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PROPS TO CAPITALISM

BY JOHN W. SLAYTON.

"PROP"—To support or prevent from falling by placing something under or against; to support; to sustain, in a general sense, as to PROP A DECLINING STATE."—Webster.

"I prop myself on the few supports that are left me."—Pope.

It may, and no doubt will, be asked by many readers of "Props," "What better foundation have you Socialists to build on than those herein condemned?"

We reply, The Great Common People—Let them Prop their own Nation.

TAFT AND LINCOLN—A CONTRAST.

The former said: "There are those who do not believe that all people are fitted for popular government. THE FACT IS, WE KNOW THEY ARE NOT. Some of us dare not say so, BUT I DO. * * * We are called upon now—we of the Bar—to say whether we are going TO PROTECT THE INSTITUTION OF THE JUDICIARY AND CONTINUE IT, INDEPENDENT OF THE MAJORITY, OR OF ALL THE PEOPLE."

Lincoln said: "This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it. * * * Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or EQUAL HOPE IN THE WORLD?"—(Quoted from the New York American.)

Taft is with, of and for the "props" as they are. He is OLIGARCHICAL. Lincoln was with the people, and for them. He was DEMOCRATIC.

Judge Cooley, "America's greatest jurist," said: "Thirdly, and this is the thing I would call your attention to more particularly, as it is exactly in point, a third influence rises up as the RIGHTFUL INTERPRETER of this great charter of American RIGHTS and AMERICAN POWER (IN THE 'GOOD SENSE') of the land, WISER THAN THE JUDGES alone, because it includes within itself the wisdom of the judges themselves; and this may lead to the better instructions of the court, or to an amendment of the constitution by the COLLECTIVE MIND of the COUNTRY."

"PROPS TO CAPITALISM"

Has been written with the above sentiments in mind, those of Mr. Taft, Lincoln, Cooley and others, which have been clarified by the illuminating philosophy of SOCIALISM. Though small, we hope that it may assist many to get a clear view of the relation of men to things, and of things to men, so that those who toil, and without whom the nation would perish, will arouse themselves to the dignity of their real worth, and act with intelligent self interest, to the end that THE "COUNTRY (the whole world) WITH ITS INSTITUTIONS" shall belong, not to the few, but to the useful, to those who help make it fit to "INHABIT." J. W. S.
THRIFT AND ECONOMY.

We are told that if the working class would prove themselves worthy,

First—By working in the interest of their employers (that is, by being industrious, always on hand when wanted, always doing a full day's work each and every day employed) they would by such efficiency prove so "invaluable" that there would be no question as to wages.

Second—We are told that if in addition to being thus thrifty, industrious and efficient, we were to be "economical," always "saving a part of our wages for the rainy day," most of our troubles would disappear.

Third—We are told that if we would only "quit drinking"; become perfectly sober, (hence all the more "efficient" and able to save still more) the last of our troubles would roll from our shoulders, like the burden did from those of Bunyan's Pilgrim.

Let us examine the points of these "Props":

First, in the matter of industry and efficiency. No sane man will deny that it is a virtue to be industrious, nor that this virtue would be enhanced by efficiency.

But why should the working class alone practice this virtue? Shall we do so to the end that the exploiting class may abandon even the shadow of it?

As a matter of fact, is not this the actual state of things today? When such a one-sided regime obtains, do not these factors, which of themselves are virtues, work disastrous results to all concerned?
For example: The more efficient we become the more we can produce in a given time, and the steadier we work, the higher grows the mountain of products; and if we who produce this mountain of wealth can buy back only an ever lessening part of it, does it not become clear that our own industry and efficiency soon produce so great a surplus that it becomes necessary to close the plant, and, regardless of our virtuous attainments, we become idle through no fault of our own? As idleness is not a virtue, if industry is, we are face to face with the apparent paradox of having been so virtuous that its too steady application will have left us without the means to further practice it!

The exploiting class, most of whom never work, and are therefore always idle or worse, are not given the same advice that is given us; nor do they seem to see the fallacy of the doctrine when preached “at” us for them; yet they in their idleness are not called “loafers” or “no-accounts,” but are referred to as the “upper” or “better” class.

Why?

ECONOMY.

Of course, the working class should practice “economy,” for is not extravagance a vice, and is not economy a virtue? To be sure!

Then we should eat sparingly; in fact, we have philosophers who tell us how to live on ten cents per day. At this rate a family of five could live on fifty cents per day; therefore ’tis argued, it is not a question of wages, but a lack of economy on our part. Suppose
we accept this advice and eat less and cheaper food, will not the result be to sooner close many factories, and thus again illustrate the silliness or worse of such purposeful advice?

Shall we wear cheaper clothes and fewer of them? Would not this in turn cause many factories to close all the sooner, and thereby deny to thousands the opportunity of exercising the virtues of industry and efficiency?

Again, suppose we do wear cheaper clothing and eat less and cheaper food and succeed in saving for a "rainy day," would not that hasten on the coming of the "rainy day," and from the very nature of the circumstances involved, limit our ability to provide for it? In addition to this, the fact of having saved (if we could do it) would prove that our wages were sufficient, or even too high, and would not this in turn furnish the best possible excuse for cutting them?

Those of us who have served on wage-scale committees know how anxious the "bosses" are to find where some workers have bought and paid for a home, or have a few dollars in bank; for when they could do so they would argue for hours in an effort to prove that it was the extravagance of the rest of us that made a raise in wages seem necessary.

It can thus be seen that when the working class exercise the virtue of home-getting it is used in an endeavor to force us from the basis of commendable economy to that of niggardliness.

We may here reasonably ask, Why should those of us who produce all the wealth not have food in plenty and wear the best of clothing and live in the best of houses?
Why should economy be preached “at” the workers, while reckless extravagance is indulged in by those who produce nothing of value?

The answer is simple: If we can be induced to accept this preachment the exploiter will have all the more to spend in more or less vicious extravagance!

He who receives less than the equivalent of the service he renders in the production of wealth cannot practice economy, but rather lives a slavish existence of debasing self-denial.

He who revels in more than he produces lives a vicious life, even though the methods that make it possible are legalized. Whether measured from the “bottom” up or from the “top” down, the inherent dishonesty of the system thus supported misdirects the virtues involved, and produces “dead sea fruit,” instead of that healthy kind the equable distribution of the products of toil would insure.

When we speak of the exploiting class as a parasitic class, we are told that the members of that class are on top because of superior brain power; that they are where they are because of inherent merits, and that they, “like cream, naturally come to the top.”

We can with much more force reply that that which is on top is not necessarily, nor is it always, “cream.” SCUM IS ALWAYS ON TOP, and it is usually dangerous to health.

DON'T DRINK.

Who will deny that drinking intoxicants is bad? But why is this accepted fact used almost exclusively as a basis for thousands of
sermons, tons of articles and a countless number of speeches that are made, written and delivered “at” the workers, the tenor of which is to the effect that it is not so much our lack of proper wages as it is our big “drink bill” which keeps us poor?

When this big drink bill is named, our advisers never separate the champagne part of it from the 5-cent beer and 10-cent whisky portion the workers are responsible for. The Seeley suppers and Waldorf-Astoria dinners are included in the bill, and the workers are forced to bear not only their own shame, but that of the rich as well.

Yet we are told that if we would quit drinking, we could save. If this be true, then it is not low wages nor high prices that is responsible for poverty, but our extravagant drink bill.

Let us see as to that: We find the per capita drink bill (including the share of the “upper class”) is $12 per year—the price of one bottle of champagne we DON’T drink. If this were saved annually, we would still be poor.

Did you ever hear the champagne drinker preached “at” to the end that he should thus economize by drinking less so dividends could be cut? We guess not! Why? If economy is such a good thing that by practicing it we can save a little, and hence get along with our current wages, would it not be equally good for the dividend taker to practice this virtue so he could live on less in the shape of dividends?
THE WHISKY TRAFFIC.

Are we defending the whisky traffic? No, not by any means; but we loathe this one-sided morality and preachment. If we should economize in food and clothing, and stop drinking so we could save some of our wages, why not cut out the $5,000,000 mansions, the $100,000 diamond necklaces and private idle pleasure yachts? Then DIVIDENDS would not need to be so high.

When our advisers, or those in whose interests the advice is generally given, are willing to take it in the same measure we are expected to do, the necessity for its giving will have disappeared and along with it the ills sought to be corrected.

A TEMPERANCE SERMON.

Fellow workers, DON'T DRINK! We know very little when perfectly sober and less when wholly or partially drunk!

The cheap stuff our wages enables us to buy is so criminally adulterated that it tends to shorten our lives. If any life is to be shortened by drinking, it should logically be the life of any one who makes it for PROFIT’S SAKE! LET US STAY SOBER, not that the amount saved thereby would enable us to start a bank or bribe a congress, but to the end that we may be able to think clearly and still more clearly until we arrive at the real solution of our problems.

ANOTHER CONTRADICTION.

As bad as drunkenness is, the drinker is, in a surprising degree, a help to the sober man. Suppose two men apply for the same
job, the one known to be sober, industrious and efficient, the other given to drink and largely unreliable: Which one will get the job? The sober one, of course; and that without question of wages, so far as the two men are concerned. But if both are sober and efficient it will at once become a question as to which one will take the job the cheaper. Thus sobriety, which is a virtue, is made to react against its possessors under this system of profit-taking.

We see in the foregoing, not the lack of virtues in the "Props" in question, but how impossible it is for them to find proper expression when we try to apply them in a system so lacking in virtue as is this system of capitalism.

Good details cannot be made to fit a bad principle, try as we may!

VICE AND IMMORALITY IN THE NAME OF "BUSINESS."

Some one has said that "Business is war," and as previously quoted, Sherman said—"War is hell," and when the STATE has declined to the point where business has fallen to the depth shown in the following, then indeed it can be truthfully said that "business depends for success upon the perpetuation of hell,—that is, our SOCIAL HELL.

"Business Men Want Vice Crusade Ended."

"Milwaukee, Wis., June 1.—A petition from one thousand business men and merchants was received by Winfred C. Zabel, the Socialist State's attorney of Milwaukee county, protesting against the vice crusade he is now carrying on with the view of wiping out the red light district.
"They say in plain, unmistakable English that they want Milwaukee's vice district to remain intact because they and their families, looked upon as respectable in every sense of the word, depend upon vice and immorality and disease and filth for the bread that goes upon their tables, for the shoes that protect their children's feet and the wherewithal that keeps them upon this planet."

"The merchants claim that if the red light district is abolished their trade will be demolished and they will be forced out of 'business'. They claim that the State's attorney ought to keep his hands off of such affairs."

"Zabel, for a time, was too pained to find words to express his feelings when he received the petition from these business men, who depend upon the vice district for the life of their establishments."

"'This is really the most pathetic and tragic document that has ever come into my hands,' said Zabel this morning. 'This petition tells a terrific story. It shows what our civilization has fallen to."

"'I wonder how any one of these petition signers would feel if they gathered their family around the supper table and said, "My wife, you depend upon the degradation of womanhood for the very food you eat; my children, my efforts to keep you pure rests upon the disease and filth of an army of women.""

"'How would they feel if they said that, I wonder? This is grim tragedy. It shows how vice and immorality has become a mainstay of society (another "PROP"). But it shows, all the more, that the time for vigorous and fearless, intelligent and uncompromising action has come.'" (Copied from the Chicago Evening World, June 3, 1912.)

Is a state of society, thus propped, worthy your support?

This took place in the city and county recently "redeemed from the Socialists" (?). "Props" to a "declining state." We have no other comment to make. There is no language more eloquent of the "tragedy" in the above than the facts themselves are.
THE GOOD MAN THEORY.

A more fallacious argument has never been used than that of the “good man.” Over and over, year after year, we hear apparently intelligent men say, “All we need is honest men,” “God-fearing men,” men who will treat the laborers “right,” men who can be sent to Congress and “not sell out,” and so on and so on, ad nauseum. As a matter of fact, the better the man who supports a bad principle or system, the worse it is and will be for the multitude who must live under its influences.

The “good man,” unconsciously, but none the less effectively, lends the respectability of his personality to the things he supports, and by so doing obscures the vision of those who mistake his character and personality for the matters to be considered, and of those who imagine that since the man is “good” he would not support anything that is not equally good.

AN EXAMPLE.

Thousands of slave-holders were as good men as can be found anywhere. Many of them were kind, hospitable, charitable, courteous, would pay their debts, and treated their slaves with a remarkable degree of kindness. Will any one argue from this fact that slavery was an institution worthy of perpetuation?

On the other hand, there were some Simon Legrees. Will any one argue, or try to, that it was such characters that made slavery bad? The good slave-holders were taught to believe in the system, and when to this we
add that feature of incomparable importance, economic interest, we can understand
the question of honesty and goodness fairly well. Still, the average man, seeing only the
gentility of the "good men," insisted that the system was not at fault, and so we find the
good man was in reality the slave's greatest enemy; for the slave himself, like many
wage-slaves of today, could not bear the idea of rebelling against a "good massa."

It was the inherent viciousness of the system that gave Legree his opportunity, and
his character helped to break down the system, for only through him many were in-
duced to look beyond the man and see the system which furnished him opportunity for
such infamies.

Suppose two men go to Congress, the one bearing the reputation of being honest and
the other dishonest,—a Gore and a Lorimer, for instance. We will all watch and suspect
the bills the latter champions, and accept almost without question those the former
sponsors; yet, if we look closely we will find that the one is, politically, only a St. Clair,
the other but a Legree. Both believe in the prevailing system of private ownership of
the means of life. The one wants the master to be lenient, the other cares but little in this
respect. It will be found that the one, the "good man," becomes a good support of this
"declining State," while the other, like Legree, is hastening the end of it; not because
he wants to, but because we look beyond him at the things he stands for.

Here is an employer who grinds his laborers down to the lowest possible level. All
call him heartless, and many begin sooner
or later to question his right to own those things which give him such opportunity. Here is another employer, who gives the “best wages and conditions he can afford.” Thousands insist that this latter kind of man as owner and law-maker would solve the entire problem. They fail to see that it is just this kind of men who prolong the agony by rallying to the support of this system millions whose support furnishes the other kind their opportunity.

A good monarch is better than a bad one personally, but no MONARCHY is good! A “good” monarch paves the way for the bad one, hence he is the worse of the two, not by personal comparison, but in the reaches of the ever-coming tomorrows.

The “reformers” (or at least some of them) are “good men”; but trying to reform a bad system is like giving quinine to the victims of an ague swamp, and preserving the swamp intact. A “bad” man draining, or desiring to drain, such a swamp, would be an angel to the victims by comparison of results to be attained, though perhaps not by individual comparison.

Let us not be deceived because there is good timber in this good man “prop” that is using itself or is being used to prop up this “declining state.” If an old, rotten building is dangerous to life and limb, we do not desire to preserve the good “props” under it in order to keep it in existence, but we proceed to tear it down and make room for a better structure; or, if we do not intend to build another in its stead, we know the bare ground is better than a dangerous structure.
PHILANTHROPISTS.

Many of these "good men" are called philanthropists, because they give large sums to "charity," build libraries, donate to churches and endow universities.

We may say, a philanthropist is a man who gets a dollar from society that he did not earn, and then gives back ten cents of it as a sort of conscience case.

Here is a story which illustrates clearly what a philanthropist really is.

A Dutchman and his dog got lost in the woods, and after several days the Dutchman, fearing he would starve, decided he would kill and eat his dog. The dog Schneider was a good dog, and the Dutchman hated to kill him, but the instinct of self-preservation was too strong, so he reasoned with himself, and philosophized to the dog in justification of his contemplated act. The dog's honest looks disconcerted the Dutchman for a time, so he began to gather up some sticks with which to make a fire to roast the dog after he should get the necessary courage to kill him. The dog, faithful to his master (just as most workingmen are faithful to their masters) also brought some sticks and laid them down by those the Dutchman had gathered. (That is the way many of us do on election day, fill the ballot box with political sticks, ballots, through the power of which our masters make laws to roast us all the rest of the year.) This worried the Dutchman worse than before, so he again told Schneider what a good dog he had been, which of course pleased the dog, and, wagging his tail, he touched the Dutchman on the leg.
This “touch” gave the Dutchman a new idea, and he said, “Ox-tail soup is good; wonder of dog-tail soup would not also be good,” so he cut off the dog’s tail, made soup of it, and after he had eaten the soup, he gave the bone of the dog’s tail back to the dog; then looking complacently at the dog he said, “Schneider, ain’t I a philanthropist, for didn’t I give you a bone to save you from starving?”

The fact that the Dutchman was responsible for being in the woods did not count. The fact that the methods which permit, aye, make inevitable, the acquisition of the millions by a few and therefore bring on the very conditions of poverty and distress they pretend to relieve through their philanthropy, is lost sight of also. Had they been just, their charity would have not been needed, nor their philanthropy necessary.

The philanthropist is a good “Prop” to this declining state.

THE GREAT MAN AND SUPERIOR BRAINS.

No reasonable person will try to belittle mental power, or decry the best possible equipment; but when we are taught to believe that those in power, that those who “succeed” are where they are, and what they are because of their “superior” mentality, it is very easy to be confused, and all the easier misled.

We frequently mistake cunning for intelligence. Cunning, as distinct from knowledge, or intelligence, consists in “deceit, trickery; employing stratagems for a bad purpose.” (Webster.)
The fox, for instance, is cunning—much more so than poultry—but not one thousandth per cent so useful. In a contest between poultry and the fox we all know which would win; so we defend the poultry, not on the theory that the "fittest" will survive, but that the fittest shall survive, and the poultry, though the weaker, is the fittest.

In a contest between men, we laud the successes of the cunning, and when they succeed at the expense of degrading the lives of thousands of their fellow men, we call them (the successful) "great financiers"—"captains of industry"—say they are worthy of reverence, and insist that without their great ability the nation could not exist, when in fact it is the exercise of these traits that brings destruction to a nation, as does the cunning of the fox, if not prevented, annihilate the poultry.

Intelligence means "commerce of acquaintance, terms or intercourse; good intelligence between men is harmony." (Webster.)

Those who bribe a Congress, or pass class laws, acquire possession of a nation's resources and thus become the industrial and legal masters of a nation, are cunning. Intelligence would not permit such things, much less commit them. Most of our superior men, our great men, are cunning. Morgan and Rockefeller are cunning—Lincoln was intelligent.

Heroes are easily made of the meanest stuff. The exercise of cunning impelled by greed, having hastened a crisis, some one among the cunning (one who helped hasten the calamity) rushes into the breach and "renders patriotic service" (?) and we at
once style him a savior and national benefactor. If a thief should steal our all and to keep us from starving return a dollar, would you style him a benefactor?

Still greater confusion arises as between the professions and “common laborers.” The Doctor, for instance, is considered immeasurably superior to the ditch-digger, whereas the reverse is true. For example, the only virtue the Doctor dare claim for his profession is that he desires and is honestly trying to restore health to the sick. A good ditch-digger, digging a sanitary ditch, would do more in one week to make it possible for people to retain their health, than the Doctor could do in a whole year to help them regain it; therefore, the ditch-digger is actually worth more in one week to society than the Doctor is in a whole year. Not only that: while health is retained, time will not be lost as in sickness; pain will not be suffered, nor will there be a big doctor bill; whereas, in the case of the Doctor’s service time will be lost, much suffering endured, a big bill of expenses incurred, and deaths often result, at times due to the Doctor’s ignorance of what is wrong. So, in every count in the illustration “common labor,” that is to say, useful service, the exercise of intelligence, is the real superior and of most worth.

If useful service were made the criterion rather than personal success, there might be fewer heroes, but there would also be fewer hobos. There might be fewer so-called “great men,” but there would be a much greater nation. These are the very characters which, used in a deceptive way, become “props” of a declining state, that is to say, of capitalism.
We are blinded by the glamor of their "greatness," confused by the halo that is made to surround their acts, and thus made to feel dependent on them, so their position as "props" becomes as dangerous as the claims made for them are fallacious.

**Patriotism: Love of Your Country.**

Dr. Johnson said, "Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel." "Love of your country"? There is the rub! Whose country is it? It makes no difference how debased a people may become (that is, the great majority of them), appeals are always made to them in the name of "their country." If it is in Russia, where autocracy is most pronounced, "patriotism" is preached. If it is in Spain, where the special privileges of the Spanish exploiters of Morocco's resources are to be upheld, "patriotism" is preached. If it is in England, when the Jamison raiders, whose lust for gain had led them to seize the gold fields of South Africa (after which these commercial brigands appealed to the "mother country" to protect their "property") "patriotism" is the shibboleth used in order to get the common people of England, who had nothing to gain, to shoulder the gun and go fight for "their country."

Prior to our rebellion, in the South it was love of the "Southland" and defense of "State Rights," the right of the people of the South to control the South, that was appealed to, and so on through the whole list of states or nations and in all times.

Did the holders of those special privileges do any of the fighting, any of the suffering?
In the present war between Italy and Turkey are those who are waxing fat incident to the slaughter of the propertyless fighters doing any of the fighting, displaying any of the "patriotism" that was so eloquently preached for them?

Did John Hays Hammond, or Jamison, carry any gun in the fight in South Africa, where the soil was drenched with the blood of the propertyless? Did the monarchs, either of Russia or Japan, become patriots and share the "fields of glory" with the working class in the fight to grab Korea? No, they stayed at home in their palaces of comfort and luxury.

Did Morgan, Rockefeller, the Goulds, the Astors, the Vanderbilts, or any of those who are now the real owners of America, go down South to whip the "rebels"? Was it patriotic for the Southern slave-holder to have a law passed exempting the owner of five or more slaves from military duty, and thus throw the burden of all the "patriotism" onto the shoulders of those who had no slaves, and but little or no other kind of property?

Is it love of country on the part of those who fan the flame of hate till war is declared, nine times out of ten for economic reasons, for the profit of schemers, who plan to and usually succeed in enriching themselves at the expense of the lives of thousands of their fellow men; or is it love of country for the workers to blindly follow such schemers, to do the fighting, the suffering, the dying, or is it patriotic to kill without asking why? No! it is blind faith and fanatical prejudice.
LOVE OF COUNTRY.

Real love of country would stay the "dogs of war"; would destroy the cause of graft; would not permit the "soldiers of fortune" to grab another country's resources and then get their home government to send thousands of its workers to help these scheming fortune hunters hold their stolen plunder.

Real love of country would prevent the workers of one country from killing the workers of any other country, in obedience to the commands or at the request of a lot of scheming territory grabbers.

Real patriotism would not permit one hundred men to own or control ninety per cent. of America's industries. Real patriotism would not permit the workers to support a system of industry that coins profits from the lives of little children; that makes it possible to throw thousands of men out of work, to reduce their wages, or raise the price of living further and ever further beyond the reach of the very people who produce life's necessities. In short, real patriotism and love of country will not permit of anything less than the ownership of each country by the whole people of each country, hence of the whole world by the people of the world, to the end that those who produce shall enjoy to the last farthing the social equivalent of all they produce.

Assisted by the misleading appeals to patriotism, the army is recruited, the navy replenished, and even the cradle is robbed in order to form the "boy scouts"; and in an ecstasy of patriotic fervor even the followers of the "meek and lowly" raise their voices in
pious (?) benediction of these “boy scouts” as they take the pledge of “obedience to authority” and of patriotism to “their country.”

All of this is done for the purpose of upholding this system of exploitation, so it becomes clear that “patriotism” is used, not in its rightful relation, but as a “prop” to “a declining state.”

If hell does not hold a jubilee when war is declared, when land grabbers mislead the workers to slaughter each other, it certainly does when ministers bless the boys in whose hands guns are placed: if not, then there is no hell. For if Sherman was right when he said “war is hell,” what will hell do but hold a reunion when ministers pray for the success of war on the field of carnage, or for the support of this industrial war (hell), this constant class struggle, instead of “peace and good will to man”?

It would be patriotic to defend one’s country whenever NEEDED, but it must not be overlooked that when appeals to “patriotism” induce the invaders to undertake the invasion, we find it is the use of this virtue as a “prop” that becomes responsible for the NECESSITY of DEFENSE.

**WAR.**

Kirkpatrick thinks WAR is the greatest “prop” of them all. In his great work, “War, What For?” among other things he says:

“The capitalist class has ready an armed and unarmed guard, ready to bellow ‘law and order’ when the unemployed call loudly for work or bread and when hungry stikers open their lips in self defense. Ready for ‘Jesus sake’ (and a salary) to glorify war and scream to the ‘God of battles’ (also to the ‘God of peace’) for victory;
ready to baptise wholesale murder and flatter the blood-stained conquerors; ready to whine and mumble over the shell-torn corpses of the victims and hypocritically snuffle and mouth consolatory congratulations to the war-cursed widows and orphans—ready thus to mock their own ruin—for a price; ready to preach—to the workers—that they must fight like hell here to get ‘a home in heaven’.

Under the title of

“STATESMEN”

Kirkpatrick has this to say:

“Defense of foreign commerce is one of the heaviest arguments offered by capitalist statesmen in defense of the vast cost of militarism—with insufferable ignorance neglecting the fact that the total cost of militarism for nineteen countries and the United States and Japan (eight billion dollars) is equal to more than 66 per cent. of the total export trade of all the world.”

GREAT MEN.

“Great men guiding the ‘ship of state’—to the rocks: Thus the nation staggers round and round in a stupid circle, the statesmen planning international wholesale murder, the working class blinded with blood and sweat and tears. Greater armies, greater navies—then still greater armies and still greater navies—and then still more powerful armies and navies: then impossible taxation, intolerable burdens: then bankruptcy; then wrath, rebellion and revolution,—this constitutes the program of at least eight ‘great nations’ of the world, if they continue, as at present, to surrender to the vanity of kings, tsars, presidents, mikados, and give free reign to the profit-lusting capitalist masters of the world.”

“Eight Billion Dollars every twelve months on war and preparations for war—and not a single silk-hatted snob sleeps in the dingy barracks, or eats cheap ‘grub’ fed to the privates, or submits to humiliating insults from ‘superior’ officers, or spills his blood on the firing line—not one anywhere in all the world.”
"This sum—all this cash cost—is, in its last analysis, slyly subtracted from the lives of the producing class, the working class. Sucked from the veins of the humble multitude of toilers, and the workers are so meek and weak and bloodless; are stunned and stunted—so constantly in dull, prideless stupor—that they are unable to stand erect in holy indignation, seize the powers of government and sweep this hell's nightmare from the world."

"War devours the welfare of the workers."

"The capitalist class dare not place all the facts frankly before the working class. Everywhere it is 'HUSH-HUSH—the working class must not study the burdens of war!'"

CHARLES SUMNER.

In the matter of preparing for war as a means of preventing it (?) let Senator Charles Sumner speak:

"All history is a vain word, all experience is at fault, if large war preparations * * * have not been constant provocatives of war. Pretended protestors against war, they have been the real instigators of war. They have excited the evil against which they were to guard. The habit of wearing arms in private life exercised a kindred influence. * * * The standing army is to the nation what the sword was to the modern gentleman, the stiletto to the Italian, the knife to the Spaniard, the pistol to the slave-master,—furnishing, like these, the means of death; and its possessor is not slow in using it."

"Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
   Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the world from error,
   There would be no need of arsenals and forts."

—(Quoted by Kirkpatrick, in "War, What For."

LAW AND ORDER.

Obey the law, have reverence for authority, "no matter how disedifying the lives" of
the authorities may be, no matter how unjust the laws may be, they must be obeyed. So we, the workers, are taught. And if we do not obey, implicitly, supinely, slavishly, we become "undesirable citizens," traitors, anarchists. Yet at other times we have been taught that "resistance to tyranny was obedience to God." But that has only been taught in connection with the memory and history of our dead patriots; it is not to be applied to the tyranny of special privileges of the present, for that would come too close home, and would be sure to interfere with "vested rights" of today.

A great war was fought in this country some years ago; men volunteered by the thousands and "went to the front" to save their (?) country. They were promised payment in gold for their services. Our "long distance patriots" who stayed at home, put an exception clause on the paper money the soldiers were really paid with, instead of the promised GOLD. It then became not only "law," but order, for the soldiers to be paid in cheap, LAW-DEPRECIATED "RAG-PAPER" money in exchange for their lives, and when any objected to this legal plunder, they were considered unsafe, traitors, calamity howlers, and were at best accused of trying to "impair the nation's credit."

In part, as the beneficent result of such "law and order" (to the capitalists as per their intentions) debts, not only personal but national, rolled up higher and ever higher, poverty increased, discontent spread, strikes became more frequent; for, supplemented as those money laws were by a long series of tariff and other class "law and order" enact-
ments. Wages steadily declined not only actually in many industries, but generally in relation to the wealth produced.

When order is disturbed by strikes or by any real attempt to improve the condition of those who have become the victims of this regime of capitalistic anarchy, it is at once decided that "order" must be restored; and, as we are taught that "order" is necessary to "business prosperity," and as we confound this kind of success with national safety, or working-class interests, most of us agree that order should be restored, so the soldiers, or the militia, are by "law" ordered out with guns, to save life by taking the lives of the disturbers of this sacred order. Thus "order" is restored by filling many graves—and we all know there is order in the grave.

It makes no difference how dishonestly the laws are secured; it makes no difference as to their class character, we are told to obey, and to refuse to obey is of itself disorder, then of course "order" must be restored.

General Otis puts it this way:

"And soon—it has begun to happen already—the plain citizens of every country will form a combine. Its object will be the suppression of sedition and anarchy in the person of the professional agitators. Theirs will be a big, powerful, effective, but unostentatious revolt. It will work quickly, surely, silently. The first thing the Plain Citizens combine will accomplish, will be the quiet removal of these gentlemen. They won't be blown up; they will just quietly disappear from human ken. There will be a little inquiry at first, but it will die down ever so quickly, for of all people in the world the professional agitator depends entirely upon his presence and his glib tongue to maintain any sort of influence over his followers. His impassioned rhetoric is his only asset."
"The idea of the plain citizen is not being mouthed abroad and it is not seeking members or subscriptions; but it is growing rapidly, nevertheless, and it is a very real and tangible thing. With the itch removed, the great disease of unrest will soon be cured, and the world will settle down for another half century."

The foregoing needs no comment, except to ask what the capitalist papers would say if the Socialist press were to express similar sentiments of vengeance and murder?

If Otis and his combine have their way, we will have "law and order" with a vengeance.

Kirkpatrick, in "War, What For," speaking of those who tell us to obey, who tell us of the beauties of order and of those who apply the "law," says this: "One seized our wrists, the other seized our reason; the one used force, the other used fraud; one used a lash, the other used a lure; one used a club, the other used (mental) chloroform; one frowned threateningly, the other smiled seductively. With curses and CUNNING these two have taught the toiler LAW AND ORDER—THE LAW AND ORDER MADE BY THE MASTERS FOR THE MASTERS."

We only ask you to look carefully at what is being propped up by these "props." If there is any good in law, see to it that it is used for good purposes, just as intelligent men would use good timber for good and constructive purposes.

The law and order of the master class has always meant tyranny and slavery for the toiling class, and so long as the toiling class can be induced, or seduced, by politician, priest, or master, to support and retain in
place by accepting such “props” we will suffer the consequences.

The workers may not even violate any law and still be jailed. To be arrested as a “suspicious character” is of itself, nine points of the ten against us. To have no “visible means of support” is equally damaging. To be dressed shabbily and act “suspiciously” is often equivalent to a warrant.

It makes no difference whether the victim in the case (and most of such are victims) struck against wage slavery—whether he refused to scab or was locked out, blacklisted, or what the cause of his “suspicious actions,” lack of “visible means” or shabby attire, if he does not “look good” to those whose “sworn duty” it is to “protect society” (?) he must be “pinched.”

If no one were arrested and convicted, lawyers would soon be out of a job, police would not be needed, and JUDGES would be as useless as many of them are now pernicious.

Do you say this is merely an expression of personal feeling, the venting of partisan spleen? Let Mr. Leavitt speak in this connection wherein he quotes and comments in part as follows: “‘If you will only stop to think of it,’ I heard Professor John H. Wigmore, of the Northwestern University Law School, tell the American Prison Association at Washington in 1910, ‘there are between three and four thousand men in this country today holding official positions whose sole business every day of their lives is to send people to jail. I mean the prosecuting attorneys’.

(He could have added, and to keep some
others from being sent to jail regardless of guilt.)

"And there are two thousand to three thousand men whose sole business is to co-operate in sending men to jail—I mean the criminal judges. (Or to co-operate in keeping the big criminals out.) And these five or six thousand men are every day sending men to jail without, for the most part, any conception of the science of sending men to jail. They not only do not know that science, but most of them do not know there is a science, and when you speak of it, they do not care.'

"Now Professor Wigmore is not a sensationalist. He is one of the foremost academic jurists of the country. He is president of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, which is the ONE LEARNED BODY in this field that America can boast. His statement, though strikingly bold, was carefully considered. It was addressed to a serious body of men and women; and it was accepted, promptly and emphatically, as a statement of existing conditions."

If the Professor's statement is true, then these lawyers, these judges, are acting ignorantly, criminally, impulsed largely by personal feelings, actuated by class—that is to say, by economic—interests.

Ignorance of the science of crime on the part of those who have the power to punish the criminal, is of itself a most hideous crime; and its result cannot be other than destructive of the best interests of the very things they pretend to protect in society's moral, social and industrial life.

These men must make a showing; they must do something. They know that crimes
are committed, and if they fill the jails with little criminals they can prove (to their own satisfaction) that they are protecting society, since they sent so many criminals (?) to jail.

"Ignorance of the law" is said to be no excuse. Why should we support or reverence and obey those who are ignorant of the SCIENCE of CRIME; especially, since by their acts of ignorance, or worse, they help increase the volume of crime?

Some of these attorneys and judges are "good men" personally. Some of them are church members—most of them are. Some of them are Christians, as they understand Christianity, and some of them are recognized, by all who know them, as crooks.

The best among them, personally, act as strong barriers of protection, as fortifications of defense, against wholesale criticism; as obstructions to clear vision; and thus by their activities and class decisions help perpetuate this system of special privileges.

Better for us all would it be if the characters of these men were all in perfect keeping with their decisions, for we could then all see behind the men, see back of them, and understand what is really wrong, and every one save the class they serve would rise up in might and wipe out the system which furnishes the same incentive as well as opportunity that chattel slavery furnished to Simon Legree.

Their reputations have, for the most part, been made for them by the interests they serve, as a tailor makes a coat. Often REPUTATION obscures or completely hides character.
ANCIENT TEACHING.

We were taught in times gone by that law was made to protect the weak, as the strong did not need protection. That is not even taught now, but the contrary is practiced; and it has come to pass that those very things it was alleged were intended to protect the weak, have come to be used to "prop" up the privileges of the powerful and of course to make them more powerful.

It needs no argument to prove that only the class that is taught to obey is the class on whose head the force of violated law descends; and when the protected class-interests can be served, all law, fundamental, constitutional, organic, civil or moral, is broken or ignored, as indicated in the Otis quotation and exemplified in the strikes at McKees Rocks, Westmoreland county coal strike, and still more recently in Lawrence, Mass. These instances need only be mentioned as samples; and the contention is made plain as to the character of, or the use to which "Law" is put and order made to obtain, to further prove they are filling the function of "props" to CAPITALISM.

If a contrasting proof is needed, observe the sugar trust, the beef trust, the oil trust and others, the prosecution of which has furnished a spectacle that could be called the World's Comedy, if it did not contain all the elements of a WORLD TRAGEDY.

THE CHURCH.

It seems very hard for most people to analyze an institution or an organization of men and women, as such, separate and apart
from the principles it is alleged to stand for. It must be confessed that since principles must find expression, when they are expressed, through and by the people, at times it is difficult; but to those who cannot make the distinction, the door of understanding is CLOSED.

Men have organized for the alleged purpose of defending the victims of brutal economics, and in addition may have incorporated as a fundamental factor to that end a religious, a theological, a metaphysical dogma, or may have combined all three into dogmas or creeds. The time may come when the dogma, the creed, becomes the only feature deemed necessary of observance, and if so, the opposition to bad economics disappears, and in its stead defense thereof appears, and the victims are promised their rewards in the future as theologically indoctrinated through the creed.

This change comes about gradually, and it will be found that the organizations, when taken as a whole, become the institution composed of or dominated by men whose material interests are best conserved by the very economics that was formerly the object of attack.

The importance, the far-reaching effect of the change in the attitude of the institution so far as worldly things are concerned is obscured by more intense doctrinal points. The importance of the hereafter, the awful sin of unbelief, the importance of the soul's salvation, the grossness of worldly things, and the necessity of "obedience to the powers that be, for they are ordained of God."
marks out a path that leads the believer into the wilderness of confusion.

The suspicion that for a long time has obtained, that the church as an institution has been defending property as against human rights, has grown into a positive conviction in the minds of an ever increasing number of people till their number is legion.

It is contended by thousands that good economics would not endanger the salvation of the soul, and it is further contended by them that this system of capitalism prevents the operation of good economics and grows all the more infamous by intensifying the worst possible economics; and just in proportion as the church supports this system, in that degree she prevents economic justice.

In the early days of the church, it was the slave, or the oppressed, who constituted it, and for whose deliverance it was formed, but with a few exceptions (merely as denominations), the church defended chattel slavery here, and it is a well-known fact that nearly every slave-holder in the United States was a member of some church. As a rule the most influential ones dominated the church councils, hence guided the institution in its economic aspect to the support of their economic interests, and that, too, not because they were bad men personally, but because their economic interests were immediate, and it was easy for them to show that the theological aspect or doctrine of the church was, if not in exact harmony therewith, at most not in vital opposition. "Servants obey your masters" harmonized with their economic interests as melodiously as do the chords of the masterpieces of the world's greatest mu-
sicians; hence accursed be those who so far violated that theological conception as to disturb the relation of master and slave. Their souls were in danger, for they could not be other than atheists who would deny so plain a command.

These slave owners were born midst the influences of slavery; they were taught to believe in it as an institution, and they knew that for the most part the slaves themselves were "satisfied"; hence all the more vicious, it seemed to them, were those whose outside influence was stirring up "discontent." It never occurred to these men that if things which had lasted a long time during which a large measure of civilization had developed, should not be disturbed, that sin itself ought to exist, and that discontent regarding it should not be aroused, for has not SIN existed from the days of Adam?

The church of slavery days, reflecting in its organic acts the economics of its slave-holding deacons and other influential members, became the greatest "prop" of that institution which Ingersoll characterized as the "sum of all infamy."

What did Christ mean when he said, "suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not for of such is the kingdom of heaven?"

Was it merely a figure of speech, a parable that can by a theological twist be made to take on a spiritual meaning only?

If that be what He meant, if His words were merely "spiritual," then of course child labor is not wrong. To coin the lives of millions of children into dividends is all right, if His words were only a parable.
If the kingdom of heaven is composed of "such as these" and is to bear any relation to the condition of the child slaves on earth, we may be pardoned for asking what would be the dominant feature of the kingdom of hell?

How many denominations, as such, oppose child labor today? How many ministers preach against it? It may be said that many preach against the effects of such labor, but how many attack its base, the economic and industrial system of which this labor is a component part?

As a matter of fact, few denominations exist that do not have in their midst some prominent member or members who own stocks or bonds in some industry in which child labor is employed, and thus again economic interests direct the institution.

Take this industrial system as a whole, and the church as a whole stands for it, supports it, and denounces any who, like those who demanded the abolition of slavery, now demand the abolition of capitalism. We know that here and there some minister stands out as an exception; that now and then one resigns the pulpit after he has found, like Phillips did, that it is almost impossible for an honest man to stay in the church in a great crisis; but on the whole, the eighty thousand preachers and priests hand down to the owners of our jobs a very comforting theology, very soothing metaphysics, and a very high grade of economics, embodied in the theory of the brotherhood of capital and labor.

Which side did the church take in the great miners' strike in Colorado? How many
ministers came to the rescue of the miners in Westmoreland county, Pa., during the progress of which thirty men and seven women were killed? Where were the inspired voices during the McKees Rocks strike? How many churches took up collections for the Lawrence strikers? To ask these questions is to answer them. Not one hundredth part of one per cent. of the church as an institution tried to help the victims of this system of exploitation.

WHY? It is safe to say that the chief source of all the reasons for refusal or inaction was economic, and the dominant factor back of the economics was the job-owning members of the various denominations which make up the institution.

IS THEOLOGY PRACTICAL?

Was Christ only joking when He referred to Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites and devourers of widows' houses, as "whited sepulchers," full of dead men's bones, and who for a pretense "make long prayers?" If He did not mean literally what he said, then He should not be worshipped in any sense, and if He did mean it, and the church by allegorical and theological explanations translates the application to the hereafter, then economics again becomes the dominant factor in the relation of the church to industry, and robbing widows' houses and children of their labor is not wrong.

If the church is right in these great labor struggles, then Christ only fed the multitude allegorically, and of course robbed workers can now be taught theologically that they will be fed forever and ever in the hereafter.
It is an ingenious thought, this allegorical conception; for in every instance where it can be used, a theological doctrine will apply as a solution of our present day problems; and since our souls' salvation depends upon belief in theology, the strength of the institution that teaches it can be easily seen, or at least felt, hence its position as a "prop" is most important.

No wonder Rockefeller donates millions to the church; no wonder Morgan starts the "Men and Religion Forward Movement"! They know the value of the support of an institution that deals in our hopes and fears: our hopes of eternal bliss, our fears of eternal punishment hereafter.

A man stands beside the grave of a babe and tells the mother, whose heart is almost breaking, that if she believes certain dogmas she will again meet her babe; or if the grave be for the mother he tells grief-stricken and pitifully sorrowing children whose greatest protector and comforter has been removed that if they DOUBT they must seek the forgiveness of a threatening Jehovah else they will not be saved nor ever again see that loving mother. Later this same man mounts his pulpit and preaches a defense of the very men who own the factory in which the mother was killed, or in which the father worked for wages so low as only to prolong the starvation of that dead baby.

Think of this doctrine, and it will be clear how strong the church is as a "prop" to the interests of the owners of our jobs; also the reason it does not assist the workers in their economic and political struggles will need no further explanation.
The capitalists may very appropriately quote Pope, when he said, "I prop myself upon the few supports that are left me."

THE PRESS AND EDUCATION.

Who can overestimate the importance of education? For, if knowledge is power, then education is the road to knowledge. But mere book learning is not necessarily education.

History has for the most part been written from the standpoint of the man on horseback, and in the glamor and manufactured glory that is made to surround him the facts as they really happened are not recorded, but, instead, a distorted version is given intended to support the class interests of those for whom the accounts were written.

Most well-informed men will tell you that they were taught so much in college that was not true and which they had to unlearn after they left, that in a great degree the years spent in college were wasted. Inasmuch as the vast majority never try to go beyond the dogmatic teaching they receive while there, the influence of distorted history can easily be appreciated.

There has been and still is a definite object in view in this long consistent historical attitude. Kirkpatrick, in "War, What For," has this to say in respect to it:

"The workers have been kicked and tricked for ten thousand years, but chiefly tricked, betrayed into helpless consent and stupid approval. The more fraud the less force.
"Far more important than the physical conquest over the working class was the conquest over the mind of the working class. Undoubtedly the idea
of teaching the working class to be a slave and to be satisfied with slavery and thus make the slave, the serf, the wage earner, an automatic ox to bear and draw the burdens of the world in brainless obedience and dull humility—undoubtedly that idea has done more solid service in the successes of injustice than any other idea ever born in the brain of tyrants.

"The ruling class have always carefully secured the services of many of the world’s ablest men to play Judas to the carpenters—to the working-class. Profound men, gifted men, eloquent men, enjoying the world’s choicest food, blissfully happy with the world’s finest wine, living in the homes of comfort and splendor, dressed in the softest raiment, many of these have traduced the serf and the wage earners without shame, though the splendid Christ said: ‘The truth shall make you free’.

We do not mean to say that all avenues of learning are thus colored, but the chief ones are, and the “conquest of the mind” not only over the working class but over the minds of the “learned,” the professors and teachers, constitutes the tyranny and turns what should be the divine power of education into a “prop” of special privileges.

Space forbids or prevents giving illustrations. Nevertheless a little thought will bring to the mind of the average reader the truth involved in the foregoing.

THE PRESS.

Again we wish to quote a statement made by Kirkpatrick as follows:

“The modern newspaper is a Roman arena, a Spanish bullfight and an English prize fight rolled into one. The popularization of the power to read has made the press the chief instrument of brutality. For half-penny every man, woman and child can stimulate and feed those lusts of blood and physical cruelty which it is the chief aim of
civilization to repress and, which in their literal modes of realization have been assigned * * * to soldiers, butchers, sportsmen, and a few other trained professionals * * * The most momentous lesson of the (Boer) war is the revelation of the methods by which a knot of men, financiers and politicians, can capture the minds of the nation, arouse its passion and impose a policy. (John A. Hobson: Psychology of Jingoism, pp. 29, 107.)"

Need you be reminded of the "full dinner pail" campaign of 1896 in this country; of the "gold standard" dogma; of the tariff humbug or of the multitude of false issues (not the least pernicious of which was the alleged humanitarian intervention in Cuba) used to mislead the "sovereign voters of America"? Do you think you were taught the truth about the Maine; about the war with Spain? Do you believe you are told the truth currently about the legislation enacted in city, state or at Washington?

The mind of man can scarcely grasp the blighting influences of systematic lying on the part of thousands of papers simultaneously appearing in every city in the United States!

The infamy of these lies during a strike, always printed to influence public opinion against the workers, thus adding to the workers' already slavish burden, transcends the scope of temperate language to describe.

Those who poison our food commit a crime that can be truthfully called wilful, deliberate, premeditated murder, but even that is less infamous than poisoning the nation's mind. In the first instance some can escape, for there is some food relatively pure; but when matters of state, which from
the very nature of things affect every man, woman and child in the entire nation, are lied about year in and year out, none can escape entirely; justice becomes an exile, and the streams of industrial, social, commercial and political life are thus poisoned, from Washington down to the individual, making clear thinking impossible, understanding out of the question, and it is easy for the cunning few to become the masters, and the rest industrial slaves. Thus are NATIONS DESTROYED!

When the workers assemble, they are called a "mob"; capitalists in session are regarded and referred to as a "delegation discussing very important business matters."

If a window glass is broken or a stone thrown during a strike, a "riot" has started; then of course the killing of a number of workingmen is perfectly justified according to the accounts of the "kept press."

The class legislation enacted by Congress is heralded as the work of the wisest legislators, intended to benefit the "whole people." State legislation is seldom truthfully reported even by the opposing party. It is, instead, colored for political reasons, and in place of furnishing real information, only adds to the already misleading confusion.

TWO SAMPLES.

"The Alton steal," made possible by the New York State legislature, together with the signature of the then Governor Roosevelt, was suppressed till the Appeal to Reason exposed it, and even then nearly every influential paper that had anything to say about it, tried to lie the expose away. That
steal made it possible for a few men to pocket $62,500,000. The amount of money involved does not signify half so much as the bribery indulged in incident to the passage of such legislation, to which must be added the far-reaching effects of the power that induced a “great” statesman (?) to sign it.

We have been told how the Western railroads “developed” that section of our country; how Harriman, Hill and, previous to them, Huntington, Stanford, Croker and Hopkins, were the “pioneers” in that great work. We have been told these men invested their millions in that undertaking, and while they worked so patriotically, “waited patiently” for the country to settle so they could get the returns “their investments” entitled them to.

As a matter of fact they never invested one cent of their own, but on the contrary, by reason of land grants (aggregating 200,000,000 acres) government and state subsidies aggregating $125,000,000, cleared for themselves $450,000,000! It must not be forgotten that most of those vast concessions, those great national steals, were made and consummated during the War of the Rebellion.

Think of it, when the nation’s mind was absorbed with that terrible conflict, hearts aching, brains reeling, and the nation was in the most intense agony of despair, these men, heralded by the press as pioneers, as benefactors, as developers of the West, were actually stealing an empire. (Legally, of course.)

These schemes were started, financed to success by a loan of $65,000,000 of bonds by
the Government of the United States, to the four last named gentlemen, which was used as a basis, allegedly, to secure the stock and bonds they later sold by which THEY GOT THE MONEY TO BUILD THOSE ROADS.

The history of those schemes is long and tiresome to follow. It reeks with the infamy of theft, plunder of stockholders and exorbitant charges of rates, to a degree so despicable that there are few other world swindles with which it can be compared.

Our (?) press, instead of exposing those thefts, distorted, obscured and lied about them by trying to make each act in its consummation appear as the embodiment of all the elements of the purest kind of industrial integrity and national beneficence.

As a “prop” the press can scarcely be surpassed. Each evening the thefts of the day, the bribery and any other paid-for act beneficial to the job owners, is covered up or so distorted as to conceal the facts. The average mind being thus poisoned, staggers around in the darkness of press-incubated ignorance.

Every effort made by anyone to really improve conditions, or to prevent further similar acts, is ridiculed, lied about to such a degree that millions of readers (of the kept press) are ready to ostracize, if not crucify the “discontents.”

If this is true as applied to mere reformers, what may one expect to read or hear when a real “revolutionary movement” is started, such, for instance, as the Socialist movement?
THE JUDICIARY.

It is indeed a question whether the press or the JUDICIARY is of the most service to capitalism. Both serve their owners and masters so well, so faithfully, so servilely, so cringingly, and both occupy such strategic positions, that it were hard to estimate the relative value—to the masters—of these "props."

We read the press daily, we have an alleged freedom of criticism thereof, but in the matter of the judiciary we are at sea. We are not expected to believe the opposing papers, but are taught by almost the entire press (outside the Socialist) to reverence the judges; that they should not be criticized, at least not in earnest.

By some seeming necromancy we are made to believe the judge ceases to be a mere man the moment he becomes "the COURT." "Contempt of court" and "lese Majeste" are of the same character. Court decisions are couched in the jargon of legal technicalities, and pedantic precedental phraseology, which of course is beyond the understanding of the average man, and to that is added (usually) a lying interpretation by the press, so the matter of understanding recedes further and ever further into the wilderness of obscurity.

This very obscurity is seemingly intended; at least it is assiduously made more and more effective by increasing it.

THE PRESIDENT HELPS.

President Taft, in his speech at Pocatello, Idaho, Oct. 6, 1911, said:

"I LOVE THE JUDGES. I LOVE THE COURTS. THEY ARE MY IDEAL ON
EARTH, AND TYPIFY WHAT WE SHALL MEET HEREAFTER IN HEAVEN UNDER A JUST GOD."

In another address, some time previous to the Idaho speech, he made a somewhat contradictory observation, as follows:

"The administration of justice in the United States is a disgrace to our civilization."

The latter sentiment was uttered by Mr. Taft before the American Bar Association. Since the speech was made in which it was expressed, the recall seems to threaten the "dignity" of the judiciary, and Mr. Taft feels impelled to come to the rescue of his fellow workers, so he compares the work of the judges to that of a "just God."

A series of judicial exposures is now in progress that are almost beyond belief. The most heartless robberies and plunderings that ever disgraced the world are being fostered by and are made possible of successful consummation by judicial help.

The Appeal to Reason heads the forces that are uncovering these unparalleled crimes, but since you may not wish to accept that paper as authority, we will quote from C. P. Connolly, whom Everybody’s Magazine regards as one of the greatest authorities in this matter in the United States.

Among other things, Attorney Connolly says: "This corruption of our courts by the corporations is not confined to any one community; it pervades every section of the country from OCEAN TO OCEAN, and the PUPPETS of corporations sit upon the bench, East and West alike."

"The interests have retreated into the courts. They are going to make their last stand behind the judiciary. * * * While
we have been giving to judges the reverence that men once gave to kings, the forces that corrupt every other branch of public life have been no more reverent to judges than to aldermen. While we have worshiped they have corrupted.” (Black type ours.)

The editor of Everybody’s adds, “The most damning indictment of the judiciary lies in a plain statement of incontrovertible facts.”

Space in so short a work as this forbids a long detailed account of the “incontrovertible facts,” but a few samples indicative of what Mr. Connelly says is “almost universal,” may suffice, at least, if not conclusive of themselves, to induce you to examine further.

AN EXAMPLE.

A federal judge in New York fined a rich silk importer $25,000 for defrauding the government out of $1,400,000, and then the same judge sentenced a Greek to three months in jail for defrauding the government out of $2,500 on the importation of figs.

The rich silk importer cleared $1,378,000, and “figuratively departed from the court with the loot under his arm. * * * Were I in the Greek’s place I would change from figs to silk.”

“Watch the elevators in our Federal buildings, and see the trembling hand-cuffed wretches who enter, charged with distilling a hogshead of wine, or some such MINOR offense. Go then into the office of the district attorneys and watch the trust magnate who has levied unlawful tribute on a nation, in unfettered conference with his lawyer and Government officials—and tell me if this is a land of equal law.”
(Will the district attorney of Allegheny county please take notice?)

Mr. Connolly claims that the labor war in Colorado, and the alleged "social anarchy" that obtained there some time ago was the result of "judicial anarchy," that the outrages committed against labor in that state, which would have appalled an honest court, "did not appall the Supreme Court of Colorado, it legalized them."

He cites the suggestive fact that the Supreme Court of Wisconsin once refused to suspend the "writ of habeas corpus, at the request of Lincoln, because there was a question of the strict Constitutional grounds involved," then adds, "Yet the Supreme Court of Colorado, in the case of Moyer, suspended the writ of habeas corpus at the behest of the Guggenheims and the mine owners in Colorado. I know of no case in judicial history which marks so pathetic a decline, a great human right upheld against Lincoln, waived in favor of the Guggenheims."

(Black type mine.)

THOUGHT SUGGESTERS.

In this direct connection, Mr. Connolly cites a number of cases similar to the foregoing; quotes some eminent men who claim they can hardly find language with which to fitly characterize such decisions, and adds: "When an incensed speaker publicly declares, in reviewing these acts of Colorado's Supreme Court, that he is not a law-abiding citizen, the press of the country rings from end to end with his 'anarchy.' Yet Wendell Phillips, in a free soil speech in Boston during pro-slavery days said: 'I say
New England is not a law-abiding community. God be thanked for it.’”

Mr. Connolly concludes his April installment in Everybody’s with these words:

“We regularly overhaul every other department of government. We would not think of letting them run on indefinitely without attention. But the law! Why we have given it head for a century, with judges who were political opportunists; judges rewarded for political crimes, contributions, and subserviencies; judges grossly ignorant who have been allowed to tinker with the scales of justice.”

It happens at times that state legislatures get a spasm of apparent honesty and pass some laws that lean towards justice, but about the time we expect to realize some favorable results the judges seem to have been seen and we get, instead, a decision of “unconstitutionality.”

In Pennsylvania the two-cent per mile railroad fare, enacted by the legislature, was set aside by the Supreme Court of the State. In California, the “Southern Pacific road makes heavy financial investments in the political conventions which nominate judges of the Supreme Court of that State. If constitutional provisions are to be construed, they want them construed ‘right’.” In a number of states eight-hour laws and wage rate provisions have been assassinated with the same constitutional dagger.

OTHER EXAMPLES.

Nearly every harbor, and nearly all the tide lands in the United States belong to or are controlled by railroads or allied interests. Leases, franchises, or fill-ins when enjoyed for a time are made the basis of property
claims, which are construed by the judges to have the rights that belong to "investments," and soon the corporations "own" the property.

If it is a fill-in, occupation, or possession, is claimed to be equivalent to nine points of the ten in favor of owning, and the judges seldom fail to add the other tenth, when properly requested, and the title is complete. (?)

If a shivering working man or woman is caught picking up a lump of coal from this honestly acquired land, he or she can be shot as safely as could the barons of old shoot the poacher who should have the audacity to encroach on the Baron's sacred preserve.

When a working man or boy or girl is killed while engaged at work for these honest corporations, and a jury can be secured who will render a verdict for even a moderate sum, the judge can as a rule be depended upon to reduce the award still lower, or throw the case out of court entirely. Yet when some politician, whose "doubtful reputation" is slandered, and he sues for damages, a judge agrees that $50,000 is not too much—such a case happened in a Western state lately.

**ANOTHER SAMPLE OF JUDICIAL JUSTICE (?).**

In St. Louis two men who are the chief officers of three allied corporations, the Street Railways Company of that city being one of them, asked for a receiver for their own companies, on the grounds of bankruptcy, notwithstanding a profit of $16,000,000 the year before the request was made.
The judge granted the request, and so framed the rules that were to guide the receiver, that none of the cripples, the victims of the Street Railway's greed, can get one cent. Among these cripples is a little girl who was run over by one of the company's cars and lost both legs. She cannot get one cent, even in spite of the fact that a jury had rendered a verdict of $50,000 in her favor.

The damage claims against the company aggregate $500,000, not one dollar of which can now be recovered.

See where the judicial dignity and honesty comes in?

In the matter of labor, there lies before me the records of 32 decisions against boycotting, unionizing jobs, picketing jobs, carrying unfair lists—in short decisions against any and all efforts made by labor to improve its condition, including a decision permitting the seizure of a union's funds; while at the same time there are 13 decisions upholding the black list and other phases of the industrial war, in favor of the capitalists,—the job owners.

There is also before us 23 decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which set aside, wipe out, and nullify 23 acts of Congress. These acts were not labor measures, but leaned just a little too far towards the public good, and lest they be reinforced by others that might lean still more, they were wiped out on the grounds of being "UNCONSTITUTIONAL." The income tax is a sample.

The Supreme Court is the chief "prop" in the judicial system. It is the "Court of last resort." Its decisions are the pivotal points
from which radiate the ethics of capitalist "property rights." Its decisions become "precedents," hence guides for the "inferior courts," from which very little deviation is ever made.

The inferior courts directly "prop" the system and consistently support the Supreme Court, making an amazingly perfect "prop," some proof of which has been given and other samples follow.

Eight hour laws have as a rule been set aside; workingmen's compensation measures have been declared void, even though none of them so far passed were more than a start in the right direction.

It appears that there is no industrial crime so base that a judicial decision cannot be had to legalize it, no tyranny so hellish that some judge cannot be found who will give it the sanction of "law." These judges thus become a law unto themselves (ANARCHY), the jury and the court.

What a prop! what a prop the judiciary has become to this "declining state" of capitalism!

We will conclude this phase of the matter by giving the outlines of a case that is so infamous we believe it will cause any reader to agree that there is no industrial or other crime so base that a judge cannot be found who will not agree to become accessory, before or after the fact, or both.

THE LIMIT OF JUDICIAL DEPRAVITY.

In 1906, at a trial in Mohave county, Arizona, a negro was convicted for committing rape on a white woman passenger in a Pullman car that was being hauled over the At-
chison, Topeka & Santa Fe railroad. The evidence was clear and conclusive and the negro, a porter on the said train and car, was sentenced to ten years in the penitentiary. The woman sued the railroad company for $25,000. She was offered $2,500, but refused to accept it. Immediately after the ten-year sentence was pronounced a motion for a new trial was denied by the judge, but after it was found the woman had brought suit, a motion for a new trial, or for the re-opening of the case in behalf of the negro (?) was accepted by the same judge. The trial was held without any witnesses being summoned, and the negro was dismissed by this same judge, who gave as one of the reasons for dismissing the case the following: "We believe a conviction can be obtained, but that the ends of justice (?) can be better served by this dismissal, thereby saving the county great expense. Whereupon, the court, after due consideration, grants said motion, and it is ordered that said charge be and the same is dismissed for the reasons stated, and it is ordered that said defendant be released from custody."

The negro was thereupon set free, and of course the woman's case fell, for when there was no defendant to arraign, he having left the (then) territory of Arizona with the help of the judge, she could have no case.

This woman has no redress, the railroad need not pay one cent (except to the judge), and in the face of all this, President Taft promoted that judge from a district to a United States judgeship.

Further comment is unnecessary. Mammon has been served, the hell of capitalism
supported, and the “God of profits” consistently upheld.

If this is Mr. Taft’s idea of “what we shall find afterwards in heaven under a just God,” what would he expect to find in hell under the regime of the devil?

The above is not written as a history of the development of these “props,” but to show how they are being used currently. All thinkers will agree that each “prop” is a part of the industrial whole when considered in a general sense. There is no attempt made to have you believe that any one of these “props” acts or is used without a close relation and association with all the rest named, and with others that could be named. The intent is to show in brief how each in part functions, and when you realize that each is made to function in the same direction, the combined strength as “props,” as supports, stands out so clearly that “he who runs may read” if he will.

The desire is to have you examine the institutions of our day, for themselves, of themselves; to examine them as they are operated, and thus affect your lives. If the results are satisfactory, then these “props” should be retained and you should combat any attempt made to disturb or dislodge them. If you are not satisfied with the effects on your life, then it is urged that you be not like the “bull in the china shop” destroying with eyes shut anything that is good, but refuse to permit the good to be used in support of that which is bad.

Good and bad after all is a matter of RELATION. We can change relations and changed relations will change RESULTS.
SOCIALISM INSTEAD.

The substitution of SOCIALISM in place of capitalism would result in the changed relations as just suggested, and make possible the right elements, factors and attributes inherent in each "prop."

The objection may at once be raised that Socialism is "impractical." What is practical? Will anyone be so far lost to reason as to pretend that the relations we have been outlining are "practical"? Let us hope not. There will then remain no good grounds for refusing to carefully examine the doctrines, or philosophy, of Socialism.

No one will deny that those who own a nation's industries wield great power, so great that all the "props" are used in their behalf. From the very nature of things it is safe to say that this great power is inseparable from ownership. If, then, the few men who own have so much power, it logically follows that those who do not own have little or no power, at least ECONOMIC power, since it is true that ownership carries with it the power of control, it is equally true that if ALL OWNED, that is, if we should adopt SOCIAL OWNERSHIP, all of us would have SOME POWER. When all have economic power, there will be real democracy.

We now have AUTOCRACY, and while it obtains all the "props" will be used in support of its regime, but when democracy shall have come, all of society's powers will be used to uphold HUMAN RIGHTS.
THE MEANING OF SOCIAL OWNERSHIP.

Social ownership means the right to use the means of production and distribution on the basis of the right to live.

If we have the right to live, we have the right to the USE of those things NECESSARY to sustain life. To deny us the right to the equitable use of these essentially necessary things, such as tools, machinery, land, in short all industrial productive factors, is to deny us the RIGHT TO LIVE except on the terms imposed by those who do own; that is to say, we may live or not as the economic interests of the owners determine. This spells MASTERY and SERVITUDE.

Those who now own get a salary when they work, or pretend to, and dividends besides, as well as get dividends when they don’t work. Dividends means “dividing up”. This dividing up takes from the workers, and enables the owners to pay the “props” for their support.

Social ownership would result in the workers getting the full social equivalent of service performed, hence bribery and special favors to “props” of all kinds would no longer be given.

A FEW PLAIN EXAMPLES.

Things used socially should be owned socially, and managed democratically.

We socially own the sidewalks; that is, every individual owns the right to use as much of the sidewalk as he needs in every city in the entire country; and in using his
share he does not abridge the like right of any other.

We socially own the free schools, including the high schools, in the same degree and with the same privilege, so far as ownership and the right to use is concerned.

Nearly every one agrees that it is highly important and advantageous to feed the brain (by educating it) in a free institution. What good reason can be advanced against feeding the body in and through the means of free industrial institutions?

The same is true of postoffices. This does not mean that any one has the right to remove a brick from the sidewalk, or a desk from the school house, or a box from the postoffice, for that would be DESTRUCTION rather than use.

A careful view of these things will reveal the fact that whatever limitations appear in the uses thereof spring from our non-ownership of a job. For if we cannot get a job (work) we will soon be unable to use either the sidewalk, the free school, or the post-office, for reasons that are obvious.

It can truthfully be said that the job is the most important factor in our lives. The job is as necessary to our lives as a foundation is to a house. You would not agree to let another own the foundation under your house, yet you will agree that another may own your job, and not only yours but thousands of jobs that others must have; and since the job is in reality the FOUNDATION UNDER YOUR LIFE, is it not criminal stupidity to allow another to own it, and by so doing have the legal right, (with your consent) to refuse to allow you
to use it in order to live, and when you are permitted to use it, you are only allowed to call one-fourth of your product your own?

**WHAT SHOULD BE SOCIALLY OWNED.**

Draw the line of demarcation between public or social ownership at the yard gate or front door, and the matter will begin to clear. All of those things that can be used privately or by the family, individually, or by the family as such, should be owned privately or by the family in proportion as they have assisted in producing them.

A hat is private property, as its function amply proves, but a hat factory is PUBLIC property as ITS functions prove. The factory cannot be used privately, the hat can and is. Hundreds of men, women and children are employed in the factory. This establishes its character as a social or public institution. Prices cannot be raised on hats by personally owning them, but prices can be raised on hats by private or corporate ownership of hat factories. Then it is that dividends will be declared and wages lowered in the owner’s interests, till in many cases the line between so-called virtue and vice will be wiped out and some of the girl workers will be driven to sell their bodies for bread.

Things are classified according to the functions they perform—the uses to which they are put, and because of certain inherent characteristics.

All the sacred relations of husband and wife, father and mother, parent and child, take place in the home. No such relations
obtain in the factory. In the one case privacy should be assured, because of the sacred character thereof; in the other the social relations are so obvious that an entirely different base of ownership MUST OBTAIN. To assure privacy in the home the family must own the home; to assure the family ownership of the home the workers must own the jobs or they will not be able to own the homes, except in an ever lessening degree.

CAPITAL IS A SOCIAL PRODUCT.

We are met at every turn with this question, “What would you do for capital under Socialism?” Money is not capital. That part of wealth that is being or can be used in connection with labor in producing more wealth is capital. That is to say, machinery, tools, etc., are capital. All such things have been socially produced, therefore, from the very nature of things all capital belongs to SOCIETY, and as it is a social NECESSITY it must be socially owned. Even if money is capital, it results from social labor also. The claim of investments constantly dinned into our ears is a capitalist myth.

We, the laborers, invest our lives each hour, day and month we work. We drive by the force of our efforts that much of our lives into the things we are producing, so it can be said with absolute truth that we and we alone make the ONLY REAL INVESTMENT. When we consider all this means the sacredness of life, the right to live, the economic base of the home, it will be seen how important our investment is.
We have just seen that we only get about one fourth of what we produce, and it is from what we produce and DO NOT GET that all capital is taken.

The owners sell the laborers' products for dollars, they then buy stocks and bonds, then with the dollars so gotten they pay other laborers to build other plants. There could not be any products to sell if labor, that is to say, life, had not been invested, and as labor was "prior to capital" it can be easily seen that when these products are sold the crystallized lives of the laborers is at the same time sold. So at every turn, viewed from any angle whatsoever, it will be clearly seen that labor and labor alone is the active factor in the production of wealth, including capital.

If we wish to stubbornly stick to the fallacious idea that money is capital, it can still be shown that this won't destroy the fact that society must own and use it socially.

HOW WE COULD USE OUR SOCIAL CAPITAL.

With the idea in mind that capital should be fully socialized let us call to mind how our partially socialized capital is being used, and from it draw a much-needed lesson.

We can safely call the money in our National Treasury social capital, in a limited sense as we shall show. The capitalists can and do reach into that fund and cause battleships to be built at a cost of ten million (or more) dollars each and equip them with 14-inch guns and employ an army of men to man these ships, train and drill them for purposes of destruction, both of property and life. What principle of equity, or argu-
ment based on logic, is there that should prevent us from fully socializing our so-called capital (dollars) and using it to build ten million dollar industrial plants, and to make shoes instead of guns and bayonets; picks and shovels instead of powder and bullets; splendid machinery with which to equip our socially builted plants instead of guns for war vessels?

We pay this army of destruction from national funds, why could we not employ an army of producers in our to-be-socialized industrial plants to make things to save and prolong life? When one of these 14-inch guns is discharged, $1,200 of labor's products is destroyed, whereas, every time the machines in those plants would turn, some wealth would be produced and the nation made that much richer instead of poorer as in the case of war and navy paraphernalia.

The one typifies war, legalized murder, national hate, useless or perniciously spent lives; the other embodies fraternity, cooperation, camradeship, peace, CIVILIZATION.

HOW WOULD WE MANAGE SUCH PLANTS?

It is alleged that these battleships, the navy and the army are intended to "protect the nation." They are managed from a limited public standpoint, that is allegedly for the good of society. We insist that industries could be managed from the same viewpoint and for the same purpose in reality instead of allegedly. If we can manage war (Sherman's hell) socially, we can manage industry, peace, from the same plane.
THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

We teach the class struggle, and in the foregoing illustrations many of the factors at bottom of this struggle are visible, even to the most casual observer.

When we speak or write of the “class struggle” we are often accused of teaching “class hatred.” This is not true.

If a physician should find a case of smallpox in your family you would not accuse him of causing it because he told of its existence. We are not responsible for the “class struggle,” nor for the “class hatred” that is inseparable from it. We point out the facts, both as to the struggle and its concomitant hate, and ask all our fellow workers to join with us in an effort to abolish the hatred by abolishing the cause.

The multitude of strikes, lockouts, boycotts, injunctions, calling out of troops, militia, deputies (Cossacks) and hired thugs, all of which are used to subjugate, overawe, break down the workers’ defense and drive them back to work or away from the jobs; in all these things “class hatred” can be seen. It is here, and we only point it out. The blood of the workers has reddened a thousand strike fields and now cries out to all but the deaf the tragedy of capitalism’s “class hatred” that grows out of the “class struggle.”

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS.

We also teach class consciousness. Do you ask why? If so, we answer, Look at the class consciousness displayed in the use to
which all the “props” are being put. None of them is allowed to function for the working class. It is no mere accident that all this transpired. This long, almost unbroken regime of class legislation and class action did not just “happen to happen,” it was made to “happen” in support of a class, for class interest, and we are urging the workers not to be so blind as to continue to support their own class enemies.

We want the workers to become conscious of the facts involved in the illustration of investment of lives as given in the foregoing, for we know that when they understand these vital life facts, they will no longer consent to being exploited of the greater portion of the products of their OWN LABOR.

There is no stronger arm of offense or of defense, than the LAW MAKING and enforcing arm. If the capitalist class conspire, lie, bribe and even cause murder to be committed in order to secure and retain such power, then we should profit by their example. Having the greater numbers we need not emulate some of their methods of securing control, nor of enforcement. If that power can be used in the shape of policeman’s club or militiaman’s gun against us, could we not use it to keep these clubs from being so used? Being used to support corporate ownership, it can be used to gain and support SOCIAL OWNERSHIP.

We must not forget that all the political powers the capitalists have which enable them to use the machinery of the State and Nation against the workers, is given to them by the workers themselves.
If we continue to give our enemies a club, need we be surprised that they use it on us, especially if by so doing they can realize millions of wealth?

Let us capture the powers of government and use them in the interest of those who produce the wealth, in behalf of all who do useful work, who render useful service to society.

**HOW WILL WE GET POSSESSION?**

We are often asked, "How can you get possession; will you buy back the industries, and if so, where will you get the money?"

Laying aside the questions involved in the killing and maiming of the workers on the industrial field each and every day, which killing and maiming aggregate each year a greater number than any war in the records of history,—laying aside all this, and the debt due the working class involved therein, if it could be reckoned in terms of debt,—we shall answer in terms of dollars, as they are found to be involved in unpaid wages.

For instance—it is safe to say that at least 20,000,000 workers have been employed forty weeks per year for the last ten years, and that they have not received in wages more than one-third of what they produced; therefore there is due them in UNPAID WAGES two-thirds of the total product, and if the average product is only five dollars per day, it means that the total wages due us for the ten years is $80,000,000,000. The total capitalization of all the industries is estimated (water and all) at $35,000,000,000. Let us make it $50,000,000,000, then we need only demand the unpaid wages due us and we can
buy back all the industries and the capitalists will still be in debt to us $30,000,000,000. We will not ask for any interest, or dividends, but we have a right to ask for the principal. When the question of "buying back" comes up, we all demand that the capitalists first pay us what they owe us.

It is indeed a strange question to ask when they are so deeply in debt themselves to those whom they pretend should buy from them the very things they have taken from us.

Since they cannot pay us what they owe us, it comes with a degree of effrontery that approaches the devilish for them to ask us to buy back our property from them, especially since they have wasted so much of it that they cannot return more than two-thirds of it to us, even if they turn over all they have left.

**CONFISCATION.**

The cry of "confiscation" is of the same devilish character. They have confiscated, and we demand **RECLAMATION and RESTITUTION.** Reclamation of what they have "legally" stolen and Restitution back to those from whom it has been stolen.

We demand that Confiscation shall cease, and cease it shall, for that is the mission of **SOCIALISM.**

**LEGALLY THEIRS.**

We admit they have legalized most of the methods by which they have stolen this industrial property, but we also insist that if they could take it from those who produced
it, "legally," by the laws they have procured, we can take it back legally by laws we shall make for that purpose.

MARX AND ENGELS.

We will conclude this consideration of "Props to Capitalism" with a few quotations from Marx, which amplify the phase of the matter just mentioned:

"The immediate aim of the Socialists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties: formation of the proletarian into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of POLITICAL POWER by the proletariat. * * * The Socialists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationalities. The workingmen have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word."

"We have seen above, that the first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy."

"The proletariat will use its POLITICAL SUPREMACY to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i. e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible."

We will prop the future state with justice instead of special privileges—with equality of opportunity, instead of guns and bayonets.

"Workers of the world, unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains—you have a world to gain."

J. W. SLAYTON.
TO LABOR.

By Charlotte Perkins Gilman.

Shall you complain who feed the world?
Who clothe the world?
Who house the world?
Shall you complain who are the world,
Of what the world may do?
As from the hour
You use your power,
The world must follow you.

The world's life hangs on your right hand,
Your strong right hand,
Your skilled right hand;
You hold the whole world in your hand—
See to it what you do!
Or dark or light,
Or wrong or right,
The world is made by you!

Then rise as you ne'er rose before,
Nor hoped before,
Nor dared before,
And show as ne'er was shown before,
The power that lies in you!
Stand all as one
Till right is done!
Believe and dare and do!
The following editorial from a capitalist paper is most suggestive, and is here reproduced for the purpose of urging additional thought in connection with the questions of "buying back the industries," "Confiscation," and "Unpaid wages"; in short, as to who is really in debt and to whom the debt is due; and you are requested to again read that part of this booklet under the heading, "How Will You Get Possession?"

"A CRUEL AWAKENING."

"Horrible as was the sacrifice of 1,600 lives on the Titanic, it should not be forgotten that heavy loss of life is not uncommon.

"It is uncommon for so many well-to-do people to lose their lives by disaster, and it could happen only aboard a gigantic ocean palace, because there is no other place where the lives of the wealthy and the well-to-do are subject to the competition of greed for the dollar that sacrifices the lives of the wage-workers every day in the year.

"Awful as it is, it is no worse than the slaughter of that many wage-workers which happens in the aggregate every few days, taken for the whole country.

"The race is between human life and the dollar, and the dollar always wins. It was a shock to the wealthy passengers aboard the Titanic to be convinced by demonstration that the wealthy shipowners make no distinction when it comes right down to the real contest—the rich go with the poor, when opposed by the dollar.

"It is the rule of the commercial and industrial world. To those who survived the shock of the Titanic disaster it was a cruel awakening to a fact to which they had always shut their eyes, when the poor toiler was the victim.

"More than 1,600 wage-workers are slaughtered by the same greed every few days, and there is not a ripple on the surface of society."