Capitalist:—Hey there! Don't shoot my hawks. They steal a living for me.
Worker:—That's it exactly. Heretofore I voted for you. Hereafter I vote for myself.
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PREFACE.

"Truth is mighty and must prevail."

"There can be no effect without a cause."

These statements are too self-evident to need any proof.

This booklet deals with the following important problems from the above standpoint.

82% of the people don’t own a home. Why?

In every nation those who do the most have the least, while those who do the least have the most. Why?

Modern machinery enables a person to produce from fifteen to twenty-five times as much as he could with hand tools. Why doesn’t he get it?

During a panic, millions of men can’t get a job while two million children and six million women are working in factories and sweatshops every day. Why?

Why don’t these idle but able and willing men take the raw material and feed it into the factories and produce the things for which they suffer?

Our modern thinkers, such as Spencer, Darwin, Morgan, Marx, Mills and others, have thrown a flood of light upon these and kindred questions. These modern scientists have written many large volumes which are at once a delight and a revelation, but nevertheless to the average busy man they are too expensive and too exhaustive.

Nothing startling or original is claimed for “Hawks and Hens.” However, I have endeavored to express in the fewest possible words, the great truths established by our modern thinkers, along economic and political lines.
One of the philosophical things that have been said in discriminating man from the lower animals, is that he is the one creature who is never satisfied. It is well for him that he is so, that there is always something more for which he craves. The man who is always satisfied with things as they are is not progressing.

The hopeful sign of the times is the general dissatisfaction with things economic and political. The various new parties are proof of this assertion.

Thinking people for ages have been seeking a solution for the social and industrial problems, during all of which time thousands of governments have been born, have lived their brief existence and have died. Born in poverty, each passed through its youthful period of prosperity,—the flower of middle age,—and attained a position of wealth and affluence, then at the pinnacle of its power and greatness, died;—died as though stricken by some inherent disease that was beyond the knowledge of man to cure. "History repeats itself" seemed to be the only answer to account for the succession of births and deaths of nations.

Yet, to thinking minds this answer is not satisfying. Why does death strike nation after nation, system after system and government after government, as a creeping palsy, at a time when they seem most prosperous? That was and is the question. That question I am here to discuss.

With the aid of charts which follow, I shall prove to you that our industrial system is joined by a sequence of links with an eternal past. Each link is knowledge, a little more knowledge. There are no links missing and each step in the future must be linked with this endless chain.

It is impossible to imagine ourselves using a new industrial system different from the one we have, unless it be based on present knowledge and grow in natural sequence out of the present system.
Socialism is based upon science, the law of continuity. Socialists do not make the mistake that many enthusiastic writers upon economies make, viz: Break away from the base of acquired knowledge, leap across an intervening space of years and plant their banner of discovery in an unknown and unknowable country. To picture Utopia at the end of such a journey is pure imagination, and of no value to the seeker after truth.

Socialism is linked with the past, is forged out of past and present conditions, is in direct harmony with natural law, industrial progress, and economic development. It is not a dream. It is a solid possibility. Nay, an inevitability.

THE LINE OF PROGRESS.

The theory of development explains that all forms of life struggle for existence and constantly change. Of these new forms which come as a result of change, those which make the more effective struggle for existence, are the ones which survive. It is this process which results in progress. In fact you may see the life struggles by which this advance has taken place still going on between individuals and between groups. Among plants, animals and men, there is a struggle against all else for the preservation of the individual, and the surrender of the individual for the preservation of its kind. It is this process which results in progress of persons, of races and of institutions.

That the life of man has been so developed is now believed by all scientific men and is so taught in the leading institutions of learning throughout the world. That this theory of development is the basis of all scientific study of the development of social institutions, is fully accepted by all modern Socialists. Socialists believe that civilization was not invented. They believe it grew out of the humblest and most natural beginnings. Socialists believe that he who
would understand modern usages and institutions must seek the reasons for their existence in the humble beginnings of the primitive life of man. The family, the church, the state, the workshop, the market, agriculture, mining, transportation, literature, art—all these have come to be what they are, not by the invention, contrivance, or decree of any man or million of men, but as the result of struggle and the slow growth of the life of the race through a thousand centuries.

Socialists believe that whoever would thoroughly understand the past must look at all the problems of the past from the "bread and butter" standpoint. Whoever would have other forces rule the future must first solve for the future the "bread and butter" problem.

These are the great natural truths which suggest and defend the theory of evolution which Darwin applied to the study of the different kinds of animals, which Herbert Spencer insisted must apply to all departments of thought, and which Karl Marx applied to the study of the labor problem and thus developed the scientific defence of the Socialist proposals.

**ECONOMIC DETERMINISM.**

The various changes through which the human race has passed are economic, hence the origin of such terms as "economic determinism," the materialistic interpretation of history, etc.

This great truth has been splendidly stated in the Communist Manifesto; viz.,

"In every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; and consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and ex-
exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; thus the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolutions in which, now-a-days, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without at the same time, and once for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class-distinctions and class struggles."

While the above truth is fundamental, yet it in no way interferes with or denies the foundations of religion or ignores any of the highest faculties of the human mind.

It is not claimed by Marx or the Socialists that the "economic interpretation of history" exhausts all the niceties and possibilities of life and progress. They insist, however, that it is the basis of all progress. But various elements in the superstructure, the political forms of the class contests, their results, the constitutions—the legal forms, and also all the reflexes of these actual contests in the brains of the participants, the political, legal, philosophical theories; the religious views—all these exert an influence on the historical struggles and in many instances determine their form.

**PERIODS OF DEVELOPMENT.**

No more harmful falsehood was ever uttered than the oft-repeated twaddle: "Things always were and always will be as they now are." As a matter of fact all historians agree that the human race has passed through many separate and distinct periods. For convenience these periods have been divided as follows:

**Savagery—**

Before fire.
After fire.
Bow and arrow.
Barbarism—
Pottery.
Taming animals, cereals, rude huts, etc.
Smelting lead, tin, copper and bronze.

Civilization—
Alphabet, iron, private property.
Feudalism, factory production, trusts.
What next? Socialism of course!

By re-tracing the line of human progress toward the primitive age of man’s existence, and removing one by one his principal institutions, inventions, and discoveries in the reverse order in which they appeared, the advance made in each of the following periods will be realized.

THE FIRST PERIOD.

The first period, as noted in the outline, embraces that ocean of time before the discovery of fire and prior to the adding of fish to man’s primitive diet of nuts and roots.

Naturally, in this early period there was little organization or government; no art or invention; probably promiscuous sex relations prevailed and certainly private property was not dreamed of.

THE SECOND PERIOD.

According to this outline the second period, still in savagery, begins with the discovery of fire and the use of fish as food. The women were left to guard and keep up the fire while the men fished in organized bands. This division of work resulted in the rude beginnings of the family. All of the men became the husbands of all the women. But promiscuous sex relation outside the group (if it ever existed) came to an end. The fires and fishing grounds were held in common.

THE THIRD PERIOD.

The bow and arrow characterized the third stage of
savagery. By its use the tribes were enabled to add flesh to their diet of fish, roots, and nuts. As an advance in government the gens appeared and a closer bond of union and mutual protection resulted. Industry was still conducted co-operatively and all property was held in common.

**THE FOURTH PERIOD.**

The making and use of pottery ushered in the fourth period—the first in Barbarism.

Women are popularly supposed to have invented pottery and certain it is that great strides were made in her condition and comfort. The gentes of the third period here developed into a larger and more protective organization now called phratres. The family idea developed to the point where each man or woman claimed or might claim some certain man or woman of the corresponding gens as especially his or hers. Exclusive possession did not necessarily follow and the sexes lived by themselves. Labor was still performed co-operatively and ownership was still in common.

**FIFTH PERIOD.**

This period is distinguished by the taming of animals, the cultivation of cereals, the use of irrigation and the building of houses of brick and stone. By these inventions a much larger portion of the earth’s surface became inhabitable. The herds ever increased and this called for wider pasturage. The permanent occupancy of territory became practically a demand. Common ownership still prevailed. The phratres joining into tribes.

**SIXTH PERIOD.**

The smelting of ores and bronze marks the beginning of the last period in Barbarism. Iron and bronze tools were used in hunting and fishing as well as in the art of war. The stronger tribes began to federate into nations. Polygamy developed as a result of the
contention of the stronger men for the exclusive use of favorite women. Polygamy was not in general practice among the masses, being generally confined to the military heroes whom the populace complimented by wreathes, women, and other tokens of appreciation for heroism on the field of battle. The progress of the human race had developed tremendously during Barbarism. Homer, the poet, mentions that the following were in general use: Wheat, oats, corn, barley, peas, beans and onions, gold, silver, brass, tin, iron and bronze, the sickle, the pruning knife, the spindle, the shuttle and the loom, the harp and the shepherd’s pipe, the dyke, bridge, irrigation ditches, garments of cloth and shoes of leather, houses of stone and brick, the dog, sheep, goat, hog, cow, horse, the wagon of four wheels, the saddle, pottery, the basket, the mill for grinding, and sailing vessels.

As the tribes began to increase and enlarge they began to trespass on each other’s territory, and the fights were to the death, and a meal was made of the victim. At that stage of development an individual could not produce more than enough to sustain himself, therefore there was no object in enslaving an enemy, so he was killed outright. Killing was an economic necessity and was morally justified. But when the individual could produce more than enough to sustain life then the victim was enslaved because the extra amount produced went into the larder of the victor and enabled him to live in idleness. Then killing was tabooed and prohibited by law. Observe how these facts illustrate the theory of economic determinism.

At first the conquered tribe became the property of, and was added to the working force of the victorious tribe. This was a tremendous discovery; viz., That a man is worth more alive than dead.

The constant increase of the tribe and the enlargement of its herds meant the constant seeking for new
pastures. This meant war. To remain at home meant decay—to go afield meant war and war it was to a finish.

SEVENTH PERIOD.

With most historians the alphabet ushers in Civilization. By this time private ownership had become quite general and was finally riveted upon the backs of the toilers. At first the tribal wars were planned for the relief of overcrowding. Toward the close of Barbarism, also at the beginning of Civilization the wars developed into means for plunder—first that the fruits of war might directly enrich the whole tribe of conquerers but later to enrich the military heroes only. It was soon discovered that it was easier to enrich the nation by war than to produce wealth. Soon appropriation became the work of the soldier, production the work of the slave. The military heroes soon learned to appropriate not only the women and men as their own personal slaves but the land and implements as well and thus made the beginning of private ownership of both land and slaves. It soon became evident that in order to have private property descend to the warrior’s own children he must establish himself with one woman. And here the idle class made its appearance. The women were both petted and ruled—both the subjects and playthings of their military masters. Thus we see that society was divided into two classes—those who had forcibly taken the earth and their workers.

We have seen how the people were first the captives in war and later the slaves of their captors, and were compelled to produce with no direct interest in the products of their own labor. Labor became the badge of servitude and dependence. The laborer was disgraced, disinherited and disfranchised—and the age-long world-wide economic class struggle made its beginning.
PERIODS COMPARED.

The last century has made wonderful progress in all lines. The progress of primitive society, however, far eclipses even these gigantic strides of later years. The discovery of fire, the creation of language, the building of the family, the organizing of free society—not one of these have been even approached during the past few thousand years of private ownership.

Primitive life achieved the brotherhood of man, for it was during these thousands of years of common property and society based on kinship—the kinsmen acting co-operatively, that the sentiment of brotherhood within the tribes was so wrought into the lives of the race that it still survives five thousand years of suffering and oppression at the hands of the anti-social and anti-brotherly military power which first transformed society from the basis of kinship and mutual interest into that of force, and then used the force to usurp for the few the common inheritance of all.

It should be noted that during savagery and barbarism there were no world-wide class struggles because there was no private property to struggle for. It should be further noted that the use of fire, the bow and the arrow, the discovery of pottery, the domestication of animals, the smelting and use of iron and bronze and finally the alphabet—these were the things one after another, which suggested new advantages in the long struggle for existence, first of individuals, then groups, then the gens, then the phratry, then the nation and finally the world-wide conquest to appropriate rather than to produce.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP.

The tremendous point which I wish to emphasize is—that private ownership has changed a world of tribal brothers struggling for each other into a world of slaves and soldiers struggling against each other.
In review, I wish to emphasize the fact that cooperation, common property and brotherhood marked the early advance of the race.

For thousands of years the earth was held in common but when finally it was permitted to be owned privately then slavery and the subjection of women followed, as a necessity. Private ownership was established by war and can be maintained by force only.

SERFDOM.

A time finally arrived in the expansion of the Roman frontier when Rome found it impossible to protect her newly acquired frontiers. New slaves could therefore not be captured and they had to devise a new means of obtaining them; viz., to propagate them. Serfdom resulted. Under serfdom the toilers belonged to the land and the land belonged to the Lord. The serf was allowed the use of a small patch of ground upon which he toiled for himself; the rest of the day he toiled for his master. Under this new plan he could have a wife and know his own children. This caused him to work the harder for his household. This new plan seemed like a heaven to the slave, yet it was by far more profitable to the Lord than slavery.

The master realized that the serf’s “home” was but a breeding pen to rear toilers which could no longer be obtained by conquest.

This change from slavery to serfdom was brought about by the masters and for their own interest. Serfdom, like slavery, was maintained by force—by soldiers—and maintained because the Lords discovered that if they owned the land they did not need to own the slaves; and to extend to the slaves some portion of rights, would add to their value as workers and promote the breeding of more workers. The masters learned that if they owned the means—the soil—by which the workers gained their living they virtually
owned the workers. Then, too, there was no vice that
could not be gratified as well or better under serfdom;
besides the profits under serfdom were much greater to
the Lord.

THE WAGE SYSTEM.

The change from serfdom to Wage-Slavery was also
brought about by the master class and for their benefit.
The toilers' interests were not considered.

I have shown how under serfdom the Master called
himself a Lord and the slave a serf and yet got all the
serf produced above his keep, because the Master
owned the land, and so I shall show that it was more
profitable to the master to call his wage workers "free
men." By owning the tools, mills, mines and fac-
tories the capitalists still own the toilers, body, boots
and breeches.

We have noticed how the feudal Lords maintained
themselves in their castles by the labor of serfs and
the protection of soldiers. As his establishment grew
the Lord found it necessary to acquire more territory
and this meant war. We have noticed how the expan-
sion of the ancient tribe produced the ancient nation,
and in a similar way the expansion of feudalism caused
the modern nation. As one feudal Lord conquered
his neighboring Lords he gradually developed into a
king having for his dependencies the conquered Lords,
the most important of whom he designated as princes.

GUNPOWDER.

The invention of gunpowder made useless most of
the feudal Lord's serfs and soldiers. All of these peo-
ple were no longer needed about the castle and were
allowed to drift to the heretofore neglected towns. The
cities were granted a large measure of home rule by
the king in return for military protection in time of
need. This stimulated the growth of towns and laid
the foundation of our modern cities. The serfs and
soldiers who were released by the feudal Lords found
employment in the cities and received wages for their services. Manufacturing was stimulated in the cities and the formerly despised peddler grew to importance and finally developed into our modern merchant prince. Commerce slowly developed with neighboring peoples and finally extended around the world. This worldwide commerce was stimulated soon by the discovery of America and the Cape of Good Hope route to India. The demand for labor was brisk and men were often kidnapped and impressed into the marine and military service. The rising factory towns absorbed all the released soldiers and serfs no longer needed at the castles. These men bid against each other in the city for work and accepted such remuneration as their new employers saw fit to give. This laid the foundation for wage slavery.

It is not contended that wages had never been paid before. Wages had been paid to those not slaves during slavery. Wages were also paid to some during serfdom. But wages did not predominate as a system until this time.

For the first time in the history of the world we find whole groups of workers bidding against each other for a chance to be wage slaves. Under both slavery and serfdom the masters were bound to furnish the toiler a living, but under our present wage slavery the slave is permitted to shift for himself and if he can’t get work die a lingering death of starvation or commit suicide. Under our present wage system the toilers produce a dozen times more than under barbarism or feudalism yet they get but a living and millions can’t even get that. As a method of robbing the toilers of their labor modern capitalism has the old system faded to a frazzle.

In the long line of evolution the workers of the world have had to support successively the warrior, the victor, the master, the feudal Lord and lastly the overbearing employer.
Thus we see that wage slavery is but the last form of the age-long class struggle.

Again I repeat that the entire chain of abuses was caused by establishing the system of private ownership and that each change was brought about by the ruling class and for their own interests solely.

The wage system also established the right of the employer to discharge, and the right to discharge is the principal weapon used to force down wages.

It should be borne in mind that the hundreds of years of fighting between the castles and the rising factory towns was not for the benefit of the workers but to determine whether the castle or the city should live in luxury from the labor of the workers.

In the same way we find the fight between the republicans, democrats and bull mooses has been and is to be a scrap to see which shall have the privilege of robbing the toiler. Not one of these parties even so much as pretends to stand for collective ownership of the means of life and we know that collective ownership is the only remedy.

**EvoLUTION OF MACHINERY.**

We have noted how through the primitive life of the race each improvement of the means of obtaining a livelihood resulted in a corresponding advancement of the race. At the end of this primitive period, or at the beginning of civilization tools had improved to a point where no important improvement was made for over five thousand years.

The introduction of slavery stopped the inventive genius of man because the slave could derive no benefit from any tool or machine he might invent. Such benefit would always go to his master and his master was busy devising implements of war.

After a lapse of nearly five thousand years the free cities of Europe gave to the self-employing workers
who built these cities an opportunity to use tools and to have a direct interest in the product of their toil. This resulted in reviving invention and this revival of invention extended to America, for wherever self-employment went there the inventive genius of man sprang into activity and the improvement of tools became a large factor in the development of the race.

This self-employment and personal benefit in the use of hand tools led to a series of inventions which revolutionized the old methods of industry and which have been the means of introducing into the statesmanship of the nineteenth century problems unknown in the industrial world before.

The most important of which was Kay’s flying shuttle, 1738; Watts’ steam engine, 1769; Earlwright’s power loom, 1789; Whitney’s cotton gin, 1793.

Following these, other inventions appeared in rapid succession until today we have the wonderful machinery of our modern factories capable of producing everything by machinery with such precision and speed as to cause a surplus with only a fraction of the people operating them a part of each year. These various machines have been systematically arranged in great factories. The individual with hand tools can no longer compete with these modern machines and consequently he is forced to sell his skill and service to the owner of the factory on the owner’s terms and conditions. The conditions are that whatever the workers produce be handed over to the factory owner, and the mechanic is handed back in wages just enough to exist and reproduce his kind. Thus, through the invention of modern machinery, has the once independent workman become the dependent wage slave.

The net result of the introduction of large machinery has been to change the once independent workmen to the mutually interdependent workmen.

Formerly, with small tools of production, the indi-
individual workman could develop into a small capitalist. This led the people to believe that all could thus advance. It also had the effect of obscuring the line of division between the owners and workers.

Large factories with millions invested now render it impossible for the individual to escape exploitation only as he joins other members of his class and thus develops class solidarity.

Thus it will be seen that modern machinery and the factory system has closed the door of opportunity for all those born to the lot of the wage worker. This fact compels the stronger minds of the working class to struggle, along with the rest of the toilers, for the emancipation of all, as the only means whereby industrial slavery may be abolished and equal opportunity established.

**SYSTEMS COMPARED.**

As aforesaid, a century ago a workman could not produce on an average one-twentieth as much as he can today with modern machinery. Yet they lived comfortably. To be sure they wore homespun clothing but it was warm. They wore hand-made shoes, but they were substantial. They grew and prepared their own food, but it was wholesome and pure. No formaldehyde in the milk—no trichina pork and pickled glanders palmed off as “Armour’s very best.” No tom cats and poodle dogs in the sausage. A century ago an increase in the family was welcome. Today a Rooseveltian family in the home of a workingman is a nightmare, especially with present high prices, and I congratulate the women who refuse to rear large families that the capitalists may have a larger army of unemployed from which to select another crop of wage slaves when their present hirings are worn out. After Socialism has been established and the workers get all they produce, it will be time enough to talk about large families, but not until then.
A century ago people worked with simple hand tools. A shoemaker of that period could tan a hide and in a day, with simple hand tools which he owned, convert it into a pair of shoes. At night he could take the shoes to his neighbor, Smith, a cabinet maker, and swap them for a chair which took Smith a day to produce.

They exchanged the products of their labor on something of an equitable basis. A century ago nearly all manufacturing was done in much the same way. A great change has taken place in manufacturing since that time, especially during the last quarter century. The shoemaker’s bench with its hammer, awl and waxed-end has grown into a huge factory employing thousands of men, operating hundreds of complicated machines and requiring millions of capital for its successful operation.

In the same way the cabinet maker’s kit of hand tools has grown until it has become one of the many large furniture factories covering acres of ground.

Because of this great change in the method of producing the commodities necessary to modern civilization—because of this change from hand tools to the factory system, the owner of hand tools cannot compete with the factory.

Formerly he owned the tools with which he worked. Today he works with tools he does not own. These giant tools are today owned by a man who cannot use them, and operated by men who do not own them. Today the modern workman is compelled with bared head and bended knee to beg permission to use the tools he himself helped to make.

Today these modern wage slaves are living by permission of an idle owning class—a useless, parasitic class—a class who by virtue of private ownership of the stocks and bonds reap all the benefits without themselves turning a hand. They employ foremen, superin-
tendents and managers to do the hustling for them, while they spend their ill-gotten gains in riotous living at our swell resorts or hobnobbing with royalty abroad.

I repeat, that a century ago the people did not starve so long as they had free access to the raw material and owned the simple hand tools with which they worked. In that day it could be truthfully said of a pauper that if he continued to remain in poverty it was largely his own fault, (barring sickness and accidents).

Today conditions have changed, never to return again to the simple hand tools. The present deplorable conditions are growing rapidly worse in trust-made soil irrigated by watered stock. Formerly the individual had a chance, by hard work he could win the topmost rung of success. Today every person who belongs to the wage earning class is absolutely dependent upon his employer for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. At best he can know but little of life, less of liberty and the pursuit of happiness is a huge joke.

The average wage worker looks into a future black as Egyptian darkness. In the skies of present conditions there shines for him no star of hope. He looks forward to the time when he becomes too old to work, then he will be cast aside for a younger man, thrown upon his family or carted away to the poorhouse and a pauper's grave. His children, God pity them. They will follow in the same footsteps and end up in the same sad way.

Today we have ten million people living on the borderland of starvation. We also have fifty million more who are not starving, they are not actually suffering, but God knows they are never so far ahead but that they can hear at their heels the baying bloodhounds of want. Candidly, isn't there something wrong with a system that breeds such conditions?

Socialists contend that since production has
changed from simple hand tools to the huge factory system, a correspondingly great change must be made in the ownership of these factories. The change must be from private ownership to public ownership—collective ownership—which is Socialism.

Since to the owners always flow the profits, how other than by becoming themselves the owners can the workers get all they produce? When the workers finally succeed in owning these modern means of production and distribution, the centuries old struggle between master and slave—lord and serf—capitalist and wage workers, will have been ended because all will have become owners and all will then be workers together, each according to his "deeds."

TRUSTS.

The question of what to do with the trusts is still uppermost in the minds of the people. The development of these great combinations of capital has been accompanied by much denunciation. Many remedies have been tried but all have failed. State after State has passed laws against trusts; Federal anti-trust laws are now on the statute books, and all political parties unite in declaring against monopolies. Yet they flourish and grow stronger; they increase in number and power; they defy or make use of laws intended to suppress them; they control state and national legislation so that all laws are rendered helpful to them and useless to others.

Ex-president Roosevelt was hailed as the great trust buster. When Teddy took office Senator LaFollett states that there were 146 trusts. After nearly eight years of Teddy's trust busting, Senator LaFollett declared that there were but 10,463 trusts left, and to back up his statement he published the list. At that rate how long will it take Teddy's successors to bust the rest of the trusts? To the common people, then,
the question arises: "Why, since public opinion is so overwhelmingly against trusts, can we not rid ourselves of the evils of the trust? The answer is: The general public does not understand the nature of the trusts and therefore does not know how to handle them. The trust owners, through the daily press and other periodicals which they control, have taught you what they wish you to believe. And what they have been feeding you has been to your detriment and for their benefit. So far, most of the well-meaning anti-trust people have handed out indiscriminate attacks on trusts and they have assailed the trusts as wholly bad and urged their immediate destruction.

This is a blunder. In so far as the trust is a mere combination of persons or corporations producing or distributing goods, it is merely a form of partnership, and is no more objectionable than the joining of teams to pull a log over a hill, or of two persons for the purpose of renting a store or running a liverystable. Nor does the large capital of a trust make it more dangerous to the public interests. That a dozen or fifty persons or corporations should unite in a trust is the same as if a dozen or fifty persons should unite in a corporation. In neither case is there any injury to the people merely because of the combination. The modern trust is an evolution from the corporation or partnership, just as the partnership was an evolution from the industrial state in which the shoemaker or weaver owned his own tools and was his own employer.

The main objections to trusts must therefore be found outside of their large capital or large number of stockholders.

During the nineteenth century a great revolution took place, not only in the economic world, but also in men's minds. Insight into the causes of social development has increased tremendously. As far back as the forties Marx and Engels showed—and from that time
on every step in social science has proved, that in the last analysis the history of mankind is determined, not by ideas, but, by economic development, which progresses irresistibly obedient to certain underlying laws and not to anyone’s wishes or whims. In the foregoing chapters I have shown how it goes on; how it brings on new forms of production which require new forms of society; how it starts new wants among men which compel them to reflect upon their social condition, and to devise means whereby to adjust society to the new system in accordance with which production is carried on. For we must always remember, this process of adjustment does not proceed of itself; it needs the aid of the human brain.

Without thought, without ideas, there is no progress. But ideas are only means to social development; the first impulse does not proceed from them, as was formerly believed, and as many still think; the first impulse comes from economic conditions.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF Trusts.

The competitive system passed through many stages of development before arriving at the trust stage. The first trust was formed when two merchants on opposite sides of the street decided to quit fighting against each other and to start fighting for each other. They closed up one store and joined forces. Half of the help was no longer needed and therefore discharged. Still the two merchants made more money than before, while the public enjoyed lower prices. From time to time as larger machinery and improved methods were developed, groups of people formed companies. These in turn became corporations, then trusts, and finally monopolies. Each of these steps were taken as a matter of necessity. They were taken to save themselves from ruinous competition. The trusts appeared not as the result of scheming men. Large machinery made
inevitable the joint ownership of production and distribution.

The trust came as the result of "the survival of the fittest" and the destruction of the unfittest. The evolution of capitalism into new forms of organization still continues. And these new forms are created just as the old ones were, by economic necessity—not as the result of good or bad men.

The trust operates with the latest machinery and with the least possible waste, and no individual or firm can stand up in competition.

Formerly two firms that bought raw material in the same market, hired help in the same market and sold goods in the same market, could not prevent final consolidation. Such firms could have but one of these three endings, viz., First, if either proved in the slightest degree to be the superior of the other it would drive the other into bankruptcy and absorb its weaker rival. Secondly, they could both fight themselves into bankruptcy and a new firm take the place of both. Thirdly, they could refuse to fight and ruin each other and combine direct. Thus we see that in all of the three contingencies consolidation is inevitable.

The trust is therefore the inevitable outcome of competitors struggling to avoid bankruptcy. If the competitors had refused to combine consolidation could not have been prevented. It would have come by the process of elimination of the more poorly equipped, or the less capably managed, followed by the survival and enlargement of the establishment best fitted to survive in the midst of such an economic warfare. The trust simply does intelligently and with foresight, without bankrupting the competing parties, what competition would have accomplished by the familiar old road of business failure and bankruptcy.

It will be noticed that the trust does not naturally arise until there are more factories contending for the
same market than are needed to supply that market. It is because the market cannot employ all, that some must fail, and hence, the fight for survival. The trust of course cannot sell more goods than the market needs and therefore the trust closes down a part of its factories. Without the trust the same number of factories would close anyhow, but they would do so by bankruptcy. Having gotten rid of all competitors, having closed the unnecessary factories, the trust proceeds to use its surplus profits to purchase related industries and the source of raw materials.

**THE FOREIGN MARKET.**

According to Census Bulletin No. 150 the average skilled mechanic produces $2,471.00 worth of goods and receives in wages but $437.00. It is self-evident that the laborer's wage of $437.00 will not buy back his total product of $2,471.00. After allowing for raw material, wear and tear of machinery, etc., the capitalists have a net profit of over two billion dollars worth of goods on hand which must be sold abroad. All other capitalist nations have a similar surplus and are also seeking foreign markets. Armies and navies are necessary to obtain and hold these markets. That is why Russia and Japan fought. That is why we trounced Spain. Markets are the cause of all modern wars. Only when the laborer receives enough in wages to buy back the full net product of his toil will wars cease.

**THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST.**

The same process of elimination takes place among those trusts which are seeking foreign markets—the stronger devouring the weaker until the international trust is formed.

Already the capitalists have established immense factories and industries in foreign countries. Hereafter when the workers in the U. S. strike for decent wages
and sanitary conditions the capitalists will simply close down their factories here and operate those in China or elsewhere. Thus they can force the American laborer to accept the Chinese coolie's wages (a mere handful of rice) or starve.

Thus does the trust become international and all-powerful. The trust must of necessity keep on absorbing its rivals and re-investing its profits until we have an international world trust owning the earth. Such is the logical and inevitable culmination of capitalism. And this is not to be the "Parliament of man, the federation of the world." It is to be the parliament of dollars, the federation of the despoilers of the earth. How does it strike you?

**THE COLLAPSE OF TRUSTS.**

I have made it plain that world wide consolidation is inevitable. I concede that the picture thus far looks dark, but there is a silver lining. The final collapse of capitalism is also inevitable and for the following reasons:

(a) When the world-wide trust has finally conquered its competitors there will be no foreign markets in which to sell its goods; (b) Then the trust will have no place to invest its profits and stagnation will follow; (c) The trust can then no longer employ its toilers as there will be no foreign market in which to dispose of its surplus goods and no place to invest its profits and there will be no other way to get employment, because of this one great trust owning the world.

Benevolent Feudalism, which the capitalists propose to foist upon the workers at a propitious time, contemplates the employment of just enough of the workers to supply the idle rich in royal luxury and starve or kill off the rest.

This plan will not succeed because the capitalists will be so few in number and the exploitation so plain
that the workers will not submit to the "full-dinner-pail" for the few and starvation or death for the rest.

The capitalists would doubtless attempt to improve the lot of the few workers they employ to keep them contented. But it should be remembered that serfdom quickly disappeared when the Lords improved the lot of the serf. This was true of the slaves of Rome when their condition was improved. In every age when the capitalists offered the toilers a half-loaf they promptly took the whole bakery. It will hold true when private ownership collapses. Indeed the future is rosy with the promise of brighter days.

TRUST BUSTING.

"Bust the trusts," shout the people and the politicians. But how will you bust or even restrain them? Every form of anti-trust law has been tried. All have failed miserably. When the first attempt was made to restrain the trusts the trusts were weak and the "restrainers" strong. Today after a generation of trust busting, the trusts have grown to titanic power and their opponents have dwindled to insignificance in comparison. How do you expect to restrain them now if you could not restrain them when they were young and weak? Every nation has tried to bust the trust. None have succeeded. Today the trusts are the government. Who, then, shall restrain them? The trust is the legitimate child of capitalism, but it has devoured its parent. Has a single real trust been forced to dissolve? No. Have the prices of commodities been brought down as a result of these legal victories? No. Have these so-called legal victories raised the wages of the toiler? No. If you doubt it bear in mind that government reports show that wages increased 18% while commodities advanced 60%. Therefore the wage worker is exactly 42% worse off than when trust busting began. Has the wealth and power of the great
capitalists been decreased, the freedom and comfort of the working class increased, or even the middle class restored to its old importance and independence? You know very well that none of these things have been accomplished. The occasional prosecution of a trust has had no more effect in squelching the trust than the occasional killing of a Russian official has had in destroying Russian despotism. The trust busters have been sincere enough. The trouble is that anti-trust legislation itself is entirely contrary to the current of economic progress. It is practically unenforceable, and therefore it cannot accomplish the impossible.

**TRUST REGULATION A FAILURE.**

That is why we find packing house regulation a failure, railroad rate regulation a failure, food regulation a failure, corporation regulation a failure, graft regulation a failure, and all regulation a failure. After all these years of universal failure we still find people so simple-minded as to call for "more trust regulation" and more "trust busting." It is to laugh.

**25,000 BANKRUPTCIES ANNUALLY.**

During 1911, 13,431 merchants failed, with liabilities of $191,000,000. In manufacturing and trading, there were 12,652 more that failed, and went down to bankruptcy with total liabilities of $201,000,000 more, making a grand total of $400,000,000. During panics these numbers are doubled and often trebled. The Socialists are not destroying these firms and industries. The onward march of economic evolution is eliminating them as useless and out of date.

It is high time for the people to realize that the day of small concerns is past. The day of competition among the capitalists is also forever past. The people should realize that neither trust legislation nor the most powerful organization of labor can cope successfully with such combinations of capital; that the
great capitalists are in the saddle and ready to use spur and lash; that half-way measures will not serve in such an emergency; that trustification has reached the point where there is but one choice for the workers—either they must submit to despotic rule on the economic field, or they must themselves act on the political field, act on the lines indicated by the Socialist platform, viz., the common ownership of the things which the trusts have centralized. In other words, let the nation own the trusts as well as all other things which the people use in common—this would establish upon earth the brotherhood of man—which is Socialism.
The trusts are inevitable—they are uniting the thousand and one small and wasteful competing firms into one gigantic labor saving concern, ready to be taken over by the toilers who alone are capable of operating them. The trusts have made Socialism practicable, nay inevitable. It only remains for the workers, thinking and acting together, to catch up with the march of events, to understand the object lessons which the march of events daily puts before them, to use their political and economic power to transform the great industrial plants into agencies for reducing the burden of labor and giving to each worker equal opportunity and the full net product of his toil.

In the fields, factories, mines and workshops are being learned the lesson of co-operation and class solidarity. When the great trinity—economic determinism, surplus value, and the class struggle shall be thoroughly understood—that day the toilers of the world will be free.

THE CLASS CONFLICT.

There exists today two industrial classes, viz., the Capitalist Class and the Working Class. There is not and never can be any community of interests between these two classes. The one buys labor power; the other sells labor power. Their interests are totally and absolutely at variance. As stated before, the average skilled mechanic produces $2,471.00 worth of goods per year and receives in wages but $437.00. The difference between the two amounts, viz., $2,034.00 is consumed largely through rent, interest, and profit, and falls into the laps of idlers, the capitalists.

The “Class Struggle” centers right here.

The wage earners are struggling to get larger wages. The Capitalists are trying constantly to get larger profits.

If the workers’ wages are increased, the capitalists’
share must be decreased. If the capitalists' share is increased, the wage earners' share is decreased. The total amount to be divided between the workers and capitalists is just so much (a definite amount, $2,471.00), and if one class gets more the other class gets less. When one gains the other loses. Any person who cannot understand that should be examined for sanity.

If this isn't true, why do the capitalists try to get laws in their favor, and why do workers try to get laws in favor of the workers?

Yes, indeed, we Socialists affirm the "Class Struggle." We Socialists did not invent it—we simply point it out.

The Class Struggle is accurately reflected in the strike, the lockout and riot. Anything that would benefit one class would harm the other. This is self-evident.

The workers want higher wages and shorter hours, while the capitalists want the exact opposite.

Capitalists and others assert that there are no classes in this country. But five minutes later in the same speech they say it is wrong for the Socialists to "stir up classes." How can we stir up classes if there are none?

Oh! such logic. You may fool a few pinheaded weaklings with that old dope, but the most of them are next to the game.

Socialists claim that the cause of "class struggle" must be removed then all will be well. But this would be Socialism.

If, as will be the case under Socialism, the workers got all they produced, there wouldn't be anything to "class struggle" about. When workers get all they produce, shirkers will get all they produce—nothing.

IDENTITY OF INTERESTS.

If the interests of capital and labor are identical,
why do workers form unions and exclude capitalists? Why do Capitalists form associations of their own and exclude the wage-earners? Why do the workers resort to the boycott and the strike, and the capitalists resort to the blacklist and the lockout, if their interests are identical?

Why do the capitalists employ large lobbies to have legislatures pass certain laws—if not for their own benefit? Why do the capitalists use the courts to interpret the laws as they want them interpreted? Why do they use the judges to hurl injunctions against labor organizations, restraining them from picketing, from paying strike benefits, from publishing the names of "unfair firms," from doing away with the things that lead to victory? Why do the capitalists use the militia and the police to crush the strikers and drive them back to work? And you reply: "Because their interests are identical."

Therefore when Socialists speak of the Class Struggle they are simply recognizing a fact. They are not advocating the establishment of such a struggle. They are not urging members of these opposed classes to hate each other. It is a self-evident fact that different classes in society have different interests to promote. One of these derives its income from labor, the other lives from private ownership. One class receives wages, while the other receives rent, interest, and profits.

The class that lives by wages wants high wages and short hours. The class that lives by ownership wants high rents, dividends, and profits.

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS.

The owning class controls the government, and it is that government that protects them in their ownership and assists them in their struggle against the laborers. Whenever a person realizes that for over five thousand years there have existed side by side these two economic classes and determines to which class he belongs that
person has become "class conscious." Class consciousness consists only in the ability to see clearly this fundamental fact.

As soon as the toiling millions come to realize this fact and to act as a body along political lines, the employing class is sure of defeat. Because "class consciousness" is but another name for intelligence and that is why the capitalists declare "class consciousness an evil thing."

The Socialists recognize that the only way to eradicate classes is to abolish private ownership which is the cause of classes. Socialists recognize the fact that only when the workers shall also become the joint owners of the tools with which they work will all classes and class lines be forever abolished. Then there will remain but one class on earth—the useful class, the physical and mental toilers—that would be Socialism.

**CO-OPERATION VS. COMPETITION.**

Historically speaking, competition has been against the advancement of the race. Such society as we have, exists through the restriction of competition. The evolution of society is the elimination of competition and the substitution of co-operation. Co-operation, then, has been the law that has made for progress and civilization. While competition has been the condition for much of the struggle for life it has not been its law. Progress means the subjection of the conflict through the development of the higher law of service. There would have been but little progress had men not united their efforts for the common weal. The true principle of society and advancement is co-operation, and civilization is measured by its attainment. The whole history of human advancement is simply the story of getting rid of conflict. At first every man fought for himself—then groups co-operated in war, then nations, then groups of nations, and at last the world, and war will be over. At every step a larger union and the
elimination of internal conflict over a wider area. It is the same with industry—at first individual workmen, then groups in shop and factory, then co-operation, syndicates, trusts, and at last a complete union and the elimination of conflict. If competition and conflict are the essential means of advancement, then the whole history of civilization has been simply a lie. But such we have proven not to have been the case. If you place yourself in the condition of early man, you will find that the first step that he needed to take was to learn how to combine. One man alone is helpless. Men organized and co-operating systematically together are able to subdue the earth.

The same idea of growth and co-operation is shown in manufacturing. Formerly the individual worked by himself with simple hand tools. Later he developed into an employer who worked along with others whom he paid wages. Then he became a superintendent and did not work with his men but directed their work. Still later he employed a superintendent while he purchased the raw material or sold the finished product. Finally, he disposed of his factory to the trust and is now the owner of a block of trust stocks and bonds which he stows away in a safe and hikes across the pond to hobnob with royalty. The sons and daughters of these merchant princes inherit these stocks and bonds and become still greater parasites than their ancestors.

Private ownership of these stocks and bonds is solely responsible for these parasites and all other parasites. Socialists are arousing the workers to a state of “class consciousness” with the object in view of having the workers themselves own these stocks and bonds. The working class feels that they are capable of holding these stocks and bonds, and if they can’t they feel confident that they can hire some cheap office boy to hold the bonds for them. Harry Thaw holds enough stocks and bonds so that his income is one-half
million a year. Yet Harry is locked up in a lunatic asylum. Don’t you think, Mr. Workingman, that you can do as well as a lunatic? If not, don’t you think that you had better be examined for sanity? Think it over.

THE MIDDLE CLASS.

Thus far we have discussed the class struggle as between the large exploiters on the one side and the wage earners on the other. The question naturally arises what position will the small manufacturer, the small merchant, the small farmer take in this fight. These are often spoken of as the Middle Class.

It is plain that the trusts are rapidly reducing the middle class to bankruptcy or to wage slavery and tenantry. The bulk of the 26,000 annual failures mentioned in a previous chapter were largely of this middle class. Soon the middle class will be but a memory.

Remember that there are and can be but two systems of handling capital, Private ownership—Public ownership. The Republican, Democratic, Bull Moose and other parties all stand for private ownership. Every one of the leaders of these parties will tell you that they do not believe that the government should own all the mills, factories, mines, etc.; if they did they would believe in Socialism. Of all parties the Socialists alone believe that all the collectively used means of production and distribution should be owned collectively, so that no person on earth could ever again gather a penny of rent, interest or profit from the labor of any human being.

The capitalist class says, “Let well enough alone—we stand pat—private ownership is good enough for us.” The Socialists say, “We want the earth with a fence around it so that the workers will have equal opportunity and get the full product of their toil; much done, much received; little done, little received; nothing done, nothing received.”
PUJO REPORT.

As before stated, it was Karl Marx who fully explained the inevitable coming of the trusts and monopolesies years before an actual monopoly existed. Time has proven his analysis of Capitalism to be correct. Socialists of a later day have shown from time to time the actual results and named the specific corporations involved. Socialists have all along pointed out the rapid concentration of wealth into a few hands. Socialists have stated the truth yet they have been vigorously denounced by the press and pulpit as muck rakers, calamity howlers, and liars.

And now comes the Pujo investigating committee of the House of Representatives, sitting as a court and not only verifying all the contentions of the Socialists but proving, by the conspirators themselves, that the conditions are much worse. At these investigations it was shown and admitted that the Morgan group of financiers controlled, not a million, not a billion, but 25 billion dollars worth of wealth. It was shown how the Rockefeller group controlled at least another 25 billion of wealth. By a system of “interlocking directorships” every important industry and railroad in the U. S. is converted into one vast machine for robbing.

The total wealth of all kinds in the U. S. is estimated at 115 billion. The productive capital of the whole nation is not over 60 billion. Yet this baker’s dozen of Wall Street sharks (the Pujo Committee says exactly eighteen) control practically all the productive wealth of this so-called free America. So complete is this giant monopoly that the capitalists themselves testify that no important enterprise could be launched without the consent of Wall Street.

In the light of such admissions how childish to talk about “regulating” the trusts or returning to the good old days of “competition.”

History teaches that the wealth of any nation has
always ruled that nation and to all intelligent observers the U. S. has for a long time been ruled by these trust magnates.

It remained for the Pujo Committee to prove that this nation is run absolutely by an oligarchy of wealth endowed with a power beyond that ever possessed by monarch or any mortal man.

Again we say the trusts are a good thing—when the people own them; they are a bad thing when the trusts own the people. Therefore we say a good trust is one where the people are on the inside looking out, and a bad trust is one where the people are on the outside looking in. The remedy, then, is, “Let the Nation own the trusts and monopolies.”

**CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
<th>Total Wealth</th>
<th>Per Cent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76,680,000,000</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,362,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32,746,000,000</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14,000,000,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A glance at the above table shows the concentration of wealth due to the private ownership of the earth. Think of one per cent. of the people owning 63% of the wealth. Then think of 12 million families, with five people to the family, representing 60,000,000 human beings that possess only 9% of the wealth.

It should be borne in mind that any person that lives on rent, interest and profit is living on the sweat of those who toil. In the above chart this so-called “Middle Class” is represented by the 8% who own but 28% of the wealth of the nation.

**FAKE REMEDIES.**

The onward march of economic development through the trust is fast wiping this middle class of exploiters off the face of the earth. In an effort to save themselves this middle class has proposed high tariff,
low tariff, gold standard, silver standard, income tax, single tax, no tax, reciprocity and other quack remedies too numerous to mention. These proposed remedies are advocated ostensibly for the benefit of the working class; in reality, all this yap and whine is to prevent the big capitalists from completely annihilating the middle class.

In substance the middle class says ‘Uncle Sam, for goodness’ sake don’t let the big capitalists freeze out us little capitalists. If you do, we also will have to go to work and make an honest living. Yes, Uncle Sam, we much prefer to ride on the backs of others and let them do the toiling, because toilers have been looked down upon, disgraced, dispossessed and disinherited for over 5000 years.’

**FAKE PARTIES.**

This middle class is represented in politics by the Republican, Democratic, Bull Moose, and other parties, and not one of them stands for the abolition of private ownership — the only thing that would abolish all classes. The struggle between the large and small exploiters has not been to protect the working class, but rather to determine which group of capitalists should have the sole privilege of robbing the toilers.

**THE REAL PARTY.**

The more intelligent portion of the working class has formed a party of their own, the Socialist Party. This party not only fights the big capitalist, but the little capitalist as well. This party knows that the big and little capitalists alike skin the workers, and if anything, the workers prefer to be sheared by the big shearers as the little shearers take flesh and all. The working class realizes that the co-operative commonwealth cannot be established without the total annihilation and burial of capitalism. The workers understand that reforms will not suffice.

All goody-goody people have tried to rid society of
its many economic ills by reforms. If all the reforms that have been tried were collected they would fill a fleet of Noah's arks. And why have these millions of reforms failed to reform? Because not one single reform measure proposed to do away with the cause. The cause of economic classes is private ownership.

A DREAM.

These reformers remind me of a dream that, by the way, was not all a dream. I dreamed that I stood on a ledge overlooking a mighty river whose banks, as far as eye could see, were lined with an anxious and weeping people. Presently I observed millions of drowning men, women, and children floating down this rapidly flowing stream. Occasionally the drowning shrieks for help would be answered by some hero on the bank who, risking his life, plunged into this roaring torrent and rescued from a watery grave some thankful soul. These heroes were given Carnegie medals and were applauded by the multitude on the banks. At other points I observed life-saving crews. Still millions perished annually, and the number kept constantly increasing. Finally a few, who did their own thinking, decided to find out why these millions of innocent human beings should be in the river at all. These investigators soon discovered a bridge up stream. This bridge stood spanning the river and connecting the natural resources on the one side with the factories, mills and workshops on the other. It was necessary to cross this bridge in taking the raw material to the mills and factories. This bridge was privately owned and the toll was so high that the masses could not save the price and consequently they took the raw material and tried to reach the factories by swimming the river. The private ownership of this socially used bridge was easily discovered to be the cause of the drowning millions.

The few investigators then developed an organiza-
tion to inform the millions of rescuers that their efforts were worse than useless. The organization grew rapidly in numbers and their motto was, “Let the people, all the people, own in common the natural resources, the factories and the bridge.”

Nearly all hirelings were opposed to this new idea. They said, “We stand pat. Let well enough alone. God in his wisdom has given the earth to a few and by divine right it belongs to them. We realize that millions of us stupid toilers sink in watery graves in this fierce competitive struggle, but our heroes shall own the bridge. We propose to give them an incentive to live by fleecing us. If our heroes were compelled to toil, we would be a common lot with nothing to look up to. Besides, the physical effort and heroism required to swim the river is a splendid preparation for the next world where we will get our full reward, plus a harp.”

To all this the bridge owners said, Amen. But those who did their own thinking said, “We believe that God made the earth and the fullness thereof for all the people; and if he didn’t we believe he would have designated the particular chunk of earth he wished each idler to have. We agree with Lincoln when he said, “We hold that if there is any one thing that can be proved to be the will of heaven by external nature around us, without reference to revelation, it is the proposition that whatever any one man earns with his hands and by the sweat of his brow, he shall enjoy in peace. I say that whereas God Almighty has given every man one mouth to be fed, and one pair of hands adapted to furnish food for that mouth, if anything can be proven to be the will of heaven, it is proved by the fact that that mouth is to be fed by those hands, without being interfered with by any other man, who has also his mouth to feed and his hands to labor with.

I hold, if the Almighty had ever made a set of men
that should do all the eating and none of the work, He would have made them with mouths only and no hands; and if he had ever made another class that He intended to do all of the work and none of the eating, He would have made them without mouths and with all hands. But inasmuch as He has not chosen to make them that way if any thing is proved, it is that those hands and mouths are to be co-operative through life and are not to be interfered with.”—(Abraham Lincoln, taken from his Cincinnati speech of September 17, 1859. Howells, page 148.)

The Stand Patters had many leaders and parties such as the Republican, the Democratic, and the Bull Moose, but all believed in owning the bridge privately. One and all believed in crossing the bridge if you had the price and letting those without the price sink or swim, live or die. They upheld and encouraged the rescuers along the banks. They opposed might and main the thinkers who believed the people should own the bridge. The new-idea-fellows were called, free lovers, home destroyers, muck rakers, anti-Christians, anarchists, and Socialists. They were maligned, insulted, and imprisoned; while many were shot or hung. The priests, preachers, poets, politicians, as well as all the kept press, made life miserable for them. Still their numbers increased.

They grew rapidly until they won the day. Then there was great rejoicing among the toilers because each and every human being could take all the raw material he needed, cross the bridge, feed the raw material into the factories and get the full product of his toil. And if they produced too much they closed the factories and had a picnic instead of a panic.

The children, these little buds and blossoms of humanity, were taken out of the factories and put into schools or turned loose in God’s fresh air and sunshine. The women, the mothers and sweethearts of the race.
were rescued from sweatshops and redlight districts and returned to the home and maternal duties that God or Nature's God intended.

These advanced thinkers did not contend that the restoration of the natural resources together with the factories and the bridge, would make the people equal, but they did claim that it would guarantee equal opportunity to all, and that all rent, interest, and profit would forever be abolished among men; and such proved to be the case.

These advanced thinkers were not so foolish as the fellow who was sure he had witnessed a perfect union when the grass widow married the vegetarian, only to discover later that the children all died of hay fever.

Soon after the abolition of private ownership it was discovered that 99% of all crime, prostitution, insanity, unemployment, poverty, disease, and kindred ailments were also abolished because their cause had been abolished. The physical, spiritual, moral, and intellectual growth of these people was truly wonderful. These new conditions proved that woman, the fairest flower on earth, was inherently and invariably pure and virtuous if given a chance, and was bad only when conditions compelled her to be bad. Under this new scheme of common ownership this whole river country blossomed like a rose.

And now, dear reader, this dream-picture should show you how utterly foolish it is to expect any relief from the Republican, Democratic, or Bull Moose parties since one and all believe in standing pat, or in reforming the evils while leaving the cause, private ownership, intact. Break away from this vast array of political deceivers, these would-be reformers and rescuers along the banks and join that ever growing army of advanced thinkers, the Socialists.

**THERE'S A REASON.**

Every plutocrat, every labor crusher, every red-light
prostitute promoter, every gambler, every swindler, every trust magnate, in fine every person who lives on rent, interest, and profit is fighting desperately to defeat Socialism, because they know that Socialism would once and forever end Capitalism.

Private ownership was established by force during barbarous warfare. But these ancient barbarous wars or even our modern wars are as nothing in their destructive effects and results compared with the civil war of daily competitive business which makes of every business man a hypocrite and liar. Modern business is based upon the principle, "might makes right"; but the field of battle has shifted from the domain of brave men and heroes of history and story, who pitted strength against strength in the open, to a civil war that rages on every hearth between brothers, friends and neighbors—a hand-to-hand conflict that stamps its imprint of destroying passions, cunning, and crime on every face. The war is at our very door, a hand-to-hand struggle: there is no rest, and woe betide the man who shows weakness or pity, or is caught without his knife.

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS.

If you analyze the history of nations you will find, no matter what their form of government, that private ownership divides the people into two distinct classes—owners and hirings, master and slave, rich and poor; and that the breach between these classes grows wider and wider, from the birth of the nation until the time when the wealth has gravitated into the hands of the few and the nation perishes.

This is history writ in large letters on the pages of time. It is not the form of government that causes the decay of nations. It is private ownership of the means of life.

A recognition of the Divine right of the modern kings of finance, the barons of industry, the princes of
privilege, who at once constitute both the legislative and the judicial power of this nation will ruin this nation also.

Are we automatons that we should follow century after century in the footsteps of folly, disaster, and crime? What are we given reasoning powers for if not to avoid mistakes and to profit by experience?

When we look over scarred battle-fields of the past where buried cities and crumbling ruins are silent monuments of man's struggle for knowledge and light, and realize that civilization after civilization has gone down to irretrievable disaster under the banner of private ownership, does it not seem strange that during all these centuries no mind grasped the idea of re-establishing collective ownership?

At last there arose to the emergency the great intellect of Karl Marx. It was he who rearranged political science. Since then all modern scientific discoveries have but substantiated Marx's analysis. Marx and all other modern Socialists contend that wealth, the product of mental and physical labor, is the accumulation of many generations, and no individual has a natural right to hold as his private property that which is the result of ages of accumulation and the product of the brain and manual labor of millions of individuals. This accumulation of the wealth of toil is an inheritance which belongs to the people, not to individuals privately. It is a trust that should be safeguarded from pillage and usurpation and should be handed down to our children's children.

Private ownership with its inevitable competition in the production and distribution of products is licensed robbery. And civil war with all its horrors follows as a result. Most crimes and degrading passions have their birth here; and heart sickness, wretchedness, and even the ills of flesh cry out against "the system." The French revolution and our own civil war were
picnics in comparison with this incessant warfare which never ends, where every individual engaged in it hides the rottenness of his soul by wearing a mask. Private ownership fans the flames of hell; makes cowards, thieves, and liars; breeds envy, selfishness, and greed; fosters hatred and is responsible for all our economic ills. To this god and idol, civilization is sacrificing every year millions of human lives that droop and perish in this inhuman struggle.

Socialists hear the cry of children, the weeping of mothers; and see in the faces of men the lines of care, worry, and anxiety that private ownership has wrought. Socialists recognize their kinship with their fellow man, and they dip their pens deep in the common misery that surrounds them, and it is not ink, but blood and tears with which they trace their awakening message to the world.

"IS IT PROSECUTION OR PERSECUTION?"
(The following appeared in the Minot, North Dakota, Iconoclast, July 26.)

"W. F. Ries arrested seven times at Plaza, N. Dak., for the same offense, viz: Defending himself from a half drunken brute who attacked Ries so savagely that the temporary platform upon which he was standing collapsed."

W. F. Ries, Socialist lecturer and author, seems to have been made the target for the vicious attacks of some of the opposition politicians.

On July 1st, while at Plaza delivering a lecture, a disturbance was raised by a big bully who was evidently coached by some of the local politicians, and during the altercation that followed the bully got the worst of it. In the melee that attended the scuffle the platform on which Ries was standing broke down, and at that juncture the marshal, who had up to that time been a minus quantity, appeared on the scene and arrested both Ries and the thug for disturbing the peace.
When the trio arrived at the lockup, the marshal was for locking both men in the same cell, but the crowd that had followed remonstrated so vehemently that he relented. There is no question but that the bully would have attempted to do harm to Ries had they been locked in the same cell together, as he is a large, powerful man, and it was stated that the bully was armed.

Ries was hounded all over North Dakota and arrested seven times all told for the same offence. The charges ranged anywhere from simple assault and battery to assault with intent to kill. To make a long story short, the criminal case charging Ries with "intent to kill" was tried in the district court, November 18. Every prospective juror in this case was promptly excused if he admitted that he had ever read The Appeal to Reason or any of Ries' books, or if he had ever heard a Socialist lecture. In spite of this outrageous proceeding the jury acquitted Ries in less than twenty minutes. By all law and decency the winning of the criminal case should have had the effect of quashing the $10,000 damage case, but it did not, and the case was allowed to proceed just the same. The $10,000 damage case was finally lost besides throwing all the costs on Ries. Ries had all the costs in the criminal case to pay notwithstanding he won the criminal suit."

These facts are recited here not because the writer happened to be the victim, but rather to show the class character of the courts. The same thing happened in New Castle, Pa. The toilers in the trust owned steel mills there insisted on the right of free speech. They were denied this right guaranteed by the constitution.

Although the government commission, appointed by the president to investigate the condition under which the steel workers toiled, showed that the conditions were simply inhuman, yet the owning class would not let the working class discuss their grievances in hall,
When these steel workers insisted upon their constitutional rights of free assemblage and free speech they were clubbed by the police, shot down by the militia, arrested, imprisoned and finally sentenced to twenty years in the penitentiary. Protest meetings throughout the country by the working class with a great rally of 10,000 toilers at New Castle is all that prevented a score or more from languishing behind penitentiary bars for twenty years.

The steel workers finally won their point, but like my Dakota case all the costs were assessed against the steel workers.

"THE APPEAL TO REASON" CASE.

Any one who seriously attempts to abolish the present system is sure to meet the combined attack of capitalists. They will endeavor to railroad all such to the gallows or the cross, as they did Jesus, or failing in that they will drag you through the courts until you are a financial wreck. This is forcibly illustrated by the attack on the Appeal to Reason, the great Socialist paper of Girard, Kansas. The Capitalist class, through one pretext or another, has had this paper defending itself in the courts for over fourteen years. The plutocrats openly boast that they will either bankrupt the editors, land them in prison, or drive them to suicide. Some of these persecutions against the Appeal have cost them over $12,000.

The case now being fought by the Appeal illustrates the desperation of the ruling class. This same Appeal to Reason unearthed conditions among the federal prisoners at Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas, that were simply indescribable. In fact they were so shocking that President Taft sent special commissioners to investigate the truthfulness of the Appeal’s charges. These commissioners not only substantiated the Appeal but their report shows conditions to be even worse. The Ft. Leaven-
worth officials who perpetrated the outrages were permitted to resign, but the Appeal editors for exposing the criminals were arrested and are now fighting to keep out of this same hellish Federal prison.

To maintain themselves in power the capitalist class is everywhere crushing the labor class without mercy. Wherever the workers, as a class, have banded together and demanded shorter hours, larger pay, or sanitary conditions they have invariably done so at the risk of imprisonment or death. The clash between capital and labor at Homestead is proof of this statement. In the coal mining regions of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, in the gold and silver mining regions of the west, among the textile workers at Lawrence, Massachusetts, among the timber workers of the south, in the turpentine camps of the the Carolinas, and among the garment workers of New York, and in fact a thousand and one strikes throughout the industrial world are constant proofs of this internecine war between capital and labor.

UTOPIAS.

Socialists are often criticised because they do not have a cut and dried plan of all the details of their proposed co-operative commonwealth. It is true that our platform intentionally and wisely leaves this item out. The entire Socialist platform boiled down to one sentence means that what the people use in common they should own in common and what the people use privately they should own privately. This would not make the people equal but it would once and forever establish equal opportunity for all. Then the mills, factories, mines, railroads, etc., would belong to all the people just as the schools, parks, bridges, fire-departments, city halls, courthouses, streets, state universities, etc., are already owned by the people. In short, modern scientific Socialism proposes the collective ownership,
democratic management, and equal opportunity to use the socially owned means of production and distribution.

From this definition of Socialism it will be seen that the useful mental and physical workers will get the full net product of their toil. Notice, that when the toilers once get full possession of the means of production and distribution, none of the product will go to those who do not in some way contribute to its production or distribution. Having the full product in their own possession the toilers will distribute it to suit themselves. Don't worry how they will distribute it. They may be foolish enough to give millions to a John D., a Carnegie, a Morgan, or a Gould so they can have monkey dinners, baboon suppers, or buy a Count or no Count, a Duke or Puke to marry their daughters. Perhaps they will be so foolish, but I doubt it.

Today, under capitalism, a toiler will build a palace and live in a rented shack, another will weave fine silks and wear rags, another will build autos and go afoot, another raise and prepare steak and eat sowbelly with stale liver on the side. Remember he does this now under capitalism because the barons of industry own his job. Under Socialism he won't have to divide up because he will own not only the means of production and distribution, but the total product—yes, all of it will be in the toiler's hands to do with as he pleases. If the capitalists thought the toilers would continue to divide up under Socialism they would not all be fighting against Socialism. Now honest, would they?

**METHODS OF ACQUIRING INDUSTRIES.**

Neither have these Socialists adopted any method of acquiring the mills, factories, mines, railroads, etc. However there are and can be but four methods; viz., purchase, confiscation, competition, pension. (These are fully discussed in "Monkeys and Monkeyettes" by
the author.) Remember that when you vote the Socialist ticket you do not even so much as consider one of these four plans. When you vote the Socialist ticket you decide once and forever to abolish capitalism by owning collectively the means of production and distribution. After the Socialists have been elected to power these matters will be fully discussed by all concerned and then each voter will cast his ballot for any method of distribution, or any of the various methods of acquiring the industries that his intelligence suggests. And whichever one of these various methods receives the most votes, that will be the one adopted. Yes, that is the way we Socialists propose to conduct affairs under the co-operative commonwealth — by direct vote of the majority.

**BLUE PRINTS OF SOCIALISM.**

On the other hand, there are those who point to the fact that private ownership has existed for at least 5000 years, that class struggle has continued for 5000 years, manifesting itself in civil war, slaughter, assassination, and murder, wholesale and retail; that these struggles have led to no marked sociological betterment. From this they conclude that wish and strife are not the only factors required to get out of the pit. They hint, in short, that some intelligent planning must be done in advance. Those who take this view should be interested in the following, by a diligent student of instincts, morality, and economics, Dr. O. E. Latham, Ph. B., Ann Arbor.

The word crooked takes on definite meaning the moment we agree upon the essentials of a straight line, while in the absence of said agreement there is no difference in meaning between straight and crooked. In like manner, assuming that all agree as to what a deal is, a crooked deal can be recognized only by agreeing upon the essentials of a straight deal.
What are the essentials of a straight deal?

The conduct of men is restricted to an extent by what is called natural law. In so far as natural law restricts us we find ourselves limited to a uniform condition in reference to rights. Gravitation, for instance, permits each one to jump towards the moon while it brings each one back with a jolt. **Like rights for each with like restrictions**—is nature's deal in apportioning rights. Now, if we can agree to regard "like rights with like restrictions" as the essence of a straight deal we are equipped to detect a crooked deal.

The conduct of men is restricted also by what is called human law, the law of the nation. In so far as the nation apportions rights it must follow nature's deal or the opposite; it must apportion unto its members like rights or unlike rights; a straight deal or a crooked deal.

The rights dealt out by a nation to its members are conspicuously four in number, each having its corresponding restriction. And fancy seems to have so arranged them in space as to popularize the expression, square deal. But it is to be remembered that the sides of a square should be straight.

The four rights referred to above may be thus indicated.

**Right I. The General Permit-Restriction,**—"Each member may respond to his sensations, feelings, and inferences in his own way;—provided that in so doing he injures not self or fellow, nor passively permits self or fellow to be injured.

**Right II. The Marriage Permit-Restriction,**—"Each member may respond to the copulative instinct;—provided he is of sound mind, of legal age, and conforms to the provisions of monogamous marriage and of privacy.

**Right III. The Political Permit-Restriction,**—"Each member may take direct part in shaping the policy of the nation and in appointing officers to carry
the policy into effect;—provided he is of sound mind, of legal age, and of male sex.

Right IV. The Ownership Permit-Restriction,—"Each member may own all the matter he acquires;—provided he acquires it according to the provisions of private ownership.

Of these permit-restrictions the first is general, applying to each and all, to life as a whole, from the cradle to the grave. It accords both verbally and intrinsically with 'like rights.' And when paraphrased thus,—"'Each may respond to his impulses provided he injures not,'" becomes a Golden Rule most satisfying and complete.

The second applies to but one instinct; and in so far as it denies to those of unsound mind copulative privileges, and in so far as it permits the female to marry at an age younger than the male, is intrinsically crooked. But, then, there are extenuating arguments based on the fear of reversion, or on the hope of improving the type by selective breeding.

The third applies to national ideals to be concreted into policy, laws, statutes. And in so far as it denies to women direct part in concreting these ideals is so obviously and crudely crooked that one's childish confidence in the honesty of his nation is not supported by evidence.

The fourth applies to the method of handling matter. It verbally accords with like rights, therefore it looks innocent. And a vast majority of the people stubbornly defend it as innocent, or about to be made innocent by some slight change in the restrictions. But the trouble with private ownership is in the permit itself, not in the restrictions. Private ownership, whatever the restriction, necessarily separates a people into owners and hirelings; into those who own various amounts, and those who rent out some part of their anatomy to these owners for the means of subsistence.
So crooked is this permit that a civilized nation is periodically in panic and occasionally in civil war without knowing how or why.

From the above it is evident that if we are to honor the morality transmitted to us by our fathers and mothers we must honor much that is crooked, while if we are to honor the straight and expunge the crooked, two changes at least are necessary.

First, to women must be granted all rights granted to men.

Second, private ownership must be expunged.

To grant women all rights granted to men involves no profound sociological change. Therefore, the grant could be made effective at once without social disturbance. But to expunge private ownership involves changes so profound, direct and indirect, that time, care, and a plan are necessary. Moreover, the plan must be so clear in all its essential features that no emotion or combination of emotions, no fear or combination of fears, no sentiment or combination of sentiments, can disturb the understanding.

Let us, then, consider the following plan, looking for defects, that we may arrive at a plan free from defects.

Measure a. Introduce on a national scale, unvexed by state rights, a simple and ready means of initiative and referendum, a simple and ready means of recalling officers, including presidents, judges, and decisions, elect the president by direct popular vote, and entertain the idea of annulling the senate, state and national.

(This measure is innocent. It merely clears the deck for action and gives some practice in direct national action.)

Measure b. Annul the right of executives to dispose of natural resources to individuals or corporations; begin at once to develop these resources by national initiative.
(Under this measure, within a few years, the values produced by the nation directly would become so great that they would have to be distributed by referendum vote. This would introduce much discussion. Each hamlet, village, and soap box would be debating the problem of distribution. The question might present itself in various language; as—

Resolved, that a people should distribute its product **consciously**, and for the glory of some in order that the many may be kept meek and needy but aspiring.

Resolved, that the highest ideal is to be as a little child, unconscious of the fact that a people is responsible for the method of distributing its product, in order that the evils arising may be attributed to powers above or to sin on the part of a few.

Resolved, that in distributing food to horses, one who feeds to a carriage horse as much as to 100,000 draft horses should be considered civilized rather than foolish.

Resolved, that we can complacently give of the annual product to Mr. X, Y, or Z as much as to any 100,000 of our ablest craftsmen so long as in so doing we are not conscious of our share of individual responsibility; but when this question has to be met face to face, by direct conscious vote, then will be determined just how much more than an ordinary man a hero should eat.

Resolved, that man does not live by bread alone, that his higher nature is sustained and strengthened by the hope of doing good by transforming others into hirelings.

Resolved, that a nation should distribute its product for physiological use, counting each good citizen a unit of equal distribution, and each child an appropriate fractional unit, possibly somewhat as follows: Between birth and one year of age, 1/20 unit, thereafter:
increasing that fraction annually by $1/20$ until it becomes a unit.)

Assuming that measures a and b have been adopted, the following measures are to be introduced at one time to complete the process:

Measure c. Annul the right of an individual to transfer to another individual real estate, stocks, or bonds.

(This measure does not disturb present conditions except for brokers. Those who own continue to own; those who own nothing continue to own nothing).

Measure d. Annul the right of inheritance.

(This measure is implied in measure c, but needs to be specified. It leaves material conditions as they are but expunges certain anticipations. Measures c and d together, in a period of twenty-four years, from deaths alone, would transfer to national management approximately 80% of all matter now privately owned. As a direct result, national management of industry would extend gradually day by day.

Measure e. To facilitate and hasten national management, the nation is to buy matter as fast as needed, issuing in payment 4% bonds. If the owner is married one-half of the bonds are to be issued in wife’s name. All bonds are to carry these provisions: Non-transferable. Upon the death of the original holder this bond reverts to the nation.

Measure f. Limit the income to be derived from the above bonds to $25,000 per year.

(Suppose that this nation buys of you $25,000,000 worth of property, issuing in payment 4% bonds. Now the face income of these bonds amounts to $1,000,000 per year. Of this amount, in order not to disturb your domestic habits seriously, introduce hardship, or fear of want, you receive $25,000. The balance, $975,000, is to be used towards removing fear of want from those who have never been free from that fear. This measure
places in the hands of executives a vast amount to be distributed).

Measure g. In distributing the annual national revenue, each good citizen is to be considered a unit of equal distribution, and each child an appropriate fractional unit.

(For a number of years the national revenue would be derived in part from the direct product, in part from inheritance, and in part from taxation as at present. This revenue would be distributed by means of booklets of coupons good for so much, for so long a time; good for use but not for hoard. These booklets would gradually displace all other forms of money. Of course individual incomes would not be equal for a number of years, but they would approach equality month by month. And the hireling would feel his condition improving rapidly for three reasons: First, because private employers would have to duplicate national wages and conditions or the hireling would transfer his services to the nation; second, because in addition to his wages each would receive from the nation, month by month, a booklet of coupons, while month by month the amount thus received would increase; third, because the hireling would look forward with scientific confidence to the end of hirelingship, for when all are hirelings, in the same sense, there are no hirelings.)

The above plan is submitted for criticism. In its favor this much may be said. It is definite, it would expunge private ownership, it would accomplish its mission in relatively few years, it would do so without subjecting the present generation of rich to annoying hardship, while it would uplift the conditions of the poor so rapidly yet so gradually that confidence would be the "best word."

FEARS AND OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Question. Are we not now alive, and who can tell that the sun would continue to shine, crops to grow, or
children to play if the product be distributed for physiological use?

Answer. It is impossible to prove that the nation will not perish the moment it introduces a straight deal. But there is no evidence that a change in human law entails a change in natural law.

Question. Would it not be a retrogressive jump for a rational nation to confine itself wholly to nature's blind plan in apportioning rights?

Answer. In one part of its policy, the first right above mentioned, the nation must conform to like rights or perish. Now, if in one or more of the remaining parts it introduces unlike rights its policy, morality, righteousness, becomes a mixture of contradictions, impossible for instincts, reason, science or vanity to harmonize. To reason, a nation needs to consider but two factors. To be rational, it needs to give due heed to all known factors involved. The process of reasoning is constantly correcting the errors of previous reasonings. Practically speaking, this is its chief function, for early reasoning overran a vast amount of territory. To assume that we are a rational nation rather than a herd of reasoning animals is one of the tricks of vanity that leads us to defend the miseries of a blunder rather than admit and correct the blunder. We are afraid to be sensible through fear of reverting to the primitive type, to man before the fall.

Question. What objection is there to private property honestly acquired?

Answer. Where a nation permits and safeguards private property there follows a struggle to own matter. For this ownership carries with it immediate private control over production and distribution, and incidentally a measure of control over the activities and incomes of hirelings. The struggle to own, usually called competition, in a few generations, gives to individuals control over the resources under the sover-
eignty of the nation. When this is accomplished, from that time on, not less than 72% of the people must be hirelings. (This is proven below.) Moreover, this percent. must increase as the nation matures. (This is proven). Again, this 72%, plus, is independent of shiftlessness, dishonesty, and so-called lack of brain, character, ability, push, etc. (This is proven). Therefore, there is no longer liberty to say, “Property honestly acquired does others no harm.” For we now know that property whether honestly or dishonestly acquired has the same effect in producing hirelings. One may as well say, Scarlet fever honestly acquired does others no harm.

Question. Cannot private ownership be so regulated as not to produce the hireling?

Answer. A stone has certain properties. Now if by heat we overpower some of these properties, the stone ceases to be a stone and becomes a something else, a lump of lime, for instance. Therefore, if a stone is to remain a stone its essential properties cannot be eliminated. The above truth is expressed in various ways; as, a thing cannot both be and not be at the same time; the effect cannot be removed without removing the cause, etc. Consequently, if we regulate private ownership so that it cannot produce the hireling, we have expunged private ownership. And from the nature of the case, the absence of private ownership brings production and distribution under direct conscious national management.

Question. Admitting that the product turned out under the stimulus of private ownership is sufficient for all if distributed for physiological use, what assurance have we that it would continue to be sufficient if that stimulus be removed?

Answer. An overwhelming majority wish to live, and to live well. They know that the earth is full of food if they but sow and reap. Therefore, urged by
hunger, fear of hunger, and the desire to live well, they will sow and reap, just as bees gather and store sweets. And one of the most delightful pastimes of this majority will be to devise tools, "Preventers of Hesitancy," which will urge the shiftless to make a hurried choice between usefulness and transmigration of soul.

Question. Would this not be despotism?

Answer. All are under the despotism of nature’s laws and the despotism of the nation, while the hireling is under an additional despotism, the despotism of the individual owner. By expunging this additional despotism all are under equal despotism. And strange as it may seem, liberty and equal despotism are exact synonyms.

Question. National management of industry involves much government. Does not that nation govern best that governs least?

Answer. Yes. And the proof is as follows: We find a minimum of government in herds of wordless animals where like rights are safeguarded. In these herds there are no professional sin-chasers. On the other hand, a civilized nation, by contracting to safeguard a crooked deal, assumes an ever increasing amount of government. For, though one of our instincts urges a crooked deal, the resultant of our eleven instincts urges a straight deal. And no combination of sentiments can expunge that resultant. Consequently, in defending crookedness a nation must make use of an ever increasing amount of force, and employ an ever increasing per cent. of its members as sin-chasers. A straight deal necessarily involves a minimum of government. Were we now to introduce the plan of distributing the product for physiological use it seems probable that fifty years from now our people would be as little conscious of human law as of natural law.

Question. Admitting that a straight deal is urged
by the resultant of instincts, and also by certain sentiments, yet the fact that each civilized nation, for thousands of years, has successfully enforced a crooked deal proves, does it not, that the ranking sentiments are in favor of a crooked deal?

Answer. Yes. But a sentiment is based upon an inference. So long as we are unable to prove the inference to be an error there is no known way of undermining the sentiment. If, however, advancing knowledge ultimately enables us to prove the inference false, then the sentiment becomes anxious. Only within the past few years has it been possible to prove, in the scientific sense, that private ownership is a malignant, not an innocent permit. With this knowledge at hand we can now appeal to the ranking instinct—Defense of the Herd.

Question. Would not national management of industry expunge individual initiative?

Answer. The individual is a fact and will continue to be a fact so long as the nation endures. An individual responds to his sensations, feelings and inferences. These responses are said to be individually initiated. When one discovers a new process, invents a new tool, or makes use of a substance hitherto unused, it is said to be the result of individual initiative. But observe, if others refuse to become interested, to use, to imitate, no sociological change follows the discovery. Social changes are the result of co-operative action. Again, owing to the instinct of fear, it is less difficult to interest a number who have something to gain and nothing to lose than to interest a number who have something to gain and much to lose. Therefore, national management of industry would facilitate the individual in getting a hearing. But it may be contended that individual initiative would not function in a social way in the absence of individual reward. The reply is, individual initiative does not directly function
in a social way, it merely functions. Society then neglects or makes use of the social features.

Question. Under the plan of distribution proposed, how could we provide for church activity?

Answer. Suppose Catholics, by referendum vote of Catholics, desire a priest for every 250 of membership. This vote would notify the executives of government to reduce the portion assigned to each Catholic by approximately 1/250 part. The same rule would apply to all other factional interests. All factional members become automatically full dues-paying members of that faction.

To show the effect of private ownership upon a nation let us take a section, nine married pairs, ranging in numbers of children from eight to none, but averaging four per family. Let these pairs be perfect machines controlled by a civilized nation. This nation believes in private ownership and contends that it is an innocent permit, and as a test compels each of these perfect machine families, at the start, to own just enough for efficiency and adequate independence, here represented by 24 shares of stock. The nation urges each family to produce as much as any other family and to save of its product annually an amount equal to $6\frac{1}{4}\%$ on its original stock, which amounts to a share and a half, or 12/8 of a share. But since it costs something to rear a child, each pair rearing children is allowed to reduce the ideal saving by 1/12 annually for each child reared. This scale of saving is continued for 24 years, then the children are permitted to inherit the accumulated wealth according to common law. Results are shown in the following schedule:
## SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line 1</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 4</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>11/8</td>
<td>10/8</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5-</td>
<td>4-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5-</td>
<td>4-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 9</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanation of the Schedule.

Line one represents nine married pairs, eighteen individuals, perfect machines under the control of a civilized nation.

Line two represents the number of children assigned to each pair, thirty-six in all, an average of four per family, all of the same age; later, they are to constitute the new generation, and inherit the accumulated stock.

Line three represents the amount owned by each pair at the start, 24 shares of stock, and for the section as a whole, 216 shares.

Line four represents the annual net savings of each family, as a fraction of a share of stock. Notice that the ideal saving, 12/8, is saved by family A only. Notice that each other family reduces this amount by 1/12 for each child reared. Notice that each family still saves.

Line five represents the total savings per family in a period of 24 years, and a total for the section, of 216 shares.
Line six represents the sum of the savings and the original stock, family by family, and for the section, a total of 432 shares.
Line seven represents the amount inherited by each individual of the new generation, according to common law.
Line eight represents a like result for and in any other section of the nation.
Line nine represents the amount owned by each pair of the new generation, assuming that all marry, each in his economic class.
Observe that:
Line three shows the families owning equal amounts, and the section owning 216 shares. Line six shows the families owning unequal amounts, and the section owning 432 shares. From this it is evident that the families have been divided into economic classes, and that the stock has been increased by 100%.
Line one shows the original section containing 18 individuals. Line two shows the new section containing 36 individuals. From this it is evident that the new section is an increase over the old of 100%.
At this point let the original section pass to its reward.
With an increase of 100% in stock and an increase of 100% in population, there is precisely enough stock to allow each individual 12 shares, and each pair 24 shares. But line seven shows that each child of classes, F, G, H, I, inherits less than 12 shares; and line nine shows that all pairs formed from these classes start married life with less than 24 shares. Now the children of classes, F, G, H, I, are 26 in number, and constitute 72% of the new generation.
Private ownership, then, throws precisely 72% of the new generation into subserviency as hirelings.
In a natural society what factors, if any, would reduce that per cent?

Partial answer. Since the members of the scheduled section were free from sin, and endowed with all recognized excellencies, it is at once evident that brain, character, industry, economy, honesty, saving, thrift, initiative, ambition, etc., would not reduce it. It is evident also that shiftlessness, extravagance, dishonesty, etc., would not reduce it. There are left, then, but few factors to be considered.

In a natural society children are born in sequence, mature, marry, and receive their portions at different times. How does this fact affect the schedule?

Answer: Pairs having more than one child would save more than the scheduled amount. But, as the children marry, each would receive his proportional amount of the savings only; later, each would receive his share of the original 24 shares. Making the best adjustment possible, this would force 91% of the new generation to begin wedded life as hirelings.

In a natural society there is a death rate among children. How does this fact affect the schedule?

Answer. Assume that, in a society averaging but four children per family, a death rate of 40% is the highest possible consistent with survival. Then the superficial conditions of the problem may be met by dividing five times the savings of each family as scheduled in line five by three times the corresponding number of children. This still throws 72% into hirelings.

In a natural, civilized society there is a measure of dishonesty. How does this fact affect the schedule?

Answer. To fleece owners tends to turn them into hirelings, and to increase the per cent. of hirelings; while for owners or hirelings to fleece hirelings, though it annoys them, leaves the scheduled per cent. unaltered.
Occasionally the rich marry the poor. How does this fact affect the schedule?

Answer. Should all the rich marry the poor, the scheduled per cent. of hirelings would be reduced from 72% to 56%.

Conclusion. The owners in the schedule are owners of small amounts not millionaires; private owners, not trusts; owners free from sin, not malefactors; therefore, provided private ownership be safeguarded, no amount or kind of regulation can obviate the forcing of a vast per cent. into hirelings, nor obviate a continuous increase in that per cent. In other words, private ownership is a disease that can be cured only by surgery.

Workers—Produce everything and get only 17%. Shirkers—Produce nothing yet get 83%. According to Census Bulletin No. 150, the average skilled mechanic produces $2471 worth of goods and receives in wages but $437. Therefore, when you vote the old party ticket, it costs you $2,034 to do so.
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No matter whose lips that speak, they must be free and un gagged. Let us believe that the whole truth can never do harm to the whole of virtue; and remember that in order to get the whole truth you must allow every man, right or wrong, freely to utter his conscience, and to protect him in so doing. Entire, unshackled freedom for every man’s life, no matter what his doctrine—the safety of free discussion, no matter how wide its range. The community which dares not protect its humblest and most hated member in the free utterance of his opinions, no matter how false or hateful, is only a gang of slaves.

Wendell Phillips.
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