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INTEMPERANCE
AND POVERTY.

One evening last summer I was unexpectedly drawn into conversation upon the labor question, with a man who, himself a workingman, had in some way managed to scrape together a little money and now considered himself in a position to criticize others less comfortably situated than himself. He said that workingmen got all they deserved. They were a worthless set anyway, spending all their money in the beer-shop. If they spent less money upon beer they would get better wages.

Such sentiment is bad enough when it comes from those who have had no personal knowledge of a workingman's life, but coming from a man who was himself only an exceptionally fortunate worker, it was especially irritating. But I was compelled to recognize the fact that the man spoke from his convictions, and so do many others who express such opinions. Misunderstanding the situation entirely, they lay the blame for the present evil conditions upon the improvidence and intemperance of the workers. It is for the purpose of setting the matter forth in its true light that I wish to say a few words upon the relation of intemperance to poverty.
IS INTEMPERANCE THE CHIEF CAUSE OF POVERTY?

We frequently hear it said that the greatest cause of poverty is intemperance. Not only do our neighbors and friends make that statement, but we find it put into print by persons engaged in professional "charitable" work, as well as by all sorts of writers upon questions connected with the working classes.

Most people are so extremely busy with their efforts to procure food and clothing for themselves and their families, that they have no time to spend upon the abstract question of poverty. When they have had a few moments to look about them, they have seen that those who were in the habit of drinking to excess soon parted with their money, and vice versa when families were in extreme want it was often found that one or more of their members was addicted to strong drink. Naturally they connected the two as cause and effect, and reasoned that if all workingmen were temperate and industrious, prosperity would reign in the homes of the poor.

Such a conclusion is excusable among those who have not the time to study the question thoroughly; those, however, who have the opportunity to study the question, who are looked upon as philanthropists, and who by putting their opinions into print place themselves in the position of teachers to the reading public should not be excused if they offer to the public false conclusions as a result of their own superficial investigation or lack of thoughtful consideration.

Let us see, then, what foundation of truth there is in the belief that intemperance is the
chief cause of poverty. Please note that I shall not consider whether Mr. Jones lost the property his father left him, through his own intemperance and neglect of business, or whether the family of Mr. Harris is going without shoes because he is spending his money in the beer-shop. The question of individual suffering must be settled by the consideration of each individual case. But the question which I shall consider is this: Are the poverty and consequent suffering of a large proportion of our working-class due to their intemperance as a class? I shall not put the case as an appeal to sentiment; I shall simply show you the facts in the matter, the cause of the poverty, and the relation which intemperance bears toward it.

First, then, what is poverty? We will use the word as it is used most commonly, and say that poverty is the lack of the necessities and ordinary comforts of life, not necessarily starvation, but want of some kind. It may mean lack of food, or of proper clothing, or even inability to meet the expense of a doctor or nurse in case of illness. In either of these cases there is suffering from poverty, and I think no one will deny that such suffering is seen frequently among our industrial classes.

If, then, some of our citizens lack the necessities of life, why do they lack them? You will say, perhaps, "Because of their improvidence and intemperance." Let us see how much truth there would be in such a statement.

And now let me ask you: "How may the necessities of life be procured?" You reply: "By working for them." By which you mean
that a man must find some work that needs to be done, that he must do that work, receive pay for his labor, and with the money thus procured purchase for himself the things he needs. That being the case it is manifest that the laborer, whoever he may be, can only purchase necessities to the amount of the payment he has received for his labor, or as we say, his wages. If, then, his wages are sufficient for the purchase of everything he needs, he supplies his wants and is no longer in need. If, however, his wages are insufficient to procure his necessities, what then? Why, then, you find the laborer suffering from poverty; he cannot supply his needs.

Under conditions which would enable anyone who desired work, to procure it easily, and having procured it, to receive sufficient wages to supply his necessities, there would be no suffering from poverty except through some fault in the individual. On the other hand, if it is very difficult, or impossible, for the worker to find work, or if having found it his wage is not sufficient to provide him with the necessities of life, there must be suffering from poverty, whether there is any fault in the individual or not. It is evident, then, that the ease with which employment may be obtained, and the amount of wages paid when it is obtained, are the first factors in determining the poverty or well-being of the worker. What are the facts in this country with regard to these two particulars?

THE UNEMPLOYED.

The territory of the United States is so broad,
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inhabitants in different sections are so diversely circumstanced as regards the actual cost of living, opportunities for employment, comforts incidental to climate, density of population, etc., that to strike an average wage for labor in the whole territory would leave us no better informed as to the actual condition of the laborer than before we had done so. The real wage of a laborer is measured by the comforts it will purchase. As we are considering the cause of poverty existing among certain of our laborers, it will be more satisfactory to take some one section of our country and consider the conditions in that section with regard to wages paid the poorer paid portion of our laborers, cost of living, and opportunities for employment. By so doing we shall get a fairly accurate idea of conditions elsewhere in the United States. For the workingman informs himself pretty thoroughly as to the conditions prevailing in different localities, and we may reasonably conclude that were the condition of the laborer very much better in any given section or sections of our country, all things considered, labor would flock to that favored section, and conditions would soon be approximately equalized.

Let us take then, for investigation, the condition of the laborer in the States of New York and Massachusetts. In these States there is a great concentration of labor power, owing to the immensity and variety of industrial enterprises there conducted, and the consequently greater facilities for obtaining employment.

The statistics of the Massachusetts Bureau
of Labor show for the years from 1890 to 1900, a large and increasing per cent of unemployed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>22.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>22.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>22.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>34.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>32.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>26.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>32.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>27.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>29.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This per cent represents those workers who do not have continuous work the year round; that is, who are unemployed at some period during the year. The figures are taken from the manufacturing industries alone, and have no relation to the enforced idleness of farmers during the winter months.

In the last quarter of 1898, the reports of the New York labor unions show that 29 per cent of their total membership were out of employment, or 46,000 members. Think of it, in the short space of three months, in the State of New York alone, 46,000 men forced to be idle, and these among the best organized and presumably more skilled and efficient workmen. The New York Labor Bulletin shows for the period included between Oct. 1, 1898, and June 30, 1900, an average of 12 per cent out of employment. This period has been looked upon as a period of prosperity.

The figures quoted are sufficient to show that there is a more or less numerous body of work-
ers at all times, out of employment, in these
great centers of industry, New York and Massa-
chusetts. If anyone is curious to know how
general such a condition is, reports may be ob-
tained from the Bureaus of Labor in many of
the States, but it is indisputable that conditions
are much worse in regard to unemployment in
those parts of our country where manufactures
are less developed, and a larger part of the pop-
ulation depends upon agricultural pursuits.

WAGES.

Next, as to the wages paid to the poorer paid
of our workers. The Massachusetts reports show
that about one quarter, or twenty-five per cent
of the adult males engaged in eighty-eight classi-
fied industries (not including agriculture), re-
ceive a wage of less than $8 per week. That is,
one-fourth of the working-class, when employed
at full time, receive per man less than $8 for one
week’s work. Of course, periods of unemploy-
ment bring down the man’s average earnings
to a much lower sum. We may safely conclude
that the official statistics do not represent the
facts in any intentionally unfavorable light.

“But,” someone says, “this wage would be
sufficient if it were not squandered in drink.”
While it may be held that a very low wage
would be sufficient to provide for the necessities
of the worker, should that worker consent to
live on the coarsest of fare and to wear the
cheapest of clothing, the fact is overlooked by
many that there is another formidable bill of
expense which our working classes find it dif-
ficult to settle. How to meet the rent is the
perplexing problem for the poverty-stricken, and
It must be conceded that some sort of a place of habitation is absolutely necessary to existence.

In the large cities of this country the rent of one unfurnished room in the poorest and most wretched location will average a little over $1 per week. So your laborer who earns from $5 to $7.50 per week, must pay for the privilege of two rooms for his family, at least $2 per week. This is taken out of his scanty earnings for a bare place to live in. "Miss Adah A. Woolfolk, of the College Settlement in Rivington street, found that among 600 families, 27 per cent of the earnings are expended in rent."

Now even supposing your laborer has constant employment (a barely supposable case), and unfailling good health, he will have only from $3 to $6 per week remaining with which to clothe and feed himself and family, living meanwhile in a tenement of one or two wretched rooms. Do you still consider, taking these figures into account, that the average wage of our workers is sufficient to keep a family in the necessaries of life, taking into account such exigencies as births and deaths? And are you still of the opinion that their poverty is only the result of their improvidence and intemperance?

We are speaking now not of the lowest wage paid, but of the wage paid to 25 per cent of the adult male laborers in manufacturing industries in Massachusetts, and this it seems to me is not sufficient to prolong existence in a city. It forces the women and children to work to help out the living. Children usually earn less than $2.50 a week, while in all the large cities
of this country, thousands of women are working for a wage of $3 a week.

Not to confine our attention entirely to the Atlantic States let us take a brief look at conditions existing among women and children employed in San Francisco, not that their condition is worse than that of similar workers in New York or Massachusetts, but merely as evidence that disgraceful conditions prevail on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic Coast. We quote from the Seventh Biennial Report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the State of California, upon the subject of "Sweat-shops."

"O——, corner Third and Minna streets, employs six to eight females, two males; does what he calls 'string work.' One girl, operating big machine by foot gets $2 per week; looks overworked and underfed, very pale. Two girls working on buttons said they earned 28 to 30 cents per day; seemed to be very much frightened. Two women said they got 20 cents for finishing. Man gets $6 per week, boy $3 per week. * * *

"S——, 641 Stevenson street (vest maker) employs eighteen to twenty-one females, three males. All work in small room, 10 by 24, in rear of house; very poor place; girls packed so close their elbows interfere with work; proprietor very surly; place utterly unfit for so many people; two girls at $1.50 per week, one at $2.50, one at $4.50, three at $5. * * *

"C—— W—— M—— (suit-makers), Market street, found fifty-four girls and twenty-seven men in factory, rear half of store; small gallery on left side filled with girls; great many young
girls, say they are fifteen and over. Two told me they got $1.50 per week, and said there were several at same price. * * * The gallery is lighted with incandescent lights, have to use lights part of time all through."

The fact that women and children will consent to labor under such wretched conditions and for so miserable a pittance, shows conclusively the extreme necessity which forces them to submit. And while these wretchedly poor may economize in everything else, the fact remains that for living-room itself they have to pay as dearly as the most prosperous; in fact more dearly in proportion to the accommodation received. The most wretched rookeries in our great cities pay their owners the highest rate of interest on their investments, sometimes it is said from thirty to fifty per cent. When we consider the vileness of the holes into which humanity crawls, when we consider that people are forced to live in such places for years, that the mortality is so fearful that more children die than are born in them, can we wonder that men, and women, too, frequent the saloon on the corner?

I hold, then, that the cause of the poverty of a large class of our workers is too low a rate of wage, as compared to the cost of living.

WHAT DETERMINES THE WAGE?

What, then, determines the rate of wages? If all workers should abstain from intoxicating drinks would the average wage increase?

When the worker goes about looking for employment, he offers his labor in the market for sale, precisely as any other commodity is offered for sale. He receives for it its market value,
sometimes maybe a trifle more or less, but approximately just what another man would receive for doing the same work; just as a man who sells a ton of coal or a bushel of wheat receives for them their market value, and a union of laborers in any one line of work, to keep up the price of labor in that line, is precisely similar to a combine of producers of any given commodity, for the purpose of keeping up the price in that particular commodity.

But what regulates the value of any commodity? The price of a commodity is regulated by its supply and demand; that is, if a commodity is plentiful and there is little demand for it the price falls; if it is scarce or there is a great demand for it, the price rises. The same causes produce the same effects in the labor market. If laborers are plenty, and labor not in great demand wages are low; if laborers are few, and the demand is greater than the supply, wages rise. These facts, namely the supply of and demand for labor, regulate the rate of wages, and upon the rate of wages as we have seen, rests in the first instance the prosperity or poverty of the laborer.

Behind this apparent and easily recognized "law of supply and demand" lie the causes out of which spring the supply and the demand. These are the productive power of labor, on the one hand, and the cost of living on the other. The productive power of labor is the cause of the demand for labor; and the highest possible productiveness of labor regulates the highest wage it is possible to pay. On the other hand, the cost of living fixes the lowest wage at which
it is possible to engage labor for any considerable period, for manifestly if you force the wage below the living point for the majority of laborers, supposing you had the power so to do, you would kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

EFFECT OF COMPETITION IN LABOR.

In a society in which there is a class of unemployed, the wage will never rise to the highest possible wage, but constantly tends to fall to the lowest possible wage, through the action of competition among the workers; and as we have seen that the lowest possible wage is determined by the cost of subsistence, it follows that any measure which lowers the cost of subsistence for large numbers of people, will lower the wage.

Now, abstinence from intoxicants appears to be precisely such a measure. The man who thinks he cannot subsist without his daily grog counts the price of that beverage in as a necessary cost of living, and can only be underbidd in the labor market by the man (or woman) who does not count the cost of grog as necessary, and who by agreeing to work for less money than his or her beer-drinking neighbor, does his or her little share to lower the average wage.

It may be objected that the grog, being only a fancied necessity and not a real one, cannot be properly considered as a part of the actual cost of subsistence, and that it is upon the actual cost of living and not upon any fancied necessities that the lowest wage depends. We would reply that a man's necessities are determined by his mind and imagination as well as by the
cravings of his body, and that so long as a large proportion of a community fancy that liquor is a necessity, it is for them a necessity, so far as its operation in keeping up the rate of wages is concerned. But if it were possible to reduce the living of the worker to the food and drink absolutely necessary to keep life in the body the wage would fall to that level, and the worker would be injured rather than benefited.

It might be supposed that as the highest rate of wages it is possible to pay, is regulated by the highest productiveness of labor, it would follow that if all employes were temperate, employers could afford to pay a higher rate of wages than they now do, for the reason that the labor of the temperate workers would be more productive than our present labor. And this would be the case if there were no class of unemployed, and if there were also a ready market for products. Under our present conditions, however, an increase in the productiveness of labor does not work a benefit to the laborer. The market for products is restricted, and on the other hand the supply of labor is greater than the demand for it. The employer of labor does not dare to produce goods to an unlimited extent. He must find a market for his goods, and produce cautiously with a view to keeping his production inside the bounds of the probable demand. Consequently, if it should come to pass that three of his workmen could do the work which it now takes four to accomplish, he would simply discharge the fourth man, and pay the other three no more than the regular market value of their labor. And he would be
forced to do this, since the competition among manufacturers, in the effort to obtain a market for their goods, compels them to put their products on the market as cheaply as possible, and necessitates reducing expenses to the lowest limit, including the expense of wages paid. As we said before, supposing there were an unlimited market for products the employer could keep all of his men, and raise their wage on account of their greater productiveness, but that is not the existing state of affairs.

Now, when this fourth man should be thrown out of employment, he would increase the already large per cent of unemployed. This body of men, hanging on the outskirts of the labor field, and forced by their necessities to underbid those now employed, exert a constant downward pressure on the rate of wages. Every addition to their ranks is an injury to the worker. So it is apparent that an increase in the productiveness of a man's labor works directly to his disadvantage, by increasing the number of unemployed. The Mergenthaler linotype, it is said, enables one man to do the work which formerly required four men. The immediate result of its use is to throw three men out of employment.

Under our present system, then, a system in which natural opportunities are monopolized, and men are forced to compete with each other for an opportunity to sell their labor power, an increase in the productiveness of labor tends to diminish the wage.

It is sometimes said that the fact of the greater productiveness of labor works a benefit
to the laborer by making the finished product less expensive, and thus enabling the worker to procure it more cheaply, but that depends entirely upon what the product may be which is thus cheapened. It is quite possible for a large proportion of our laborers to be engaged at low wages in the manufacture of articles which not one in a hundred of them will ever be capable of procuring. It is of no advantage to them that the price of these luxuries is cheapened. To really benefit the worker you must lower the price of flour, of meats, of vegetables, of substantial clothing, and greatest of all benefits if it were possible, minimize the rent.

Let us consider the state of labor in this country. There is a large class of unemployed, and the employer has therefore a chance to make a selection in hiring labor. It is fair to presume that he hires temperate men in preference to intemperate ones, and it is every day becoming more and more true that the steadily employed men are temperate. If the intemperate, unreliable worker becomes temperate and reliable and suddenly swells the ranks of the workers, will wages go up or down?

We often see statements in temperance papers, of the amount of money spent in strong drink, and comparisons made with the amount spent for the necessities of life. The conclusion is drawn that if this money were not spent for liquor the worker would have it to use for other purposes, and would presumably receive much comfort from it, but this is an error. If the use of spirituous liquors should suddenly cease, unless some other equally harmful appetite
should be created to take its place, there would at once be put upon the market a greater number of competent, dependable, active workers, increasing the supply of labor power, and consequently lowering the price that labor would bring. So that in the end the abstainer would have less money than the beer-drinking worker has now, the amount spent in liquor having been entirely eliminated from the wage.

Thus we see that what should be a benefit to society, namely the increase of sober, industrious, capable workers, is through the pernicious system of competition in labor made to work a positive injury. The person who would be immediately benefited by the abstinence of the workers, as a class, is the man who employs labor, for if all were abstainers he would be able to obtain labor power at a cheaper rate.

Do not imagine that I am attempting to argue here in favor of the use of intoxicants. Far from it. I am only attempting to show to you that intemperance is not and cannot be the cause of low wages for large classes of people, and that if wages are too low, poverty must exist even if every citizen were temperate and industrious. I am endeavoring to turn into the proper channel the inquiry as to the cause of the suffering among our people; and in doing so I shall do no injury to the cause of temperance. A knowledge of facts is the first essential to efficient action in that or any other cause. I would encourage sobriety and discourage intemperance because of their effects upon the character and well-being of the individual and of society as a whole, but I would not so distort
facts as to make it appear that the habit of in-
temperance is responsible for conditions which
the utmost sobriety would not be capable of
altering.

INTEMPERANCE A RESULT OF POVERTY.

It is evident, then, that the temperance of the
worker will not annihilate poverty. One thing,
and one only, can do that, and that is work
whether desired at sufficient wages. But, you
say, "Why is it that intemperance and poverty
are so commonly seen together if intemperance
is not the cause of poverty?" We answer that
intemperance is a very common result of
poverty.

Place a man in the midst of a large city; allow
him a wage too small to enable him to support
his family decently, and as a result oblige him
to live in a crowded tenement opening on
some back alley, where there is nothing to be
seen from the windows but the windows or
doors of other equally wretched tenements;
nothing to be heard but the squalls of babies or
the scolding of women; is it any wonder that
he takes to the sidewalk for a breath of fresh
air, and as the policeman will not allow men
to congregate upon the street, is it any wonder
that he steps into the nearest saloon to joke
with his friends and talk over the latest news?
And as there is an etiquette, even among the
poorest, is it at all strange that he feels himself
under obligation to buy some of the liquor which
is sold in this place which offers him free shel-
ter and a welcome? The fact that in a large city
the saloon is practically the only meeting place
of the poor, for social intercourse, accounts in a
large measure for the habit of drinking; but we must also allow for the temptation to forget wretchedness and misery in a glass of liquor, and as most of the suffering of the poor is caused solely by the fact of their poverty, you see here, in poverty itself, a powerful cause of intemperance.

Hunger. The fact that our poor cannot obtain the food they crave is a factor that must at all times be reckoned with. Excessive fatigue also causes a craving for stimulants. It is often the case that the stomach rejects the notion of food, under the influence of too great fatigue. Then comes the positive demand of the physical system for drink. Possibly drinks not alcoholic, but nourishing, would be as acceptable to the stomach and not injurious in the end. But how are they to be obtained? The ordinary workingman has no knowledge of them, or opportunity to obtain them. The liquor is always at hand. It stimulates the stomach and creates an appetite for the food which, though coarse, and unpalatable is all that the workingman can afford to eat.

Prof. Richard T. Ely says in "The Labor Movement in America:" "We should never forget the temptation to intemperance which lies in the character of the toil of many laborers. Long hours are regarded by competent authorities as a cause which predisposes to the use of intemperants. The strain of work by the side of rapidly moving machines, on the nervous system, is another predisposing cause of intemperance which has attracted serious attention," and he quotes from a report delivered by Robert Howard be-
fore the Blair Committee of the United States Senate: "Drinking is most prevalent among the working people where the hours of labor are long." Henry George, in "Progress and Poverty," says: "In every civilized country the diseases are increasing which come from overstrained nerves, from insufficient nourishment, from squalid lodgings, from unwholesome and monotonous occupations, from premature labor of children, from the tasks and crimes which poverty imposes upon women." Among the diseases caused and fostered by poverty we may safely class the prevalent disease of alcoholism.

If we grant, then, that poverty is a common cause of intemperance it follows plainly that one of the most promising methods of promoting temperance is to improve the condition of the worker. When our workingmen shall have a hopeful outlook, cheerful surroundings and intelligent amusements, it is reasonable to believe that the folly of the drink habit will greatly decrease.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

It is held by many that a tax imposed by government on the manufacture or sale of spirits, has a beneficial effect, and tends to restrict consumption; while there are a few well-meaning advocates of the theory of government ownership of the liquor traffic as an effective means for preventing the increase of drunkenness. All such should consider the result of the application of this principle to the liquor question in India, where there was an exceptionally good opportunity to illustrate its merits. Much informa-
tion may be obtained upon this subject, from a volume entitled "Indika," by John F. Hurst, D. D., LL. D., published in 1891. The author states that his statistics have been taken from the tabular reports issued at Calcutta by the departments of the Indian government, and we shall take the privilege of quoting very freely. It should be remembered that the native population of India is composed almost entirely of Hindus and Mohammedans. Both of these religions prohibit the drinking of spirituous liquors. Dr. Hurst says: "Though made up of many races, and presenting a singular variety of languages, religions, intellectual strength and social condition, no people of India, whether aboriginal or Aryan, were addicted to intemperate habits when Vasco da Gama first landed on their shores." The testimony of Warren Hastings was as follows: "Their temperance demonstrated in the simplicity of their food and their total abstinence from spirituous liquor, and other substances of intoxication." Let us now see what has resulted from the interference of the British government in the manufacture and sale of liquor in India. We quote from "Indika:"

"The excise regulations of the government of India began in Bombay in the year 1790. It was claimed that the people began to develop a taste for liquor, and that the cost of a quart of mowhra spirit, made of the juice of the palm, was so low—only a half-penny—that anybody could get drunk on it. Then the fallacy came once to the front—tax, and therefore restriction. Put a tax on the tree and the people will drink..."
less. This was the outspoken argument, a good exoteric weapon in defence of the excise. The real argument was nothing of the kind. Tax the juice of the tree and the government will have all the money it wants. That was the whole philosophy, and it has been steadily adhered to in India for a whole century. The object of the government has been to raise money out of the vice, and not to suppress the vice.

Two systems have been adopted by the government, which is the real purveyor of liquors to the people of India. * * * The first was that of the government distillery. The government was the responsible proprietor of every distillery in the land. It was the owner of the machinery. The amount turned out by each distillery was fixed by law. Only a certain number of distilleries was permitted in each district. The size of the stills was limited and only pure liquor could be manufactured, and from wholesome material. The distillery was strictly watched by the government police, and the drink kept under lock and key. There were other safeguards by which the output of liquor was comparatively limited. What was the result? The government did not make all the money it wanted for its general treasury. In order to carry on the government, six hundred and forty thousand pounds sterling were assigned to the Excise Department of Bengal, as its share to meet demands. But under the Government Distillery plan only from five hundred and fifty thousand to six hundred thousand pounds had been raised for years. It seldom went beyond six hundred thousand pounds sterling. Now
came the demand for six hundred and forty thousand pounds sterling. What was to be done? The old principle could not be worked up to that paying basis.

"Now came a happy thought. The old Sudder system must be given up. It did not put enough money into the treasury. Mr. C. T. Buckland must go down into posterity as the brilliant man who was equal to the occasion. His genius evolved the Out Still system. He laid it before the government. It was adopted. The treasury soon had all the money it wanted. The Government Distillery was a ruin, and the Out Still was erected on the site. The new arrangement was introduced in the year 1876, but did not go into complete operation until two years had passed. But when once in full motion it answered all expectations—except those of the friends of temperance. It filled the treasury to overflowing, but covered many a fair plain with drunkards.

"Let us now look at this brilliant invention—the Out Still of New India. All the Sudder distilleries for country spirits must be shut up. The right to set up Out Stills, or stills outside government control, must be offered at auction to the highest bidder. He can distil what he likes and as much as he likes, on condition that he keep his bargain with the government to pay the price at which he bought his right to distil. The government in this way is released from all expense and all supervision.

"Now the direct result of this system is that the number of distilleries has been vastly increased. The people can now get all the liquor
they desire. The Out Still is before all eyes. The increase in revenue is enormous. During the last five years there has been an increase in India's revenue from liquor, of six hundred and sixty thousand pounds, or nearly twenty per cent. Such is the financial triumph of the Out Still.

"The government never adopted the original plan of the Government Still, or the new Out Still to take its place, in order to lessen intemperance, but simply to increase its revenue. It gained its end. Besides, the special Bengal Commission was appointed in 1886 for the express purpose of investigating this very subject. It did its work thoroughly, and reached the conclusion of a vast increase in consumption. It declared that in Bengal, which is one-fourth of all India, and contains a population of sixty-six millions, the quantity of liquor distilled and sold in 1874-75 was one and a half million gallons. The population at the utmost had increased eight or nine per cent, but the output and consumption of liquor had increased one hundred and thirty-five per cent. Here we have the government against itself. * * * 'I contend that the whole tendency of the excise system is to increase consumption and that I have proved it to the hilt by the very documents which the government of India, misled by some mendacious official, has put forward to prove the contrary. The government are driving this license trade as hard as they can. Collectors find it the easiest way to increase their contribution to the revenue, and for years they have been stimulating the consumption of liquor to the utmost.
If the government continue their present policy of doubling the revenue every ten years, in thirty years India will be one of the most drunken and most degraded countries on the face of the earth.' When there was no tax on the palm furnishing the juice which served as a simple beer for the natives, the natives contented themselves with that. But now the government taxes every tree which produces the juice. The people, having gotten the taste of the strong drink, now prefer it."

It is evident then, that government ownership, as illustrated by its results in India, does not offer a very hopeful solution to the "liquor question." But the question arises, "Does government ownership then increase the evil use of intoxicants?"

It must be remembered that previous to the government of India taking the matter into its hands, the liquor used in India was manufactured mainly by the person, family or community which consumed it, and its use entailed no great expense to the user, and no profit worthy of consideration to the maker or distributor of the drink. Here you come to the real root of the matter. While the production of liquor and its delivery to consumers brought no considerable profit to those producing or distributing it, neither production nor distribution were stimulated, and consumption was therefore slight. When the manufacture and sale of liquor were made a government monopoly, and the element of profit entered into the business, production and distribution were greatly stimulated, with the result that the consumption increased enormously. It will be found upon examination that wherever the manufacture or sale of liquor is conducted for profit, whether that profit be reaped by a government or by individuals, there you will find the consumption of liquor stimulated.

We offer, then, as a solution to the sphinx's riddle, "How shall we act to reduce the growing evil of intemperance?" Improve the condition of the worker, and do away with the possibility of making a profit by the manufacture and sale of liquor.

I can imagine that you reply to this suggestion: "Why, of course no one would engage in any business without a prospect of profit, but the public require and demand intoxicants, and how can you then expect
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to do away entirely with the business of manufacture
and sale?"

As to this we would say, that where a community
demands strong drink, it can find a means of manufac-
turing it for its own use, and can consume it without
necessarily paying a profit to anybody for so doing.
If a city can furnish its citizens with pure water at
the cost of obtaining it, charging them only a sufficient
tax to cover expenses, it could also furnish its citizens
with whisky at cost if it thought fit to do so. The
whisky so furnished would undoubtedly be much
purer than most now sold, and it would probably be
much cheaper, but there is a logical certainty that
there would be very much less of it consumed. But it
must be ensured that no profit shall be reaped from
the manufacture. If this were done there would be
no inducement for the manufacturers to stimulate the
trade, nor for any private individual to set up a dis-
tillery of his own.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

In connection with the efforts put forth for the re-
striction of intemperance, it is well to note a state-
ment made by Prof. R. T. Ely, in the "Labor Move-
ment in America." He says: "Labor organizations
are perhaps the chief power in this country, look-
ring for temperance." And he quotes sections in the con-
stitutions of various labor organizations, imposing
fining for intoxication, and forbidding members to have
any connection with the sale of intoxicating liquors.
The intelligent workingman realizes that while tem-
perance in itself would not benefit the worker pecu-
arily as a class, it is not to be overlooked as a neces-
sary condition of success in any effort the worker
may make to emancipate himself. When men are
training for an athletic contest, they regulate their
food and drink, their exercise, their recreations, to the
end that they may come into the arena with all their
physical and mental powers in their highest perfec-
tion. The workers of the world are approaching a
contest for a tremendous prize, the prize of liberty it-
self. With this contest upon him, at his very door,
no man can afford to trifle with his powers of mind or
body. Temperance in all things must be the motto of
the worker of to-day. There must be no brains mudd-
ded by liquor, no nerves and muscles weakened by
excess, to meet the attack of the wily, powerful foes
who even now confront him. Workingmen, keep your
brains clear, that you may be able to act intelligently
to further your own interests.

MUST POVERTY CONTINUE?

We have been taught to think that poverty is a nec-
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Essary condition for a large proportion of the human family, and opinions which have been inculcated for centuries, and are incorporated in the tradition and literature of the race, are necessarily too deeply rooted to be easily shaken. Nevertheless, if we take the trouble to examine closely into present conditions, we may see that the environments of humanity are vastly different to-day from any of which we have a record in history. There is no longer a necessity for the wearing toil which was formerly required to provide sustenance. The brain of man has conceived and his hand has contrived tools of production, weapons for the conflict with nature, which make him a thousand times as powerful as his ancestors. The man of to-day is capable of producing, through the use of his improved machinery, vast amounts of wealth with very little labor; so that conditions are greatly altered among men, while the opinions and literature of the race are mainly unchanged. In this respect our books are a drag upon us. They prevent our realizing the highest possibilities open to us. It is now morally certain that with proper direction of labor, a proper supervision of the processes of production and distribution, no man need suffer from want, or be oppressed with excessive toil.

It is time that all would-be benefactors of humanity should look to the great evil, the mother of vices and destroyer of happiness, the terrible evil of poverty for millions of toilers. Is there no method by which this evil can be eradicated from the earth? Have we progressed to the extent that one man can produce more that is useful to humanity than a hundred could produce a few centuries ago; and are we still to be cursed with poverty? The human race existed and perpetuated itself under the most primitive conditions; shall we do no more now? Are we never to have more than a hand-to-mouth existence?

ORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY.

The industries of the world are at present, and have been in the past mainly conducted without any general system or supervision. Men spend their labor in producing those things which they consider will be useful to themselves, or which being useful to others can be exchanged for the things which they themselves desire. If their calculations at any time go astray, the producers are the sufferers. Their goods remain on their hands, and represent a useless expenditure of their labor. This has often happened when the greatest possible foresight has been used. Again, it has often been the case that products of value to human-
INTEMPERANCE AND POVERTY.

ity have been allowed to waste because they could not be brought to the market which demanded them. Grain has been consumed for fuel. Fruit is thrown into the sea, while thousands suffer for lack of this very article of diet.

It is this lack of supervision of production and distribution which is to-day the only real cause of poverty. It is not enough to say that the working world is capable of producing all that is necessary for a comfortable existence. We can go farther and say that the labor now expended would more than suffice to keep us all in abundance, if it were only properly organized and well directed.

It is beginning to be recognized partially, and by scattered individuals, that this is the great need of the present stage of industrial development, and the fact will be more plainly seen, and will be evident to large numbers of our citizens, as industrial enterprises progress in the direction of combination and organization. For the user of capital, the employer of labor has come to realize the immense advantages to be gained by co-operation and organization, and is making use of these principles in the combinations known as "trusts."

When men who have been conducting different enterprises independently as individuals, unite for the sake of greater strength and economy in production, and form what is called a "trust," they have abandoned competition among themselves, and adopted cooperation and organization. Eventually the laborer will also understand this principle, and will use it to his own advantage.

The manufacturer has, in fact, been forced into combination for self-protection. The working of the competitive system which compels the weak to yield to the strong, and the strong to struggle among themselves until only the strongest hold their places in the industrial field, results naturally in the combinations of individuals for the sake of greater strength, and as these combinations can only be resisted and successfully competed with by other combinations of equal or greater size, larger and ever larger combinations are formed. That is, competition is being carried to such an extreme as to force co-operation.

The recognition of the trend of industry toward larger and ever larger combinations of capital and labor, leading finally to conditions in which the combinations will be so large that the people must either control them collectively or submit to be employed and therefore ruled by a very small number of immensely wealthy and powerful individuals: it is this under-
standing of the present progress of civilization, which is the distinctive mark of the believers in what is called "socialism."

The theory of socialism is co-operation in production, organization of industry, and the collective ownership by the people, of the means of production and distribution. By the "means of production" the Socialist designates land, machinery used in producing, etc., and the means of distribution would include railways and all other facilities for transportation, as well as the various devices used for transmitting intelligence.

The working of the principle of co-operation in production, and organization of labor, without collective ownership of the means of production, would result in the formation of vast industrial armies, organized and operated systematically, but directed and controlled by a few individuals whose aim would be their own benefit and aggrandizement. The workers would become a horde of slaves. If such a state of society could exist for a brief period it is hardly possible for it to continue. The more stable form of government, the democracy, must eventually supersede it.

It is hardly understandable how civilization can be so blind to the great gain to be had by the organization of industry. In many undertakings its usefulness has been proved. It now remains for us to apply the principle to the whole system of industry, and reap in return an immense saving of labor and elimination of waste, with a consequent reduction in the hours of toil, and increase in the comforts of life for society as a whole.

Let me give a simple illustration. In a large city, milk is supplied by a great number of independent milk-vending corporations or individuals. They work without a general system. Four or five different milk carts rattle over the same street, each supplying milk to a portion of the residents. If the city were districted, and the milk supplied systematically, there would be an immense saving of labor. A saving of labor, of course means a saving of expense, for the community is obliged to pay for the delivery of the milk as well as for its first cost coming from the cow.

In considering the conditions which would result from a general organization of industry, we should also recognize the fact that it would do away with the immense number of so-called "middlemen," who, although they perform a necessary part in the present system of industry, by bringing the product to the consumer, are nevertheless in the strict sense non-producers, and their support a burden on the community. This would be better realized by the masses if they
could know the actual cost of production of the goods which they consume. If a man knew that the pair of boots for which he pays $3 cost the manufacturer about 60 cents and that all the rest of the amount paid had been frittered away in payment of profits to wholesale and retail merchants, salaries to traveling salesmen, and expense of handling and freight, much of it entirely unnecessary, together with the cost of keeping a dozen shoe stores where one would be sufficient, he would, perhaps, be a little more ready to consider whether it is not possible to do away with some of these unnecessary expenses.

But there is another fact to be considered. At present our industries are conducted for profit. The idea of the Socialist is that each industry should be conducted by the people collectively, for the satisfaction of their own wants, and that the goods thus produced shall be supplied to the people at the cost of production. The element of profit is thus eliminated. Now, under such a system as this, the people being at once producers and consumers, there would be no competition in production. When competition ceases much unproductive labor is saved.

It is not generally realized how large a part of the labor of modern times is directly expended in the effort of competing producers to hold their own, or to defeat their neighbor in the sale of their goods; that is, in the effort of competition rather than in production itself. Costly advertisements, armies of drummers, magnificent displays in show windows, these expenses the consumer of the goods must pay, although they in no way benefit him, and they add no small per cent to the cost of the article bought.

Then there is the waste arising from misdirected labor, as for instance in the raising of vegetable produce which excessive freight charges will not permit to be brought to market. Thousands of tons of fruit are wasted yearly from this cause alone, while some of our population are obliged to do without palatable food, and the remainder pay enough for what they get to cover the loss.

There seems to be a general idea that if everybody is kept busy, and has enough to eat, the main objects of existence have been attained. And if we argue that the work of the middleman or advertiser is unnecessary and unproductive, we are met with the reply that advertising provides employment for vast numbers of people. What is not realized is the fact that under a different system the labor of these people might be expended in adding to the real wealth of the community that they might become producers.
When the eyes of the public have been opened to the fact that it is possible for us to have a great deal more than a bare subsistence; when the public realizes that there need be no class of unemployed, whom the remainder of society must support; when they see that by organizing and controlling our industries collectively and democratically, we may provide for all our wants, and live securely and happily in the certainty of the comforts of life, then we shall make an end of the terrible evil of poverty. We shall live together as human beings who find in association both pleasure and advantage, and not as now be obliged in the struggle for existence to trample upon every sentiment and affection which leads us to consider the welfare of our neighbor.

No Socialist presumes to state what sort of a community the Socialist state of the future will be. To predict what any state under any form of government will be fifty or even twenty years hence, is manifestly unwarrantable. Under the present rapid rate of progress, with nobody knows what discoveries and exigencies in store for us in the immediate future, no intelligent person who does not pretend to prophetic insight, would venture to predict the environment of future generations.

We, who are advocating Socialism, are not advocating a cut and dried formula of life, a government under which such and such laws will prevail. The Socialist advocates a principle. The republican of a little over a century ago advocated a principle—the principle of political equality—and he did not and could not predict just the condition of affairs to which that principle would carry him in a hundred years. The Socialist of to-day advocates the principle of economic equality, and he does not pretend to state in detail just how this principle will work itself out. By economic equality we mean that the opportunity to work shall be assured to all, and that the proceeds of a man's labor shall be assured to the laborer.

The principle around which the theory of Socialism is developed as the apple around the core, is the principle of co-operation. This is no newly-discovered principle. It has been at work in all forms of society from the earliest history of man, and the Socialist only assumes that it will continue to work, and will develop higher forms of co-operation than have yet been realized.

The Socialist contends that our present state of anarchy in production, under which every man produces goods by guess-work, not knowing whether he will have a market for his goods, is a wasteful and unreas-
sonable method of production. He contends that an-
archy in production, and the consequent competition
among producers, leading as it does to all kinds of
deception and adulteration in the efforts of producers
to undersell one another, is not a wise or beneficent
form of production. The Socialist claims that if we
should organize our industries and produce what we
wish to produce in a reasonable and methodical man-
nner, we should gain in saving of labor and in economy
of resources.

This is precisely the same principle which is dem-
onstrated in the working of the great trusts, in which
economy is conserved by an organized method of pro-
duction. The only difference between the idea of the
Socialist and that of the private trust advocate is that
the Socialist would have the management of industries
vested in the people themselves, thus doing away with
the immense profit which is being continually drained
from the veins and sinews of the workers, for the
benefit of the stockholder in the trust.

The statement sometimes heard, that under a social-
ist form of government the life of the individual would
be regulated, down to the minutest detail, has no foun-
dation in the Socialist teaching of to-day. The Social-
list looks forward to a democratic form of government,
a perfected democracy, and it is not reasonable to
suppose that the people of a democracy will enforce
laws which they find it inconvenient and unnecessary
to obey. It seems hardly necessary to say it is under
an autocratic form of government, such for instance
as that now existing in Russia, that individual rights
are most arbitrarily interfered with.

The Socialism of which Socialists speak, means co-
operation in industry, the organization of industry, the
ownership by the people, of the means of production
and distribution. It means that we shall so conduct
our industries as to provide intelligently for our wants,
and give to the laborer the proceeds of his labor.

The theories of Socialism have so gained ground
during the past decade that it is now almost inexces-
able in those who have opportunities for information, to
be uninformed concerning them. The Socialists of
Europe form a large part of the voting population,
and in our own country their numbers are rapidly in-
creasing. They advocate the use of the ballot to ac-
complish the changes they desire to make, and earn-
estly invite investigation of their aims and methods.
They alone, of all modern economists, teach that pov-
erty is unnecessary, and that the human race is
progressing toward conditions in which it will be un-
known.