Proportion to Brains"

"Poof! Bah! Nonsense!"

That is the handsome sneer of the dollar-dreaming capitalist whenever he hears any discussion of more life, more income, more leisure, for the wage-workers.

"Let the working people know their places and be contented and cease jabbering about their poor condition in society. They are where they are because they are what they are—they are down in the world because they haven't brains enough to get up in the world. And that settles it! There is too much chatter about this matter in union labor halls and at Socialist meetings. Damn the agitator and the agitation."

Those, my friend, are the sentiments and phrases of the employer class, repeated over and over again. Musically sociable and beautifully fraternal—are'nt they?

Then, having "caught the idea," some eminent human toad, some high-salaried, professorial university serf of the employer class, knowing well what will please the plutocratic masters of the universities, repeats the masters' sneers at the workers; and thus and otherwise the sneers become a part of the literature and thought of the land; and thus more firmly are the manacles riveted to the wrists of the working class.

Here is a handsome sample from the leading university of the United States:

"Further, the more prosperous strata among the population are those in which intellectual gifts ['brains'] are likely to appear. They are prosperous in the main because they have such gifts. . . . The lower strata of the population, on the other hand, multiply most rapidly. Though some individuals of high qual-
ities emerge from among them, the great mass are mediocre, and perpetuate mediocrity.'—F. W. Taussig of Harvard University, one of the most distinguished and influential teachers of Political Economy in the United States, in his Principles of Economics, Volume II., p. 235.

Thus the prideless professor, gratefully licking the boots of the plutocratic plunderers who endow professorships, barks against the humble workers in all lands.

Well, does that settle it? Are you going to be meekly hushed up by the masters' sneers and the academic butler's barking?

Shall we meekly "shut up," bow our heads in shame and do just as the employers wish us to do—simply cease discussing such things? What do you say? Are you through? Is your life finished—in quality?

A horse's life is finished. The horse is all he ever will be—he is to remain a horse, to work and only work. That's all. His destiny has been determined, fixed, absolutely beyond discussion.

There's nothing to discuss.

A chattel slave's life is also finished. The chattel slave is to remain a slave—and work—that's all, as long as chattel slavery lasts. And if chattel slavery is correct in purpose and method, there cannot be reasonable discussion of the matter. The chattel slave's destiny is determined. His program is made out for him—he is to "shut up" and keep busy working.

There is nothing to discuss.

As a class, the wage-slaves' lives of to-day, also, are finished. They have reached their wage-level of life as a class;—and that wage-life level is their proper level, too, if the wage-system is a proper industrial system; and, moreover, that is their final, fixed level as long as this capitalist wage-system lasts,—the system of wages for the working class for working, and profits for the capitalist class for owning the industrial foundations of society. Just as the chattel slave master got his income from owning the chattel slave, so to-day the capitalist gets his income from owning the mills, mines, factories, rail-
ways and so forth. Now, if the wage-and-profit arrangement is right and proper, then there is nothing to discuss. *And the capitalist assures us with a sneer that it is all right, and that, in the distribution of human welfare, things are as they are because, in the struggle for existence in the world, the worker's lack of brains places the worker down where he is, and the capitalist's possession of brains places the capitalist up where he is. And that, precisely that theory of distribution, is one of the fundamental propositions of despotism, taught by all masters everywhere and in all ages.*

Well, is your life finished—in fullness and fineness? If so, there is nothing to discuss—with you. But wait a little—I don't like to give you up. Before you crawl back into your den and shut up in your shell and close your mind and pull down the brain-blinds of voiceless poverty and tongue-tied humility to accept your doom in humble silence, let us discuss this matter just a little bit any way,—this matter of your brains in connection with your poverty and condition and position in society under the present industrial arrangement called Capitalism, the wage-and-profit system of industry.

In the preceding Chapter I promised to attend to this "lack-of-brains" argument so commonly and contemptuously thrust into the faces of the working people concerning their poverty. And now let us talk it over briefly.

First of all, let us for a moment consider the outlook, the probable future, for the working class, under Capitalism.

Professor J. Laurence Laughlin, head of the Department of Economics, University of Chicago, writes thus of the wage-earners' outlook:

"But certainly the progress of the laborer is not that which can excite enthusiastic hopes for the future, as long as he remains a mere receiver of wages. . . . Under these conditions, it seems that the only hope of improvement for the laboring classes lies in the limitation of population. . . . What must be the ultimate outlook for wage receivers? How can they escape the thralldom of dependence on the accumulation of others?"—Laughlin's edition of Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*, pp. 518-19, 522.
Professor Richard T. Ely, head of the Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, sums up in strong, frank words:

"We [in America] have never had a permanent laboring class, but with the increase of population one is rapidly developing. If it is now becoming extremely difficult for the laborer to rise, what will be the condition of things when we number two hundred millions? And this time is not far off. It is a laboring class without hope of improvement for themselves or their children which will first test our institutions."—Ely: French and German Socialism, pp. 25-26.

When in 1888 Dr. Ely used the words just quoted he also predicted that within the lives of the men then living two distinct industrial classes would appear in the United States. In 1908, only twenty years later, Dr. Ely wrote thus:

"There is, however, in society to-day, as every one recognizes, a 'laboring class,' marked off by lines that are fairly distinct. The sale of labor is most often a forced sale. But in the case of the wage agreement the advantage is apt to be all on one side."—Ely: Outlines of Economics, New Enlarged Edition, 1908, pp. 367, 371, 381.

Occasionally, in rare, refreshing moments of moral audacity, Andrew Carnegie frankly tells the truth about the future of the working class. In a public lecture to young men in Pittsburgh in 1886, even before the formation of the modern domineering trust combinations, he said:

"There is no doubt that it is becoming harder and harder, as business gravitates to immense corners, for a young man without capital to get a start for himself, and in this city (Pittsburgh), especially where large capital is essential, it is unusually difficult."—Carnegie: Business Enterprise, p. 14.

And this from John Mitchell, Ex-President of the United Mine Workers of America:

"The average wage-earner has made up his mind that he must remain a wage-earner. He has given up all hope of a kingdom to come when he himself will be a capitalist."—Mitchell: Organized Labor, Preface, p. ix.
One of the most distinguished lawyers in America, Mr. U. M. Rose, President of the American Bar Association, in 1903, in his annual address as President of the Association, August 27, of that year, said:

"At the present time there are many avenues of success that are practically closed to men of moderate fortune, and which are sealed against young men of ability and energy who must fight the battle of life without adventitious aids."—See American Bar Association Reports, Volume XXV.

The Hon. John F. Dillon, one time president New York Bar Association, in his annual address before the New York Bar Association, Albany, 1895, spoke thus of the situation:

"From the standpoint of political economy and of provident political policy, the existence of enormous fortunes is of evil tendency tending to divide society into classes and to separate the rich and the poor by an impassable chasm."—See New York State Bar Reports, 1895.

Yes, the outlook is cheerless, hopeless, for you and your wage-earning class. The future looks dreary, cold and barren—as joyless as a rainy day in bleak November—for the wage-earning class. In spite of the wage-workers' effort and willingness to serve society and save themselves the devilish wolves of poverty press close behind them and keep persistently snarling in the road to the future of the wage-earners.

The future, like the present, mocks the wage-earner.

But what is the matter with you? How do you explain your poverty and the fact that you are stuck, doomed, hopeless in your poverty?

Explain? You explain? Well, if you have not studied this matter, what is the use to ask you to explain anything concerning your poverty and the poverty of your class? You probably would not explain it at all. You would simply repeat the explanation you got at the school, at the church, at the public lecture, in the newspaper. I don't blame you. For a long time I explained my own poverty in the same way, simply repeating thoughtlessly what the employer class wanted me to
believe and certain cunning, well-dressed people told me to believe concerning poverty.

Yes, the employer class have our poverty explained in the schools, churches, newspapers, and public lectures—explained for us over and over again while we are young; and when we grow older we gullibly repeat what we learned when we were young—whether it has any sense in it or not.

“This matter of being rich or poor is wholly a matter of brains. Under the present wage-and-profit order of society, people are rewarded according to their brains; and the working men and women are poor simply because they haven’t brains enough to become rich.” This is the explanation the employers are eager to have us accept—always.

I don’t like this explanation. I resent it. I have brains enough to resent this explanation as ridiculous, vicious and dangerous.

How do you like this explanation?

Millions of our class humbly accept this insult thrown into our faces. Remember, too, that when, in the gloomy future, our little children are grown men and women, and are poor, the same shameful insult will be thrust into their faces that is now thrown into our faces concerning the cause of the rich man’s riches and the poor man’s poverty.

Millions of our working class brothers and sisters are whipped into dumb silence with crushing insults.

Stand up.

If you are not a meek, weak thing, a spineless lump of flesh, 

wake up and strike back—with argument.

And right now and right here I am going to arm you with weapons, that is, arguments, with which to strike back in self-defense.

First Argument,—The Facts:

Take one hundred bankers’ boys and girls and one hundred manufacturers’ boys and girls, and one hundred mine-owners’ boys and girls; and take also one hundred carpenters’ boys and girls, and one hundred machinists’ boys and girls, and one hundred miners’ boys and girls,—take these six hun-
dred children—three hundred from the homes of the capitalist class and three hundred from the humble homes of the working class—six hundred children of the same average age; place them in the same grammar school and later in the same high school, and while they attend these schools provide the three hundred working class children with as good food and as much food, as comfortable clothing, and as good shelter and as much freedom from toil outside of school hours as the three hundred children from the capitalist class homes are provided with,—and you will find—and you know you will find—that the three hundred children from families of the working class, by actual intellectual tests, will make just as good records, will win just as high marks, will show just as much brains and just as good brains as the three hundred children from families of the employer class.

The public school records in a thousand towns and cities and farming communities have proved, by actual oft-repeated mental tests, that the toilers' children are the equals of the employers' children—in brains.

Isn't that a good solid argument? It certainly is. And you should use that argument in your home and at the factory and in your labor hall and at Sunday School and have your children carry that argument to the day school, too. Talk about this matter—discuss this matter as widely as possible. I assure you that your employer does not want you and your neighbors and children to discuss such things. No, indeed.

The silent slave suits Caesar.

But look at this same argument again: Even with inferior food, with inferior clothing, with inferior shelter and with unencouraging home conditions the brave little children of the working class—when they have an opportunity—in the schools—show beyond all doubt that they are indeed the equals of the employers' children—in brains.

That strengthens the argument, doesn't it?

Well, get up off your knees and defend yourself. Strike back—and strike hard.

Examine your arguments, your weapons, for self-defense.
Second Argument,—More Facts:
Take 9,000 useful and admittedly intelligent members of society, thus:—
Take 1,500 school teachers at $2,000 each per year, and
Take 1,500 physicians at $2,000 per year, and
Take 1,500 farmers at $2,000 each per year, and
Take 1,500 carpenters at $2,000 each per year, and
Take 1,500 musicians at $2,000 each per year, and
Take 1,500 expert miners at $2,000 each per year,—
Take this total of nine thousand intelligent servants of society, many of them with long years of training or experience, or both, with an income of $2,000 per year; and have all of them serve society and save all of this reward for forty years, spending nothing at all even for the common necessaries of life. The total savings of these nine thousand efficient social servants for forty years would be seven hundred and twenty million dollars ($720,000,000.00); and that amount would be more than two hundred and eighty million dollars ($280,000,000.00) less than John D. Rockefeller’s fortune in the year 1915.

Now are these nine thousand down in the world—so far down below Rockefeller—because they haven’t sufficient brains combined to get up in the world,—the whole nine thousand of them with a total combined reward—as high as Rockefeller alone?

If you believe that you can accurately explain the violent inequality between the total reward of these nine thousand intelligent and extremely useful social members of society and Mr. Rockefeller’s reward, by attributing the inequality to difference in quality and quantity of brains, then you have been hypnotized with false teaching to the extent that your mind, on problems of this sort, is as helpless, your mind is as completely paralyzed, as if your brain had turned to solid bone—or water.

Wake up! Wake up your neighbors!—on this matter.
I tell you this brain argument against the working class must be destroyed—killed. As long as millions of toilers gul-
libly accept this brain argument against themselves, they will be helplessly weak—with the *weakness* of meekness—chloro-
formed into stupid acceptance of frightful injustices.

Now, it is likely that if the shame-faced, hypnotized working man should call at the employer’s large, beautiful home for a friendly chat (as he so often does), and were to read the foregoing argument to the shrewd capitalist, the capitalist would probably “sidestep” and brazenly say that farmers, teachers, miners, musicians, carpenters and physicians are only ordinary people after all and that Mr. Rockefeller’s brain, *in* quality, is more than equal to nine thousand of them.

But, reader, let us hold the capitalist to the mark. He shall not dodge in any such manner.

**Third Argument,—More Facts:**

Here is another way to see the nonsense of that brain argu-
ment against the toilers:

Make a total of the following yearly official incomes, incomes made liberal because the work performed, it is said, “*requires very unusual brains,*” unusual both in quality and quantity:

- The President of the United States........... $75,000
- Nine members of the President’s Cabinet at $12,000 each per year ................ 108,000
- Ninety-six United States Senators at $7,500 per year .......................... 720,000
- Three hundred and ninety-one Congressmen at $7,500 per year .............. 2,932,500
- Nine members of Supreme Court of the United States, total salaries......... 131,000
- Forty-eight State Governors at an average salary of $5,000 per year......... 240,000
- Four thousand and eight hundred University professors (100 Professors in each of the forty-eight State Universities) with an assumed salary of $2,500 per year........ 12,000,000
- Twenty-five Presidents of our very greatest Universities with an assumed average sal-
  ary of $8,000 per year ...................... 200,000
Two thousand seven hundred County School
Superintendents at $1,500 each per year. $4,050,000
Total official annual salaries of these eight
thousand and seventy-nine statesmen and
educators ................................. $20,456,500

The total of the annual official salaries of these eight thou-
sand and seventy-nine "specially brainy people" is at least
ten million dollars less than Rockefeller's annual income, and
probably less per year than Carnegie's annual income when
he discontinued his activities in the steel business.

The absurdity of the capitalists' claim to intellectual supe-
riority becomes more manifest with every turn you give it.
For example,

Fourth Argument,—More Facts:
Since 1850 our population has increased three fold and our
millionaires have increased six thousand fold. The rate of
increase in great fortunes since 1850 has thus been two thou-
sand times as high as the rate of increase in the nation's popu-
lation. Thus if we consider the possession of great fortunes
as evidence of the millionaires' superiority of brains, we are
driven to the hopelessly absurd conclusion that since 1850
the rate of increase in brains among our most "successful and
brainy" people themselves has been two thousand times as
high as the rate of increase in population!

Does one modern multi-millionaire possess more brains and
better brains than twenty-five or fifty of the wealthiest, brain-
est Americans in the days of the American Revolution?

"'Cornelius Vanderbilt died leaving his son William $50,000,000.00; eight years
later William died leaving $300,000,000.00.'—Popular Science Monthly, Oct.,
1886.

Question: Did William Vanderbilt have at least six times
as much brains as his father?
John D. Rockefeller, Sr., has an intelligent brother com-
monly reported to be very poor. Has John D. Rockefeller
two or three hundred thousand times as much brains as his
poor brother? Now, don’t meekly repeat somebody else’s answer—think a bit for yourself, if you have ceased taking your food through a nipple.

The late Doctor William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago, was recognized as being mentally one of the most powerful and original men the world has ever known. Mr. Rockefeller’s income is at least three thousand times as great as President Harper’s was. Is this a case of incomes according to brains?

The average salary of the one hundred best-paid University Presidents in the world is not over six thousand dollars. Rockefeller’s income is at least fifty times as large as the total income of the entire hundred University Presidents. Is Rockefeller’s brain fifty times as good as the total brains of all of them? Have your children compare their school principal’s income with Carnegie’s income, or with the income of Harry Thaw, or with the average income of tens of thousands of the grown-up sons and daughters of the millionaire masters of this country. Let the college boys—and girls—compare their professors’ incomes with George Gould’s income, in connection with the “rewards-according-to-brain” argument. Perhaps the school principal and the haughty college teachers, if they defend the “brain argument,” will have at least sufficient self-respect to blush. You might try the preacher, too—if he says that under Capitalism rewards are in proportion to brains. *Put it up to any man or woman who dares repeat the masters’ sneers at the ‘workers’ lack of brains.’*

When teachers, preachers and editors defend the argument of “rewards-are-according-to-brains” they should be forced into a logical corner and compelled to confess that they are drones, fossils, or dead-beats.

Defend yourself, you robbed wage-slave. Nobody else will do it for you. If you won’t respect yourself and defend yourself, you do not deserve respect.

There is still another line of argument in reply to the capitalists’ insult,

**Fifth Argument:—Testimony:**
Mr. Henry Clews, of Wall Street, New York City, one of the best known multi-millionaire bankers in the world, president of the great banking house, Henry Clews and Company, does not attribute great fortunes to the possession of great brains. He says:

"It does not require a genius to make a fortune. . . . This species of architecture requires only the exercise of ordinary endowments . . . and a due regard to the first law of nature—self-preservation."—Clews: Wall Street Point of View, pp. 54-55.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie wrote in 1908 as follows:

"After making full allowance for difference in men, it still remains true that contrasts in their wealth are infinitely greater than those existing between them in their different qualities, abilities, education, and, except the supreme few, their contributions to the world's work."—Carnegie: Problems of To-day, p. 17.

Notice that Mr. Carnegie emphatically declares (with somewhat defective grammar) that the contrasts among men as to their wealth are infinitely greater than the contrasts among them in their ability, that is, in "brains." As for the "supreme few," he speaks of them to compare them, not in wealth and ability, but in wealth and "contribution to the world's work." And as for those who have made the supreme "contribution to the world's work," they have never been rewarded with worldly goods in proportion to their contribution;—for example, the supreme poets, painters, architects and musicians; the supreme inventors, discoverers, and scientists; the supreme statesmen, liberators and educators; and the supreme leaders of the world's greatest movements, both ancient and modern.

The testimony of such unwilling witnesses as Mr. Clews and Mr. Carnegie is of great value, but it is of less value than the testimony of a man who as a social scientist has given a lifetime of study to the subject of the intellectual resources of society.

The brain power of the different social classes is a subject
of profound interest and importance in sociology. Sociologists have given much attention to this great problem. The brain power of the human race?—it is by this brain power that mankind has discovered the resources of the earth, mastered the forces of the earth and reached the present levels of civilization; and it is by this brain power that mankind must yet climb to higher and ever higher levels of civilization and welfare—onward and upward for many hundreds of thousands of years—on and on till the earth itself grows too cold to support human life;—and therefore this brain problem, in some respects, surpasses all other problems. The distance between an oyster and a man can be measured in brains. Brains?—the climax of physical creation, jewel of the universe, residence of the mind, engine of human progress,—of course this problem of brain power is the crowning problem of sociology. Fortunately, the greatest of sociologists has testified, after many years of patient investigation, concerning the brains of the working class in comparison with the brains of the ruling class.

The late Professor Lester F. Ward, of Brown University, had in America—and probably in the whole world—no equal as a sociologist;—this is the rank gratefully and admiringly given him by all other sociologists in this country. Dr. Ward’s conclusions concerning the brains of the working class are of the very greatest importance to the working class and should be studied carefully.

In reading what Dr. Ward says on this subject keep in mind that a man may have a mind of great natural power and brilliance, and at the same time he may have very little information in his mind; and, also, that by the term "intellig-ence" Dr. Ward does not mean quantity and quality of brains but quantity and quality of information possessed. To illustrate: Everybody knows that a boy with a beautiful and powerful mind may grow up to be an ignorant man, that is, an "unintelligent" man.

Unfortunately there is space here for but a few paragraphs of Dr. Ward’s conclusions drawn from many pages of elabo-
rate and potent argument on this subject as set forth in his great work, *Applied Sociology*. With gratitude let me say here that in fine scorn for the snobs who sneer at the working class and for bold and logically powerful defense of the intellectual strength and worth, and of the intellectual promise and rights, of the working class, Dr. Ward’s *Applied Sociology* is probably unequaled by any other book in all of the sociological and educational literature of the world. Here are some of his conclusions:

Page 92—‘The uninformed class is regarded as an inferior class. It is assumed that their ignorance is a natural condition and something that could not be otherwise. Their stupidity, gullibility, and susceptibility to deception and exploitation are supposed to be attributes inherent in their individual natures, which render them the natural dupes, tools and servants of the intelligent class. . . .

Pages 95-96—‘The proposition that the lower classes of society are the intellectual equals of the upper classes will probably shock most minds. At least it will be almost unanimously rejected as altogether false. Yet I do not hesitate to maintain and defend it as an abstract proposition. But, of course, we must understand what is meant by intellectual equality. I have taken some pains to show that the difference in intelligence [that is, information] is immense. *What I insist upon is that this difference in intelligence is not due to any differences in intellect*. It is due entirely to difference in mental equipment. It is chiefly due to difference in knowledge. . . .

‘Of all the problems of applied sociology, that which towers above all others is the problem of the organization of society so that the heritage of the past shall be transmitted to all its members alike. . . .

‘But here we encounter the great sullen, stubborn error, so universal and ingrained as to constitute a world view, that the difference between the upper and lower classes of society is due to a difference in their intellectual capacity, something existing in the nature of things, something pre-ordained and inherently inevitable. Every form of sophistry is employed to uphold this view. We are told that there must be social classes, that they are a necessary part of the social order. There must be laborers and unskilled workmen to do the drudgery work of the world.

Pages 100-101. ‘There must be menials and servants to wait upon us. . . . But there nevertheless exists in fact only a completely submerged tenth. *The essential fact, however, is that there is no valid reason why not only the other*

*Published by Ginn and Company, New York City. The publishers' finely generous permission to make the following lengthy quotations is here most gratefully acknowledged.*
partially emerged eight-tenths but the completely submerged tenth should not all completely emerge. They are all equally capable of it. This does not at all imply that all men are equal intellectually. It only insists that intellectual inequality is common to all classes, and is as great among the members of the completely emerged tenth as it is between that class and the completely submerged tenth. Or, to state it more clearly, if the individuals who constitute the intelligent class at any time or place had been surrounded from their birth by exactly the same conditions that have surrounded the lowest stratum of society, they would inevitably have found themselves in that stratum; and if an equal number taken at random of the lowest stratum of society had been surrounded from their birth by exactly the same conditions by which the intelligent class have been surrounded, they would in fact have constituted the intelligent class instead of the particular individuals who happen actually to constitute it. In other words, class distinctions in society are wholly artificial, depend entirely upon environing conditions, and are in no sense due to differences in native capacity. Differences in native capacity exist, and are as great as they have ever been pictured, but they exist in all classes alike.”

Page 107. “The difference between social classes is a difference only in the extent to which the social heritage has been transmitted, not at all in the capacity to inherit. Society at present is organized under a sort of law of primogeniture. Only the first born, i.e., the especially favored, receive the legacy; the rest are disinherited, although they may embrace the flower of the family.”

Page 209. “Again we are brought back to the fundamental truth that is taught by all the facts, that the manifestation of genius is wholly a question of opportunity.”

Page 220. “The trend of the whole investigation has been in the general direction of showing that great men have been produced by the co-operation of two causes, genius and opportunity; and that neither alone can accomplish it. But genius is a constant factor, very abundant in every rank of life, while opportunity is a variable factor and chiefly artificial.”

That is to say, no matter where genius is, high or low in society, IT MUST have OPPORTUNITY in order to fully manifest itself.

Page 228. “Indigence is an effective bar to achievement. On the other hand, the resources of society may be enormously increased by abolishing poverty, by reducing the hours of labor, and by making all its members comfortable and secure in their economic relations. Any sacrifice that society might make in securing these ends would be many times repaid by the actual contributions that the few really talented among the hundreds of thousands thus benefited would make to the social welfare. For talent is distributed all through this great mass in the same proportions as it exists in the much smaller well-to-do or wealthy class, and
the only reason why the latter contribute more is because their economic condition affords them opportunity."

Page 240. "Whatever theories different writers may have on the subject, they all practically agree that genius exists in all strata of society."

Page 242. "The two principal forms of opportunity are leisure and education. Both are furnished by the economic and social environments, but more especially by the first."

Pages 252-253. "We find that all the noise [concerning alleged ‘self-made men’] is made over a comparatively small number, and consists in perpetual repetition of the same old things about the same men."

Page 277. "The only thing that can be done is to equalize opportunities so as not only to enable the really exceptional man to demonstrate the fact, but to make the open avenues so numerous and so easy to travel that he will be sure to find the one to which he is adapted by nature. In this way . . . the energy of society is set free . . . ."

Page 281. "Much of the discussion about ‘equal rights’ is utterly hollow. All the ado made over the system of contract is surcharged with fallacy. There can be no equality and no justice, not to speak of equity, so long as society is composed of members, equally endowed by nature, a few of whom only possess the social heritage of truth and ideas resulting from the laborious investigations and profound meditations of all past ages, while the great mass are shut out from all the light that human achievement has shed upon the world. The equalization of opportunity means the equalization of intelligence."

Page 293. "The only kind of inequalities that do harm are artificial inequalities. . . . We have seen, and statistically demonstrated, that all the great social inequalities are purely artificial. They are due to privilege.* They are made by society."

Here following (quoted from a letter to the present author) is additional expert testimony on the mentality of the working class from Dr. Edward A. Ross (of the Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin). The value of Dr. Ross’s testimony is immeasurably heightened by the fact that for many years he has been generally acknowledged to be in the first rank of industrious, brilliant and profound students of human society. His writings command respect throughout the world. He says:

"I esteem as a great truth Dr. Lester F. Ward’s generalization that native ability exists in about equal proportions at every level of society, and that the great difference between social classes in respect to the production of contributors to human progress is due mainly to inequality of opportunity. . . ."

* The new Standard Dictionary defines privilege as ‘‘a peculiar benefit, favor, or advantage, . . . a prerogative, franchise, or permission.’’
The supreme, brutal iniquity and inequity of capitalist society is this:

All the mills, all the mines, all the railways, all the forests, all the splendid machinery—the total industrial foundation and equipment of present society—all these things will become the private property of the children of the present capitalist class—by the laws of property inheritance—whether those children have large brains or small brains, poor brains or good brains. That will be their "reward" for being the children of the employer class.

That will be their privilege.

Brains or no brains the children of the present capitalist class have a mortgage on the opportunities of the future. The "race for success" is already won—by these children—brains or no brains.

That is their privilege.

And the race is already lost by the children of the working class—brains or no brains.

Thus the dice of life are loaded against the children of the poor.

Think of the millions of sweet children who bud but never bloom and ripen—blisted by poverty in the springtime of their lives.

"A fair race requires an equal start." For example, in a dog race or a horse race we have sufficient decency to protect the brutes against unfairness by giving the racers an equal start. Yet the many millions of working class children begin the supreme race, the race of life, the struggle for existence, hobbled by poverty, while many thousands of the children of the employer class begin the race of life with a start of millions of wealth in advance of the wage class contestants.

Why talk of a "square deal" or "fair play" or "equal protection under the flag" while the children of the poor are mocked by overwhelming inequality of opportunity in the race of life? Shackled, plundered, and mocked, the children of the workers are shamed from the race course where they
receive even less protection against unfairness than is given to a horse or a dog.

Oh, you who are slandered into shame-faced, silent meekness,—you who patiently toil for sweat-wet bread,—you who toil honestly and usefully for ten, twenty, forty years and still remain too poor for abundant comforts, too poor to feel secure from want in your old age, too poor to face death unashamed because of the mean want and ignorance in which you must leave those you love—you who are too poor to educate your children thoroughly and thus have them discover and develop and enjoy their intellectual powers and gifts—hold up your heads and in sane wrath hurl back the foul slander,—the charge that your poverty and your lack of education are due to your lack of brains. Teach your children that the charge is a lie. Teach your children arguments with which they can defend themselves and defend their class against any and all who belittle the working class. Urge your children to discuss this matter in the Sunday Schools and the grammar schools. Discuss this matter yourself in the place where you work. Help kill this lie and do it now.

Your industrial masters years ago paid teachers, preachers, politicians and editors to capture your young mind, and saturate it with error and place your brain in the bondage of false teachings and chloroform you with meekness and humility and the damnation of contentment and cheap satisfactions—as your “proper reward.”

Rouse, ye slaves—and remember that in the same way, in the same institutions, the minds of your own children are at this moment being enslaved with the same brain-chilling curse called humility.

Arm your children with arguments—or apologize for being parents. It is up to you.

With whatever brain you have, think.

Sharpen your mind—with facts. Put an edge on your mind—with arguments—and cut your way through the lies that blind you and bind you in the bondage of poverty and ignorance.
Think for your class.
Think—or surrender.

I wish you would read the following Open Letter to University Presidents aloud to your children and to your fellow workers in the shop or mill or mine or on the farm where you work. Bring this Letter to the attention of pupils and teachers, students and professors in your local schools and colleges.

An Open Letter to Guilty University Presidents:

Dear sirs:—Your catalogs are before me. In these catalogs you attractively set forth the advantages to be enjoyed by young people who attend your institutions. Among these advantages are some specially liberal ones which you hold out enticingly and particularly to those young people who, you say, are conspicuously above the average in intellectual gifts, to those graduates of high schools and those college students who have indeed already shown that nature with unusual generosity has equipped them for the struggle for existence. These specially liberal advantages are in the form of gifts which you call “fellowships” and “scholarships” and which yield the recipients from $100 to $1,000 a year, for one or more years. This sum of money is to be used by those who receive it in defraying their expenses for a year and thus protect themselves against economic want and worry while they, graduates already, add still more training, more knowledge, more equipment—more armor—for the fierce life-strifes of the struggle for existence under the present wage-and-profit industrial system called Capitalism.

You thus propose to help those most who need help least—those who have already had much training and who have also been discovered to be above the average of those immediately around them in the race of life.

Admit, gentlemen, the large and illuminating sociological fact; namely, with rhetorical drum and trumpet and other almost coercively seductive catalog-and-circular advertising you proudly announce that this economic support is for those, and for those only, who, having had opportunity to do so in high schools and colleges, have already proved their superiority in mental endowments. Admit that this economic protection is for those who from nature and training already have great advantages—for those while they still further sharpen their intellectual weapons for the battles of life. In high schools, academies and colleges, thrilled with many forms of inspiring environment, those
superior young people have already had opportunity to discover and
develop their tastes and powers and special gifts; those have already
had opportunity to have their ambitions roused, their hopes enlarged,
and their life plans grandly expanded;—those have already had oppor-
tunity to demonstrate their strength for the battle and also acquire
additional equipment for the race of life.

Those alone you propose to assist with hundreds of dollars a year.
I do not object to your doing so, and for two reasons I do not ob-
ject:—because all youths should be protected while they study; and
also because what you propose to do gives the lie to your own sneer
at the poor and ignorant: “Anybody can get an education and suc-
cceed, if he wishes to do so.”

And that brings me to the main question, gentlemen: What about
the tens of millions of youths who do not get a single hour of training
in even the first year of the high school or academy—what about those
who are thus beaten before the race begins?

It is about this economically damned and socially doomed majority
that I wish to write a very special word to you.

The facts (Note at foot of page) certainly show that probably more
than 80 in 100 of all the boys and girls in the United States never
enter even the first year of the high school or schools of the high school
grade, and only 14 in 1,000 finish four-year college courses.* Now,
place that fact, that big, bald fact, beside the following important
statement by the most profound and productive student of human
society that the world has yet known, the late Dr. Lester F. Ward:

“...But really, for all except the rarest cases, something more than a ‘common-
school education’ is required to insure success. A much broader view of the
principal branches of learning is necessary to enable a person of talent or even a

* On page 14 of Federal Document, “Introductory Survey,” Bureau of Educa-
tion, reprinted from the Report of the Commissioner of Education for the year
ending June 30, 1914, we find the following facts:

(1)—The total number of children (560,397) in the first year of the high
schools and schools of the high school grade in 1912-13 was less than 14 per cent.
of the total number of children (4,023,026) in the first year of the elementary
schools—same class—in 1904-5.

(2)—That the National Commissioner estimates that about 109 in every
1,000 pupils entering the first grade in 1904-5 will graduate from the High School
in 1916.

(3)—That the National Commissioner’s estimate is that in 1920 the number
who will finish four-year college courses will be less than 14 in every 1,000 of those
who entered the first grade in 1904-5.
genius to select a career and pursue it successfully. The great men of all time have had this. . . . All outside of that group, whatever may be their native talents, are excluded even from candidacy to achievement."—Ward: Applied Sociology, pp. 229-30.

And this from President Butler, of Columbia University:

"Statistics show that out of 10,000 successful men in the world in all classes, 8,000 were college graduates. . . . Even your self-made man isn’t satisfied unless his son can go to college.”—Chicago Tribune, March 13, 1905.

(Probably far more than 8,000 of the 10,000 were high school or academy graduates.)

Now, what of the astonishing majority, the more than eighty per cent., who do not have opportunity to discover and develop their tastes, their powers and their special gifts? These must make the struggle for existence practically without education, without maturing of their powers, without enrichment of their minds with knowledge, without the inspirations, without the ideals, without the grandly expanded life plans to be secured chiefly in the finely cultural stimulating environment of the high schools and academies and colleges, and universities. These, my learned gentlemen, must face the bitter competitions, the strangling, suffocating competitions of life unprepared, unarmed. And that brings me to my next word with you.

YOU BELIEVE, you say you believe—in competition and your university trustees, many of them presidents or directors of powerful industrial trusts, force you to say you believe in industrial competition. You glorify the wage-and-profit competition of Capitalism; you scorn the Socialists who urge co-operation—who urge that in a cooperative commonwealth the economic handcuffs shall be stricken from the wrists of all the children of all the people for all time.

But in the distribution of cash-paying fellowships you endeavor to give them to the strong.

And thus, precisely thus, you admit—your action proves that you believe—that the competition of the present order of society is so fierce, so hot, so crushing and disastrous, that even these specially gifted ones, the unusually powerful ones who have already had much training—you admit that even these in the coarse, crude, brutal competition of the present social order would probably fall short of their glory, fall short of lives of greatest possible usefulness, fall short of
conspicuous success, without your economic support, without your
gladly and proudly offered cash assistance while they further prepare
for success, honor and social service.

So even these powerful and already trained young people—even
these—need help, do they? Indeed!

Well, what of a social system so fiercely competitive and so wolf-
ishly unjust that even these discovered, specially strong young people,
already considerably trained, are in danger? What of a social order
so cruelly unfraternal, so swinishly competitive that it would balk
even these discovered choicest ones short of full maturity of their
powers and usefulness if they were left without economic protection
while they study still further? If these do not need this economic
defense while they study, why do you give it to them? Surely you
would not belittle education by offering bright and economically com-
fortable young men and women an expensive toy—say five hundred
dollars in “pin money”—to induce them to study hard? As men of
intellectual distinction and great moral influence have you so little
in your repertoire of inspirations for aspiring human souls that you
must offer these young people paltry, filthy cash as an incentive and
goal? No, no—your catalogs explain that you seek to economically
assist and protect strong but poor young people, already much de-
veloped, because you know that they, even they, actually need the
money to complete their necessary systematic development by means
of prolonged academic training.

Clearly your action in the distribution of these fellowships is im-
plied admission that the Socialists are correct in contending that the
present competitive wage-and-profit capitalist system involves so
much poverty, such heavy poverty as to arrest and wreck the intellec-
tual development of the majority,—that the present system is so
cruelly fierce and so disastrously harsh that you gladly and proudly
rush—must rush—to the economic rescue of even the admittedly
strong members of society who have already had years of training
and encouragement for the struggle for existence.

Gentlemen, under the present competitive system the dice of
life are loaded against both the bright and the dull children of the
poor, and your own actions prove that you yourselves believe this
to be the situation. You yourselves are constantly whining at the
millionaire’s back door for money to establish cash fellowships with
which, as with life-preservers, you can rescue at least a few from the
bitter storms of competitive life. But I must remember that you are
cultivated gentlemen whom I must address in the gentle language of polite society. Well, then, let me use the sweetly metred smoothness, the rhetorical honey, the flute-like softness of graceful phrase appropriate in addressing your academically sensitive and shrinkingly vulnerable natures,—let me with delicately diplomatic indirectness tell you this, just this, gentlemen: You seem ridiculously inconsistent, vulgarly illogical, mockingly insincere—and contemptible. With your learning, your eloquence, and your unusual moral influence you defend the competitive system that forces you to cringe and fawn before coarse-grained, lard-and-tallow, morally barbaric millionaires, forces you to tease these industrial Caesars for some of their bloodstained money for fellowships with which you may rescue at least a few dozen of their mentally gifted but economically plundered and pauperized victims.

Have you no shame? Really, have you forgotten how to blush? Has the competitive system of society so poisoned the well-springs of manly pride that you are become incapable of Christlike indignation, incapable of hot resentment for the merciless tyranny of masters who force you to crawl and whine and also force you to teach a falsehood and commit a social treason? Has your intellectual servitude morally emasculated you?

Get up! Stand once erect! Show us the soul-shine of men, defiantly proud men, men too finely proud to defend a system that perhaps robbed their own fathers and mothers of the greatest thing in the world, a liberal education. Show us men too noble to mock their own families—perhaps their own uneducated mothers whose gnarled hands in days gone by were blistered and calloused with toil in furnishing their sons economic support while they studied in college. Come! Speak out, gentlemen. What message of cheer have you for the vast majority, some of whom no doubt are weak, many millions of whom are surely splendid, capable average, and great numbers of whom are doubtless magnificently gifted, but many millions of whom are in the total eclipse of the cursed oblivion of fatalistic poverty—what message have you for this mighty host whom the coarse and brutal rudeness of the competitive system robs of the privilege of even the first year’s training in the high school? What message of cheer have you for the lean and bony little girls toiling in the cotton mills of New England and the South, competing, each pale, hungry, ragged child competing, aye, competing with a multi-million dollar corporation? What message have you for the tender
little boys in the breakers of the Anthracite Coal Trust? What cheer-
ing message have you for the multitude of little dust-breathing con-
sumptives who slave in the great department stores, each child, each
alone, competing against a gigantic corporation? *These, all these are
helplessly young, helplessly small, helplessly ignorant, helplessly inex-
perienced, and helplessly poor.*

These—and millions of others in factories and shops, and on petty
rented or mortgaged farms—have no sufficient opportunity to prove
their intellectual gifts—they have no economic support while they
study. What message have you for this host of helpless girls and boys
whose intellectual eyes are burned out by the blistering heat of the
competitive system? Stunned and balked by the brutalities of the
competitive wage-and-profit system, these are helpless, and you know
they are helpless. These have no opportunity because they lack
economic defense while they enrich their minds, polish their pearls
and prove their gifts. *You well know that a mentally gifted child
though keenly willing to study, may nevertheless grow up to be a
stupidly ignorant man or woman.* These ignorant children in the
mills and mines, competing against profiting-lusting employers, are
struggling, gasping for the economic breath of mere animal existence,
while you admit that even the brilliant and powerful young men and
women who already have high school and perhaps several years of
college education need economic protection while they prepare further
for lives of usefulness and honor and the many deep pleasures of
mental maturity. Speak distinctly, please,—What is your message for
the ignorant youths whose joyless lives are stuffed and damned with
poverty and toil, whose hopes are stillborn, whose souls shrivel in the
fires of competition while you mock them?

For this sweat-stained host, *barred by poverty from the halls
of learning,* you have no sincere message of cheer. And later when
these economically helpless children of wage-paid slaves are grown to
men and women—what then? Will you then, your eyes burning with
scorn, your lips curling with contempt,—will you then with your
rented tongues, your rented culture, your rented rhetoric and your
rented eloquence *further damn these lost ones with stinging, viperous
insult,*—“Ignorant nobodies!”

Shame! Shame upon you! How long will you defend the system
that makes toadies of you and dulls the bright eyes of the children
of the poor?

Will you reply that—“in this country opportunities are abundant
for any one to get an education who has brains enough to make it worth while to be educated?" How is it then that the children of the uneducated poor, prevented by poverty from proceeding further with their education, make just as good records in the primary "grade" schools as the children whom you seek to help after they have fortunately gone through the high school and part way, or perhaps all the way, through the college?

If sufficient opportunities are abundant for all why do you furnish special economic assistance to any?

Consider what I have just quoted above from Professor Lester F. Ward's Applied Sociology, which work is indeed largely an exhaustive investigation of the sociological and educational significance of opportunity and of the lack of opportunity.

"Opportunities are plentiful—and anybody can succeed in this country who wishes to do so,"—did you say? What you say thus of opportunity is false, you know it is false, and you prove that you believe it is false when you rush to the rescue of a few discovered specially strong young people with fellowships and thus economically defend even these trained, discovered, favored ones against the saber-like teeth of the wolves of poverty.

With pity and contempt I say to you that the hideousness of poverty is surpassed only by the tragedy and shame of strutting, suave and smiling intellectual prostitution. As for prostitutes I have more respect, a great deal more respect, for my infinitely humbled sisters, painted slaves of pimps and policemen, lashed into the street by poverty to rent the mocking smiles that hide their anguish, to rent the very temples of their souls to unwashed babbling brutes-of-lust for money enough to live on day by day—I have more respect for these, for any one of these, in the desolation and degradation of her sex prostitution than I have for the most "cultivated" intellectual prostitute that ever rented his brain, milked a plutocrat for gifts with enslaving "understandings," strangled a fearless professor, and helped damn the millionaire's victims in poverty and ignorance with the cruel slander that "the poor and ignorant are poor and ignorant because they haven't brains enough to be otherwise."

I have asked you for your message of cheer for the poor.
You have no message for the poor.
You? You! You fawning fops-and-serfs, fattened on "conditioned" endowments, protected with salaries tainted with the blood of children gasping in the ignorance of poverty and the poverty of
THE WORKERS HAVEN'T BRAINS ENOUGH

ignorance, you prideless tools and toads of capitalist Caesars, hired to pollute public opinion with your poisoned piffle and your learned sneers at the uneducated poor—you have no message: crawling, prostrate moral eunuchs that you are in the academic he-harems of the plutocratic masters of the world, you—you have no message for the bright-eyed, keen-brained children of the poor wallowing uninspired and unprotected in the ignorance of poverty.

No university, silently or openly agreeing to strangling "understandings" for "conditioned" gifts from plutocratic filchers of the fruits of toil—no such university ever helped free an economic slave class. No such university ever even tried to do so. And whenever in such an institution some brave teachers have raised their voices in criticism of despotism and in defense of the hosts that sicken in ignorance and poverty—such teachers have been silenced or promptly driven from the university or college.

With no thanks to you, guilty presidents of universities, we of the working class will hew our own way to freedom through the mountains of prejudice and slander you have helped build in the path of human progress. Servile assassins of academic freedom of discussion, boss strike-breakers of the professorial nobility who strive for the right to teach without toadying, we expect nothing from you except hollow mouthings and cruel slanders. We know you.

And, fortunately, we also know this: In the lower grade schools our children matched your children and the children of your masters too, in brains,—matched them there till poverty kidnapped our boys and girls and drove them to the mills and mines and factories of the class who pay your salaries for your cunning silence or for your shameless slanders. And that fact makes us scorn your slander and inspires us to challenge you to the battle of brains for the rights of the brain.

Each year now we more thoroughly understand you—and your kind.
Read this more than once—won’t you?

Why not read what the Socialists themselves say instead of what the cunning slanderers say—as to what the Socialists really propose? Wouldn’t that be a good deal fairer? Well, let me tell you.

THE PROGRAM OF SOCIALISM:

The Socialists propose to reconstruct society industrially on the following Plan of Reasonable Mutualism:

(1) THE NEW FOUNDATION: The social ownership (that is, public ownership) of the socially usable industrial wealth—that is, of the chief material means of production.

To illustrate: we shall have the private ownership of whatever is necessary for the proper degree of privacy of life,—such as the home, the piano, the automobile for personal use, clothing and the like. But the forest and quarry and mine materials used, and the factories in which the automobile, the piano and the clothing are made—will become public property. (See “Caution,” at foot of last page.)

(2) THE NEW METHOD: The social control of the socially usable means of production.

The New Method will be the maximum practicable degree of democratic management of industry—which is the only true line of escape from the present despotic control of the industrial life of the workers. Those who do the work will have a voice in controlling the work.

(3) THE NEW PURPOSE: The production of goods primarily for the social service—of all, instead of primarily for profits for part, of the members of society.

This is why the dollar-marked snobs hate and slander Socialism.

(4) THE NEW DEAL:—The self-employment of all who are willing to do useful work—by means of the joint ownership of the things the workers must collectively use in production, each to receive the value of his labor, undiminished by rent, interest and profits.
By relaying the foundation of industry (Proposition 1, above) the capitalist's power to hire and "fire" and rule, and filch in the form of rent, interest and profits, is taken from under him—and then he and his grown-up children and other pets must work or starve. "If he will not WORK, neither shall he EAT." Every soft-snap, silk-lined loafer on earth specially dreads just this particular Socialist doctrine. Be it remembered, however, that the taking of rent, interest and profit under the present legalized capitalist system can be justified as long as the capitalist system is defended by the ballots of the working class who thus consent to be fleeced. The working class should not whine when it gets what it hurrahs for. Any man who votes for a master—deserves to have a master; any such man is too tame, timid and stupid to get along without a master.

(5) THE FIRST STEP: The possession and control of the powers of government by and in behalf of those who seek freedom and justice for all who are willing to do useful work.

Under Socialism "government" will become largely the administration of industry and the general public's institutions for promoting human progress and social welfare, instead of the present brutal repressive political machinery and chicanery by means of which the ruling class legally hold their places on the backs of the fleeced and irritated workers.

Beware. Always remember that the same crew of plutocratic masters and their cringing boot-lickers who have slandered you workers for "lacking brains" have also slandered Socialism in every possible way. Slander ing the workers and organized labor and Socialism—this slandering is one of the strongest methods of supporting and protecting plutocracy. With this in mind, read further.

The mutualism in industry, proposed by the Socialists, will politically and industrially disfranchise all loafers and gilt-edged pretenders and pry them loose from unearned incomes; and these sneering snobs and plutes will have to go to work—or starve. Then the lives of all willing workers will be sweetened with plenty and sociability and will no longer be soured with want and sneers.

This mutualism in industry will not interfere with private affairs, such as religion and the family life, any more than the mutual ownership of the public library and the fire department now interfere.
fere with private affairs. Under Socialism you will have your own private *family* life, your own private *religious* life and your own private *social* life. But in *industry* we shall be brothers. Then the brotherhood of man will really have a fair chance to win the world.

**This mutualism in industry** will not be a “dividing up” scheme any more than the present mutual ownership of the public park or the public wagon-road is a “dividing up” scheme.

**This mutualism in industry** will no more be *anarchy* or *communism* or *atheism* or *free-love* than the mutualism of the post-office service is anarchy, or communism or atheism or free-love.

**This mutualism in industry** will leave an enormous amount of *wealth in private hands as strictly private property*. So far as property is concerned, Socialism is simply an *extension of a principle and policy already admitted by everybody*, the principle of *public ownership* of wealth. Everybody believes, for example, in the principle and policy of public ownership of the public library;—but the Socialists want also, for example, that the stone quarry and marble quarry from which the material of the library building was secured, should also be publicly owned. (See (1) above.)

**Caution:** Public ownership alone is not Socialism. For example,—if the Swedish railways were public property while the *capitalist class still remained in power* by means of a capitalist political party controlling the *powers of government*, of course the capitalists thru their capitalist political party would naturally have the railways controlled and managed in a manner to suit the *capitalist class* interests. To illustrate: As long as the *capitalist class controls government* the capitalist owning a *private flour mill* can and will manoeuvre the surplus earnings of a *public lumber mill* so as to reduce the taxes on his *private flour mill*. See that? Think it over. Re-read (2) and (5) above.

A **LAST WORD:** Look your neighbors in the eye and ask them: *Are you going to help defend the working class against the vile slander of the workers?* This booklet was made for *your use in defending yourself and your class*. Re-read pages marked (74) and (75)—then go to the mat. Arm—with arguments! March—to the bloodless war of education! Look at the price at the foot of page 3.