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PREFACE.

THE chapters of which this book is composed were originally printed in serial form in the Social-Democratic Herald of Milwaukee. Frederic Heath, editor of the Herald, had often asked me to contribute something for his paper. The requirements of my own newspaper duties in Detroit, however, were such that I procrastinated until an idea that had long been pressing itself upon me had time to develop. That idea was that I could write a book that might be useful in conveying to the average man an adequate definition of Socialism. Mr. Heath generously accepted the suggestion by offering to print whatever I might write, and this volume is the result.

Far greater minds than mine having enriched the abundant literature of Socialism, some further explanation is required to dispel what would otherwise be the inevitable impression that in expecting any small effort of mine to supplement their great efforts I had been guilty of gross presumption. And I would be guilty of such presumption were I less mindful of the fact that writers of splendid abilities have covered, with infinite care and profound knowledge of economic laws, every phase of the philosophy of Socialism. But it occurred to me that the very profundity of such writers, exhilarating as it is to the student, is more or less stupefying to the average man—to the man who, without any particular knowledge of political economy, merely wants to obtain a good working definition of Socialism.

In this book I have tried to give such a definition. I have tried to make it as plain as I could in order to reach the average man—the man who must be reached before Socialism can come. And I have preceded the definition of Socialism
with census figures issued by the United States government that should give pause to those who contend that Socialism is not needed—that "prosperity" is abundant and that the Republican or Democratic parties may be depended upon to protect the interests of those who produce wealth by their labor.

If such a work in one volume—instead of the five or six in which the various phases of Socialism are sometimes discussed—shall contribute even a little toward the dissemination of information, not alone with regard to what Socialism is, but as to what it is NOT, the purpose of the author will have been achieved. For Socialism wants only a fair hearing. It asks no more. It will accept no less. And the campaign of slander that is now directed against it by those who doubtless believe they have good reasons for being satisfied with existing conditions will fall of its own weight when the fact is generally known, as stated in the Encyclopedia Britannica, that "The ethics of Socialism are identical with the ethics of Christianity."

ALLEN L. BENSON.

Detroit, Mich.
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CHAPTER I.

An Introductory Word to the Reader.

Let us reason together.

Presumably you do not believe in Socialism. Doubtless you have read in the newspapers that Socialism and anarchy are the same, and that Socialism stands for disorder and destruction. Probably you have also read in the newspapers that Socialists are a lazy lot who want to rob the rich and divide the wealth of the country evenly among all the people.

If you believe these things, we Socialists do not blame you. You depend upon the newspapers for news, as we all do, and if the newspapers mislead you, you do not know it. We love our country as much as you do and for the same reason. It is our home, as it is your home. We expect to stay here as you expect to stay here, and we expect our children to live here after us, as you expect your children to be Americans after we all are gone. Therefore, we do not want to do anything or believe in anything that will make the United States a poorer place in which to live, either during our own lifetime or in the time after our children have taken our places.

We Socialists do not believe that great wealth makes happiness. We do know, however, that great poverty and great uncertainty about continued employment make unhappiness. It is therefore not our purpose to provide conditions under which every person might be a millionaire. Human beings are incapable of producing wealth rapidly enough to make them all rich. All of the wealth in the country amounts only to a hundred billions, and if it were divided up into million-dollar lots there could be only 100,000 millionaires, and the rest of our eighty millions of people would have nothing. We want everybody who works to have something. We want every honest producer of wealth to have what he produces. Nobody pro-
duces in his whole lifetime value that is the equivalent of a million dollars. Therefore, we want no millionaires. On the other hand, no one who is willing to work ought to go hungry or cold for lack of an opportunity to work. Nor do we believe that one who works faithfully and well should be compelled to live in a hovel and to deny himself and his family all of the pleasures and advantages of life. We believe this world was made for all of us to live and be happy in, rather than for a few to become rich in.

We believe you will agree with us that this is so. Working together as we do, we produce enough from the earth to make us all happy and comfortable if we could enjoy it together. But we do not enjoy it together. A few have too much and the rest too little. This is not just. Those who have too little produce the bulk of all that is produced. Everywhere, in field, in factory, and in mine, they drudge their lives away for a pittance. They get a living and that is about all. The margin over the cost of living goes to the few, who become rich.

This is the way we Socialists look at the world as it is today. This is our criticism of conditions as they exist. And our purpose is to assist, if we can, in changing these conditions. We want every human being in this country of ours to have exactly what belongs to him—no more and no less. And we believe there is a way to accomplish this purpose.

In the following chapters, the Socialist plan of remedying existing evils will be fully set forth. But, before going further, do this: Do us the justice to believe that what has been said in this first chapter about our desires for the well-being of our country is true. And give us credit for desiring to do only that which is just. We respect the honest beliefs of others, even though those beliefs be opposed to our own. The great mass of the people—Republicans, Democrats, and Socialists—are honestly trying to bring about conditions that will be better for us all. And there is no reason why those who are working together for better government should look upon each other with suspicion.
CHAPTER II.

The Wrongs That Demand a Remedy.

MAN is a peculiar being. The most intelligent animal that lives on the earth, he is in some respects the most stupid. Possessed of an inherent love for justice, he is blinded by that very love itself. Let him even imagine that he is being wronged by another and he will fight to the utmost to defend what he considers to be his rights. But let him really be wronged most grievously, and he will endure with marvelous patience the direst poverty, the greatest hardships and the most acute mental and physical tortures, so long as he believes there is no one to blame; that whatever his sufferings or his sorrows may be, they are not the products of injustice.

From the earliest times, selfish men have sought to take advantage of this weakness of their fellows. To rob a man without letting him know he is being robbed has, therefore, become the art of robbery. And since most men are deprived of their own NOT by brigands who come at them with gun or pistol, but by the crafty, calculating class who see in the control of the powers of government greater possibilities for depredation than were ever afforded by firearms or bludgeons, what is more natural than that this class should have dictated the enactment of laws that would APPEAR to help those whom they, in fact, robbed?

The elder Pitt, in the British parliament, more than a hundred years ago, laid bare this highest type of robbery in speaking of the advantages of indirect taxation over direct taxation.

"It does not require much direct taxation," said he, "to make a people rebel. But by indirect taxation you can tax the clothes off their backs and the crust out of their mouths, and they will not only endure it, but they will give up their lives on the battlefield, if necessary, to defend such a government."
That is why indirect robbery, like indirect taxation, is the safest for the robbers, but the most dangerous for the victims. Direct robbery would be resented and stopped before it had hardly begun, while the other kind goes on indefinitely, because those who are being robbed do not know it.

And that is why the first chapter of this book on Socialism is devoted to poverty—to the poverty of the great working class that produces all the wealth of the nation and gets so little of it. Socialism is a cure for poverty and the things that poverty creates—the criminals, the insane, the depraved and all who are usually regarded as "unfortunates." This being true, it would be idle to advocate or explain Socialism—a cure for poverty—to those who do not believe that such a thing as widespread poverty exists in this country. They must see the wrong before they can see the force of the remedy.

The first step in explaining the philosophy is, therefore, to show these things:

That "prosperity" is one of the most abused words in the English language. Ask a definition of prosperity from a man who has been accustomed to GETTING—not EARNING—$2,000,000 a year as his "rake-off" for financing watered-stock corporations, and if the decreased gullibility of the public has reduced his income to $1,000,000 a year, he will doubtless declare that times are very bad. Similar ideas of what constitutes prosperity FOR THEMSELVES, are held by all of that cunning little class that never CREATE anything of value to society, yet GET a tremendous proportion of what is produced by those who DO toil.

Yet, ask any one of these gentlemen what constitutes prosperity for the working class, and he will declare:

1. That the farmer, who, as a rule, is given so little for his labor that his land is steadily slipping into the hands of the landlord, as the census figures prove, is nevertheless very "prosperous." Every time a mortgage is paid on a Kansas farm the world knows it the next morning. The foreclosed mortgages are never mentioned.
2. That the wage-worker who lives in a rented house and is never more than 30 days away from an empty cupboard, as he invariably learns during a strike, when he is compelled to apply to the relief fund of his union for money with which to buy food for himself and family, is nevertheless enjoying "great prosperity," because he has a "full dinner pail."

So, it is tolerably plain that prosperity for the class that produces NOTHING and the class that produces EVERYTHING that is of value to society are very different quantities.

Prosperity for the class that TAKES things means not only a living far beyond the dreams of any toiler, but it means thousands, if not millions, in excess of actual needs for the larger members of that class.

While prosperity for the class that MAKES things, means a rented house and plenty to eat, such as it is, SERVED IN A TIN DINNER PAIL.

Now, right here is where Socialism drives its first stake and resolves to fight out the definition of that word "prosperity," not if it takes "all summer," but if it takes a thousand summers. And it need not take many summers if the wealth-producers will concern themselves as much about filling their heads with THOUGHTS as they do in drinking in the twaddle of the politicians about the "full dinner pail."

SOCIALISM IS UNALTERABLY COMMITTED TO THE PROPOSITION THAT A PROSPERITY THAT MEANS COLOSSAL RICHES FOR A FEW WHO PERFORM NO USEFUL LABOR AND A BARE LIVING FOR THE MILLIONS WHO PRODUCE EVERYTHING IS A LYING, THIEVING, HYPOCRITICAL PROSPERITY THAT COULD EXIST ONLY UNDER A LYING, THIEVING, HYPOCRITCAL SYSTEM OF INDUSTRY!

Socialism also boldly asserts that if there is to be any difference between classes as to which should receive the greater prosperity, the difference should be in favor of the class that does the most work that is useful to society. But Socialism would wipe out all class distinctions by compelling every able-
bodied man to work for a living, with a guarantee that he would receive the full product of his toil.

Socialism denies with all its vigor the monstrous contention of the capitalist class that the farmer who toils laboriously to feed a hungry world should be content with a few old clothes and enough food to keep life in his body; that the wage-worker, who toils, day in, day out, with hand and brain, in a whizzing factory, to fashion into merchantable shapes these raw products from field, forest and mine, shall be given only a rented house and a "full dinner pail" for his toil; and it, therefore, brands as the very quintessence of injustice, an industrial system that condemns to lifelong toil for a bare living these most useful members of human society—the farmer and the wage-worker—while it gives to the men who only sit in skyscrapers and scheme, the very cream of what the working class has produced.

Yet that is what the private ownership of capital and the competitive system of industry are doing; and they are doing it because the wealth-producers whom they are despoiling are voting the capitalist class the power to do it. This may be news to the "intelligent" wage-worker or farmer, who never voted the ticket of any party that did not claim to be the "friend of labor;" but it is true nevertheless, and proof of its truth will be furnished in a subsequent chapter. The first thing to prove, however, is the assertion just made, that under the competitive system of industry and the private ownership of capital, the large class that produces ALL of the wealth is permitted to retain only enough of it to enable the producers to live in the poorest manner in which they will consent to exist, while the small class that produces NONE of the wealth, not only lives in luxury, but hoards away vast sums that it cannot expend even by the extravagant methods of living that have made New York and Newport infamous.

Perhaps this will prove it:

The census reports of 1900 estimate the material wealth of the United States at $90,000,000,000. Every dollar of this wealth was created by labor—even the value of the land was
thus created, since wealth is defined by the political economists as "anything of limited supply possessing an exchange value;" and land did not possess an exchange value, that is to say, nobody was willing to pay anything for it until labor had been applied to it, either to a tract of land in particular, or to other land in the vicinity, which thus gave some measure of value to all surrounding land.

Jot that fact down in your memory then: "There is $90,000,000,000 of wealth in the United States, and every dollar of it was produced by labor."

Who possesses it?

Let us see. There are only two classes of men in this country, or any other country, for that matter. Possibly you never heard such a statement before, but that does not alter the truth of the matter, which is as stated.

Let's prove up now, on this assertion regarding the two classes. All men consume, or use, products of the earth that have been manufactured into usable form by human labor. There is only one exception to this rule and that is—dead men. All living men must eat to sustain life, and the things they eat must come from the earth, and they must be manufactured into eatable form, since the day of eating roots and raw fruits as exclusive articles of diet has passed. All men also require clothing, which must be manufactured by human labor out of some article derived from the earth; and all men must have shelter of some kind, manufactured by human labor out of some product of the earth.

All men, it will doubtless be conceded, are alike in these respects. But there is another respect in which they differ—and this difference is what constitutes the two classes into which all men are divided.

Some men labor to obtain what they consume in the form of food, clothing and shelter, and some do not; that is, some men consume what others have produced without rendering any equivalent of their own labor.

Can you think of a class of civilized beings—for we are not talking about savages—who consume food, wear clothing,
sleep under roofs, ALL OF WHICH MUST HAVE BEEN PRODUCED BY HUMAN LABOR, who did not produce these things by their own labor, either directly or by exchange, yet who do not consume the products of the labor of others?

If you can, the case of Socialism falls of its own weight, and it will be useless to continue the consideration of the subject. If you cannot think of such a class, it may be well to assume, for the time being at any rate, that there is some truth in the Socialist contention that there are but two classes in civilized society, and go on with the investigation of the Socialist philosophy.

Now, what are the names that have been given to these classes by the political economists?

The class that produces the things it consumes—the GREAT class comprising the vast majority of every nation—is called the working class.

The class that DOES NOT produce the things that it consumes—the SMALL class, constituting but a small fraction of any people—is called the capitalist class—the class that uses WEALTH, the product of labor, to acquire MORE wealth, either by lending it out at interest, or by using it to buy the tools with which other men must work to get a living.

An apparent inaccuracy in these definitions may be found in the fact that porch-climbers, safe-blowers and tramps belong to neither the capitalist nor the working class; but it may be offered as a temporary explanation of this apparent inconsistency that these gentlemen, perhaps, have the latent instincts of capitalists without possessing a sufficient amount of the capitalist's fine "business" training to enable them to exert their activities in more remunerative, though not always in less wrongful ways. However, there is a very good reason for the existence of the porch-climber, the safe-blower, and the tramp—a reason that is co-existent with capitalism—and it will be given in the proper place in this book.

So, there are the two classes—the capitalists and the workers—in whose possession must be all of the $90,000,000,000 of our national wealth, since there is no other class to share it.
Let's see how much of it is in the possession of the SMALL capitalist class.

Well, twenty billions of it is held by the trusts. On September 1, 1902, John Moody & Co., of Chicago, published a little pamphlet on the "Morganization of Industry," which contained the names of 82 "great" combinations, capitalized at $4,318,005,646, which had been formed since January 1, 1899. The same authority said at that time there were 850 other trusts which, with the railroad combinations, had a capitalization of "over" $15,000,000,000. Congressman Littlefield, of Maine, later prepared a list of trusts—published in the Congressional Record—which included the names of about 1,500 corporations. A good many trusts have collapsed since then, but the "big fellows" have not lost anything. The small fry that invested in their "securities" are the only losers. The money that was paid for stocks is still in existence, the only change being that the promoters have the money and the stocks are not worth anything. This fact also applies in a measure to the employees of the steel trust who were "let in on the ground floor," to buy steel trust "securities" as a "profit-sharing" investment, the price of which began to fall like mercury in a blizzard shortly after the money was handed over. Others that invested in steel trust stock were bitten in the same way.

Then, there is Mr. John D. Rockefeller, whose individual holdings account for the disappearance of part of the ninety billions that labor has produced but has not got. Thirty-five years ago, when Mr. Rockefeller was a useful member of society—a bookkeeper in a Cleveland oil store—it was easy enough to tell how much he was worth. Mr. Rockefeller, at that time, had the usual change of underwear that comes to the lot of the faithful worker and a regular weekly salary. But it is now more than 30 years since Mr. Rockefeller has done a day of useful labor—he has only bribed public officials by proxy and schemed to put other people out of business—and it is therefore more difficult to tell the value of his present holdings. His wealth is generally estimated at a billion dollars, which is probably in the vicinity of the correct figures.
This much we know, however—that his income is in excess of $50,000,000 a year. AND HE DOES NOT CREATE A DOLLAR OF IT BY HIS OWN LABOR. He only schemes to get it after others have produced it.

What are his schemes? Well, they are probably not so numerous or complex as one might imagine, in view of his great wealth. Mr. Rockefeller's principal two sources of income are monopoly and unpaid labor; that is, as an employer of labor, railroad, mining and other businesses, he pays labor in the form of wages only a small part of what it produces and retains the rest for himself in the form of profits. And as a monopolist, of course, he robs the public in the price of oil, railway transportation, or whatever it may be that he has monopolized. As a monopolist of oil, iron and copper, Mr. Rockefeller is enabled to stand between these natural products and the people and tell his fellow men that they may not use, except upon his terms, these gifts of a bountiful nature that some persons suspect were placed in the earth for the free use of all, rather than for the private profit of Mr. Rockefeller. Standing across the great steel highways as he does, telling the people that they may travel or ship freight only upon his terms, it is apparent that Mr. Rockefeller is so fabulously wealthy only because he has a vast machine for picking the pockets of others, the operation of which is defended and supported by the law.

And some idea of the stupendousness of this machine may be gained from these facts:

That Mr. Rockefeller is the greatest banker in the world—that money is to a nation what blood is to the living body, and the system of government under which we live enables Mr. Rockefeller and his kind to absorb the nation's vital force quite as effectively as a bloodsucker empties the veins of its victim.

That Mr. Rockefeller controls the Standard Oil trust, which yields him a colossal annual income.

That he controls the copper supply of the country.

That he controls the steel trust and its vast tracts of min-
eral and coal lands, stretching from West Virginia to Lake Superior.

That he is reaching out every day to control new industries, because his tremendous income is steadily bringing him in a hoard of surplus wealth that must be quickly re-invested, or lie idle and unprofitable.

Consider the further fact that Rockefeller is the railway king of America, and you will have a fair idea of the confiscating powers that have been seized by this one man under our present system of producing and distributing wealth. Simply because of his financial power, Mr. Rockefeller was enabled in December, 1903, to compel the railroads leading from Pittsburgh to the Atlantic coast to give him a reduction of 33 per cent in freight rates on steel to the seaboard. The steel trade had slacked up in the United States and he wanted to break into foreign fields by shipping his products across the ocean and selling them more cheaply abroad than foreign manufacturers could make them, and also more cheaply than steel is sold in the United States. The railway presidents balked for a day or two, but Mr. Rockefeller had no difficulty in "convincing" them that his "request" was only moderate, and, as usual, the railroad presidents reimbursed themselves for Mr. Rockefeller's depredation by increasing the farmer's grain rates 11 per cent.

So, it is apparent that Mr. Rockefeller's position as the world's greatest banker, WHICH IS ENTIRELY HARMONIOUS WITH THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM OF INDUSTRY, gives him the opportunity to exercise powers as a mere private citizen that a congress or a president elected by the people would not dare to exercise, no matter how slavish they might be in the service of capitalism. The "taxation without representation" against which our fathers fought was a small affair as compared with the confiscation of a part of the value of the farmer's grain by the railroads for the benefit of Mr. Rockefeller. And it should be borne in mind, of course, that the railroads that increased grain rates because they had been compelled to lower steel rates were not owned
by the king of Standard Oil, steel, copper, banks and other things. If Mr. Rockefeller does such things with OTHER men's railroads, what does he do with his own? Here is a list of the railroads controlled by Rockefeller in January, 1904, according to the Chicago Record-Herald, a paper that is considered an authority in financial matters:

New York Central.
Pennsylvania.
Lake Shore.
Boston & Albany.
West Shore.
Michigan Central.
New York, Chicago & St. Louis.
Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis.
Dunkirk, Allegheny Valley & Pittsburg.
Lake Erie & Western.
Cincinnati Northern.
Indiana, Illinois & Iowa.
Lake Erie, Alliance & Wheeling.
Detroit, Toledo & Milwaukee.
Baltimore & Ohio.
United Railroads of New Jersey.
Northern Central, Buffalo & Allegheny.
West Jersey & Seashore.

Besides, Mr. Rockefeller and the Goulds control the following lines, according to the same authority:

Missouri Pacific.
St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern.
Denver & Rio Grande.
Rio Grande Western.
International & Great Northern.
Texas Pacific.
Half of the Galveston, Houston & Northern.

So much for Mr. Rockefeller; but he is not the whole capitalist class, although he is the largest one in it, and it therefore becomes necessary to go farther into the investiga-
tion of the subject of what has become of the ninety billions of wealth that has been produced in the United States by labor, and is still in existence. Dr. Charles B. Spahr in 1896 produced a valuable work on this subject, entitled, "The Present Distribution of Wealth in the United States."

After making a most careful and impartial investigation of the subject, this is what Dr. Spahr found:

*That seven-eighths of the families hold but one-eighth of the national wealth.*

*That one per cent of the families hold more of the national wealth than is held by the remaining 99 per cent.*

Mr. Thomas G. Shearman, in the Forum for 1889 and for January, 1891, made an estimate of the national wealth. This is what he found:

*That 1.4 per cent of the population owned 70 per cent of the wealth.*

*That 9.2 per cent of the population owned 12 per cent of the wealth.*

*That 89.4 per cent of the population owned only 18 per cent of the wealth.*

*That 25,000 persons own one-half of the wealth of the United States.*

*That the whole wealth of the country is practically owned by 250,000 persons.*

And at the present rate of concentration of wealth, 50,000 persons, he estimated, will in 30 years own practically all of the wealth of the country.

Then, here are some more figures. They are given by Mr. G. K. Holmes, the expert on wealth statistics for the tenth census. The government, for some reason or another, no longer furnishes figures on this subject in its census reports. But these are the conclusions that Mr. Holmes reached in 1890:

*That 0.3 per cent of the people own 20 per cent of the wealth.*

*That 8.97 per cent of the people own only 51 per cent of the wealth.*
And that 91 per cent of the people own only 29 per cent of the wealth.

All of which makes it fairly plain that the capitalist class that does no productive labor, not only possesses a large part of the wealth that labor has created in the United States, but that the process of concentration is going on and on. A constantly diminishing number of persons are gaining control of the bulk of the wealth that the many have produced. In the single city of New York, 1800 individuals and firms own most of the land in Manhattan Island, and the people who use it are paying tribute to them for its use.

We have thus learned with a tolerable degree of accuracy what has become of a part of the wealth that labor has produced in the United States.

THE CAPITALIST CLASS HAS IT.

Dr. Spahr, who is probably as nearly right as any of the others, estimates that one per cent of the families hold more of the nation’s wealth than is held by the remaining 99 per cent.

Let’s see if we can find any verification of his statement by inquiring into the financial conditions of the wage-workers and the farmers, who comprise the bulk of the working class. And in order that our figures may be safe from capitalistic attack, let’s take them from the census reports, which were prepared and issued by a capitalistic government, and may, therefore, be presumed to portray conditions at least as favorably as they should be, however much they may err in the other direction. Take the ownership of homes, for instance—that is a good barometer to gauge the financial condition of the wage-workers, because whenever the wage-workers can afford to do so they usually own their homes.

Now Greater New York is a good city in which to begin. The working class of Greater New York, in November, 1903, contributed toward a 60,000 majority for the Democratic city ticket; and as New York has been governed by Tammany most of the time during the last 20 years, it would seem as if the workers who provide the majorities must have good reason to be satisfied with their condition. Yet these are the census
figures, for 1900, with regard to the ownership of homes in Greater New York:

- Total number of homes in Greater New York: 722,670.
- Percentage of homes not owned by occupants: 95.1.

In other words, 4.9 per cent of the residents of New York own their homes. The census reports, unfortunately, do not say whether the working class or the capitalist class comprise this 4.9 per cent.

Then Philadelphia. Philadelphia, in November, 1903, contributed largely toward a 200,000 majority for the Republican state ticket. Here is what the census figures show:

- Total number of homes in Philadelphia: 265,093
- Percentage not owned by occupants: 88.9

Philadelphia is known as the “City of Homes,” we believe. It is evidently a very appropriate name, since there are many homes in the city. The only trouble seems to be, however, that those who live in these homes do not own them. Perhaps Philadelphia is also called the “City of Brotherly Love” for as excellent a reason.

Now cross the continent to San Francisco, where the working class in 1903 re-elected a Union Labor mayor by a large majority. Again the census figures:

- Total number of homes in San Francisco: 67,592
- Percentage of homes not owned by occupants: 85

Strange, isn’t it, that whether a wage-worker live in New York under Democratic rule, in Philadelphia under Republican rule, or 3,000 miles away in San Francisco, under Mayor Schmitz’s rule, the chances are about 90 to 10 that he will not be able to obtain enough in the form of wages to enable him to own the roof over his head? Can parties that produce results so similar to each other be very much different in vital principle?

Yet these are the conditions that exist all over the United States. We have the census reports for 1900 with which to prove the statement that only 31.8 per cent of the 16,187,715 families in the United States actually own their own homes; that is, that their homes are paid for. And notwithstanding
the fact that the eager statisticians of our “prosperity” ad-
ministrations always classify a home as “owned,” even though
it be mortgaged for all it is worth, it is not so classified in this
book. A home that is mortgaged quite frequently proves to
be owned by the mortgagee, as the mortgagor finds to his sor-
row.

To get back to the census figures: As has been said, only
31.8 per cent of American families own their homes. Of the
remaining 68.2 per cent, 53.5 per cent rent their homes out-
right, and 14.7 per cent have mortgaged homes. The per-
centage of actual owners has decreased from 34.4 per cent in
1890 to 31.8 per cent in 1900. The percentage of mortgaged
homes increased from 13.4 per cent in 1890, to 14.7 per cent in
1900, and the percentage of rented homes from 52.2 per cent
in 1890, to 53.5 in 1900. Here are the detailed census figures
for some of the more important cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Whole Number of Homes</th>
<th>Percentage not owned by occupants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>114,705</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>72,436</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg</td>
<td>62,992</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>73,519</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>80,114</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>28,319</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>59,836</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>104,146</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>60,796</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>354,036</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>58,889</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>121,123</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>29,979</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, it would seem as if it must be admitted that if the
wage-workers in the cities have any considerable portion of the
ninety billions of national wealth they have succeeded ad-
mirably in concealing most of it. How is it with the farmer?

The American farmer shares with the American wage-
worker the distinction of belonging to the most pitifully deceived class of human beings on the face of the earth. The farmers of most other nations are not taught to expect anything but a bare living, and are therefore seldom disappointed. But not so with the American farmer. The political orators tell him—during campaigns—that he is a most prosperous as well as a most independent person, and the capitalist newspapers that supply him with “information” repeat the tale the rest of the year. The simple fact seems to be that the farmer is a participant in a game in which every other member, except himself and the wage-worker, may fleece someone else to reimburse himself for the loss of that which another has taken from him. If the manufacturer charges the wholesaler too much for his product, the wholesaler can take it out of the retailer, the retailer can pass it on to the consumer, and the consumer, if he be other than a wage-worker or a farmer, can look around for someone to “do,” with a fair prospect of making a successful search. But not so with the farmer. If he has been charged an excessive price for his food, clothing, or farm machinery, he cannot reimburse himself by demanding more for his grain, his wool, or his livestock, for the simple reason that he must sell, if he sell at all, for whatever he can get. Like the wage-worker, the farmer cannot fix the price of a thing he sells, or a thing he buys—all this is done for him by eager gentlemen, who, perhaps, may fear that these tasks, in addition to their others, might break down the health of those who till the soil and manufacture its products.

And what is the result? The farmer is losing his land as rapidly as the landlord can take it from him. Farm tenantry in the United States is increasing so surely and so steadily that it is plain that the same forces are in operation in this country that have turned Ireland over to the landlords, given the ownership of most of Prussia to 31,000 persons, and placed the title to most of the land in Austria in the hands of the “nobility.” In 1880, the American farmer owned 74.5 per cent of the land he tilled; in 1890, he owned but 71.6 per cent of it, and in 1900 only 64.7 per cent. Generally speaking, therefore, the
farmer who owned 160 acres in 1880 has since lost 16 acres. Some farmers, of course, own more land than they did 25 years ago; but the average is as stated, and the figures are from the United States census reports of the years mentioned. And this increase in farm tenantry has taken place in the face of the fact that during the same period the value of the farmer's land and his livestock products have tremendously increased.

Part of the increase is doubtless due to the increased acreage under cultivation, but it is nevertheless a fact that the price of land is steadily increasing, as the competition for its use, due to a growing population, becomes more intense. Here are the census figures on the tenantry question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States and Territories</th>
<th>Percentage of Farms Operated by Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>3.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>3.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dakota territory.

Just one more reference to the census reports and we shall be able to tell where we stand on this question of the division of wealth between the capitalist class and the working class. In 1900, there were 28,295,796 women and girls in this country—girls more than 10 years of age. Of this number, 5,329,807 were working for wages, 1,315,890 being employed in factories alone. In other words, nearly one woman in every five, including girls more than 10 years of age, is working out to earn a living. Fifty thousand children less than 16 years of age are working in Georgia! The cotton mills of the Southern states are filled with children who are working from 10 to 14
hours a day for $1.50 to $2.00 a week. The coal mine owners of Pennsylvania employ thousands of "breaker" boys, and armies of boys are at work in every other state.

What then have we learned about the wealth of the country and the amount of it that each class possesses?

That the total wealth of the nation amounts to ninety billions—ALL PRODUCED BY THE WORKING CLASS.

That the best authorities practically agree upon the estimate that 1 per cent of the families hold more of this ninety billions than is held by the remaining 99 per cent.

That, taking advantage of the opportunities for confiscation offered by the capitalist system of industry, one man has accumulated a billion dollars in 30 years and with impunity exercised powers of spoliation that even a congress or a president elected by the people would not dare to exercise, for fear of creating a rebellion.

That the greater number of American families live in rented or mortgaged homes, most of the homes being rented outright.

That the number of the working class who can afford to own their own homes is constantly diminishing.

That farm tenantry is steadily increasing, notwithstanding the alleged "prosperity" of the farmer.

That the members of the working class are so poor that one out of every five has to send his wife or daughter out to become a wage earner with him in order to support the family.

That hundreds of thousands of little children who ought to be in school are compelled to work in factories, mines and stores because their parents cannot earn enough at "prosperity" wages to support them.

Now, let's get together on these statements before we go on to the next chapter. Are they true, or are they false? If they are true, it must be conceded that there is at least some basis for the Socialist contention that the capitalist system of industry robs the working class for the benefit of the capitalist class. If the working class is being robbed, it is being robbed by one or more methods which it is the duty of the workers, as
intelligent men, to discover and block. The Socialist philosophy proceeds upon the assumption that it has discovered the methods of capitalist robbery and has a plan to supplant them with a system that will give the working class what belongs to it—ALL THAT IT CREATES. If the statements just made about the unequal distribution of national wealth are true, every intelligent toiler must admit at least this fact:

That the "prosperity" of the working class is a hideous fraud—a monstrous fake.

Furthermore, he must recognize the necessity of SOME remedy to relieve existing conditions.

Are the statements, then, true? Can you believe the census figures issued by your own government? Do you believe the capitalists who control the United States government would issue statistics that would unnecessarily reflect upon themselves? And, if you cannot believe the census figures, can you believe your own eyes and ears?

The proof that the working class that produces ALL the wealth has LITTLE money and the capitalist class that produces NO wealth has MOST of what the workers produce is all around you.
CHAPTER III.

The Poor Growing Poorer and the Rich Growing Richer.

That the many are poor—struggling hard for a bare living—while the few are in the possession of wealth out of all proportion to their numerical strength are facts that are apparent, not only from the census figures given in the preceding chapter, but from what must have been the observation of every careful observer. Nor would these facts, lamentable as they are, be so important if they were not so full of evil prophecy for the future—if they did not point inevitably to the conclusion that under the existing order bad must go on to worse until a maddened, plundered people wipe out their wrongs and set up a new government more nearly to their liking.

Yet, read history as you will, you will find that when forces have been put into operation, and permitted to continue, that caused the concentration of wealth into the hands of a few, the concentration has gone on and on—the rich have grown richer and the poor have grown poorer. The fate that has overtaken the governments that have permitted the continued operation of such forces has invariably been obliteration in the darkness of revolution. And oftentimes the blind hatred that caused such revolutions has caused the people to suffer more terribly for a while afterward than they did before. Socialism seeks to avoid a revolution of force in the United States by substituting an industrial system that will make such a revolution unnecessary. And the purpose of this book—as it is the purpose of every Socialist writer and speaker—is to give the working class the knowledge that will enable it to act intelligently before it is too late.

For the forces are surely in existence in this country that have wrecked every other nation in which they have operated long enough. In 1850, capitalists owned only 37½ per cent of
the nation's wealth. In 1870, they owned 63 per cent; while, in 1896, so expert and impartial a statistician as Dr. Spahr estimated that seven-eighths of the American families held but one-eighth of the national wealth, and one per cent of the families held more of the wealth than was held by the remaining 99 per cent. What will such conditions produce? Read history:

Egypt WENT DOWN when 2 per cent of her population owned all the wealth.

Babylon WENT DOWN when 2 per cent of her population owned all the wealth. The people starved to death.

Persia WENT DOWN when 1 per cent of her population owned all the land.

And Rome WENT DOWN when 1,800 men owned all of the known world.

Any doubt about where the United States is headed for? Are we secure from the operation of natural laws that have wrecked other nations? Some persons seem to think so.

But are the "poor growing poorer and the rich growing richer?" That the rich are growing richer is a fact so plain that proof is hardly required. Seventy years ago there was not a millionaire in the United States, and such rich men as there were in most cases were rich only in the sense that private ownership of vast tracts of land gave them the power to exploit those who tilled it. George Washington was that sort of a rich man. Now there are 8,000 millionaires and multi-millionaires, and one billionaire, so it is hardly worth while for anyone to deny that the rich are growing richer. And, as the rich are not usually engaged in productive labor, it must necessarily follow that they are growing richer by appropriating the products of those who do toil.

It is not so plain, however, that the poor are growing poorer, and therefore the politicians always deny it— which is not strange, perhaps, when the fact is considered that their ability to produce "prosperity" hallucinations in the minds of the thoughtless is their principal stock in trade. Yet the charge so often made that the poor are growing poorer seems to be important enough to require frequent denial, President
Roosevelt himself having devoted a whole speech in South Dakota to its denial, during his memorable trans-continental trip in 1903, for which the railroad companies kindly furnished him free transportation and free board from the time he left Washington until he returned.

The opportunity of the politicians to quibble on this point comes from the simple fact that the poor are not poorer, or becoming poorer, in the sense that they receive less for their labor or live more poorly than their forefathers did. Wages are higher than they were at the beginning of the last century, but in many branches of industry they are not as high as they were in 1870—in fact, wages steadily declined from 1870 to 1898, when there came a revival, which was followed in 1903-4 by another depression. The downward course of wages from 1870 to 1893 is plainly shown in Carroll D. Wright's book, "The Industrial Evolution of the United States."

Nor will any fair-minded man who is familiar with the facts deny that the average worker of today lives on a much better scale than did the working class a century ago—a fact for which the very good reason may be offered that the working class will not consent to live more poorly than it does; IT WILL STRIKE FIRST.

But, when this much has been said, nothing more can be truthfully offered in denial of the allegation that the poor are growing poorer. That the poor are not growing less poor is readily apparent from the fact that the poor man today is working for exactly what the poor man of a century ago toiled for—a bare living. Between the so-called "prosperity" of the working man of today and the poverty of an empty cupboard there is no wider margin today than there was in the case of the poor man of a century ago—in, fact, it is doubtful if the margin is so wide. The wageworker of the present usually has about ten days' supplies between his family and utter destitution. If this statement seems to do injustice to the wageworkers' financial condition, please watch the course of the next great strike and see how much time elapses before the strikers begin to apply to their unions for relief. If you are a
wageworker, ask yourself how long you could be idle without going hungry, borrowing money or getting credit. If you could go more than ten days, you are an exception to the general rule.

The fact is that the working class lives on a higher scale now than did the working class of 100 years ago, but it is nevertheless working for only a bare living. To the extent, then, that the working class scale of living is now higher than was the working class scale of living a century ago, it is therefore assuredly true that the condition of the class has improved.

But, in other respects equally as important, the condition of the workers is much worse than it was in 1800, in 1850 or in 1870. Since the bulk of the national wealth has fallen into the hands of a few, it has followed as a logical consequence that most men—farmers excepted—have to work for the few that own all the machinery of production. Of course, the farmer is to all intents and purposes only a wageworker, since the ownership of a farm has come to mean little more than the ownership of a job; but the farmer, plundered as he is, ordinarily has the satisfaction of knowing that he cannot be thrown out of work. In fact, if there is anything the farmer is sure of it is work—much work and little money.

With the great class of men compelled to work for wages for the small class, the workers have been injured to the extent of having lost one of their most valuable natural rights. We still talk about the “right to live” as if, having been given by the Creator, it could legally be taken away from the most humble human being only as a punishment for crime; but the working class has lost this right, even though it was to get and to hold it that the forefathers of the toilers fought in the Revolutionary war to establish for themselves and their descendants the rights of “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”

If you are a wageworker and flatter yourself that you still have a right even to live, to say nothing about being free, or pursuing happiness, ask yourself what the right to live is worth without an equal right to obtain from your own toil,
without anybody’s permission, the things that are necessary to sustain life.

You cannot live without food, clothing and shelter.

To secure these essentials to life, one must either work or steal.

If a man steal so miserable thing as a loaf of bread, or a coat, society sends him to prison.

If he refuses to work to obtain them, or to devise legal means for fleecing somebody else out of them, society also lands him in the lock-up.

The average man is therefore between the devil of capitalism—the capitalists owning all the land and the tools with which he must work or starve—and the deep sea of hunger and the workhouse.

Society tells him he must work and earn a living—or GET a living without working, by some legal means—or be imprisoned for vagrancy; yet, when he seeks an opportunity, he finds that everything with which a living may be produced is owned by someone else. All the land that is good for anything being taken, though there is much land that is not being used, he finds himself barred from the earth at the start. There is then nothing left for him but to work for wages for someone else. And, while society tells everybody that he must make a living or get a living, it does not tell those who own all of the things with which a living may be made that they must let these things be used by anybody who wants to work.

Our sacred “right to live” is therefore worth just this much under existing conditions:

A wageworker has a right to live, provided he can get a job—and nobody is under any obligation to give him a job.

Can you think of anything more pitiful than the sight of a strong man, eager and anxious to work, but unable to find employment in a world that has never yet had its wants satisfied and cannot afford to spare the labor of a single man?

Is there anything more heartrending than the fear that haunts millions, that they may be soon out of work?

“There is nothing worse than poverty except the fear of
poverty" someone has said, and it is pretty nearly true. The uncertainty of employment under the wage-system hangs like a pall over the world. Men who grow old without ever losing their jobs suffer mental tortures with the rest for fear they will lose them; for there is and can be no security for the man whose right to obtain from his labor the necessaries of life for himself and his family is dependent upon the whim of an employer. Wonder is often expressed that the tendency toward insanity is becoming so great in this country—a tendency that is proved by the increasing number of asylums for the insane that are provided by the various states. Is it any wonder that men and women become insane when millions of persons cannot know whether they will have work even for another day? Some day go into the home of a wageworker who has lost his job, and see how his wife feels about it. The man may try to put on a bold front, but his wife's heavy eyes will tell you her thoughts, even if her lips be still. They will tell you of a landlord who will soon be around for his rent, though there is not enough money in the house to pay him and no more in sight; they will tell you of hungry little mouths to feed and no apparent hope of being able to feed them except by getting credit at the grocery. Without credit at the grocery and without employment, BOTH OF WHICH MAY BE LEGALLY WITHHELD, this man and his family would actually starve to death unless sent to the poorhouse; yet he doubtless firmly believes that he has a "right to live." It would be interesting, however, to see him live without obtaining the permission of somebody to work.

And it is this necessity of asking permission to work that is maddening to the man who thinks, as the insecurity of employment is torturing to the millions who can barely make a living by working all the time. William Dean Howells, the foremost living American novelist, put this well when he said:

"What I object to is this economic chance-world in which we live and which we seem to have created. It ought to be law as inflexible in human affairs as the order of day and night in the physical world that if a man will work he shall
both rest and eat, and shall not be harassed by any question of how his provision and repose shall come. Nothing less ideal than this satisfies the reason. But in our state of things no one is secure in this. No one is sure of finding work; no one is sure of not losing it. My work may be taken from me by the caprice of my employer. At any time of life—at every time of life—a man ought to feel that, if he will keep on doing his duty he shall not suffer in himself, nor in those who are dear to him, except through natural causes. But, as things are now, no man can feel this. And so we go on, pushing and pulling, climbing and crawling, thrusting aside and trampling under foot; and when we get to the end, covered with blood and dirt, and sin and shame, and look back to the way we have come to a palace of our own (or to the poorhouse, which is about the only place we can claim with our brother man), I don't think the retrospect can be pleasing.”

So that is one of the valuable things that the working class has lost almost in the last half century—the peace of mind that comes from a sense of security in the right to make a living. The shoemaker of half a century ago knew he could make a living, if alive, not only the next week, the next month, but the next year! But the shoemaker cannot work in his own little shop any more, because improved machinery has enabled the big factory to become too strong a competitor for him; and when he goes to the big factory he finds that he can have work just so long as the owner of the machinery is willing to hire him, and no longer. And this illustration holds good practically throughout the whole industrial world.

Then, there is another important respect in which the American working class is far poorer than it was a century or a half-century ago—it cannot satisfy so great a percentage of its desires. Henry George gave very good definitions of “riches” and “poverty” in “Progress and Poverty.” Mr. George said that to be rich meant to be able to satisfy most of one's wants, while to be poor meant to be able to satisfy but few of them. He illustrated his definition by saying that a savage without a coat would not consider himself poor,
while an Englishman without a coat would feel that he was very poor. Regarding poverty as inability to satisfy desire—and that is what it really is—there can be no doubt that the working class is poorer now than it ever was before. History teaches nothing more plainly than that the wants of men increase as they become civilized. The worker of today is therefore not satisfied with the few things that satisfied his grandfather. He will not consent to live in a loghouse without a floor, but, instead, demands at least a cottage. He wants more furniture in the cottage than his grandfather had in his log house; he wants better food and better clothing. Furthermore, he would like to dress his wife and children well; he would like to give his children an education, and he longs for a multitude of things that he sees in profusion in the lives of the rich.

The wageworker of today usually gets the cottage, but his inborn desire to own it is not realized in the great majority of cases. The furniture in the cottage is cheap and poor—bought at exorbitant prices on the installment plan. His wife and children look like outcasts beside the wife and children of his employer, who served his mind as fashion plates when he was thinking about dressing his own family well; and, so far as giving his children an education—it is out of the question. There are free public schools, of course, but his children can never go through them. Pressed by poverty, his daughter has left the school before finishing the grammar grades, to enter the factory; and, by the time that his employer's daughter has finished the high school, the wageworker's daughter has become hollow-chested and pale from toiling year after year over a cigar factory bench or a machine in a laundry.

Does the worker fail to make the mental contrast between the employer's fresh young daughter, dressed in her graduation dress of white, and his own poor girl?

Could the father of any working girl make the contrast without wanting something, inability to obtain which would make him poor?

But that isn't the worst of the wageworker's lot. The
present has little enough of light in it for him and his class, but the future is black, and the further ahead the working class looks, under existing conditions, the blacker the future becomes. Just now there may be a chance to quibble about whether the poor are becoming poorer, for the reason that wages are higher than they have been at times in the past and the standard of living is higher than ever. Labor has thus far been able to force wages that would enable it to maintain the present standard of living, for the reason that the country is enormously rich in natural wealth. Development has gone on at a terrific pace, with such wonderful material results that the United States is the richest country in the world. Small wonder, then, that from this abundance labor has been able to increase a little its standard of living, even from so greedy a task-master as capitalism.

But there is an end even to the natural wealth of the United States. The end has already been reached in some of the New England states, in which the population is steadily decreasing and the value of all property diminishing. In fact, there is nothing east of the Mississippi that cannot be said to be pretty well "developed." And most of this development has taken place in the last fifty years, with a population that never exceeded 60,000,000 until 1890.

Population, however, is like a snowball rolling down hill—the larger it grows the faster it grows. The population of the United States is now doubling every thirty years, and we have become so numerous a people that to double now means something. In 1870 we had 38,000,000. Thirty years later, in 1900, we had 76,000,000—and at the present rate of increase we shall have approximately 150,000,000 in 1930 and 300,000,000 in 1960.

Think of it! A boy born today will, when 26 years old, have to fight for a living with 150,000,000 other persons, when his father now finds himself unable to make more than a bare living in competition with only 76,000,000 other persons.

With a population of 150,000,000 in 26 years, and a population of 300,000,000 in 56 years, how long will it be, if the
present industrial system be continued, before the United States will have been squeezed as dry as a sucked lemon by the capitalist class? Yet men now only 21 years old must face the prospect of competing with 150,000,000 of others for a living before they are 50 years old.

Will the present standard of living for the working class be maintained then?

Will wages be as high then as they are now, with millions more men competing for jobs and the natural resources of the country much exhausted?

Ask a peasant from some European country. Those are exactly the conditions that those European peasants have been facing for years—tremendous populations and worn-out countries, with their small classes of very rich and their great classes of very poor. That is why emigration from Europe to America has been so heavy—because the poor wanted to get to an undeveloped country where there was more wealth and less competition for its possession.

Of course, the United States would have no trouble in maintaining a population of 250,000,000, or of 500,000,000, if everyone were to be given the right to work and the right to keep everything he produced, without sharing it with an employer. But that is exactly what the capitalist system will not permit the working class to do—to keep all of its products. If labor were to keep all its products, there would be no rent, interest or profits for the capitalist class, and without rent, interest and profits the capitalist class cannot live.

So while it is now practically, though not absolutely, true that the poor are growing poorer as the rich grow richer, it will be but a few years, if the capitalist system be continued, until the poor will have no difficulty in determining the direction in which they are going. The poor may not be thinking much about such questions now—the poor often think when it is too late, thereby explaining their poverty—but the capitalist class know what is coming. David Starr Jordan, president of Leland Stanford, Jr., University, who was instrumental in removing a professor from the university who had offended Mrs. Stan-
ford by advocating certain features of Socialism, delivered a lecture on this subject in the Light Guard Armory in Detroit in January, 1904. The Detroit Free Press of the next morning quoted him as follows:

"The twentieth century will be strenuous, complex and Democratic. The poor will grow poorer, the rich richer and the energetic more energetic. This country must allow men to rise and it must also let them fall."

Well, if the rich are to grow richer and the poor to grow poorer during this century, there will probably be no doubt that plenty of men will "fall." Nor is there any reason why President Jordan's forecast, brutal and cold-blooded as it sounds, should not be expected to become an actual fact if the same economic forces that are now in operation should be left undisturbed. Capitalism has filled Europe with hovels and palaces, and there is no reason why it should not do the same in the United States if the men who have the power to change conditions with their votes continue to sleep.
CHAPTER IV.

The Causes That Make the Wrongs.

STATISTICS issued by the United States government, as well as the observations of the most casual investigators, unite in establishing these facts:

That the great majority of persons in this country, including a fifth of the women and little girls, are toiling hard at productive industry for which they receive in wages only a sum sufficient to afford them a bare living.

That a few who are not engaged in productive industry are tremendously wealthy and growing wealthier.

"The rich few ARE engaged in productive industry," did you say and are therefore entitled to financial reward? Let's see. A man who is engaged in productive industry must necessarily produce something that adds to the world's supply of material wealth. Scheming to produce profits adds nothing to the world's supply of wealth. It benefits only the individual who does the scheming. And in the case of industry, it always hurts both the producers and the consumers from whom the profits are wrung, because it decreases wages and increases the price of the finished product. How, then, does Mr. Rockefeller, in his capacity of a railroad king, perform any USEFUL labor, when he never throws a pound of coal into a locomotive fire-box or handles a pound of freight? How does Mr. Rockefeller qualify for admission into the class of productive laborers by controlling the steel trust, when he never smelts an ounce of ore or forges a bar of steel? The world is poorer whenever a productive laborer ceases to produce, because the total product is diminished to the extent of the laborer's ability to produce. Will the world be poorer when Mr. Rockefeller "ceases to produce?" What is his "product" that will be missed? Steel is higher now than it was before
he went into the steel business. The prices of kerosene and gasoline would shrink mightily if Mr. Rockefeller would only let go. And you can apply these identical tests to any great capitalist with the same results. The capitalists are scheming for PROFITS; they are NOT producing wealth in the sense that their activities are in any way connected with the production of the material things in which they traffic. None except the small capitalists are even entitled to "wages of superintendence," since the large capitalists always hire somebody to superintendent their railroads, their factories, or whatever their wealth may be invested in. And these superintendents, however large their salaries may be, are truly "laborers," since they perform USEFUL labor to whatever extent they may assist in production. They are NOT laborers to whatever extent they may assist capitalists in exploiting labor. It is incorrect to suppose that only men who wear overalls are laborers. The president of the United States is a laborer whenever he is engaged in doing work that is USEFUL to the people; it's only when he is doing something else that he departs from the working class.

But to get back to what we have learned—that the many who are engaged in productive industry are receiving only a bare living for their reward, while the few who only scheme for profits are tremendously rich and becoming richer. Such a situation, on the face of it, constitutes a monstrous injustice, since it furnishes conclusive proof that the system under which we are producing and distributing wealth is robbing the producers for the benefit of the non-producers. For, bear in mind the clean-cut truth expressed by Ernest Crosby that "when a man gets something that he did not produce, it must necessarily follow that some other man produced something that he did not get." Nobody can get a dollar that he has not earned without wronging the man who DID earn it. The existence of a man who has MORE than he has produced, inevitably implies the existence, SOMEWHERE in the world, of men who have been deprived of something that rightfully belongs to them. From this truth there is no escape.
Then, there is another truth to which there is no exception—a truth that was made when the universe leaped from the mind of the infinite. IT IS THE TRUTH FORMULATED INTO A NATURAL LAW THAT NOTHING SHALL HAPPEN BY CHANCE; that behind every EFFECT there shall be a CAUSE. And it is to THIS law that we must turn if we would discover the CAUSES that have produced the EFFECTS that we have come to know as poverty for the great working class and colossal wealth for the small capitalist class that is not engaged in useful labor.

What, then, are the causes that make the wrongs; the causes that we must REMOVE if we are ever to get rid of the EFFECTS?

Let's go back a little.

MACHINERY DID NOT BECOME A FACTOR IN PRODUCTIVE INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES UNTIL THE EARLY PART OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

THERE WAS NOT A MILLIONAIRE IN THE UNITED STATES UNTIL MACHINERY HAD BECOME AN IMPORTANT FACTOR IN PRODUCTION.

Now it would be unwise as well as absurd to argue that merely because two conditions or two events appeared or transpired within a few days or a few years of each other, that one must logically be the result of the other. An epidemic of fever may be followed by the blooming of roses, but the closest investigation could hardly show that one event bore any relation to the other, even if any one were so foolish as to make the investigation. But if it should be found that all of the fever victims drank the same kind of water, or lived in a section of a city where sanitary appliances were bad, these facts, related as they are to the subject of health, would furnish a reasonable basis for an investigation to discover the CAUSE that produced the EFFECT called fever. But even then, it could not with certainty be declared that either the water of which all of the fever suffered had partaken, or the poor sanitary arrangements of their homes was the cause of the epidemic, unless the
two circumstances could be connected by a chain of proof, not one link of which should prove broken.

- Let us therefore see if a chain can be forged that will positively link the coming of machinery with the coming of the millionaire. It is the contention of Socialism that it was the introduction of machinery into industry that produced the millionaire. Here, then, we have a sharply defined allegation of cause an effect:

CAUSE—The introduction of machinery into productive industry.

EFFECT—The making of a very rich class, composed of those who OWN the machines, at the expense of those who do NOT own, but nevertheless USE the machines to make a living.

Let us see if Socialism can prove its charge in this respect—for if it can, a long step will have been taken toward the discovery of a remedy, because the CAUSE of existing EFFECTS which we call wrongs, will have been found.

What, then, is the first result of the introduction of machinery into productive industry? It vastly increases production, does it not? Everybody knows that it does. If the use of machinery did not increase production, there would be no incentive for capitalists to invest their money in machinery.

Now HOW does the introduction of machinery increase production? In at least three ways:

1—By making possible the use of water, steam or electric power to perform tasks that must otherwise have been performed by human labor. The census reports for 1900 show that the aggregate motive power employed in manufacturing establishments in the United States amounted to 11,300,081 horsepower, as against a fraction more than 2,000,000 horse power in 1870 and practically nothing in the early part of the nineteenth century.

2—By enabling the individual laborer to produce much more with a machine than he could produce by hand.

3—By enabling labor to be “divided;” that is, enabling each laborer to work to advantage at some particular task con-
connected with the manufacture of an article, instead of making the whole article himself. One man, for instance, could go into a shoe factory and, by using all of the various machines that enter into the manufacture of shoes, he could make a pair of shoes much more quickly than he could make them by hand. But 50 men, each performing one of the fifty odd tasks that enter into the making of shoes, could make much more than 50 times as many shoes as any one of them could make if each were to perform all of the tasks of shoemaking instead of one of them.

Very well. Machinery having increased production in the ways just mentioned, what effect have these methods had upon the general character of industry? At least three effects that should be spoken of now:

1—Since the "division of labor" means increased productivity and therefore decreased cost of production, manufacturing is now done on a LARGE scale, with HUGE factories, containing MUCH machinery which, in turn, is operated by MANY individuals.

2—The small factory, that is, the workshop of the individual who used to make things WITHOUT machinery, has been driven out of existence, simply because it cannot compete with the large factory which produces more cheaply.

3—It being impossible WITHOUT machinery to compete with those who HAVE machinery, and it also being impossible with a LITTLE machinery to compete with one who has MUCH machinery, it has followed as a logical and inevitable consequence of these facts that a large part of the population, unable to buy the expensive machinery that is necessary to production, has been compelled to seek to work for wages for those who DO own the machinery.

So, we have these important facts with regard to the effects of machinery upon production:

1—The productivity of labor is increased. No less an authority than Mr. Gladstone said that owing to machinery, "the manufacturing power of the world is doubled every seven years." The United States census reports make the conserv-
ative estimate that machinery and the division of labor now enable one man to produce as much as six men produced a hundred years ago. Machinery is doing the work of 50,000,000 men in the little state of Massachusetts.

2—Manufacturing can be profitably carried on only on a LARGE scale with MUCH machinery, so the man who has learned to USE machinery, but has not acquired enough wealth to OWN it, must work—if he works at his trade at all—for the man who owns the tools without which the laborer would descend to the ranks of the unskilled workmen.

Now let us see what effect the introduction of machinery into productive industry has had upon those who OWN the machinery and those who OPERATE it. In other words, let us see what effect the OWNERSHIP of the machinery by the class that does not USE it and the USE of the machinery by the class that does not OWN it, has had upon the financial condition of each class.

Take a shoemaker, for instance: Being no longer able to compete with the machinery in the big factory, the shoemaker abandons his little shop and goes to the owner of the factory. To ask for what? Employment? Not a bit of it. The people who buy and wear shoes are the ones who really employ those who make shoes, since they furnish a market for their products and thus EMPLOY them in the true sense of the word. What then DOES the shoemaker ask of the owner of the factory? The public having created a demand for the shoes that the shoemaker is willing to make, is there anything plainer than the fact that what the shoemaker really asks of the owner of the factory is PERMISSION TO USE HIS MACHINERY?

Get this plainly in your mind before you go on.

There stands the public demanding shoes.

There stands the shoemaker willing to make shoes.

But the shoemaker cannot make shoes without machinery, since other shoe manufacturers that HAVE machinery can make shoes with the machinery more cheaply than he can by hand and therefore undersell him.
And the machinery that the shoemaker needs to make shoes is owned by the capitalist who owns the factory.

Is it not a fact, then, that what the shoemaker asks of the capitalist is NOT employment—for the public offers him employment when it expresses a demand for the product of his labor—but an opportunity to use the capitalist’s machinery?

Do you see it?

Very well. What, then, does the capitalist say when the shoemaker applies to him for permission to USE HIS MACHINERY? Does he say, “Go ahead; the shop is open. Use my machinery as much as you like, furnish your own leather and take all you can make?”

Certainly not. Where would the capitalist, who does NOT use the machinery, come in if he were to have no advantage from the ownership of the machinery—in other words, if he were to have no opportunity to make profits?

What the capitalist really says—though he uses other words—is this:

“I will let you use my machinery on these terms: That you agree to work for a wage that represents only a part of the value you can produce by your labor. The difference between what I pay and what you earn, I will keep as profit. I will furnish the leather you use and the shoes you make I will sell at a price that will also wring from the public not only a profit on the cost of YOUR labor, but a profit on the materials that you put into the shoes."

Do you see the tremendous advantage that the private ownership of the machinery of production by the capitalist class gives to that class?

Here is a nation filled with wage-workers who, under existing conditions, cannot afford to use the very tools with which they must work or starve. The tools are in the hands of the small capitalist class that says to labor: “You shall not use my tools unless you will consent to work for a wage that shall represent only a part of your product, while I shall keep the rest.” The toilers MUST obtain access to the tools, or starve. Pressing HARD on one side are their necessities, to
which they MUST submit. Pressing HARD on the other side is the capitalist class that owns the tools. WHAT CHANCE HAS LABOR IN SUCH AN UNEQUAL CONTEST? Labor MUST gain access to the tools, AT ANY PRICE. In other words, a man who cannot afford to own the tools with which he has learned to work MUST work for somebody else for a wage that represents only a part of the value of his product. And the census reports for 1900 give some interesting figures with regard to the part of its product that labor retains in the form of wages. The census reports say:

That the average American laborer's annual wage amounts to $437.00.

And Dr. Spahr says that 1 per cent of the families—families whose heads do little or no productive labor—hold more of the national wealth than is held by the other 99 per cent. Is it not significant that the rich 1 per cent own the machinery with which the poor 99 per cent work?

Now don't dispute this statement regarding the large part of labor's product that is retained by the capitalist on the ground that if the average "employer," so-called, were to make so great a net profit on each laborer who used his machinery that the owners of machinery would accumulate wealth even more rapidly than they do. That would be true if the capitalist system of production and distribution were an ECONOMICAL system—if there were no waste of labor's products after it left the hands of labor. But the fact is that the capitalist system of production and distribution instead of being an economical system is a most wasteful method of supplying the world's material wants. Under this system, the products of millions of men are annually wasted in paying other men to do things that do not add to the world's store of wealth and therefore are of no value to society. How? We shall see:

The cost of making a reaping machine which the International Harvester Co., otherwise known as the harvester trust, sells to the farmer for $120 is $19. These figures were given to the writer by an agent of the trust with whom the writer is in confidential relations. The same authority also vouches for
the fact that it costs $5 to put the separate parts of the machine together AND $40 TO SELL IT! The cost of making and selling the $120 reaping machine that the trust sells to the farmer at a profit of nearly 100 per cent is only $64 and the cost of selling the machine is NEARLY TWICE AS MUCH AS THE COST OF MAKING IT!

Is there anything economical about a system of industry that requires such a waste of human effort? Does the payment of $40 for SELLING a reaper add anything to its value as a REAPING machine? How long could the government afford to sell postage stamps for 2 cents apiece if it were compelled to spend 4 cents apiece to sell them?

But the government is not trying to make a profit on the cost of carrying letters, you say, and therefore does not need to send out traveling agents to put them before the people or advertise "bargain sales" in the newspapers. YOU'VE PUT YOUR FINGER ON THE HEART OF THE WHOLE QUESTION!

It's the scheming for private PROFITS that causes one capitalist to send out "drummers" to get trade away from some other capitalist.

It's the scheming for private PROFITS that causes 1,087 grocery stores to exist in the city of Detroit with its 285,000 population when perhaps a dozen located in proper localities could satisfy the demands of the public much more cheaply.

It's the scheming for private PROFITS that floods every city with a proportionate number of useless stores of all kinds.

It's the scheming for private PROFITS that causes capitalists to spend millions of dollars each year to advertise their goods in the newspapers and magazines and to pay commercial agents for traveling the whole world over to sell them.

It's the scheming for private PROFITS that causes five newspaper plants, the machinery of which probably cost a million of dollars, and the most costly part of it (the presses) are in use not more than four hours out of each 24, to exist in a city like Detroit, when one plant, costing half as much, owned
by the people, through the government, could print even more newspapers than are now printed.

And it is this scheming for PRIVATE PROFITS that in the first instance is so costly to the capitalists themselves, that in the end falls bodily upon the shoulders of labor. For the cost of selling a thing is always added to the selling price, which the consuming class, which, broadly speaking, is also the producing class, must pay. Even newspaper-making is subject to the same rule. With most newspapers selling for a cent a copy, the unthinking believe they are getting their newspaper at a low price. It is not true. The modern method of newspaper-making is to saddle most of the cost of production upon the merchants who advertise, since a cent will not pay for the ink, paper and presswork represented in a 10 or 12 page paper, to say nothing of the cost of collecting the news of the world and editing it. But the merchants who pay outrageous prices for advertising promptly shift the burden to the working class who buy newspapers, by charging more for the goods that the merchants advertise in the newspapers. Every merchant that amounts to anything, financially or commercially, makes a large annual appropriation for advertising, and in marking his goods every one of them adds the cost of advertising to the original cost. If he didn't, he would be forced out of business very quickly.

And this criminal waste of human energy runs all through the operations of the capitalist system of production and distribution. The municipal officers, or the chamber of commerce of a city, by offering a bonus, or some other inducement, lures a manufacturing establishment from another city. There is great rejoicing in the city that gets the factory. But in the other city, there is a dismantled factory and the men who worked in it are out of jobs unless they are to go to the expense of moving with the factory. Great waste is the result. A thousand factories are established to make something for which the public demand could be supplied far more economically by a few larger establishments.
And then the owners of the thousand factories start out to make production as expensive as possible by employing "drummers" to go out on the road and try to get trade from each other. "Business," in the modern acceptation of the word, has come to mean little more than a scramble for what the other fellow has got. And while the fact that most of us are here and alive, even though poor, is proof that human beings CAN exist under such a wasteful system, the proof is just as abundant that it is a disastrous system even for the small capitalists who compose the greater part of the capitalist class, while it is a life sentence of hard work and a bare living for the great working class that constitutes practically the whole population.

So that is why a capitalist who pays a laborer in wages only a part of the value of the laborer's product does not become richer to the extent of the value of the rest of the product. Much of it is wasted in the competitive struggle for profits. And if you think this competitive struggle isn't fierce—that most of the capitalists themselves are not "sweating blood" most of the time—please remember that most men who go into "business" fail sooner or later. The pace is too swift for them and they have to go down. Most men who go into business never accumulate enough so they feel able to retire until they die. But Bradstreet's is authority for the statement that 60 per cent of those who begin business at 21 fail before they are 65. It is commonly reported that the percentage of failures is given as high as 95, but the estimate of Bradstreet's, which is probably conservative, shows that the capitalist system is terribly disastrous for most of the capitalists, as well as merciless in its robbery of those who produce the world's wealth.

Is there no escape from such conditions? Must the world plod on forever under a system of industry that is constantly increasing the percentage of toilers who cannot afford to own even the roofs over their heads while it as constantly increases the already colossal wealth of a few who do not toil?

Well, there is a division of opinions on these questions. Intelligent members of the capitalist class, like President Jor-
dan, of Stanford University, realize even if they do not always admit it as publicly as he did, that “the poor will become poorer in the twentieth century.” Such men contend there is no escape from what they consider the “inevitable destiny of most of humanity, not only to be poor, but to become poorer.” And this attitude of hopelessness is assumed, either with or without intent, by all who vote the capitalist tickets of Democracy or Republicanism, which, formulated and controlled by capitalism, seek to perpetuate the very conditions that capitalism has brought about.

Then, there are some—AND A RAPIDLY GROWING NUMBER THROUGHOUT THE WORLD—who believe there IS a means of escape. They are the Socialists. They have a plan. They believe industrial liberty and economic justice can be found where they were lost—at the ballot box. They believe that unjust laws constitute the root of all the wrongs from which those who labor suffer. And they deny that in this world-wide struggle between the wealth-makers and the wealth-takers, that JUSTICE for the first class can be attained by voting either of the tickets that capitalists form and vote for the express purpose of perpetuating INJUSTICE. They seek to show the men who produce the wealth that there is and can be no real community of interest between capitalists and laborers, since the chief aim of capitalists is to get the most labor for the least money, and the chief aim of laborers is to get the most money for the least labor. And since the struggle for wealth is between the GREAT class that makes it and the SMALL class that seeks to TAKE it WITHOUT making it, and the small class is able to wrong the great class only because of the existence of unjust laws, Socialists urge the wealth-makers to STAND TOGETHER AS A CLASS and recover their rights from the ballot box in which they lost them. They have a clear-cut program which they are eager to defend on the grounds of justice, reasonableness and practicability. Nor are they dismayed because their program is scoffed at and derided by the rich class, that under its operation would be compelled to go to work or starve.
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CHAPTER V.

Socialism, the Inevitable Remedy, Defined.

As a cure for the economic and industrial wrongs of capitalism, Socialists advocate what their philosophy teaches them to believe is both a logical and an inevitable remedy. Yet it is not, strictly speaking, the remedy OF Socialists, in the sense that it was formulated, or created, by any man or men who belong, or who ever belonged to the Socialist party. If the remedy of Socialism were a MAN-made affair there would exist a very great possibility that it would fail when put to the test. But Socialism is something vastly greater than the creation of any human intellect. It is a remedy provided by the operation of natural laws for a diseased social state. That it IS a natural remedy is proved by the fact that the only way to cure any ill—whether it be an ill of the physical body or an ill of the social body—is TO REMOVE THE CAUSE. The CAUSE of any ill is lack of harmony with natural laws, since the natural condition of anything is health.

If physical man be threatened with tuberculosis of the lungs, his physician, if he be learned and intelligent, will tell him that the cause of the condition of which his disease is the EFFECT is lack of wholesome air in the proper quantities, as he will also advise him that the imperative first step toward removing the disease—EFFECT—is to remove the CAUSE.

In like manner, Socialists contend that the wrongs that have grown out of the private ownership of the machinery of production cannot be cured except by removing the CAUSE that produced the EFFECT which we know as wrongs—by enabling the working class which produces all wealth to gain access to the tools which its necessities compel it to use at SOME price, without agreeing to give the owner of the tools any part of labor's product as the price of their use. Could
any remedy be MORE reasonable? IS any other remedy SO logical?

And yet the mere fact that Socialists advocate this remedy is no more reason for saying that it is THEIR remedy, in the sense that any Socialist or Socialists CREATED it, than it would be to say that the first physician who saw the absolute necessity of prescribing fresh air in abundant quantities to remove the CAUSE that produces the consumptive EFFECT, in any way CREATED the fresh-air cure for tuberculosis. The Power that created the universe created the fresh-air cure for tuberculosis when it was decreed that all living things on this earth shall have a certain amount of fresh air or become diseased and die. And the physician who prescribes plenty of fresh air for consumptives, instead of CREATING a remedy, or utilizing a remedy that any other human being has created, merely recognizes the utter futility of trying to remove an EFFECT known as disease without removing its CAUSE; without, in other words, causing the patient to place himself in harmony with natural laws.

Socialists contend—and they are eager to defend their philosophy on the grounds of reasonableness—that the only way to remove the effect known as the robbery of labor of the greater part of what it produces is to abolish the private ownership of the machinery with which men must work; because it is the private ownership of such things that has CAUSED the little capitalist class that owns the tools but does not use them to obtain most of the wealth produced by the great working class that uses the tools but does not own them.

If the Socialist contention be admitted that the Socialistic state is an EFFECT that is being produced by the existing capitalistic state which is its CAUSE, it must also be admitted that the Socialist remedy, which seeks to remove the EFFECT known as unjust poverty by removing the CAUSE known as the private ownership of the tools of production and distribution, is logical.

But, as was said at the beginning of this chapter, the Socialists contend that their remedy is not only logical, but that
it is INEVITABLE—that the Socialist state is as sure to come as the sun is sure to rise every morning. Now let us see what reason, if any, there is for believing that this contention about the inevitability of Socialism is based on truth. And for this reason, we need not go farther than the natural laws which decree that every cause shall produce its effect and that the constant tendency of every living thing is toward health. That we have here CAPITALISM—a powerful cause that must inevitably produce an effect, be it what it may—is a fact that is made only too plain by its multitude of attendant wrongs. That capitalism is also a diseased social condition, tending as it does toward the blighting and dwarfing of humanity, is proved by the fact already stated that the NATURAL condition of anything is health.

More than that, all of nature’s processes are toward restoring health when it has once been lost as the result of failure to live in harmony with natural laws. The late Col. Ingersoll, when asked how he could have improved upon the work of the Infinite if he had made the world, gave expression to a popular delusion when he said that he “would have made health, instead of disease, catching.”

As a matter of fact, that is exactly what nature has done, as any physician will tell you. Disease is an attempt on the part of nature to relieve the body of certain elements that endanger its life, and as such is an attempted return toward health. That man has introduced into his body these dangerous elements, and may even die as the result of them if nature be unsuccessful in throwing them off by the purifying process known as DISEASE, is no fault of nature. But nature always makes the attempt to restore health through the eliminating process of disease, and those who go out of the world in physical suffering, instead of sleeping into eternity as the centenarian does, do so because they have violated laws whose penalty is death. And let it be understood that no man ever died of any disease. All men not centenarians die as the result of the CAUSES which brought disease into being as an attempted cure. The man whose heart stops because he has
palsied it with tobacco is killed with tobacco and not by "heart
disease."

And that is why Socialists say that the Socialist state is
inevitable—because the pillaging, murderous capitalist sys-
tem affords unmistakable proof of the existence of a diseased
social body, and disease is always the sign that nature is trying
to restore health by compelling obedience to natural laws. We
can hinder, if we will, the operation of this natural law that
makes Socialism inevitable, just as we can hinder the operation
of the natural law that every human being shall so live that he
will be in a state of bodily health or die before the time to which
his inherent vital forces should have carried him. But society
cannot without literally dying—actually ceasing to exist—
steadfastly, persistently and continuously violate this natural
law that decrees that the Socialist state shall be the EFFECT of
the existing capitalistic state which is its CAUSE, without suf-
ferring untold agonies and actually meeting the same premature
death that comes to the human being who suffers and event-
ually dies before his time as the result of his neglect or refusal
to live in harmony with the laws of physical health.

The constant tendency of capitalism is to place the owner-
ship of the wealth of the world in a smaller and smaller num-
ber of hands, with increasing poverty for the many. And while
the development of the virgin resources of our marvelous
country has thus far enabled the producing class of the United
States to live with less distress than is endured by the produc-
ing classes of other nations whose natural resources are nearly
exhausted, it is inevitable that there must be poverty that will
not only be appalling, but infinitely more murderous if capi-
talism shall endure in this nation even for another century. For
the United States would have a population of half a billion be-
fore the struggle for existence under capitalism would become
so fierce that human beings would no longer consent to increase
the population by having more than two children in each family.
And with half a billion persons in this country striving for the
means with which to sustain life, and the wealth of the nation
concentrating into a fewer and fewer number of hands, it would
not be difficult to forecast the time, under capitalism, carried to its logical conclusion, when the masses would actually starve to death because a few had appropriated all the means with which life might be sustained.

But history teaches that however much society may suffer as the result of maintaining inharmonious relations with natural laws, that it always learns from its suffering and stops short of annihilation by adjusting itself to the laws of the Infinite. And that is why Socialists say that Socialism is inevitable—because they know that the sorrows inflicted by capitalism are teaching the lesson that our economic and industrial affairs are being conducted on principles that are in violation of natural laws and that society's only hope of continued existence lies in OBEEDIENCE to those laws.

The time has now come to define Socialism—to tell what it means and what it stands for. All that has been written in this chapter up to this point has been written for much the same purpose that a lawyer precedes the presentation of a case to a jury by making an opening statement in which he outlines his case, tells what he expects to prove and gives his reasons for believing that justice demands that the verdict shall be in favor of his client. The reader who has closely followed the reasoning up to this point, ought, therefore, to be able not only to comprehend the philosophy of Socialism once it is stated, but to sympathize with its purposes and realize both its desirability and its inevitability.

BRIEFLY STATED, SOCIALISM STANDS FOR THE TRANSFORMATION OF PRIVATE COMPETING CAPITAL INTO PUBLIC CO-OPERATIVE CAPITAL.

Don't make the mistake now at the beginning of assuming that Socialism stands for the abolition of all private property, for it stands for nothing of the kind. All wealth that is not used to acquire more wealth for the possessor would be permitted under Socialism to remain in the private ownership of individuals, since it is only CAPITAL—that is wealth used to acquire MORE wealth—that Socialists would transfer from
private to public ownership. It is communism and not So-
cialism that stands for the public ownership of wealth. And
this distinction must be kept in mind by anyone who would
understand Socialism. The very heart of Socialism is that
each individual should be permitted to acquire all the wealth he
produces. And it is because the members of the producing
class are permitted, under capitalism, to acquire but a fraction
of the wealth they produce that Socialists protest against ex-
isting conditions.

Very well. It is the public ownership of capital then that
the Socialists desire, and, as we have shown, capital is that part
of wealth which is used to produce MORE wealth. What part
of capital then, IS used to produce more wealth?

Beginning at the bottom, wealth invested in land is capital,
since it is wealth used to produce more wealth. Socialism
therefore demands that the ownership of all lands shall be
vested in the people as a whole—that no individual shall claim
exclusive ownership of any part of the earth, as it would also
guarantee to each individual the right to use as much land as
he might need without paying anybody anything for the privi-
lege. Socialists argue that since access to the land is just as
necessary to human life as the use of the air or the water which
the Creator alone brought into existence, that it is just as wrong
to demand a price for the use of land as it would be to demand
a price for the privilege of breathing or of drinking from a
mountain stream.

The next great example of wealth that becomes capital by
being used to produce more wealth is the machinery of pro-
duction, the ownership of which Socialism would also vest in
all the people through their government. But "machinery of
production" is an expression that needs to be explained.
Briefly, it means everything that labor uses to produce wealth.
It means not only the machinery used in the great manufac-
turing establishments, but it means the railroads, the steam-
ships, the stores and every other factor that is involved in the
performance of completing production by placing manufac-
tured products in the hands of the consumers.
So much for the purpose of Socialism—and the public ownership of capital is all there is to Socialism. Remember that. The man who tells you that Socialism means either more or less than the conversion of private, competing capital into public, co-operative capital is either ignorant or untruthful. That is the beginning and the end of the Socialist program so far as fundamentals are concerned.

Next come the reasons that are advanced in support of the contention that it is both necessary and desirable to convert private, competing capital into public, co-operative capital. Let us take up the land question first.

Socialists contend that every human being has a natural right to free access to enough land to enable him to obtain the means with which to sustain life by applying his labor to the land. They contend that this natural right cannot be enjoyed so long as the law supports the claim of any individual to private ownership of land and thus enables him to dispose of it only to those who have wealth to give in exchange for it, or to appropriate a part of the product of the labor applied to it as the price of its use. No human being is born into the world with wealth of his own creation; few human beings are born into the world even with wealth that others have created; yet all human beings, immediately after their birth and until they die, must have "access to the land"—to use a term of political economy—or die.

Private ownership of land has denied the greater part of humanity this natural right to apply its labor to the soil and produce the wealth necessary to sustain life without paying anybody for the privilege of doing so. That is why most of the American people own neither land nor their homes, notwithstanding the fact that there is more than enough land in the country for all who are here to use it. There is plenty of land not USED, but none that is not CLAIMED by someone. And this condition must not only continue, but it must grow worse so long as the law shall defend the claim of private ownership of land. And contending, as the Socialists do, that the private ownership of an element that is as essential to life as water or
air in violation of man’s natural rights, they also affirm that the injustices produced by the private ownership of land can be eradicated only by removing the cause and restoring the land to its original place as the common heritage of all people of all times. Yet this does not mean that every human being would be denied the right to live unmolested, so long as he might please, in the spot that he had chosen for his home. In fact, it means exactly the opposite. Socialism would guarantee this right, as a future chapter will show.

Now, on what ground do Socialists base their contention that the ownership of the machinery of production should be vested in the people through their government? On the ground that it is unnatural and inhuman that a small class of men should control the means by which a large class must obtain a living or starve. Man’s wants have so increased with civilization that he cannot supply them without machinery. The machine has become as necessary to labor in the making of a living as the hand that guides it. The man who cannot get the opportunity to put his hand to some sort of a machine—using the word “machine” in its economic sense—cannot produce wealth. And Socialists therefore say that, so far as earning a living is concerned, it is just as wrong to permit the capitalist class to control the tools with which the producing class must labor or starve as it would be to give the capitalist class control of the very flesh and blood arms that use the tools.

What would we think of Nature if she had made stomachs without making arms to feed them? What would we think of nature if, having made arms to feed stomachs, she had made it impossible for the stomachs to use the arms to use the arms without getting the permission of someone else to use the very flesh and blood that the stomachs had stored up in the arms? Think of a monstrosity whose arms would not respond to its stomach’s demand for food—a monstrosity whose brain would hear its stomach’s cry, yet could not give a direct order to put food in its mouth!

But, more hideous yet, think of this first monstrosity, desirous as it is of using its own arms to put food in its mouth—
think of it being compelled to beg this right as a privilege from another monstrosity with huge stomachs, but NO arms!

Hideous as these pictures are, they are the pictures of the working class and the capitalist class as they exist today.

There stands the working class, the real owner of every particle of machinery in the world, because the working class has made it all. It has good arms. But each of the arms with which labor produces wealth contains four sections instead of two. The first two section are bone and muscle. These sections the working class controls. The next two sections are land and machinery. The last two sections of its own arms the working class does not control, and without them the first two sections are useless.

Putting it in another way, of what value are labor's bone and muscle arms if it cannot reach out at will and grasp the land and machinery without which its bone and sinew are useless in the production of wealth? Ask the man whose bone and muscle arms are amputated at his shoulders and the man who is "out of a job," denied the privilege of using land or machinery—THE MAN WHOSE ARMS ARE AMPUTATED WHERE THEIR REAL POWER BEGINS, AT THE POINT WHERE THE FINGER TIPS GRASP THE MACHINE. An armless man can produce just as much wealth as can the man who is "out of a job"—the man who has been denied the opportunity to use land or machinery. And the man who is compelled to relinquish a large part of his product as the price of the privilege of using the last two sections of his arms is actually forced to try to make a living with only part of one arm instead of two whole arms.

But look again at the picture. Beside the working class stands the capitalist class—the class that TAKES, but does not MAKE, wealth. And this capitalist class says to labor, "You are hungry. I have enough food to last me a year, but I would like to store away a still larger supply. You cannot get food for the present, nor I for the future, unless somebody produces wealth with the machinery I own. I don't want to work with this machinery myself and I will not let you work with it unless
you will agree to take in the form of wages only a part of what
you create and give me the rest for the use of the machinery."

AND THE WORKING CLASS PAYS THIS AWFUL
PRICE FOR THE USE OF ITS OWN ARMS!

Why?

First, because the working class cannot get food into its
stomach in any other way.

Second, BECAUSE THE WORKING CLASS IS
HUNGRY TODAY; unlike the capitalist class, it is not think-
ing about appeasing a possible hunger next year. IT MUST
HAVE FOOD AT ONCE AT ANY PRICE. To get food, it
must produce wealth with MACHINERY. And if the class
that controls the machinery will not let it be used except for a
price that represents half of labor's products, LABOR MUST
PAY THE PRICE! THERE IS NO ESCAPE. Labor
is hungry TODAY. The capitalist will not run out of food
until next year. HE CAN WAIT. He knows that labor's
hunger will drive it to the machine at any price long before the
capitalist can possibly consume his year's supply of food.

So Socialism takes this position:

So long as one class of men have the power to control the
machinery that other men must use to get a living, so long will
the greed inherent in human nature enable the controlling class
to exploit the others.

Labor can obtain its full product only when it can apply
itself to the things that are used to produce wealth—land and
machinery—without agreeing to give any part of its product
to another as the price of their use.

Land and machinery being necessary to produce wealth,
man has the same natural right to their free use that he has to
life itself, because the value of the right to live is in direct
proportion to the opportunity to exercise it. In other words, a
man's "right to live" is of no value to him if he cannot obtain
anything with which to sustain life.

Therefore Socialism says that man, machinery and land
must be BROUGHT TOGETHER; that the toll-gates of capi-
"tialism must be TORN DOWN, and that every human being:
OPPORTUNITY to produce the means with which to sustain life shall be considered as sacred as his RIGHT to live.

Unless access to land and machinery is free to all, those who are compelled to beg as a privilege the right to use land and machinery will be robbed by those who dispense this privilege.

Access to land and machinery cannot be FREE to all until land and machinery are OWNED by all.

In other words, the individuals that form the atoms of which the giant of labor is composed must wrest control of the giant's arms from the armless monster of capitalism.

A condition of society that denies a man the right to use his arms to produce food to satisfy his hunger, without giving part of his product to another for the mere privilege of working, is as unnatural as would be a human being with a brain to feel hunger, but without the power to move his arms to obtain food, except as someone else might give him permission to do so.

If there were such a monstrosity in the world, the NATURAL way to cure him would be to destroy the power of all other persons to prevent him from moving his arms at will.

And that's why Socialists say that the destruction of private ownership of land and machinery—neither of which is now owned by labor—and the substitution therefore of public ownership is the only NATURAL remedy for the economic diseases produced by the private ownership of the means of production. In other words, Socialists affirm that it is unnatural for a few to own all the land and tools with which the many must work or starve. And the only way to guarantee to every man the right to use land and tools without paying a price to an idling class for the privilege of using them is to destroy the private ownership of everything that labor uses to produce wealth and vest the title to such property in all of the people.

FOR JUST SO LONG AS THE LAW DEFENDS THE CLAIM OF ANY MAN TO THE EXCLUSIVE OWNERSHIP OF A FOOT OF LAND, OR A POUND 
OF MACHINERY, THE LAND AND MACHINERY OF
THE WORLD WILL BE HELD BY A FEW AND THE
REST OF THE WORLD WILL BE COMPELLED TO
GIVE THEM MOST OF THEIR PRODUCE FOR THE
PRIVILEGE OF KEEPING THEIR FEET ON THE
EARTH AND USING TOOLS TO MAKE A LIVING.

Karl Marx was the first man to grasp this great truth in its entirety.

But he did not CREATE the remedy when he discovered it any more than Newton created the law of gravitation when he saw why the apple fell. Each simply saw a fact in advance of his fellows, and while the world disputed Newton for a time as it is now disputing Marx, the fact remained as Newton stated it and the world had to accept it in the end.
CHAPTER VI.

Why a New Medium of Exchange Is Needed.

UNDER Socialism, the medium of exchange now known as money would be abolished and in its place would be substituted the labor-time check.

If a man were to work four hours to make a pair of shoes, he would receive from the government in place of what is now known as "wages" a labor-time check, which would merely certify that the bearer had done four hours of useful labor and was entitled to exchange his labor-time check or any article created by anybody else in the same length of time.

And the shoes that he made, instead of being marked "$3.50" or some other figure, would be marked "4½ hours"—for example, the extra half hour, or whatever it might be, representing the wear and tear on the government's tools, which the shoemaker who used them would be under obligations to make good, as it would also represent the time devoted by others in preparing the raw materials for the shoemaker's use. These figures are not exact, of course, but they will do for the purpose of illustration.

Now, why do Socialists contend that it is necessary to abolish money as a medium of exchange and substitute the labor-time checks?

So radical a change in the method of exchanging the products of labor would not be justified unless there were an equally radical defect in the present method.

Wherein, then, do the Socialists contend that the present method is defective? Let us see.

No civilized man can satisfy even his most moderate wants with the things he makes himself, if he work ever so hard. In other words, no civilized man—or uncivilized man for that matter—can labor on the coffee plantations of Brazil long
enough to produce as much coffee as he wants, then flit to the coal mines of Pennsylvania to mine his winter's coal, go back to the south to produce some sugar for his coffee and then raise sheep and cotton for a few days to obtain clothing. The things that every man consumes come from all quarters of the earth, and the only way any man can obtain the things he needs to satisfy his ordinary wants is to exchange the products of his own labor for the products of many other men scattered all over the world.

And since a numerous, civilized people cannot exchange the identical articles they produce for the article created by others, it is necessary that there shall be some medium of exchange—something representing value that can be exchanged for anything of equal value. That is why we now have what is known as money.

But let us see how labor fares when it receives money for its labor and exchanges money for the products of other men's labor. We have seen from the census figures that the average American laborer receives in the form of wages only $437, and D. Spahr shows us that an idling 1 per cent gets as much of the total product as is held by the productive 99 per cent. It is this monstrous injustice that Socialism would abolish by giving labor the ownership of the tools with which it works. But while the public ownership of capital—of machiery and land—would enable labor to obtain what it produced, we have seen that the individual laborer can not satisfy his wants with the things that he, himself, produces. He must exchange the things he has produced for the things that other laborers have produced. And any medium of exchange that will not permit him to exchange equal amounts of value on even terms is unjust.

Socialists contend that the existing medium of exchange IS unjust to labor, and, in proof of their contention, they only ask the fair-minded to trace the dollar that labor gets in the form of wages until the dollar is exchanged for something that labor desires.

WATCH NOW, AND SEE THE DOLLAR GO FROM THE HAND OF THE CAPITALIST INTO THE HAND
OF THE WAGE-WORKER AND FROM THERE INTO THE HAND OF ANOTHER CAPITALIST WHO HOLDS THE PRODUCT OF SOME OTHER LABORER THAT THE FIRST LABORER DESIRES:

The laborer produces $2 of value and receives therefor $1 in wages—ROBBED OF 50 PER CENT OF HIS PRODUCT AT THE START!

But that would not be so bad if he could exchange the dollar he DOES get for a full dollar's worth of the product of some other laborer.

CAN HE DO IT?

Watch again:

The laborer takes his dollar and goes to a store to exchange it for a dollar's worth of groceries, a dollar's worth of meat, or a dollar's worth of clothing that other laborers like himself have produced.

Does he GET a dollar's worth of any of these products? Does he GET the same amount of meat, or clothing, or groceries that other laborers received a dollar for producing? HE GETS NOTHING OF THE KIND!

Between the laborer who goes to buy (and we will suppose that he is a maker of furniture) and the other laborers who have produced groceries, meat and clothing there stand a long line of middlemen capitalists who demand PROFITS before they will permit the makers of furniture, meat, groceries and clothing to exchange their products among each other.

And these capitalists demanding PROFITS compel the furniture-maker who goes to exchange the dollar's worth of value he has created for a dollar's worth of the value of some other laborer to accept for his dollar an article that the laborer who created it received only 30 or 40 cents for making.

And when the makers of groceries and clothing go with their dollars to exchange them for the other laborer's furniture, these same capitalists, with their incessant demands for PROFITS, compel them to exchange each of their dollars for an amount of furniture that the man who made it received only 30 or 40 cents for making! And the fact that values are ex-
pressed in dollars and cents instead of in labor hours blinds labor’s eyes to the extent of the robbery.

Do you begin to SEE why the Socialists contend that the present medium of exchange called money robs labor for the benefit of capitalists?

Do you begin to SEE why the labor that creates ALL wealth is itself POOR when one laborer is compelled to produce $2 worth of value in order to get 30 or 40 cents worth of the value that some other laborer has produced?

And do you begin to SEE that while the private ownership of machinery enables the capitalist class to rob labor of the first $1 it loses when it accepts in wages only half of its product, THAT THE PRESENT MEDIUM OF EXCHANGE ENABLES LABOR TO BE ROBBED OF MORE THAN HALF OF WHAT IS LEFT WHEN IT GOES TO BUY?

The law makes it a crime punishable by a long term of imprisonment in a penitentiary to erase the figure “1” on a dollar bill and substitute the figure “2”, on the ground that such substitution tends to rob the person to whom the bill is next passed.

Is the robbery less actual if the dollar bill be disguised as corn, potatoes, or anything else and then “passed” as $2?

And if it be right to send to the penitentiary the man who “raises” a $1 bill to $2, is it very brilliant to give a palace to the man who can “raise” and pass a MILLION dollar bills merely by exchanging them for commodities, the real value of which is unknown to the persons to whom he sells them?

Yet, to a limited extent, that is exactly what takes place every time any article is sold for more than it cost to produce it.

Capitalists rob each other in this way to the full extent of their powers of deception and falsification. A capitalist has money lying in the bank. He cannot take $10,000 in a sack and by canvassing his capitalist friends find someone who will give him $15,000 for it. He cannot get a cent more than $10,000 for his money, BECAUSE EVERYONE KNOWS EXACTLY WHAT IT IS WORTH. What, then, does he do? He disguises this $10,000 as a corner lot, a brick block, or
something else, the actual value of which is not so plain as was the value of the $10,000 that he paid for it. He represents that his corner lot, brick block, or whatever it may be, is worth much more than $10,000—perhaps $12,000 of $15,000—with the result that in a few days he finds a purchaser and deposits possibly $15,000 in the very bank from which a few days before he had drawn $10,000.

In the millions of cases of which this is typical, has anything been done except to exchange a smaller sum of money for a larger sum, merely by disguising the smaller sum as a commodity, the real value of which is not known to the purchaser?

Is it less ROBBERY to induce a man to pay $15,000 for $10,000 disguised as a brick block than it would be to blow the door of a safe and take $5,000? The difference in the net result is not apparent, except that the man who is robbed has, in the possession of the brick block, what a burglar would call a “kit,” by means of which he may hope to reimburse himself from somebody else’s safe. And yet this sort of legalized thievery is what the world calls “business,” and the capitalist who is most successful at deception is the “best” business man.

The capitalist system having compelled the capitalists to cultivate their ability to deceive others, or get out of the game, it has naturally followed that a few have become vastly more expert in deception than the rest of the class. Therefore we have a few monumental business liars who are feared by all their kind. The less expert liars—the small capitalists—more than half expect to be buncoded every time they deal with them, while the wageworkers read of their depredations with much the same feeling that children read of giant robbers in fairyland.

Under this system of legalized robbery by means of a deceptive medium of exchange, no man can have so much money that he may not lose it all if he stay in the game and play hard enough. Everybody is bent on getting his money, and while, ordinarily, it is a game in which the big fish feed on the size next smaller, the larger fish sometimes combine and bite a piece
out of the biggest swimmer in the group. But on the whole, the present medium of exchange not only permits a monstrous injustice to be done to the producing class, but it is disastrous to all except the greatest capitalists. The capitalist with only $50,000 or $100,000 must keep a sharp eye on his business all the time, or he will be swept off the board; and watch as sharply as he can, he is often swept off anyway.

Since money as a medium of exchange is detrimental to the interests not only of the entire working class, but of the real interests of most of the capitalist class, why is such a medium of exchange retained? Why was it ever adopted, in fact?

Money, as a medium of exchange, had its origin in ignorance, as it depends for its continued existence upon the ignorance of the many and the greed of a few.

In the beginning, when hunting wild animals was the occupation of most human beings, skins and furs were the mediums of exchange.

A little later, when most of the population had turned to cattle raising, cattle became the medium of exchange. Then unstamped metals, like tin, iron and lead, were used, their exchange value being solely dependent upon their weight. And a thousand years before the time of Christ stamped metals of the kind now used appeared as money.

NECESSITY, as we have seen, first compelled the use of a medium of exchange and IGNORANCE caused the use of mediums that had no scientific basis, because they contained no element by means of which those who wished to exchange their products could know that the exchange would do injustice neither to the buyer nor the seller. In the beginning it was probably not the intention that the absence of this element should work to the advantage of any class of individuals; but thousands of years of experience has shown that the absence of such a safeguard HAS and DOES work, to the advantage of a few at a corresponding disadvantage to the many. The few who are enabled by this unscientific medium of exchange to enrich themselves at the expense of the others are naturally well satisfied with it and wish it to remain. The many who are
being wronged by the use of money as a medium of exchange have never recognized the nature of the wrong and have therefore never sought remedy. The Socialist party alone, of all the political parties in the United States, has recognized the nature of this monstrous wrong and has devised a remedy. And it is so simple a remedy that, when once stated, neither its absolute justice nor its practicability can be honestly questioned.

How, then, would Socialism make the labor-time check serve the purpose of a medium of exchange without enabling anyone to profit by it to the disadvantage of another?

Well, to begin, we would all be working just as we are now—this man in a shoe shop, that man in a foundry, another at house building, and so on. For the most part, we should all be working in the same factories and work-places in which we now toil, though if it should be found that the capitalist desire for profits had caused too many shoe-shops to spring up the superfluous shops would be closed and the shoe-makers would be given an opportunity to make something for which there was a demand—not a difficult task when the fact is considered that no human being is now able to obtain more than a few of the things he would like to have. But most of us would be working just as we are now, the only difference being that the government would own the land and machinery with which we would work and we would therefore not be required to give half of our products as the price of the use of the other elements that labor must use to produce wealth. And when pay-day came, instead of getting an envelope containing $6, $9 or any other sum of money, the government, as the representative of all the people, in whom the ownership of the land and machinery would be vested, would simply issue to each laborer a labor-time check.

This labor-time check would be nothing more than a certificate that the person to whom it was issued had performed a certain number of hours of useful labor that week and was entitled to anything else that had been produced by any other man in the country in the same number of hours.

If the laborer were a shoemaker and had worked 48 hours
that week, he could buy back practically all of his own product if he wished and receive, say "47½ hours' worth" of shoes, the government retaining the product of a half hour, or some other small amount, to make up for the wear and tear on the machinery, etc.

On the other hand, if he wished to buy a piano, he could make a payment of "47½ hours" on it. Now there is no means of knowing, unless one be in the business of manufacturing pianos, how many hours of labor are represented in the manufacture of a piano from the time the necessary wood is cut in the forests and the ores are mined from the ground until the finished piano is ready for a Beethoven to make the angel choirs peer down at earth. But it is tolerably certain that 47½ hours of labor—a few minutes cutting a tree; a few minutes sawing it and planning the boards, a few more mining the necessary minerals and the rest of the time at fashioning the raw materials and putting them together—would make a big start toward completing a piano. But perhaps the labor represented in a piano that now sells for $650 would be equivalent to the labor of one man for 500 hours—probably 250 hours would be nearer the correct figures, but let's err it, if at all, on the side of liberality. If "500 hours" be the price of a piano that now sells for $650, is it not apparent that a laborer who received his full product represented by a labor-time check of "47½ hours" could pay for the piano in a little more than 10 weeks?

How long would it take the man who now works 8 hours a day in a shoe-shop for $10 a week to pay for a $650 piano? Only 65 weeks. How long would it take such a laborer to pay for such a piano if he received all of his product—$20 a week—instead of half of it, but were compelled to use money as a medium of exchange and meet a price-mark on the piano that concealed its real value? Thirty-two and one-half weeks.

Of course it may be said that if the government controlled all industry in behalf of the people, it would not strive to make a profit and therefore would have no incentive to charge more than cost for a piano. True enough. But a medium of exchange that does not clearly indicate the number of hours de-
voted to the production of an article loses sight of a vital fact that is likely to do injustice to the baker who desires to exchange his 10-hour product for the 10-hour product of the weaver. The moment the attempt is made to translate labor-hours into dollars and cents that moment error is likely to creep in, even with the best of intentions. The only safe way is to make the price of an article the product of the same number of hours of useful labor that were required to produce the first article.

That, in brief, is the Socialist idea of a just medium of exchange. When Socialism comes, ALL the people will take this idea, and, after giving it their best consideration, do as they please with it. That they will not reject it as a whole is certain, because it has a fundamental element of justice that is apparent.

That the people will not adopt it as a whole is just as certain. No human brain is great enough to sit down and outline a revolutionary change in our medium of exchange and not err in some minor details. Experience must show the weak points and they must be strengthened as they develop. One weak point can already be seen. If two men were sawing wood and one should saw 10 cords in 48 hours and the other by working harder should saw 12, it would of course be manifestly unjust to give each a labor-time check for 48 hours, provided each had the same health and strength. It would be too costly to put an overseer at each woodpile where two men were working. Possibly EXACT justice could never be brought about in such cases. But Socialists nevertheless adhere to their theory on the ground that it would come nearer justice than is possible under the present medium of exchange. For, in cases like that of the wood-cutter who might saw 12 cords of wood and be given a labor-time check that would enable him to buy back only 10 cords, he would nevertheless receive five-sixths of his product instead of the half that labor now receives in the form of wages.

Then again: Socialists regard all kinds of useful labor, generally speaking, as equally valuable to society and therefore
deserving of the same compensation. That's why they would let the wood-cutter's 10 hours of labor buy the product of the piano-maker's 10 hours at HIS trade. As a matter of man-to-man justice the position is impregnable—at least Socialists think so and are willing to defend it against all comers. Yet Socialists can see a strong probability that experience would show the desirability if not the necessity of making slight variations in a few cases. For while Socialists maintain that, generally speaking, all kinds of labor are equally valuable to society, they realize that a few kinds of labor are not equally AGREEABLE. Nor are their eyes closed to the fact that certain other kinds of labor are of extraordinary VALUE to society.

So, under Socialism, the Edisons and the sewer-diggers might—in fact, they WOULD—get more than the rest of us, the first as a matter of enthusiastic appreciation, the second as a matter of stern justice.
CHAPTER VII.

Why All Forms of Useful Labor Are of Equal Value.

UNDER the labor-time check medium of exchange proposed by Socialists, any laborer could exchange the wealth he produced in any given number of hours for the wealth produced by any other laborer in the same number of hours.

If the labor-time check system be a just system, it must therefore follow that all forms of useful labor are equally valuable to society.

Else the laborer whose product was of great value would be wronged in exchanging it upon even terms for the wealth produced by a laborer whose product was of small value.

To prove that the labor-time check medium of exchange would, in practice, prove to be a just medium, it therefore becomes necessary to prove that the product of one man's labor, hour for hour, is worth no more than the product of any other man's labor.

And it may as well be admitted at the start that, while Socialists contend that the rule would hold absolutely good in practically all cases, they believe its application would show the necessity of making a few exceptions.

In other words, they would give extraordinary compensation for extraordinary service as a matter of gratitude, rather than as a strict obligation of justice. And the exceptions of a decade could probably be noted on the fingers of one hand.

This may sound strange now—this idea of giving extraordinary compensation as a matter of gratitude instead of duty—but it will be made plain in what is to follow.

And realizing, as Socialists do, that while all forms of useful labor are of equal value to society, and therefore entitled to equal compensation, that all forms of labor are not equally
agreeable, they would give extraordinary compensation, if necessary, to those who are engaged in some of the particularly disagreeable callings.

And again, they would give extraordinary compensation, if necessary, to those who are doing the most disagreeable work, not because their work is of more value to society than the work of anybody else, but because experience would doubtless demonstrate the necessity of offering some extraordinary inducement to get the work done.

Now to prove that all forms of useful labor are of equal value to society. Let's begin at the bottom.

Food may be well regarded as the first of man's necessities. Food for civilized man cannot be produced except by applying the labor of man to the earth. So, there would seem to be little necessity for enlarging upon the fact that no labor is more useful than the labor of the man who produces food for other men, without which they must die; nor for contending that, as a matter of stern justice, no man is entitled to more for his labor than the man who produces food for other men.

We have, then, this first fact: "Man would die without food, but his life has been saved by food that other men have produced."

But the man is naked and standing outdoors in a blizzard. Even with food in his stomach, he cannot long survive unless he have clothing.

Clothing is produced for him and the clothing does exactly what the food did—enables him to live.

Second fact: "Man's life had been saved by food, but he was about to die from cold when his life was again saved by clothing that other men had produced."

His hunger satisfied and his body warmly clad, man still lacks something without which he must die. He has no shelter. The winds of winter quickly penetrate his thick clothing and the snow drifts down about him. And, for the third time, his life is saved by the action of other men in providing him with the various materials with which a house may be constructed.
Now, let the preceding facts sink into your mind before you proceed. Without food, clothing and shelter, man would most certainly die; no shadow of doubt about it. And since no service can be rendered to man that is more valuable than to prevent him from dying, is it possible, as a matter of actual fact, for any kind of labor to be worthy of greater compensation than that which is devoted to the production of food, clothing and shelter? If you were without all these things and had been without them even two weeks, is there anything on this earth for which you would give more, even if you had all the wealth of Wall street, than something to eat, something to wear and a place to sleep?

So far, so good. We have provided for man, the animal. We have fed, clothed and sheltered him. And however gross it may sound to refined ears, the animal part of man is a most important part. A man who is not a good animal is not likely to be a good anything. A good body is necessary to a good brain. But a man who has merely a good body is fit to rank only with the beasts. To be a man in the highest and best sense of the word, he must be developed, intellectually and morally as well as physically. He must have access to those things that tend to develop the brain, exalt the mind and coax into blossom all of the latent potentialities for good that are in him. Else he will remain merely an animal. To the extent that he obtains these things, he will rise above those living things that are content with food, warmth and protection from the elements. To the extent that he is denied them, he will settle back into that class. And the things that man needs to develop him to the uttermost are almost as numerous as the sands of the sea and are more diversified in character than the hues of an Italian sunset.

He must have learning. For centuries astronomers have sat through weary nights to scan the heavens, all for him—to wrest from the realms of endless space a meager knowledge of how the world was made and why the planets keep on their tireless ways with all the precision of delicately adjusted machines.
Other men have sailed the seas in storm and calm to wrest still further secrets from nature. They have tempted death in the far corners of the earth to gratify the insatiable desire of man to know. Others have written books, composed music, painted pictures and done innumerable other things, all of which are necessary to the greatest development of man's powers to rise above the purely animal.

Is the work of the astronomer, then, less valuable, or deserving of less compensation, than that of the farmer, the weaver, or the carpenter? It is true that man could exist without any definite knowledge of whether the moon was made of green cheese or baled hay, but is ignorance of anything that men have been able to discover pertaining to the mysteries of the universe in keeping with the highest type of mental development? On the other hand, is the work of the astronomers more important, or deserving of higher compensation, than that of the farmer who maintains the animal, without which the mental and moral parts of man could not exist?

Is the work of the men who provide the world with mirth and melody less important, or deserving of less compensation, than the work of the farmer, the cotton planter, or the house-builder? It is true that man could exist without mirth or melody. Dumb animals do. But what a sorry world it would be without them. How many hearts would stay heavy for the lack of soothing influence of song, or the mirth that revives the drooping spirits at the end of the day's struggle. The fact that man enjoys mirth and melody shows that his nature requires them; that he cannot be a whole man without them. Yet, are the makers of mirth and melody entitled to greater compensation than the farmer who supplies the food for the physical body, without which mirth and melody could not be enjoyed because life could not exist?

It is the same with all kinds of useful labor. Look closely into those lines of human endeavor that at first glance may seem the least important and far down in their depths will be seen the plans of the Infinite, working for man's good. Every man engaged in useful industry has his work to do, and if he
were to cease the work the world would miss him. It may seem as if the man who is engaged in making a child's undershirt is more useful to society than the man who makes children's toys, but it is doubtful if even this is true. Childhood demands amusement. God made it so. The child that has no toys is a sad child and an additional care to its mother. A sad child is an abnormal child, for mirth and gayety are the qualities of natural childhood. An abnormal child is more likely than a normal child to become an abnormal adult. And abnormal adults are the penalties inflicted upon a careless world for ignoring the rules of right and wrong. "The world makes its own criminals," says Lombroso, the celebrated Italian criminologist. It is doubtful if the world knows how many criminals are made in childhood. Few persons become criminals after they have reached maturity. At any rate, it may be said that the world demands toys as well as undershirts for its children, and as a matter of justice it ought, therefore, to give as much compensation to the toymaker as it does to the shirtmaker, because the toymaker would be just as willing to make shirts as toys if the world, by withdrawing its demand for his product, would signify its desire that he produce something else.

Then there are certain callings that the world now seems to consider deserving of extraordinary compensation, not only because of their nature, but on account of the length of time that must be devoted to study before work can be begun. Of this class of highly-paid labor, the physician is a good type. The physician prolongs life—at least theoretically. But the physician would never get a chance to earn a fee, or his patient a chance to draw the first breath, if it were not for the farmer who supplies both with food. On the other hand, the carpenters and many other laborers, who are paid much less for their labor than the physicians, devote as much time to learning their trades as the physicians devote to learning how to do their work. And the tools that a good carpenter must have cost him as much as the ordinary physician's medical books cost. Not only that, the physician is usually educated in a
aniversity at the expense of the state, while the carpenter pays for his instruction by working for years as an apprentice for little or no wages.

Look wherever you will among those to whom the world is now giving extraordinary compensation, and in a great majority of the cases you will find no valid reason for the discrimination that exists. Most of the highly-paid men are paid highly because they are proficient in the art of wresting profits from the world, either for themselves, or for the men who pay them their salaries. As we are doing things now, it is a very valuable man who can buy for two cents a yard of cloth that cost three cents to make and then sell it for four cents. And the man who can manipulate a stock market or get ten per cent more than the average amount of work out of a big force of men can live in a palace if he can only find a large enough scope for his peculiar activities. His ability as a slave-driver was one of the qualifications for his position that were possessed by the first president of the steel trust. But what does the world profit, merely because a man has the ability to buy commodities cheaply and sell them dearly, or to wheedle labor into lashing itself to the utmost to produce the most for the least money? As a matter of fact the world loses by each operation. It is the capitalist who gains.

Under Socialism, much of this "special ability" that we hear so much about would be compelled to devote its energies to more useful purposes, since there would be no occasion for such services in a world that had decided to eliminate profit by making things for public use instead of for private gain.

Then, there are other kinds of labor that are as useful to society as that of the farmer, the weaver or the carpenter, but are less agreeable. In fact, they are disagreeable. No great city could long exist if there were not sewers, and the digging of sewers is not only very unpleasant, but very unhealthful, work. Yet somebody must dig the sewers in order that the rest may live. Of course the sewer-digger who prevents a man from dying of disease at fifty performs no more useful service to that man than the farmer who produced the food that
prevented him from dying at birth—or, rather, that enabled him to be born at all. Yet Socialism contemplates that probable necessity of paying the sewer-digger more for his work than the farmer would be given for producing the world’s food supply. If the sewer-digger, under Socialism, were to be paid more than the farmer, his extraordinary compensation, however, would not be because of any belief that his work was the more valuable, but because society would recognize that it was plainly more disagreeable work than that of the farmer.

As to how much more the sewer-digger should be paid than the farmer, experience would have to determine. Society would simply have to place a premium on sewer digging in the form of extra compensation until the inducement was sufficient to tempt men into the trenches in order that they might gain freedom from all toil that much earlier in their lives. And sewer-diggers can be drafted from any rank of life, if the compensation offered be sufficiently alluring. Offer $100 a day for sewer digging and any city can even empty its office buildings, so anxious will their occupants be to increase their incomes. On the other hand, the necessity of paying exorbitant prices for such disagreeable work will always be avoided because of the increased supply of laborers that will seek employment the moment the inducement becomes greater than most men would demand. And whatever the price for sewer digging may be, because of its extraordinary unpleasantness, it will be worth, and society should pay, the lowest price for which those who do it will consent to toil, even if that price be three or five times the price for the farmer’s work.

Premiums in the form of extra compensation would doubtless also have to be offered to a few other kinds of laborers—the coal-miners, for instance, who imperil their lives and their health to provide the world’s coal supply. But, as in the case of the sewer-digger, the extra compensation would arise, not because coal is more valuable than food, but because digging coal is more disagreeable than farming.

But, aside from a few particularly disagreeable callings, like the ones mentioned, it is plain that society would not be
compelled to offer extra compensation in order to get all the laborers it might desire in any line. Men's tastes are so diversified that no occupation would lack for laborers. In fact, with all useful labor paid the same, many that are now engaged in the so-called aristocratic occupations would prefer manual labor on the farm or in the workshop. There are plenty of men working in offices in every city who would rather run an engine in a factory or work on a farm than to pore over books, if the compensation in each case were the same. And this statement will be the more readily believed when the fact is considered that if all were engaged in productive industry and each were to receive all of his product instead of only one-half of it and then buy at cost it would be unnecessary for anyone to work more than three or four hours a day in order to live as well as, or better than, he does now.

But, under the actual operations of the Socialist system of industry, men would have to do the work for which they were best fitted, just the same as they do now, except that under Socialism the individual would have a better opportunity to ascertain the particular occupation for which he was best adapted, because poverty would not compel him so often to take the first thing he could get. But, in the long run, the good blacksmith who persisted in being a bad musician would have to go back to the forge, just the same as he now has to do. Common sense would not be dethroned under Socialism. On the contrary, it would be intensified and developed.

In the first part of this chapter, it was said that under Socialism men like Edison would doubtless be given extraordinary compensation, "as a matter of gratitude, rather than as a strict obligation of justice." Conceding, as Socialists do, the extraordinary value of the services performed by a man like Edison, who forms one of the very few exceptions to the rule of the equal value of all labor, it doubtless seems strange to suggest that the extraordinary compensation should be for anything except the discharge of a direct obligation on part of society to the individual. Here is the explanation:

Edison could not have done what he has done in the way
of invention if other inventors had not blazed the way from utter ignorance up to the point from which he started. They labored before he was born to make it possible for Edison to begin where he did. Society cared for these early inventors while they were struggling to unravel nature’s secrets by providing them with food, clothing and shelter. And during all the intervening years other laborers have supported universities in order that the accomplishments of these early inventors might be cherished and the knowledge regarding them handed down from one generation to another. It is a recognized principle even of law that any invention, even if it be a patentable one, belongs to society after a certain number of years, and therefore Edison is indebted to society for the knowledge that has enabled him to accomplish what he has brought about. Furthermore, it was Edison’s environment and the environment of his ancestors, the effects of which were inherited by him, that enabled him to take up his work where others had left it. And it should also be remembered that it is society that has given to Edison’s inventions all the value they possess. It is the people here who have made the electric light and the telephone valuable. If Edison were to take the electric light and the telephone to the heart of Africa, they would not be worth anything.

Nevertheless, Socialists would favor the giving to Edison, “as a mark of gratitude and enthusiastic appreciation, rather than as a strict obligation of justice,” of a lump sum, perhaps, that would enable him to indulge to the uttermost any desires that he might have for travel, study, or modest luxury, and the chances are that he or any other inventor would be better satisfied with such an honorarium than with the uncertain rewards that now come to inventors who, because of the infringement of their patents, are compelled to pay for expensive litigation.

But each generation produces so few men of Edison’s rank that the Socialist contention regarding the equal value of all kinds of useful labor would not be seriously disturbed.

These, then, are the reasons why Socialists hold that the
labor-time check medium of exchange, which would enable any worker to exchange his product for a given number of hours for the product of any other laborer made in the same length of time, would be a long step toward justice. Like every good rule outside of mathematics, it has a few exceptions, and Socialists are rather proud of the fact that these exceptions would result in giving the greatest compensation to men of really extraordinary ability and to those who do the most disagreeable useful labor, instead of making sewer-diggers and coal-miners the most poorly paid laborers in the world, as capitalism does.
CHAPTER VIII.

The Incentive to Individual Effort Under Socialism.

NOTHING is more improbable than that the application to industry of the principles of Socialism would impair or destroy the incentive of the individual to produce wealth. So well grounded in reason is the contention of Socialists that, so far from being decreased, the incentive of the individual to produce wealth would, under Socialism, be increased that only a little consideration is required to demonstrate its probability to the point of absolute knowledge.

Yet, in explaining and advocating the philosophy of Socialism, it is always necessary to deal with this question of incentive. The man who has labored hard until old age has come upon him, without ever having acquired a dollar's worth of wealth that he has used as capital, is terribly alarmed at first, when he learns that the private ownership of capital would be abolished under Socialism. Such men form the vast majority in this country, and just why they should hang so tenaciously to their undoubted RIGHT to become capitalists, when the opportunity to exercise this right is practically as impossible of achievement under capitalism as is their equally well-established RIGHT to fly to the moon, which they also lack the power to exercise, is not apparent. It can only be explained on the theory that such men have no conception of the real purpose of Socialism. And, because of this lack of understanding, their fears are played upon by the little capitalist class, that understands only too well that under Socialism the capitalist idlers would lose their power to exploit the laborers, and that the laborers would, therefore, retain possession of the wealth they produced.

If Socialism were to make us a wandering tribe, none of which could know that he would be permitted to till the same
land or live in the same place the next year, or even 50 years later, if he should be alive and desire to do so, it might be well feared. But Socialism stands for nothing of the kind. In fact, those who advocate Socialism do so because there is such an appalling element of this very uncertainty under capitalism, of which they are extremely tired. And, in this connection, it may be well to call attention to the fact already stated, that Socialism contains nothing that would impair, even ever so slightly, the right of any individual to own the house in which he lives, or to till any particular piece of land so long as he might desire. On the contrary, Socialism would guarantee these rights which exist now, in most cases only in theory, as it would likewise enable the individual to own his house, by preventing any “employer” from withholding half of his product. And, in like manner, Socialism would transform the present shadowy right of the farmer to till any particular piece of land so long as he may please into a REAL right; and, in addition, it would destroy the power of any man or men to take the most of his wealth from him as fast as he produces it, in the form of “profits.”

Let us take up the question of incentive in its specific application to those who produce wealth for wages. All things being great or small, either by comparison with each other or with some other thing, perhaps the reader can best be impressed with the fact that Socialism would present a greater incentive to human endeavor than has ever existed by comparing the incentive to work that would be given by Socialism to the incentive to put forth useful effort that exists under capitalism. And in doing so, it may be well to quote some figures contained in Bulletin No. 49, issued in November, 1903, by the Bureau of Labor at Washington, which can be obtained without charge by anyone desiring it, upon request to the Department of Commerce and Labor.

This report, covering the period from 1890 to 1903, used figures for 1901 from 2,567 workingmen’s families, distributed among all sections of the country, none of the heads of which were in receipt of an income of more than $1,200 a year.
The average number of persons in a family being a fraction over five, and there being in each case two or more wage-earners, the report shows that the average annual income of such families was $827. The purpose of the report being to ascertain the cost of living, as compared with wages received, the interesting fact is given that the average annual cost of the necessaries of life for each of the families enumerated was just $769, or $58 less than the average amount of wages received by each.

Now, let us see what incentive to lifelong toil is held out by these figures to the average American family; and in this connection, the fact should be considered that the families referred to in this report of the Bureau of Labor were in reality more fortunately circumstanced than the majority of families with one wage-earner, each of whom, according to the census reports of 1900, is in receipt of only $437 a year for his toil. Suppose that a man were to become a wage-earner at the age of 21 years and work steadily until he reached the age of 50 without any sickness in the family, or any enforced idleness. With an excess of receipts over necessary expenditures of $58 a year, it is apparent that he would have, at the age of 50, as the result of 29 years of unremitting toil, the magnificent sum of $1,595.

Nor are these figures, based as they are on the experiences of a few widely scattered families, misleading when applied to all families. For the same census figures, issued by our government in 1900, show that 68.2 per cent of the population do not own their own homes. And it may well be assumed that the instinct to own one's own home, which is so strong in the American character, would cause every man to hold the title to the roof over his own head if he were financially able to do so.

Now, what would be the incentive to labor under Socialism? Let the figures issued by our own capitalist government tell you. We will say that the average cost of living would be just the same under Socialism that it is under capitalism—$769 a year. Socialism, by destroying the wastes of competition and eliminating the profits of private ownership, would give
each worker his entire product, thus enabling his to save not $58 a year, but a sum probably in excess of his present annual wage.

Do you think the average man would consider that his incentive to work had been materially decreased if he were assured that, living and working as he does now, he could save $12,000 in the years between 21 and 50, instead of a beggarly $1,595, which he now has if he never spends a cent for enjoyment or has any bad luck?

But, perhaps you are saying that nobody wants to be an average man—a mediocre man, if you please!—that every man of bounding blood and throbbing brain considers himself an exception to the general rule of human beings, who needs only the opportunities presented by capitalism to develop him to the uttermost. Ah, that is the will-o'-the-wisp that has been dangled before the eyes of humanity since the dawning of the first day of capitalism. It is like the delusive hope that Napoleon thundered to his legions when he sent them flying over the Alps and into the Italian peninsula with his word for it that “In every soldier’s knapsack is the baton of a marshal,” if he would but bare his breast to the foes of France and fight hard enough. And today our own “captains of industry” are luring us on in the same way to the greatest possible productivity. “Work hard (for one-half of your product), work long and never say die and you may become a millionaire” like Mr. Schwab, Mr. Morgan, or somebody else who started in poor and managed to snare a fortune. But the results of our pitiful attempts to emulate these worthy gentlemen make Napoleon’s shadowy promise to his men seem very real; since Napoleon did make a score or so of marshals out of his 100,000 soldiers, while capitalism has made only 8,000 millionaires and multi-millionaires out of 76,000,000 of people.

Doesn’t it strike you that there is something excessively cruel about a system of industry that holds out such magnificent possibilities and such miserable realities; about a system that takes the boy from his mother’s side and nerves him up to high tension toil by the hope that industry and frugality may
give him plenty, aye, even luxury in his old age, when the cold facts are that he will be given only 32 chances in 100 even to own the humblest sort of a home? Yet, knowing these facts, men do find an incentive to work under capitalism.

The fate of the average man, under capitalism, to lifelong toil for a pittance in excess of the actual cost of living having been pretty well established, not only by the government statistics quoted, but by what must have been the observations of each individual of discernment, it would seem as if the only question for solution, in connection with the discussion of this subject of “Incentive,” is whether governments should exist for the purpose of promoting the welfare of the average man or the exceptional man. All governments are established, in theory at least, for the purpose of securing the greatest happiness for the greatest number. And it would seem especially appropriate that a government like ours, that is supposed to be ruled by majorities, should seek by every available means to conserve and promote the welfare of the majority, which, as our census and labor bureau reports show, is overwhelmingly composed of average men—men who are given each year in the form of wages only $58 more than it costs to live.

The average man—the weakling, if you please—surely needs the aid of his government to obtain for him common justice more than does the brilliant man to secure the utmost products of his brilliancy. No one, it may be assumed, would seriously contend that our government should be maintained for the primary purpose of promoting the welfare of the “exceptional” gentlemen like Mr. Rockefeller, who constitute but 8,000 of our 76,000,000 of population. Nor does it seem as if the exceptional man should be very much downcast at his outlook when he considers the fact that if, under Socialism, he were to receive for his labor only what the commonest ditch-digger might receive, he would nevertheless be in receipt of an income that would enable him to retire at the age of 50 with $12,000, provided he were willing to live as the average American now lives. But, if this prospect should dishearten the exceptional man, who will say that it would not be better that
he be disheartened than that the average men, who compose such an overwhelming part of the population, should continue to be compelled to work for a wage that represents only half of the value of their product?

If we assume that the “exceptional” man—the man who is now conspicuous principally because of his ability to appropriate the products of others—would become discouraged under such conditions, it must be admitted that to that extent Socialism would tend to diminish the incentive to individual effort. It seems, however, as if some who are not Socialists have been heard to express the desire that something be done to curb the incentive to activity of a few of the exceptional men that are now prominent in finance and industry. But Socialists deny that the prospect of having $12,000, instead of $1,595, over and above living expenses, as the result of 29 years’ labor, would deprive the average man of the desire to do at least as much as he does now.

If it would, perhaps we could increase the present incentive to labor by decreasing wages and increasing the cost of living still more. If a part of one’s product is more desirable to the producer than the whole of it, why not spur the worker on to greater efforts still by giving him only one-tenth of the value he creates, instead of one-half of it? Such a program would certainly not meet the opposition in certain quarters that has been engendered by the Socialist plan to give the worker ALL he produces, with nothing left for the idler, be he rich or poor.

Another question often asked is: What incentive would there be under Socialism for men who have special abilities—unusual abilities—to devote themselves to the tasks for which they would be best fitted if the remuneration were not greater than for ordinary labor? In other words, would the Edisons devote themselves to inventions, the Verdis to music, the Murillos to painting, and the men with great executive ability to the management of industry?

No one knows. Perhaps the Edisons would prefer to peddle clocks, the Verdis to boil soap, the Murillos to whitewash fences instead of painting their soul-pictures on can
vasses, while the gentlemen who are now sitting in offices and managing industry would prefer to put on old clothes and carry the hod. But this we DO know—that if these men have any joy in their work; if the inventors invent because they are overpowered by thoughts surging for expression; if the musicians sing because the divine harmonies wrapped up in their souls will not let them be still; if the painters paint because their hearts and not their hands have hold of their brushes; and if the men of great executive ability manage industry because they are controlled by natural inclinations that master them as completely as the inventor, the musician and the painter are mastered by their tastes—if these things be true, there is small danger that men of special ability would turn from the paths to which nature assigned them merely because those paths offered them no advantages over other paths.

And who will deny that these things are true? When under capitalism, was genius in literature, the arts or the sciences, ever so well rewarded with material things that any one has reason to say that inventors, musicians, painters and authors devote themselves to their various occupations because of the MONEY they expect to get out of them? As a matter of fact, such men in all times have, for the most part, been miserably poor; yet they have gone down to their graves with their eyes fixed upon the same blazing stars—the stars of their inclinations—that first lured them into the field of the world’s activities.

So far as concerns the men of great executive ability who now are and properly should be charged with the management of industry, these facts should be remembered:

With the scheming for profits eliminated from industrial life, as it would be under Socialism, the management of industry would not be the nerve-killing, temper-trying occupation that it now is. To the man capable of managing industry, it would be the thing of all other things on earth that he would desire to do to gain a livelihood.

That’s the way we Socialists look at it, anyway; but perhaps we are wrong. If we are, the “captain of industry” who is determined to carry the hod can probably be accommodated.
CHAPTER IX.

What the Farmer Has; What He Might Have.

Among the most conspicuous of the privileges that the farmer has under capitalism is that of working from 14 to 16 hours a day during the planting and reaping seasons.

His wife has the same privilege, and usually his children are taken out of school by the time they are 16 years old and put to work, in order that it may not appear that their parents are monopolizing an undue proportion of the blessed privilege to work.

Generally speaking, almost two out of every three farmers have the privilege of owning their land, though this is a privilege that is rapidly being taken from them, as is shown by the census figures for the last 60 years. And the movement toward farm tenantry is gaining such headway that, under existing conditions, not many more generations of farmers will be required to pay any taxes on land. Thus another of the farmer's burdens will be unloaded upon the shoulders of the struggling landlord.

The farmer and his wife also have the privilege of working for less wages than they pay their hired man, as is shown by these census figures for 1900:

The total value of all farm products raised in 1899 was $4,717,069,973.

The number of farms was 5,737,372, each averaging 146.2 acres.

Dividing the value of the farm products by the number of farms, we find that the average annual income of each farmer was about $770.

A hired man, six months of the year, with wages at $25 a month and board estimated at $8 a month, amounts to $198, and reduces the farmer's cash in hand to $572.
All farm property being valued at $20,439,901,164 and the number of farms being 5,737,372, it follows that the average value of a farm from which $770 is annually produced is $3,562.

The annual interest on $3,562 at 6 per cent is $213.72, which, subtracted from the $570 that the farmer has left after paying the hired man, leaves $356.28.

The farmer's wife, contributing as much as her husband to the value of the wealth produced on the farm—and there is no doubt that she does—their joint net product, $356.28, must be divided by 2, and the quotient, $178.14, divided by 156, the number of days in six months, to ascertain the daily wage of the farmer and of the farmer's wife.

Which shows that the annual income of the average farmer and his wife is equivalent to a daily wage of $1.11 each.

The hired man's income for six months, including board, is equivalent to a daily wage of $1.28.

And the farmer and his wife, instead of working only six months for what they get, as their hired man does, have to work the whole year.

Divide the net annual income of the average farmer and his wife—$356.28—by 313, the number of working days in a year, and the daily wage of the farmer and his wife amounts only to 55 cents each. And, of course, that is the way it should be figured, because the farmer and his wife have to work all the year for what they get.

And again, let the fact be emphasized that these figures were not made by Socialists. They were compiled by the United States government and may be found on pages 217-219 of the "Abstract of the Twelfth Census," as well as in volume 5, pages 122, 604, 696, 698 and 700 of the regular reports, references to which are noted in the "Abstract."

Of course, these figures do not blend very nicely with the "prosperity" statistics that the politicians prepare when they want the farmers' votes.

But they DO fit in very nicely with the conditions that exist on the farms, where the farmers and their wives work,
year in, year out, to eke out a very plain sort of existence. They also tally quite accurately with the figures that the census bureau gives out with regard to the rapidity with which the farmers are losing the ownership of their farms. Yet the government's figures on farm tenantry and farm incomes and the politicians' "statistics" on the farmer's glorious "prosperity" cannot both be true. Any observing individual should be able to make a tolerably fair estimate as to which of the conflicting sets of figures is likely to be near the truth. But this fact may be of assistance to those who are unable to make up their minds from their own observations as to the farmer's prosperity or poverty: The census figures were not prepared with the expectation that they would be generally read and, as a matter of fact, they are NOT generally read. Only an insignificant few ever delve in the eleven ponderous census volumes, and hours of study are necessary to find the few important figures that are buried in the masses of unimportant statistics. On the other hand, the politicians who prepare the "prosperity" statistics always desire that they shall have the widest publicity, and, as a matter of fact, they are heralded broadcast over the land.

Now, since it is plain that there was lying, either in one case or the other, since the figures are in such violent conflict with each other, is it likely that the census officials lied when they prepared figures that they expected few would read, or that the politicians lied when they prepared "statistics" that they knew ALL would read?

As a matter of fact, the farmers are poor, and, since the census figures show that they are steadily losing the ownership of their land, it is plain that they are growing poorer and will continue to grow poorer so long as the existing system of industry be maintained. Go at random through the country, take any old farmer who has been working all his life, divide the value of his present holdings by the number of years he has been at work, and it will be found that the annual sum that the farmer and his wife have been able to save, over and above the cost of their meager living expenses, constitutes an extremely small wage for each.
In brief, this is what the farmer has under capitalism, not mentioning the mental anxiety connected with such poverty, which is perhaps the most important consideration of all.

This is what the farmer WOULD have under Socialism, and what he WILL have when Socialism comes:

Every farmer would own a house, just as some farmers now own the houses in which they live. A house is not capital, since it is not wealth used to produce MORE wealth, and the ownership of houses would be vested in individuals, just as they are now.

No longer despoiled of most of his product, each farmer would be able to own his own house, and such temporary renting as there might be from time to time would be for a rental that would represent only the actual depreciation of the house through wear and natural decay—not a great item when the fact is considered that, with the profits cut out of the prices of building materials, the cost of a house would be much less than it is now.

Or, of course, if a majority of the people should decide that it would be more economical for the government to buy all the houses that their owners wished to sell and rent them for a sum barely covering depreciation, giving the tenant the right to stay in the house a lifetime if he desired and reserving to his family the right to keep the house as long as they might wish—if a majority of the people should decide to do this way, of course they could do it. Socialism, however, would not give the government power to terminate a lease so long as the tenant fulfilled his part of the contract and desired to continue the contract. Nor would the government be given power to terminate a lease because of the inability of the tenant to fulfill the obligations of his contract, provided such failure were due to sickness or any extraordinary misfortune. The chronic loafer, however, would be given short shrift.

Coming to the land, every farmer, as well as every other individual, for that matter, would be given the right to use, as the site for his home, a generous plat of land, without charge of any kind. Any individual could select any site for his home.
that was not already in use by another, and keep it until he died of old age if he liked, and his family could have the first claim upon it after his death, and keep it so long as any member of it should desire to live on that particular spot. No individual, or family, however, would be permitted to retain the land upon which a house was located after they no longer desired to live upon it. When the occupant of a piece of land no longer desired to use it, its control would again revert to the government, which would place it in use again by any one of a dozen simple, yet just, methods that might be adopted. The house, belonging as it would to the individual, could be sold by him, rented for a sum equivalent only to depreciation, or sold to the government, if a majority of the people should so decide, for a sum representing the cost of duplicating it in its existing condition.

The land could be worked in either of two ways. All that Socialism now says of the land question, so far as it pertains to the land the farmer tills, is that any individual should have the right to till as much land as he may need to make a comfortable living without asking anyone's consent or paying anybody for the privilege of using land that was made by God for all his children, rather than by God for a few real-estate speculators and land-sharks.

If the majority of the farmers should so declare, each could till his own farm, just as he does now, and keep it until his death, with the right given to his wife and children to keep it so long as they might care to use it. If this plan were adopted, anyone would have the right, under Socialism, to apply for a generous tract of land not in use, and be given as absolute possession of it, so long as he might care to till it, as he would have if he actually owned it. Not even the government could force him off the land against his will so long as he wished to use it, except by condemnation proceedings for public purposes, as is now done when some public improvement makes it advisable to disturb the rights of an individual.

On the other hand, if a majority of the farmers should say that they wished to farm their lands in common, instead of each having a farm by himself, they could do that way. A
Director of Agriculture, for a state or some specified tract of land, acting under the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, could direct that certain grains should be raised in a certain territory, because the soil and climate were better adapted to the raising of such grains than anything else. The market would be studied, just as it is now, by the agricultural department, and enough of each farm product raised to afford a safe margin over the probable demand. Production could be carried on under a big scale and the greatest product attained with the least expenditure of labor. At the end of each week, or each month, each farmer would make affidavit to the number of hours he had worked since a given date, and the government would forward a labor-time check in payment. Capitalism has so developed the tendency to lie that a few perjurers might have to be sent to the penitentiary first, but the lying would not be extensive even at the start and would soon disappear. The individual whose income has been increased 100 or 200 per cent is not likely to reward the person or persons who have increased it by loafing at his work, or perjuring himself in order to steal from them. Still, a few might do so at the start and they would be sternly dealt with.

If the farmers should choose to till their land in common, they might also choose to live in little communities near the center of their tracts of land, instead of living far from each other as is now the custom. A profitable social feature would thus take the place of what is now the monotonous existence of the farmer's wife. With each farmer receiving all of his product instead of half of it, it would not be necessary to work so many hours in order to live even much better than the average farmer now lives, and the leisure time would be devoted to beautifying the homes—which would still remain the private property of those who lived in them—or to study and recreation.

Anyone will agree that this is a beautiful picture of rural life. The only question now is, whether it is possible to make this picture a reality. Let's see about that.

No reasonable man can escape the conclusion that the
average laborer produces about twice as much wealth by his labor as he receives in the form of wages. Socialists claim that the difference between the value of a laborer's product and the amount of his wage is eaten up by interest, rent and profits, or wasted in competition.

Suppose that interest, rent, profits and competition were to be destroyed. What would happen? What would be the result to the farmers and the rest of the wealth-producing class? Is there anything plainer than, if the wealth they produced were not wasted in competition, or absorbed by others in the form of interest, rent and profits, that each member of the wealth-producing class would be permitted to retain his whole product and thus be in receipt of an income almost more than twice as great as the average toiler now receives?

Where else could the wealth go if none of it were wasted in competition and no one were permitted to take it from the producers?

Does the picture begin to look more like a real world, that is only waiting for us to step into it?

Take up some of the things that lie close to the farmer's life:

The railroads are now operated to enable certain gentlemen to juggle with their stocks and have marble palaces in New York and Newport, with million-dollar summer homes in the Berkshire hills—all these are made possible by charging those who use the railroads, the farmers among the rest, three or four @ices for freight rates and equally exorbitant prices for traveling.

Suppose the people, through the government, were to own and operate the railroads, NOT for the purpose of making wealthy any man, or men, but for the purpose of carrying freight and passengers at the cost of giving the service?

Would THAT help the farmers any?

The packing companies now exist, NOT for the purpose of performing a public service by butchering the farmers' hogs, cattle and sheep and distributing the products, but for the purpose of making the stockholders of the packing companies rich.
This they do by entering a conspiracy to pay the farmers as little as possible for their live stock and charging the public as much as they can for dressed meat and the by-products of the packing business, which are numerous and valuable.

Now, meat can be manufactured into merchantable forms much more economically on a large scale than it could be by a horde of small packers, and the trust is therefore an economical device to the extent that it saves labor and wealth. But suppose the people, through the government, were to pack all meat, and manufacture all of the numerous by-products of the packing business and do it at cost.

Would THAT help the farmers any?

Reaping machines are now made, NOT to enable the farmers to cut their grain, but to enable a few estimable gentlemen to live in mansions on the Lake Shore drive in Chicago and spend more money in three days than the average laborer receives in a year. This they do by paying labor $24 for making a reaping machine, wasting $40 to sell it, and then selling it to the farmer for $120.

Suppose the people, through the government, were to make their own reapers and thus reduce the cost of reaping wheat.

Would THAT help the farmers any?

All other farm machinery is now made by private individuals, who engaged in business, NOT because they want to perform a service for the farmers by supplying them with machinery, but because they want to make profits for themselves. This they do by charging much more for farm implements than it costs to make and sell them.

Suppose the people, through the government, were to make all the machinery that is used on farms, cut out the private capitalists' profits and the wastes of competition and thus reduce the cost of tilling land to the lowest possible figure.

Would THAT help the farmers any?

Men who now buy the farmers' products pay them prices therefor that do not enable the farmers to obtain from their own labor what any other laborer has produced in the same length of time, notwithstanding the fact that no man's labor
is entitled to greater reward than that of a farmer. This they do because the prices of farm products are fixed by the necessities of the poorest class of farmers, who are compelled to rush to the markets and accept practically any price that is offered; and, in this, they are aided by the unjust and unscientific medium of exchange that we now have.

Suppose the government were to cut out all of this middleman business and pay the farmer with a labor-time check that would enable him to exchange any given number of "hours' worth" of his produce for the product of any other laborer for the same number of hours.

Would THAT help the farmers any?

The picture is NOT a mirage. It is the shadow of a coming event that is cast before us. We can hasten its coming if we will; we cannot stop it if we try. But we can make present conditions even worse before they will naturally become better, if we are determined to do so.
CHAPTER X.

What the Wage-Worker Has; What He Might Have.

Of all God's creatures, the wage-worker, under capitalism, is deserving of the most pity. By all the rules of right and justice, he should share with the farmer in the possession of all the material wealth in the country, because it is HIS labor that has produced all of this wealth that the farmer has not produced.

It is the labor of the WAGE-EARNER that brings to the surface of the earth the coal that keeps millions warm, generates the steam that sends trains whizzing across continents, and supplies the motive power for practically all of the manufacturing establishments in the country.

It is the labor of the WAGE-EARNER that wrests from the earth the iron and the copper that are smelted with the coal preparatory to their use in a variety of forms.

It is the labor of the WAGE-EARNER that fashions the iron, the steel, the copper and all the other minerals of commerce into merchantable shapes and distributes them over the continent.

It is the labor of the WAGE-EARNER that builds the great cities, from the lowest sub-cellar of the sky-scraper to the last stone on the roof; and it is the labor of the WAGE-EARNER, joined with that of the farmer, that produces the food and the clothing without which our 80,000,000 of human beings would be hungry and cold.

Yet what has the wage-earner received for all this mighty output of productive effort?

Does he own the coal that he, and he alone, brought to the surface?

A thousand times no! It belongs to Mr. Baer and the other "Christian gentlemen, to whom God, in His infinite wis
dom, intrusted the property interests of the country”—accord-
ing to Mr. Baer, not to the Bible.

Not owning the coal, can he buy it more cheaply than the capitalist idler who took no part in its production?

He cannot. The price of coal is the same to all.

Does the wage-earner own the iron, the steel, the copper and the other metals that he has wrenched from the mines with his brawn, teased into usable forms with his brain and delivered to those who wish to buy iron products?

Ask Mr. Rockefeller, a man who never mined an ounce of metal in his life, yet owns more metal than any other man in the world.

Does the wage-earner own the great cities that were raised, paved and perpetuated by his labor?

Go back to the census reports and read them again. Scarcely 33 in 100 own the very roofs over their heads, and it a wage-earner were to be asked if he owned any of the great structures of brick, steel and granite that his labor has pushed up toward the sky he would think his inquisitor was either a fool, a lunatic or a cruel jester.

The wage-earner, who, with the farmer, creates ALL wealth, is desperately poor; struggling hard for a bare existence; seldom more than 30 days away from hunger, as he learns whenever his wages stop for a few days.

And, unlike the farmer, he cannot know that he will have work even for another day, or shelter for another month.

The farmer, burdened with debt, may see his land slowly slipping into the hands of the landlord, and, though the spectacle of the fruits of a lifetime’s toil gliding into the pockets of others may be heart-breaking, he at least may know that he can work tomorrow—that his day of reckoning is months or years away and that, however little he and his family may have, they will at least have food and shelter, with enough clothing to keep them warm. And while their prolonged agony is oftentimes intense, it seldom, if ever, takes the acute, brain-baffling form that the wage-earner’s troubles assume when his foreman comes to him and says:
"Draw your wages tonight. We shall not need you any more. You are an agitator—a disturber. You don’t know when you are well off."

Or,

"There will not be any work for you after Saturday night. The shop is going to shut down."

Either one of these announcements—and both are common—puts Mr. Wage-Earner right up against the immediate prospect of want—not against the prospect of want next month or next year, but of want within a very few days.

His last week’s wages may have been spent in paying a doctor’s bill for a sick baby, and his rent may be due the next day, but for him there is no relief, so far as his present source of income is concerned.

The word has gone forth that he shall no longer be given an opportunity to produce with his labor, in that particular place, those things that are essential to the very lives of his wife and children.

The law, as well as his own inclination, says that he MUST provide for his family, which he is eager to do if given only an opportunity.

Scattered all over the continent are the millions of his fellow-creatures whose wants create a demand for the things he is able and willing to produce with his labor, yet the man or men who possess the tools with which he must labor, if he labor at all—these tools that must be used by labor if the wants of those who desire their products are to be supplied—have either arbitrarily denied him the right to use those tools or told him that he and his family must suffer for food, clothing and shelter because “over-production” has brought about an industrial depression.

In other words, if the last reason be assigned, this wage-earner must be denied the opportunity to create food, clothing and shelter for himself and his family because he and others of his class have made TOO MUCH food, TOO MUCH clothing, and TOO MUCH shelter!
And the wage-earner, if he be a thoughtful man—which he usually is not—then makes the discovery that, while labor is necessary to honest living, labor is NOT a right to be demanded as freely as one would demand air, but a PRIVILEGE to be begged from men who do NOT labor, but who nevertheless own all of the machinery with which other men must labor or starve.

"The DIGNITY of labor," did some political orator say? Since when has "dignity" become a word that may be appropriately used to describe so base a position? The dictionaries define "dignity" as meaning "elevation of rank"; "equality suited to inspire respect or reverence." Is there anything very "elevated" about the rank of a wage-earner who must go to some capitalist and beg for the poor privilege of putting forth his physical and mental efforts for half of his product, in order that he and his family may not suffer for the necessities of life?

Is there anything very "elevated" about the rank of a wage-earner, who, care-burdened and heart-sore, must go out of his place of employment like a whipped cur when access to the tools with which he works has been denied him by the man who owns but does not use them?

Is there any "quality suited to inspire respect or reverence" in the wage-earner who BEGS for what is as plainly his right as the right to breathe—the right to apply his labor to the earth and its products to produce the necessities of life—who suffers with his family when his capitalist "employer" denies him the right to labor, and who then votes either one of the two tickets that the capitalists vote to perpetuate the very indignities that they have heaped upon him?

Is there any DIGNITY about any or all of these things? Is there anything about any or all of them to inspire RESPECT or REVERENCE?

If there is, "dignity" does not mean what the dictionaries say it does. There is no dignity in wage-slavery: The dignified man stands on his rights when he can, and if he cannot he always makes a vigorous attempt to do so. And the man who "inspires respect or reverence" is not the man who obsequiously
thanks those who kick him and furthermore offers to furnish the boots with which the kicking is done. "Pity"—not "dignity"—is the word to use in connection with wage-slavery.

What compensating feature is there about a system of industry that holds so much of uncertainty and unhappiness for the wage-earners? Why, the possibility that the wage-earner may become a "captain of industry"—a millionaire—and live in luxury from the labor of others, as others are now living in luxury from his labor. This brilliant bauble is always dangled before the eyes of labor by the capitalist class. Whenever capitalists feel called upon to defend the system of industry under which they have prospered so greatly, they seldom fail to mention the "glorious" possibilities that are held out by it to the humblest laborer. Mr. Rockefeller goes to his son's Bible class and regales its members with the story of his early struggles—his industry and his thrift—and declares in his most solemn tones that this is an age and a country of great possibilities; that the poorest boy, if he be industrious and saving, may well hope to become a "captain of industry."

Unquestionably every wage-earner has the right to become a millionaire. But this right, like some other rights of the wage-earners, is of value only to the extent that he can find opportunity to exercise it. And, fortunately, the exact value of this right, when there is so little opportunity to exercise it, is susceptible of mathematical demonstration.

There are in the United States approximately 16,000,000 adult male persons.

Of this number, approximately 8,000 are millionaires, or multi-millionaires.

Which makes it quite plain that the average wage-earner has about one chance in 2,000 to become a millionaire.

Even in cities where gambling houses are permitted to run wide-open, the police "pull" a house long before the game gets so hard that a player stands only one chance in 2,000 to win. And they "pull" it on the ground that it is no longer a gambling house, but a robbers' roost!
The Louisiana Lottery Co. used to offer greater prizes in proportion to the investment than capitalism holds out to the wage-earner, but the government long ago denied it the use of the mails and drove it out of the country.

Socialism takes the ground that capitalism is as disreputable in principle and more disastrous in practice than any lottery company that ever existed, and in proof of its assertions it points to the $90,000,000,000 of wealth that labor has produced in this country, and the 68.2 per cent of those who have produced it who do not even own their homes. Socialism would destroy this system of industry as utterly as the United States government destroyed the Louisiana Lottery Co. and give those who are now wage-earners these rights:

1—The right to labor to sustain life without asking any man or men for the privilege.

2—The right to use the land and machinery without which wealth cannot be produced without giving any part of one’s product for the privilege of using either.

3—The right to live without fear of periodical “industrial depressions,” since panics, so-called, are caused by UNDER-consumption instead of OVER-production.

4—The right to exchange the product of any given number of hours of labor for the product of anybody else for the same time.

These are some of the things that those who are now wage-earners would be permitted to do under Socialism:

To select any unused land as the sites of their homes and to use such sites for a lifetime, if desired, without the payment of a dollar to anybody as a purchase price.

To obtain the materials with which a house might be built by giving the products of as many hours of their own labor as there were hours of labor expended by others in the production of the materials. NO PROFITS FOR ANYBODY.

To obtain, on the same terms, their food, clothing, furniture, and all other things desired, for which their labor might be sufficient to pay.
The right to labor would never fail so long as there were an inch of unused land or an unsatisfied desire on part of anybody for the products of another; and that time has never come and never will come. Desire grows upon its food, and the more civilized human beings become the more they want. Men are now denied the opportunity to labor during industrial depressions, simply because the wage-earners have received so little in wages for their products that they are unable to buy them back, and the capitalists therefore cannot make profits by permitting labor to continue to exert itself. As stated a moment ago, it is under-consumption, and not over-production, that causes all industry to lag at regular intervals. Socialism would insure the wealth-producers against under-consumption and enforced idleness by giving them ALL of their products, instead of a wage that represents only one-half of their value. Give labor the power to purchase its full product and the time will never come when men will have to go hungry because they have produced too much food, or shoeless because they have made too many shoes.

Under Socialism, those who are now wage-earners would, for the most part, labor in the same places and at the same tasks at which they are now employed. The president of the steel trust would continue to manage it just as he does now, save for the fact that he would make steel in order that others might use it, instead of to enable a few millionaires to derive a profit from its production; and, instead of working for a board of directors composed of private capitalists, he would work for a board of directors composed of the President and his cabinet, representing the people.

Those who are now superintendents and “bosses” in other lines of industry would continue to be superintendents and “bosses” under public ownership, provided they should give good service; and the less skilled laborers would continue at their present tasks until such times as their ability might make it advisable to give them more important work to do. But they would receive just as much for their day’s work as would the men at the heads of their institutions.
In fact, industry would be conducted in a sane, business-like way, except that “business-like,” under Socialism, would mean the production of the best qualities with the smallest possible waste of labor or materials, instead of the production of the poorest qualities that will pass muster for the purpose of obtaining the greatest profits. Socialism would make things for use and not for profit.

It has been said that under Socialism those who are now wage-earners, as well as everybody else, would have the right to labor without asking the permission of anybody. So far as this pertains to the use of the land, it is literally true. So far as it pertains to the use of machinery, it is practically, but NOT literally, true. All things should be construed reasonably. A man would not be permitted to burst into a machine shop and go to work without asking the foreman. Socialism would systematize industry and such a procedure would absolutely destroy all system. In that particular machine shop there might be no opportunity to permit another machinist to work to advantage. But, so long as every human being has so many unsatisfied wants, there would always be a demand for the labor of every toiler and the task of finding where the labor might be needed would not be difficult. The fact should be remembered, however, that if the machinery of production and distribution were owned by the public industry would not be placed on a “go-as-you-please” basis. Everybody, in the end, would gravitate to that task for which he might be best fitted, just as most men now do. But men’s tastes are so different and their abilities are so varied that the desire of the individual would seldom clash with the welfare of the people as a whole, which, in the last analysis, would rise superior to all else. We do not now all want to be blacksmiths, farmers, physicians, or school teachers. Human nature would be just the same and men would distribute themselves among the various occupations much as they do now, with the result that the individual would seldom, if ever, be denied the opportunity to perform exactly the kind of labor for which his tastes and his abilities seemed best to fit him. And no man would ever
He denied the right to labor at SOMETHING, to receive his full product and exchange his product for anything that anybody else had made in the same number of hours.

The wage-earner now creates about $2 worth of value to get $1 in wages, the rest being wasted by the capitalist "employer" in competition, or pocketed in the form of profits.

With the dollar in wages, the laborer goes to buy some other laborer's product, but finds that profits and waste make it impossible for him to get with his dollar more than 30 or 40 cents' worth of the other laborer's product.

The average wage-earner, therefore, produces $2 worth of value to get 30 or 40 cents' worth of the product of some other laborer.

If all profits were to be abolished, and every human being were to be given steady employment and his entire product, who, besides the capitalist idlers, would be injured?

That is the plan of Socialism, but it is hardly likely that the capitalist will ever put it into effect. That is for the wage-earners and the farmers to do.
CHAPTER XI.

What the Capitalist Has; What He Might Have?

CAPITALISM builds a pyramid of dead men's bones and puts on its apex a circlet of gold. That it its idol. The dollar, the Dollar, the DOLLAR! What will the dollar not do? What, in life, is more to be desired? What may not be wisely sacrificed to get more dollars? Who is greater than the man who has the most dollars? It is a money-mad age and we are a money-mad people—money-mad because capitalism, with its deification of the dollar, has made us so.

At first glance, then, it may seem strange to suggest that the capitalist, representing as he does the class that possesses the great bulk of the nation's wealth, lacks any earthly happiness that it would be possible for him to enjoy under different conditions.

And it may seem stranger still to suggest that Socialism which would do away with the billionaires, and millionaires, and all the other capitalists, would give those who are now capitalists an opportunity to enjoy pleasures of which they have never dreamed.

Yet Socialism makes these assertions and is as eager to submit them to the test of reasonableness and probability as it is eager to submit all of its other assertions. And it makes these particular assertions with regard to what the capitalists have and what they might have because it knows that capitalists, notwithstanding the fox-like, hyena-like instincts that capitalism has bred into them, are still human; that in the depths of the hardest heart there is still that subtle thing called conscience, and that far back in the brain that has worked the most sorrow upon mankind there is still the desire to serve and be loved by his fellows. Was there ever a time when so many men of great wealth gave great gifts to the people?
See the conscience at work. Was there ever a time when men who had spent their best years plucking the people were more eager to devote their last years, with little or no compensation, to the service of the people in public places? See therein the manifestation of the all-human desire to be helpful to one's fellows and to have the good-will of all. Of course it may be said that the rich men who enter the public service in their declining years do so to help their class more than they do to help all of the people; but the fact remains that such men are always fond of public applause, and their activities, useless as they are to most of the people, are nevertheless the dwarfed expressions of their desires to serve and to be loved—desires that would assume their full proportions if given the proper environment.

Socialism proceeds upon the firm belief that it is the natural desire of every human being to be honest—to deal fairly with his fellow men, so far as in him lies the ability to determine what is fair. It believes that this instinct, upon the expression of which not only all orderly society but the very perpetuity of society itself depends, can be suppressed to a great extent, but cannot be obliterated. And while Socialists recognize the fact that the stress of circumstances has caused to be entertained almost as many individual conceptions of what constitutes honesty as there are individual conceptions of what constitutes morality, they also believe that those who invade the rights of others are invariably punished for such invasions, whether they realize that they are invaders or not. To believe otherwise would be to believe that the law of compensation is not always in force—that it is possible to get anything in this world without giving something in return for it. The gambler may believe that he is "honest" if he gives to his employe, who deals "crooked" faro, half of what the employe steals from those who play at his table. The "captain of industry" may believe he is "honest" if he robs another "captain" by depressing the value of his stocks in the market and buys them for a fraction of what they are worth. Each of these men may believe he is honest, because the customs surrounding
their respective vocations have caused such acts to be considered “honorable.” But there is a conscience higher than custom that deep down in their hearts makes such men unhappy. Such victims of conscience may never realize that conscience is pricking them, but the fact remains that they are unhappy—and there is a reason for their unhappiness.

In what respect, then, are capitalists less happy because of capitalism than they would be under Socialism? Let us subdivide the capitalist class into the many small capitalists and the few great capitalists of which it is composed and consider the small capitalists first. The small capitalists are those who have comparatively small sums of capital invested in industries connected with the production of wealth. Merchants and small manufacturers are common types of the small capitalists. What kind of lives do they spend?

The success of the merchant depends solely upon his ability to buy cheaply and sell dearly. To buy for a little and sell for much seems so simple on the face of it that at first glance it would seem to be no difficult task to become a successful merchant. But it is not so easy as it looks. Every man from whom a merchant buys is playing the same game he is—trying to sell for as much as he can—and the result is a battle of wits. To outwit the seller, the merchant must bring into play all the arts of deception of which he is master. He must pretend that he does not care much about the particular thing with regard to which they are haggling. If possible, he must pick flaws in it—it is defective in some way, or not of the right quality. Whether it is true or not, he must declare that So-and-So has offered him the same article for much less, and if all these things do not bring the prospective seller to terms the merchant may break off negotiations for a few days to convey the impression that he is not eager to buy. All the while, the man who has goods to sell is practicing the same deception on the merchant, and if a sale be made, the question of which gets the better of the other depends solely on which is the more skillful liar. And, in the long run, the question of
which shall "succeed" in business and which shall fail is dependent upon the result of the same test.

Having bought the goods that he branded as inferior when he wanted to buy them for a little, the merchant offers them for sale. Then he sings a different song. The goods then are of the "best quality." His prices—which are from 40 to 100 per cent more than he paid for the goods—are "exceedingly low." Usually, he unloads in a reasonable length of time, but if not he has a "sale." Everything is "marked down." He puts large advertisements in the newspapers. He marks this article "$18—was $25" and that one "$6.50—was $10." And the gullible crowd that has been taught by capitalism always to be on the look-out to get something for nothing rush in and buy his wares. Get on good terms with any head of a department in a great department store and ask him how much these "sales" amount to, so far as being genuine is concerned. He will tell you that as a rule—not always—these great "marked-down" sales are fraudulent. The goods are sold at practically their original prices. The merchant lies when he says that the article he now offers for $18 has been "marked down from $25." No particular wrong has been done to the public, since the prices it pays are no more than the merchant asked in the first place. Having failed to sell his goods in the ordinary way, the merchant has simply lied to dispose of them, because he knew that the desire to get something for nothing which capitalism has cultivated would bring customers to him.

The manufacturer resorts to similar lies to buy his raw materials for as little as possible and sell his manufactured products at the highest prices. Labor being one of the most important things that the manufacturer has to buy, he tries to buy this as cheaply as he can; and lies to depress its price, just as he lies to depress the price of any of the raw materials that are used in his particular business. Increases of wages, as a rule, are given grudgingly, while reductions are enforced upon the slightest pretext. It matters not that the manufacturer may be able to pay his laborers all they are receiving, he
will cut their wages if he believes he can do it and avoid a strike. And if the army of the unemployed becomes large enough to lead him to believe he could even get a new force, if necessary, at a smaller expenditure for wages, then he begins to agitate for the "open shop." He develops a sudden interest in the non-union man and is even willing to have his business tied up for a few days to prevent further discrimination against the abused laborer who does not belong to a labor union. Of course all this heroic sacrifice for the non-union man is pure falsehood, but it is "business." That the manufacturer must buy everything, including labor, as cheaply as he can and lie to carry a point is one of the approved customs of capitalism. There never was a liar that in his own heart did not hate himself. To believe otherwise would be to charge capitalists with a degree of degradation of which Socialists do not believe them capable. And to declare that business as it is now conducted is not based on falsehood and perpetuated by falsehood would be to display a childish ignorance of the facts that would be beautiful if it were not so stupid, or to demonstrate a capacity for falsification that would mark the falsifier as a man remarkably adapted for a "successful" business career. The man who would literally obey the injunction not to lie could not stay in business a day. This fact is freely admitted by frank business men, who seek to justify it on the ground that it is necessary to lie to meet competition.

Another stern fact that tends to decrease the happiness of the small capitalists is the ever-present possibility of financial failure. Most capitalists fail sooner or later, and many of those who have never failed have so closely grazed the brink of failure that it made their hair stand when the danger was greatest. The trick of a competitor in securing lower freight rates or cheaper raw material may cause a small manufacturer to be put out of business very quickly unless he discovers why it is that his competitor is able to undersell him. Circumstances over which he has no control may ruin him at any moment, in spite of the utmost caution, and the man who has $100,000 invested in industry today has no assurance that
he will be worth a dollar five years hence. That, at least, is what small manufacturers say in private conversation, and there appear to be sufficient reasons for their fears.

If deceit and mendacity are a "necessary" part of the small capitalists' mental equipment, it would be difficult to characterize the most conspicuous attributes of the great capitalists—the financiers and "captains of industry" who sit in Wall street and hold the industries of the country in the hollows of their hands. It is only fair to say that most of these gentlemen are "honorable," according to their peculiar moral standard. But what a standard! To flim-flam the public with watered stock is regarded as all right. To hammer each other's stocks in the market and get them for less than they are worth is all right. To rob millions by arbitrarily increasing the prices of the necessities of life is all right. And, low as is the moral standard of these great capitalists, many of them descend still lower when pressed to it. They steal each other's mines, bribe judges, juries, governors and congresses, palm off properties for several times their values in forming trusts and do everything except to go out with a piece of lead-pipe and hold up pedestrians in the street. Nor are these things hearsay. They are matters of court record. They are being told and re-told in the litigation that is constantly coming up as a result of the attempts of these capitalists to rob each other.

No man who leads such a life can be really happy. These men are not happy. Greed has made them insane on the subject of money. Most of them are nervous wrecks. Their money is a curse, rather than a blessing to them, just as an over-supply of food is a curse to the man who eats it. They are always pursuing happiness—never catching up with it. Each owns three or four houses in a vain attempt to find one home. Their wives lead aimless, spoiled lives, and their children, if they have any, are reared in an atmosphere of luxury that rots the fibre of their moral natures and leaves their brains undeveloped. They travel to the ends of the earth, seeking the pleasures they could find at home if they
would but lead simple, natural lives—if they would but do some kind of useful work, enjoy its products and permit everyone else to do the same.

Socialism would make respectable, self-respecting men of these capitalists. With interest, rent and profits eliminated from the scheme of life, the small capitalist would no longer be compelled to be the haggling, scheming, lying individual that he is. Under Socialism, most of the small capitalists who are now merchants and manufacturers would be employed as they are now employed in the production and distribution of merchandise, but they would not be compelled to lie to buy cheaply, to lie to sell dearly, to lie to cut laborers' wages, or to lie about anything else. Socialism would enable such of these gentlemen as now profess Christianity to be Christians—to lead Christ-like lives. Are they leading such lives now? Imagine Christ doing any of the thousand-and-one disreputable things that the small capitalist is compelled to do in order to do business. Imagine Christ using all sorts of subterfuges to buy cheaply and telling all sorts of lies to sell dearly, putting glucose in the honey, sand in the sugar, formaldehyde in the milk and alum in the flour. Imagine Christ employing little children in the cotton mills of the South, in the coal mines of Pennsylvania and in the factories and department stores of the North. Imagine Christ superintending a sweat-shop where women were forced to commit slow suicide to obtain bread. Imagine Christ reducing the wages of the workers, when they were receiving so little that most of them were unable to own even their homes.

Socialism would make men of these wolves and, being men, they would be happy. It would enable them to lead normal lives. It is abnormal to have too much or too little of anything, and one is nearly as bad as the other. Capitalism falls almost as heavily upon the capitalist as it does upon the wage-earner. The capitalist is simply robbed of his happiness in a different way. And the pity of it is that he does not understand what is robbing him. It is as if a dyspeptic man, whose stomach was bursting with food, were to deny that an
excess of food was the cause of his uneasiness and to resist
all efforts to keep him from eating more. Everyone needs
money, but no one needs a million nor a billion dollars. Every-
one needs water to drink, but no one needs Lake Michigan
nor the Atlantic ocean to furnish him his water supply. And
the man who would try to drink either one would be quite as
likely to feel distressed as would the man who would die of
thirst in the middle of the Sahara.

It is not money that these great capitalists need to make
them happy—it is useful labor. Socialism would give them
an opportunity to be of real service to their fellow men. Most
of them are men of great executive ability, and it is just such
men that Socialism would greatly need. They would be given
an opportunity to devote their talents and their energies to the
management of industry, and while the financial compensation
of none of them would be as great for a lifetime as the com-
pensation of Mr. Rockefeller now is for a few hours of idle-
ness, it would be sufficient for all of their legitimate needs.
They would not lack any of the comforts of a well-ordered
life. They would have good homes, good books, time to read
them, and time to indulge any other tastes they might have for
study or recreation. And, furthermore, they would have some-
thing that they now DO NOT have—the genuine respect and
admiration of their fellow men. This may seem like a small
consideration, but it is not. It is natural to be fond of appre-
ciation. Millionaires are now paying colossal sums in an
effort to BUY that which would be given to them spontaneously
and enthusiastically under Socialism—public approval. Why
else has one man put a library in nearly every town that would
have one? Why has another given a university the greatest
endowment that ever came to an institution of learning?

The whole question, then, simmers down to this:

Unless falsehood, deception, trickery and sometimes down-
right robbery are entirely consistent with the greatest amount
of happiness, the capitalists, as a class, are not as happy as
they might be if they were not compelled to do such things—
and they are now compelled to do such things—and they are
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now compelled to do most of them or get out of business; there is no doubt about that. The man who will not lie either about great things or small things cannot stay in business under the competitive system, because some man who is willing to lie will get his business away from him.

And, if it be admitted that falsehood, deception, trickery and sometimes robbery are NOT consistent with the greatest happiness, it must also be admitted that Socialism would make the capitalists happier, provided it would remove the incentive that now causes them to lie and steal.

And what is that incentive?

Doesn't the word “profits” tell the whole story?

Socialism would abolish profits, along with interest and rent.
CHAPTER XII.

The Private Ownership of Land and Machinery a Moral Crime.

The private ownership of land makes the men who till land poor.

The private ownership of machinery makes the men who use machinery poor.

The private ownership of land and machinery makes a few men, who neither till land nor use machinery, rich.

All of which constitutes a moral crime, from the Socialist point of view.

The Socialist point of view, however, is not the point of view of the Individualist—the gentleman who believes that all the powers of government should be devoted to developing the individual to the uttermost—who believes that one man is of more importance than all men and that a part of a thing is greater than the whole of it.

The Individualist is so concerned in creating opportunities for the One Man with which his world is peopled that he forgets that there are other men in this world and that a vast majority of them are not cunning enough, unscrupulous enough, or perhaps intelligent enough, to take advantage of the opportunities that he has created for his One Man. And, as a result, the ninety-and-nine who will not or cannot take advantage of these opportunities are compelled to endure injustice in order that the One Man—the Ideal Individual—may develop his opportunities to the uttermost.

So the Individualist may be depended upon to defend the private ownership of land and machinery.

The Individualist will hardly claim that he created the earth and is therefore entitled to claim the ownership of any part of it because of such creation; but he will claim that he
created part of the VALUE of the earth and is at least entitled to his share of his land-value.

In like manner, he will claim that the private ownership of machinery is correct in principle. "If I make a wheelbarrow, I contend that I have a right to own it" is a terse way of expressing the belief of the Individualist in the right of individuals to own capital, as represented by either land or machinery.

Socialism does not dispute the right of the Individualist to own the wheelbarrow he has made. But it does dispute the right of any man to use even the wheelbarrow he has himself made to carry off the products of others. And, since all wheelbarrows—if the name of so homely a vehicle may be used to represent capital—are held by their owners for no other purpose than to cart off what other men have produced, Socialism denies the moral right of individuals to own wheelbarrows—to own capital.

At first glance, this may seem to be in violent conflict with the Socialist contention that the creator of a thing is entitled to it, but Socialism always puts the rights and the welfare of all men above the rights and the welfare of any one man. Socialism denies the moral right of any individual to own capital, for the same reason that capitalism denies the right of the burglar to own the safe-cracking implements that he may have made. The burglar may have made all his tools, but capitalism denies his right to own or use them, on the ground that they cannot be used without invading the rights and appropriating the property of others.

In like manner, neither land nor machinery can be owned by any individual without invading the rights of all other individuals.

Human life cannot be maintained in civilized communities without wealth, wealth cannot be produced without labor applied to land or machinery, and everyone has the same natural right to produce the means of existence that he has to live.

So, whenever any individual sets up a claim to the ex-
exclusive ownership of a piece of land—the essence of "ownership" being the right to dispose of as one may see fit—he denies the rights of all others to obtain the right to labor on that land when he no longer has use for it, without paying him a price for the privilege of such use.

And when an individual sets up the claim of exclusive ownership of any machine used by other men he not only denies their right to labor at will to create the means of subsistence, but in denying this right he obtains the power to appropriate a part of the products of those who use his machine as the price of its use.

But Socialism has other reasons for declaring the private ownership of land and machinery to be a moral crime.

One of these reasons is that the wage-system is based upon the private ownership of land and machinery.

Wherever there is private ownership of land and machinery there will there be a wage-system.

Wherever there is no private ownership of land and machinery there will there be no wage-system.

Wherever there is a wage-system there will be found a few men in whose possession are all the means of existence, while the many are unable to get access to land or machinery, except upon such terms as those who hold all the land and machinery may see fit to impose.

In no place will there be found a few men in the exclusive possession of all the land and machinery unless such possession—such ownership is profitable to them—unless such possession enables them to fix the terms upon which other men may be permitted to apply their labor to these things to obtain the means of existence.

And in no place will there be found men who cannot labor to obtain the necessities of life without obtaining permission from somebody that there will not also be found men who are in fact slaves—men who are ground between the upper and the nether millstones of their own necessities and the greed of others until there no longer remains for them such a thing as freedom. Such men are compelled to pay tribute for the
privilege of living. They cannot live unless they labor, they cannot labor unless they can use land and machinery, and they cannot use land and machinery without agreeing to take only a part of their product and give the rest to their "employers."

The wage-system means the paying to the man who does the work of a sum that represents only a part of the value of his product.

The wage-system means the appropriation by those who pay wages of a part of the products of others.

The wage-system means a large class of dependents and a small class upon whom they depend—a large class of opportunity-less men whose necessities compel them to work for whatever wages they can get and a small class of men profiting as a result of the necessities of their unfortunate fellows.

All these things are hostile to the ideals of Socialism, which regards freedom as something more than the right to choose between exploitation and starvation. The wage-system is based upon inequalities of opportunity; some men have opportunities that do not belong to them; others have not the opportunities that do belong to them. Those who have opportunities to spare are willing to dispose of them for a consideration, while those who have no opportunities are compelled to obtain the surplus opportunities of the others at whatever cost. Thus arises the wage-system, whereby those who have opportunities to spare are enabled to live in idle luxury off the labor of those to whom they sell their surplus privileges.

Socialism would make opportunities equal among all men. It would not permit a few to hold all the land and machinery with which the millions must work or starve, and therefore would not permit the few to exploit the millions.

But there are other reasons upon which is based the Socialist contention that the private ownership of land and machinery is a moral crime.

Next in importance, perhaps, is the fact that the private ownership of capital constantly deprives society of the services of millions of men who are unable to obtain an opportunity to labor.
In so-called "good" times, the standing army of unemployed is estimated at 2,000,000, and in times of industrial depression the number of men out of work often reaches the 6,000,000 mark.

Society is deprived of the services of so great a body of men, not because there is nothing for them to do, not because the world has not innumerable wants that have never been filled, but for what the capitalists evidently consider the very good reason for such non-employment—the fact that there is no opportunity to permit such men to labor at a profit to the capitalists. Think of it! Millions of men, women and children suffering all the year around for the necessities of life. Millions of men eager to earn a living for themselves by supplying the wants of others if the capitalists who own all the land and the machinery with which wealth may be produced would only give them an opportunity to labor. And this opportunity is denied the army of unemployed merely because the products of these men, if employed, could not be sold at a figure that would afford a profit for the manufacturers. There never was an industrial depression from which the working class could not have extricated itself in three days if it could have had an opportunity to labor and exchange its products among its own members upon an honest basis. Yet, in every business depression, the working class suffers untold agonies because it has committed the enormous sin of producing more goods with its labor than it can pay for with its wages, the result being inability on the capitalist's part to manufacture at a profit, since he can no longer dispose of his wares, and then—idleness for the workers, who are denied the opportunity to labor to support themselves merely because the capitalist temporarily cannot secure any profits by permitting the laborers to work.

There may come a time when 3,000,000 men or 6,000,000 men may well be permitted to remain idle in this country for months at a time. But that time will be when there shall no longer remain an unsatisfied want on the part of any person in this broad land; when everyone has every material thing that
his heart can desire and there remains no incentive to the putting forth of human effort.

But, at the rate things are going, with our wants increasing with our civilization, the time will never come when the desires of all the people will not furnish employment for all of the people. And, as long as there is a demand for the products of human labor, there is no legitimate excuse for the enforced idleness of any human being. Nor would there be such idleness if the working class were rid of this capitalistic Old Man of the Sea, who sits astride the neck of labor and refuses to let labor exert itself to satisfy its own wants, unless such exertion shall result in the creation of fresh profits for the capitalist. Of course, if the main purpose of creation is to keep profits rolling in upon the capitalists, why, then it is unquestionably proper for the capitalists to refuse to permit the working class to satisfy its hunger by means of its labor unless it can also satisfy the capitalists' greed for profits. But if the Socialist contention be correct, that the principal reason for making shoes should be to enable others to wear shoes instead of to enable some manufacturer to make a profit upon their sale, and that the only valid reason for making anything is for use and not for profit, it follows that it is a crime to deny to millions of men the right to labor, merely because the labor of such persons would not result in the creation of more profits for capitalists.

It seems to be a beneficent provision of nature, however, that the worst evils shall contain the latent germs of their own destruction—germs that need only to develop to transform the evil into good. Tyranny is bad, but there is nothing that has caused so much freedom as tyrants. We Americans are as much indebted to George the Third for our political independence as we are to George Washington, since it was the tyranny of George the Third that caused Washington to lead the revolt against English rule. In like manner, capitalism contains the germ of its own destruction in the wage-system—the system that will not permit men to labor unless others can profit from
their toil, and keeps from two to six millions of men idle all the time.

In other words, the problem of the unemployed insures, in itself, the passing of capitalism and the coming of Socialism. To be more explicit:

The tendency, under capitalism, is to keep an increasing number of men out of employment in "good" times and to bring more closely together the terrific industrial depressions by which millions of others are thrown out of employment and misery brought to millions of homes. The introduction of machinery into production, utilizing as it has millions of horsepower of motive power, has so increased the productivity of labor that all of the laborers in the country are not needed, even in the most "prosperous" times, to produce all of the goods for which the laborers, who constitute the great bulk of the consuming class, can pay. For 60 years after the introduction of machinery into productive industry, millions of men were employed in the making of new machinery, but the coming of the trusts was the sign that too much machinery had been manufactured—that the capacity of the machines to produce was greater than the capacity of the people to buy the products of the machines. Of this there can be no doubt, since the organization of a trust is invariably followed by the closing of some of its constituent plants, while the smaller number of plants find no difficulty in producing sufficient quantities of goods to meet the limited demands of the public—demands that are limited by the ability of the public to pay.

What must be the result? With more than enough machinery in existence to produce all of the goods for which the people can pay, it must necessarily follow that there will be no work in the immediate future for the millions who have heretofore been engaged in the manufacture of machinery. This does not mean that no new machinery will be manufactured during the next few years—such a statement would be preposterous—but it does mean that the manufacture of machinery will, for the most part, be confined to the making of tools with which to meet new demands—like the demand for
automobiles, etc.—and to the making of machinery to replace worn-out machines. In other words, there will be no great number of new steel plants erected in the immediate future, nor will there be many new railroads built. And the lull in the production of many other kinds of machinery will be just as marked. As the population grows, there will come times when more machinery will be needed, and at such times employment will be given to labor that would otherwise be idle; but again, labor, with its great productivity, will prove to be its own executioner. The needed machinery will be produced in a few years and there will be another period of perhaps a generation in which there will be no machine-building to speak of.

When the rapidity with which population is increasing is considered, together with the fact that, aided by machinery, each individual is capable of producing much more than his wages will permit him to buy, it is plain that under capitalism and the wage-system the constant army of the unemployed must continue to grow greater and industrial depressions must become more frequent and more intense. The wages of those who work can never rise much above what is demanded by those who are idle, since, generally speaking, capitalists will discharge those who are operating their machinery the moment idle men offer to operate it for less. The idle man therefore fixes the wage of the man who labors, and the idle man is always eager to work, even if it be for a wage that is only sufficient to maintain him upon the lowest standard of living upon which he will consent to exist.

With wage-workers toiling for wages that represent only a bare living and producing much more than they receive in the form of wages, it must inevitably follow that industry can be speeded up to its full capacity only at intervals, after each of which there must be a lull to permit the capitalists to work off their surplus stocks of goods—the goods that the wage-workers produced but could not buy with their wages. The greater the population, the greater the surplus of production over the amount that the wage-workers can buy and the more frequent the industrial depressions during which little is pro-
duced. The idle man fixing, as he does, the wage of the man who labors, it must necessarily follow that wages will be forced lower and lower as the army of the unemployed becomes greater and the increasing intensity of its sufferings makes it willing to live on a poorer scale. With an increasing number of men competing for a limited number of jobs, the necessities of the unemployed will compel them to underbid the workers, and the workers will be compelled to accept lower wages or lose their jobs.

These are the tendencies of capitalism: To increase the number of the unemployed; to bring industrial depressions more closely together and to reduce wages. The fact that the United States is relatively undeveloped has, in the past, modified these symptoms to some extent, simply because the country is so remarkably rich in natural resources that even with the highest percentage of exploitation there is still more left for the American wage-worker than the European wage-worker is able to wrest from his total product. But, under capitalism, the American wage-worker will not only ultimately reach the present depths of industrial degradation of his European brother, but he and the European will continue to go down together.

The logical outcome of capitalism is all the wealth for a few, with starvation for the masses.

Starvation means revolution.

Revolutions are of two kinds—peaceful and bloody; by the ballot and by the sword.

Either kind of a revolution will be for the destruction of capitalism.

Socialism stands for the peaceful revolution of the ballot and it bases its hopes for victory on the ability of the American people to recognize the nature of their wrongs before it is too late and apply the logical remedies.
CHAPTER XIII.

Capitalism the Curse of Womanhood and Childhood.

WHEN the world was young, one could always tell which woman was regarded as the most beautiful of her sex in the community in which she lived from the fact that the most beautiful woman always bore the most scars. In those days men went courting with clubs. Women were hunted in much the same manner that wild game is now hunted, and whenever a man saw a woman whose appearance pleased him he resolved to capture her. The woman invariably ran, and it thus became necessary for her admirer to drop her with a club or a stone. The most beautiful women were chased the most frequently and therefore had most scars.

And, parenthetically, let it be said that the men of this day had little higher regard for children than they had for women. It was the custom to kill most children, until it was realized that it would be well to let the male babies live in order that they might grow up to become warriors and fight for their tribes. Then the discovery was made that if all of the girl babies were killed there would soon come a time when there would be no more women to become the mothers of warriors. And out of this murderous instinct of man—this desire to engage in war—came the custom that finally permitted children to live—the boys that they might fight for the tribes, the girls that they might become the mothers of fighters.

It was a long time ago that the rights of women and children were so lightly regarded, and ever since then the best men and the best women have labored unceasingly to improve the conditions that surrounded these most nearly helpless portions of humanity. In this direction, much has been accomplished, but the ideal for which such men and women strive—justice for women and children—is still far away. Woman is
still a drudge and a burden bearer, as she was thousands of years ago, the only difference being that, instead of being the drudge of any one man, she is now the drudge of capitalism. She is the slave of her environment and her necessities. And her children? They are born to slavery—the same economic slavery that holds their parents. In the rural districts, the children have a few years of natural, child-like happiness. The open fields, the running brooks, the pure air and the sunny skies are theirs to enjoy. But, just as they are beginning to believe that they have been born into a world of utter happiness, there passes over the average child, like a cloud over a bright landscape, a new realization—a realization of poverty; a realization that his parents need his help in order that the family may continue to live together. And thereafter the life of that child becomes a grind—a battle with poverty, a continuous and laborious attempt to sweep back the waves of the ocean of want that never cease to threaten to overwhelm it.

The lot of the child in the city is even more miserable. The child in the country has what nature intended every child should have—pure air and ample playgrounds. The child in the city—the average child, the wage-earner’s child—has impure air and no playgrounds. The smoke of the factory and the death-dealing fumes of the alley are mixed with the air that the city child breathes. And his playgrounds? His playgrounds are the street and the vacant lots. He plays ball on the street car tracks, and if a street car happens to kill him the coroner’s jury, which all well-regulated street railway companies make it a point to control, returns a verdict exonerating the company. Sometimes the streets are even too crowded for the children to use them as playgrounds and then the children who live in flat-top buildings play on the roofs. The roofs are the only playgrounds that thousands of children in the great cities ever know. In May, 1904, the New York newspapers made much of the fact that a little girl who was supposed to have been kidnaped had fallen down the chimney of the tenement house in which her mother lived and been
smothered. She had been playing on the roof and, presumably in chasing her kitten, had stumbled to her death.

Not only is the city child denied pure air and playgrounds, but he is denied the opportunity to get more than the most meager sort of an education. Take the city of Detroit, for instance, a city with a population of approximately 300,000 in 1904. The percentage of those who finish the high school course in Detroit is somewhat greater than it is in most American cities. Yet only 2.8 per cent of those who enter the Detroit public schools ever graduate from the high schools. The other 97.2 per cent are compelled to give up school and go to work, because their parents are too poor to support them. These absent children—these children whose parents are too poor to permit them to go to school—may be found in the factories and department stores all over the land. Thousands upon thousands of children are working in the cotton mills of the South for wages that are pitifully small—only a few cents a day. Many of them die before reaching maturity, and the rest become mentally and physically dwarfed men and women.

What it means to deny so great a proportion of the children an opportunity to get even a high school education is shown by a bulletin that was issued by the Michigan Bureau of Education in May, 1904. The Michigan bureau took a book entitled “Who Is Who” as a basis from which to deduct certain conclusions. “Who Is Who” is a book that contains the names of all those who have achieved real distinction in any line of lawful human endeavor. Examination of the book showed that from 1800 to 1870 only 24 self-taught men succeeded in achieving enough distinction to gain them a place in this list of notable men. It was found that a boy with a common school education had only one chance in 9,000 of attaining distinction, while a high school education increased each boy’s chances 22 times. And the graduate of a college has 10 times as many chances as the high school boy and 200 times more than the boy whose education stops with the common school.

“It is unnecessary to extend this inquiry to women,” says
the report. "Education is practically the only door through which women may pass to eminence."

Of course the test of success or failure is not whether one succeeds in getting into "Who Is Who." The book contains the names of many men who are eminent only because of the skill they have displayed in appropriating the products of others in a lawful manner. It contains the names of many bad men. But it contains the names of no fools. And every name it contains is proof of what education has done for that particular individual in the way of developing his mind to the point where he could conquer obstacles. And that is all there is to success of any kind—the conquering of obstacles.

Deprived of the opportunity to obtain an education in her girlhood, the young woman who has been forced into a factory or a store to become a wage-worker eventually becomes a wife and a mother. Sometimes she marries for love; sometimes she marries to get a home, but, whatever her motive, she enters upon a life of drudgery that surpasses anything she has ever experienced. Her husband spends his days in the factory or the workshop, but, waking and sleeping, she must be with her children in the rented little cottage that they call their home. Woman-like, she would like a comfortable, pretty home. But in her home there is little to suggest comfort or beauty. The furnishings are few and cheap. And, besides, there is the endless drudgery of washing, ironing, baking and—what is worse—planning to make their scanty resources go as far as possible. She knows her husband's income; she knows the demands that are made upon it—the rent, the groceries, the fuel and the other things that are indispensable to housekeeping. And she knows that if they are to avoid a financial crash she must keep their expense at least down to their income. And every year many a poor woman worries herself into the grave trying to do this very thing—trying to make ends meet.

The poor woman does not know it, but she and her children are the victims of capitalism—and the most pitiful of all its victims. She lives in a poorly furnished rented or mortgaged house, merely because the greater part of what her
husband produces with his labor is wasted in the competitive struggle between the employer and his employer’s business rivals, or pocketed by his employer in the form of profits.

She has to worry, scheme and go without, to make ends meet, for the same reason—because her husband is given in the form of wages only a small part of what he produces.

And she has to tire out her body and ruin her health in doing the three most laborious parts of her housework merely because her husband and the rest of his class do not know how to take the necessary steps for her relief. To be more specific:

There is the best possible reason why no woman should ever do a family washing and there is no valid reason why she should. In the first place, the average woman is not physically able to do such work. There are physiological reasons why she cannot undergo the inevitable strain without impairing her health. Besides, it is unhealthful work, particularly in winter, when it is necessary to go from a room filled with steam into the open air to hang up clothes. Many a woman has been killed by pneumonia as the result of such exposure.

Now, there is only one reason why poor women are compelled to endure such drudgery—to take such chances of ruining their health and perhaps to invite death. That reason is that it costs too much to send their washing to a laundry. Why? Because there are too many profits to be wrung out of this poor woman’s purse if she gives the laundry owners a chance at it. The building upon which the laundry stands is owned by an idler, perhaps, who demands high rental for it, merely because so many persons have settled in the same city that there is a great demand for land. The building itself represents enormous profits that have been paid to the lumber, steel and other trusts. The machinery represents other profits that have been paid to the builders of machinery, and the coal, starch and soap required call for continuous contributions of profits to the makers of and dealers in these things. Now, in making out a laundry bill, the proprietor has to provide for the payment of all these profits to others, and, in addition, a profit for himself. That is why the wives of poor men cannot afford
to send their washing to the laundries. That is why they have to do their own washing at the risk of ruining their health and perhaps losing their lives.

Suppose all of the profits were to be squeezed out of the laundry business—the profits for the landlords, the trusts and everybody else—and washing were to be done by men—not girls and broken-down women—at the exact cost of doing the work. With the husbands of those who are now poor women receiving all they produce, instead of a part of it, would not that end the day of the family washing done at home? That is the way Socialism would settle the laundry question—and the one who believes the laundry question is not as important to the poor man’s wife as the ship-subsidy question is to a crowd of millionaire ship owners simply does not know much about the lives of the poor. There is no reason why a washing should ever be done in a private residence. The work can be done better and more cheaply on a large scale in a public laundry; and that is the way it will be done just as soon as a majority of the people grasp the fact that there is a better way of doing it—a way in which there is no profit for anybody. just comfort for the housewife.

In the same manner, housewives can be relieved of the drudgery of baking. It is perfectly feasible to have all of the baking down in a public bakery. The products of public bakeries are now oftentimes poor, because the desire for profits has caused the proprietors of bakeries to sacrifice quality to cheapness. But with profits eliminated, as they would be under Socialism, there could be no cause for complaint. With no profits for anybody, all women could do their cooking with gas, just as the wives of a few now do; and an infinite amount of other drudgery could be taken from their shoulders.

These things may seem like relatively unimportant matters. They are not. These burdens, when combined, form the drudgery that falls to the lot of the poor man’s wife. They keep her tired from morning until night—week in, week out—and often send her to the grave prematurely. Surely, they decrease the pleasures of her life. And how unnecessary they
all are is proved by the fact that they would not exist if a few
men were not permitted to wring profits from the labor of the
many. Every toiler would then have a good home, his wife
would be spared what are now her hardest tasks and neither
one would ever have to worry for fear of want.

And their children? Socialism says it is a crime for chil-
dren to be compelled to play in the streets and upon roofs, to
be denied the opportunity to get even a high school education
and to be hustled off to a store or to a factory at the earliest
possible age. By opening the land to the free use of the
people, Socialism would do away with the terrible congestion
in the great cities and no more children would be compelled
to play on the roofs or in the streets. And, with the parents
of all children receiving all they produce, every child would
have an opportunity to graduate from a high school. Under
existing conditions we have free schools, but not “free” chil-
dren—the children are not free to obtain the necessary amount
of education, because the poverty of their parents compels the
young to become wage-earners at the earliest possible moment.

In 1900 there were in this country, according to the census
reports, 28,295,796 women and girls more than 10 years of
age. Of this number 5,329,807 were wage-earners, 1,315,890
being employed in factories alone. Under Socialism, such of
these women as have husbands, and all of the children, would
be spared the necessity of toiling for others, because the hus-
bands and fathers would receive enough from their own labor
so it would not be necessary for their wives and children to
work for others. And, under Socialism, such women as might
choose or find it necessary to be self-supporting would be given
in return for their labor enough to enable them to live in
decency and in comfort. There would be no $3 of $6 a week
incomes under Socialism.

Incidentally, Socialism would help women as well as men
by decreasing crime and insanity. Generally speaking, it may
be said that every time a man commits a crime some woman
suffers—either his wife, his daughter, his sister, his mother, or
perhaps all of them. The great majority of crimes are the
unlawful expressions of man's greed, or the attempt of an individual who has been wronged by society to satisfy his natural wants. Capitalism cultivates greed, and therefore tends to increase crime. Furthermore, capitalism, by creating worry, want and suffering, tends to make abnormal brains in future generations. The autopsy over the body of a great criminal invariably reveals a misshapen brain. Yet thousands of persons whose ancestors for many generations have been ground under the heels of capitalism, and perhaps government tyranny, in the old world have abnormal brains. And it is such men that constitute a great part of our criminal classes. Socialism would decrease crime by ceasing to cultivate the incentive to crime when it is greed, and by enabling human beings to be born into the world with normal brains. Of course, the breeding out of criminals would be a matter of slow growth, but it could be done. Crime is but an effect, back of which there are many causes, and if the causes be removed the effects will in time disappear.

The growing tendency toward insanity falls particularly hard upon women. The asylums for the insane in every state are crowded to their capacities, and still the tide of human wrecks keeps setting toward them. Statistics seem to show that women are even more likely than men to become insane; yet practically every man in an insane asylum means a ruined home somewhere, a weeping wife and perhaps suffering children. And the pity of it all is that much of the increased insanity seems to be directly traceable to the growing intensity of the struggle for existence. With more men than there are jobs, the competition for the jobs is becoming more fierce every year, with the result that there are few homes in which the anxiety that comes from fear of want because of enforced idleness does not at times become seriously annoying, if not distracting. Many of the great corporations, particularly the railroads, have made it a settled policy not to hire wage-workers who are more than 40 years of age, and, as a result, newspaper readers, for the first time in history, are often shocked at the news that some poor fellow has committed
suicide because, in the prime of life, he had been cast aside because he was "too old."

Insanity, like crime, is only an effect, back of which there is a cause; and the cause is always inharmonious relations with natural laws. It was never intended that men and women should have to worry for fear of starvation on an earth that is capable of sustaining a greater population than ever existed upon it at any time; and, since the uncertainties of capitalism compel human beings to worry, it is only natural that the minds of many should break down under the strain. Of course, there are other causes of insanity than the fear of want, but probably none that is more prolific of victims.

Socialism seeks to increase happiness by adjusting men and women to the natural laws that were intended to govern their existence.
CHAPTER XIV.

Capitalism the Cause of Modern Wars; Socialism the Cure.

For the smile of a woman, or because of the frown of a man, nations used to go to war. Troops were hurled against troops, cannon were trained upon cannon, cities were destroyed and thousands were made to suffer or to die because two quarreling rulers had willed it so. The rulers were everything, the people nothing, and the injured “honor” of a king, or the ruffled feeling of an emperor, was enough to set their respective subjects to slaughtering each other.

Times have changed since then, and the causes of wars have changed with them. Nations no longer go to war because a court beauty desires a ruler to humble the occupant of another throne. Nor does that shadowy thing so often referred to as “national honor” play much of a part in the causes of modern wars. The people of one nation do not now, nor did they ever, insult the people of another nation. The people of one nation are seldom, if ever, angry at the people of another nation. And when the statesmen of one nation, representing the ruling class of that nation, insult the ruling class of another nation, the brawling rulers usually find a way to thresh out their differences outside the battlefield. For, with education more generally diffused, the members of the working class of the world, who have always fought the battles, will no longer consent to go to war merely to gratify the whim or the pique of a ruler. That is to say, the members of the working classes of the most enlightened nations will no longer consent to wage such wars. The Turks and the natives of some other semi-civilized or barbarous states would doubtless go to war for any reason that their respective rulers might trump up, merely because they do not know any better; but we Americans, for instance, would not be in favor of going to war with Great
Britain merely because King Edward might have made some slurring remark about us. Nor are the people of other enlightened nations less wise.

But, while the causes of wars have changed, and the most deadly weapons in use have made war so costly of life and treasure that they are less frequent than of old, the world is still troubled with wars. Not only is the world still troubled with wars, but it is cursed with more fiendish wars than ever were known at any previous time in its history. The ingenuity of man has been exhausted to make war more deadly than ever before. Machine guns on land fairly rain bullets, and every bullet may mean a widow or an orphaned child. On the sea the floating fortresses stand back ten miles and hurl their bursting charges into the camp of an enemy. Below the surface of the waves, the sub-marine ships steal unseen upon the battle-ships and with one terrific shot of gun-cotton or nitroglycerine hurl a thousand men into eternity. And, as if this were not enough, warring nations scatter the seas with floating explosives to the end that a passing warship, its crew resting in fancied security in the apparent absence of an enemy, may be blown to pieces in the twinkling of an eye. Thus did Admiral Makaroff and his crew go down to their death in April, 1904, in the war between Russia and Japan. Thus did the Japanese battleship Hatsuse and her crew go down a month later. And for what are such terrible cruelties practiced? For trade, for profits. Because the wars of today are commercial wars.

"Gold was good—they hoped to hold it.
Life was cheap—wherefore they sold it,"
to use a modified version of Mr. Kipling's lines, is an adequate enumeration of the causes and impulses of the ruling classes of the nations in bringing about wars, the fact always being kept in mind that it is the lives of the working class, and not their own, that the rulers "sell" for gold.

Why is this so? Why are wars fought for trade—lives sacrificed to a lust for gold? Go back a little. Go back to the introduction of machinery into productive industry—the ma-
chinery that has so increased the productivity of labor that men are able to live as they now live on a part of their products.

The question that agitated the world a century ago was how to make production equal the demands of the people for consumption. In 1826 Thomas R. Malthus issued in England a pamphlet in which he showed that, inasmuch as population, unchecked, tended to increase more rapidly than production, it was the patriotic duty of some of those who loved their kind to refrain from marriage, or at least to refrain from becoming parents.

Then along came the machine and what had become known as the "Malthusian theory" ceased to incite alarm. The perfection of the steam engine and the introduction of electricity as a motive power still further increased the productivity of labor, which, even in 1850, had become so great that, according to Carrol D. Wright, for many years United States commissioner of labor, there occurred the first panic due to the modern cause of "over-production." In other words, the introduction of machinery into industry solved the question of production by showing the world how to produce enough for its needs.

But in solving one problem it created another—the problem of how to dispose of surplus products—the excess of the workers' products over their wages, which the capitalists withheld as profits. And, from the beginning, this became an important problem for two reasons:

1—Because the capitalists could not make profits unless the workers were employed.

2—Because no government could long exist under which the working class was in a chronic state of idleness—the suffering people would arise and overthrow their government.

The problem of the statesmen of all industrial nations for the last 50 years—particularly during the last 20 years—has been how to find markets for the manufacturing industries of their respective nations. And, coupled with this, there has been manifested a strong desire on the part of every great nation, and some of the smaller ones, to relieve the pressure.
at home due to poverty by conquering and annexing other lands. The conquering and annexing of other lands, like the gaining of foreign markets, served a twofold purpose:

1—They furnished new fields for exploitation and therefore profits for the capitalists.

2—By encouraging emigration, they relieved the competition for jobs at home and therefore tended to the security of governments by diminishing the unrest of the people due to poverty.

And what has been the result? Read the newspapers. What is the great question that is being discussed in the congresses, the parliaments and the reichtags of the world? Isn't it “What can we do to get foreign markets for our products?” For what other reason are the envious eyes of the world cast upon China and the far East, whose teeming millions offer tremendous prospective profits to the nation that can awaken a desire for its goods on the part of the slumbering Orientals and thus market its surplus products? Why, if not for this reason, did the United States insist upon the “open door” in China—otherwise, equal trade privileges with all other nations—even though Senator Hale, of Maine, gave timely warning during the congressional session of 1903-4 that strict adherence to this demand might sometime involve this nation in war with a combination of other powers? For what reason did the United States pay $20,000,000 as the purchase price of the Philippine Islands, half a billion in treasure and thousands of lives to subdue them? Did we do it to “bring the Filipinos the blessings of civilization?” If so, why didn’t we wage other wars to “bring the blessings of civilization” to other peoples as unhappy as the Filipinos? When we were drafting the treaty of peace with Spain at Paris, we could as easily have provided that she should retain the Philippines. The Filipinos would then have been in exactly the position they occupied before the war began—free to continue their fight for liberty. Nor, by so doing, would we have betrayed the Filipinos more than we did by buying them at $2 apiece, after Dewey, by bringing Aguinaldo to the islands and furnishing him arms, implied, if
he did not promise, that the Filipinos would be permitted to achieve their independence from Spain if they could.

And, if we did not take the Philippines to "bring them the blessings of civilization," why did we take them? Does the fact that the Philippines lie at the door of the far East, into whose markets we are anxious to force our surplus products, offer any hint of our real purpose? Does the fact that American capitalists are seeking franchises in the Philippines and planning in every conceivable way to exploit the natural resources and the labor of the islands throw any additional light on the question of why "Duty and Destiny" so suddenly made it manifest that we should become holders of subject peoples? And, as a matter of fact, is there any reason to doubt that Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, after visiting the islands, stated his party's whole case in a nutshell when he came home and advocated the retention of the islands on the ground that "it would pay?" Yet eight years' occupation of the Philippines—occupation that has "paid" or is expected to "pay" somebody—has cost us thousands of lives and hundreds of millions of dollars.

Other nations plunge into commercial wars for the same reasons—to find markets for their surplus products or to acquire more territory to which some of their congested population may be lured. Why, if not for both of these reasons and the added incentive of rich gold mines, did Great Britain find it advisable to spend a billion dollars to crush out the South African republics? By trumping up fraudulent appeals to the patriotism of the English workingmen, the English statesmen succeeded in inducing the toilers of the kingdom to fight the battles of the British capitalists; but there was never any inspiration for the Boer war, so far as the British government was concerned, but pounds and pence—and the pounds and pence were for the British capitalists—not for the British workingmen who did the fighting. For it was doubtless observed that as soon as the war was over and work in the mines was resumed the British government, instead of maintaining conditions that would have created an opportunity
for the greatest number of white men to labor in the mines, concluded a treaty with China by means of which coolie labor was imported to South Africa to work in practical slavery for wages upon which the English soldiers who fought to hold the mines for their capitalistic countrymen would not consent to exist.

The workingmen of Russia and the workingmen of Japan engaged in mortal combat to decide which should control Manchuria and Korea. Yet the workingmen of Russia and the workingmen of Japan had no grievance against each other; nor had the workingmen of either country anything to gain by slaughtering the workingmen of the other country. If Russia had won the workingmen of Russia would have been just as poor, just as ignorant and just as miserable as they now are.

In like manner, the workingmen of Japan have gained nothing worth their sacrifice by defeating Russia. But not so with the Japanese capitalists. Japan's victory means millions of dollars to the capitalist class of Japan, who have formed rich fields for exploitation in the conquered territory. And the victory has given Japan a great advantage in the race that all nations are running to break into the markets of China. Furthermore, the territory conquered by Japan will afford an outlet for part of her 44,000,000 of population that is now huddled on a few little islands. With fewer Japanese competing for the jobs that are to be had in the islands of the empire, there will be less discontent due to extreme poverty, and the capitalist class will therefore become more firmly entrenched in the powers of government.

And it was to decide which of these sets of capitalists—the Russians or the Japanese—should exploit Manchuria and Korea, which neither nation owned, that the workingmen of Japan and Russia slaughtered each other!

Why do rulers find it expedient to permit their subjects and citizens to be slain by wholesale to "get trade" for their capitalist classes? It is not a difficult question, nor does it necessarily follow that a ruler must be a cruel or "bad" man,
as men go, to permit such inhuman contests. Take the late President McKinley, for instance. He was a humane, tender-hearted man. Of course, it is the fashion in certain quarters to denounce as a murderer every ruler who permit a war, without reference to the environment and point of view of the ruler. Yet McKinley, kind-hearted and sympathetic as he was, did not scruple to hold the Philippines, which he well knew might involve war, after the interests that usually controlled him decided that it would be a profitable thing to have the islands held. McKinley unquestionably invited and obtained a war with the Filipinos for no other reason than to advance the commercial interests of the country, as all other rulers wage commercial wars. And McKinley, like all other rulers who wage commercial wars, doubtless justified his position to himself by arguing that foreign markets were needed to furnish an outlet for the surplus products of American labor, without which there must be idleness for millions, and, therefore, unhappiness. Because the statesmen of these commercial nations estimate the prosperity of their respective countries by the amount of their annual exports. If a nation exports $100,000,000 worth of goods in a year, its statesmen plume themselves on the wonderful "prosperity" that has come to their country because of the great wisdom in governing it, while the plain truth is exactly the reverse. Heavy exports in proportion to the total production always mean that the laborers who produced the goods received so little for their labor that they were unable to buy back more than a fraction of their products, and that the capitalists were therefore compelled to go abroad for a market. For, as a matter of fact, there are only a comparatively few things that we can really afford to export. If we raise more wheat than we need for bread, the surplus may consistently be exported, but the trouble is that we export millions of dollars' worth of goods each year—clothing, furniture, and innumerable other things—which the American wageworkers who produce them would have liked to keep if they had received in wages enough to enable them to pay for them.
Under capitalism, commercial wars must necessarily become more numerous and bitter as the increased productivity of labor more rapidly gluts the home markets with its own products and brings about commercial stagnation while the surplus is being consumed. The government that cannot keep its citizens or subjects from suffering as the result of idleness at frequent or lengthy periods will naturally become an unpopular government, and, as such, be in danger of destruction by its own discontented people. All governments so threatened will therefore strive to perpetuate themselves by securing markets for the surplus products of their manufacturing industries, to the end that discontent may be allayed by the revival of industry. And, of course, the revival of industry will also result in more profits for the capitalist classes who control the governments. But, to dispose of these surplus products in foreign markets, it will often be necessary to engage in wars with other nations who are striving to obtain the same markets for their respective peoples; and it is doubtful if the capitalists themselves have more than the most hazy idea of where the spirit of commercial warfare, upon which they have been compelled to embark by the force of necessity, will lead them. No one knows but the greatest war in the history of the world will be fought in the Pacific ocean in the present century for the control of the markets of the Orient. And if such a world war should be fought, and a certain combination of nations should defeat another combination, no one can know how long it might be until a realignment of the nations would precipitate another war.

To recapitulate: Modern wars are commercial wars. Commercial wars are waged for two purposes:

1—To afford profits for the capitalist class.

2—To decrease the possibility of rebellions by providing the working classes with an opportunity to labor; or, to be exact, to enable the capitalist classes to permit the working classes to labor at a profit for the capitalist classes.

Socialism would destroy both of these incentives to commercial warfare. Under Socialism, a man who had produced more than he could consume for a considerable time would sit down to a well-earned rest, instead of trying to kill a man beyond an ocean, whom he had never seen.
CHAPTER XV.

Other Remedies Than Socialism Worse Than Futile.

BEFORE taking up the consideration of remedies, about which we may disagree, it may be well to mention certain wrongs, with regard to the existence of which we shall not find occasion to hold conflicting opinions.

In the first place, it may be set down as a fact that there are a few thousands of very rich persons in this country—persons whose personal fortunes range all the way from the million to the billion mark.

Even Republican politicians will not dispute this fact.

It is also true that there are millions of persons in this country—about 80 per cent of our entire population, in fact—who are poor—struggling hard for a bare living.

Only Republican politicians will deny this fact and they themselves admit it in the census reports issued under Republican administrations.

Equally true is it that the few who are so very rich do little if any useful labor, since their activities, for the most part, are directed toward the accumulation rather than the production of wealth.

This truth will be denied by every Republican and every Democratic politician in the country, but it remains a truth, nevertheless.

And it is certainly a fact that the many millions who are struggling hard for a bare living are exclusively engaged in useful labor—in the actual production of wealth, in other words.

We have, therefore, two great facts, about the existence of which there can be no dispute:

1—That a few thousands of our population are in the possession of enormous wealth;
2—That many millions of our population are in the pos-
session of little wealth—so little, in fact, that the question of
how to gain a livelihood is always uppermost in their minds.
And it is to improve the conditions of this greater and
poorer class that millions of American citizens vote the
Republican ticket; that other millions vote the Democratic
ticket and that thousands of others advocate the principles of
the Prohibition party and the Single Tax.

Socialism recognizes the individual honesty and the good
intentions of the rank and file of all these various political
parties and beliefs. But it also asserts that there is nothing
in any or all of these parties or beliefs that will give the wealth
of the nation to the class that makes it. Socialism even goes
farther and asserts that the two great parties—the Republican
and the Democratic—are organized and controlled by the capi-
talist class for the purpose of maintaining the very conditions
that exist—the conditions that give a small number of men
the control of all the land and machinery with which wealth
may be produced and compel all the rest to seek to use land
and machinery for such parts of their products as those who
own the means of production may find it necessary to give
them.

All of which is, of course, most emphatically denied by
those who are in favor of maintaining the existing system of
industry. But the fact remains that if you cannot obtain the
means with which to sustain life without using my hoe to
cultivate potatoes in my garden, your hunger will compel
you to get my permission to use my hoe in my garden, even if
I tell you that you can have as your share only one-half of the
potatoes you raise. Nor will you ever be released from my
clutches by any political party that permits you only to own
your hunger while it permits me to own the garden and the
hoe without which you cannot appease your hunger. For there
is nothing more certain in all history than that the class that
has the power to oppress another class has always used that
power to the full extent of what it considered to be safe. We
are all alike in that respect and if the Socialists were in control
of this government today, and there were two classes in this
country, there is nothing more certain than that the Socialists,
representing the wealth-producing class, would oppress the
other class. It is a disagreeable fact, but it is nevertheless a
fact, that it is human nature for the strong to domineer over
the weak. And while Socialists possess this fault, in common
with all the rest of humanity, there is no danger that they will
use it, when in control of the government, to wrong others,
for this very simple reason:

There will be no class for the working class, as represented
by Socialism, to oppress; because every individual who is able
to labor will belong to the working class and no one will be
able to wrest from others the products of their toil.

If it be admitted (1) that the man who has only hunger
is at a disadvantage as compared with the man who owns the
garden and the hoe without which the man with the hunger
cannot obtain food, and (2) that the man who is made eco-
nomically and industrially powerful by the ownership of the
garden and the hoe is certain to use his power to exploit the
weaker, hungry man, we may take the next step and ask what
principle, or principles, are embodied in the Republican, Demo-
cratic or Prohibition party, or in the Single Tax program, that
might reasonably be expected to place the hoeless and landless
man upon equal terms with the man who now owns the land
and the hoe.

Take the Republican party, for instance. What does it
offer?

The Republican party is emphatically in favor of a pro-
tective tariff to prevent foreign manufacturers from invading
American markets with their goods upon terms of equality with
American manufacturers. Republican orators, statesmen and
newspapers wax eloquent over the stupendousness of the aid
that is given to American laborers by a protective tariff, basing
their claims on the plea that the tariff "protects" American
laborers from the competition of less well paid foreign laborers.
But it may have been noticed that the Republican party has
never placed a protective tariff on foreign laborers, who are
left free to come to the United States in as great numbers as they may please to compete with American laborers on their own soil. The coal mines and the great industrial plans in which hundreds of thousands of unskilled laborers are employed are always beckoning to Europe for laborers, and it is a well-known fact that the trans-Atlantic steamship companies employ tradesmen and men of other occupations in all the ports of Europe to drum up steerage passengers for them by telling the European peasants of the magnificent prospects that will await them if they will only remove to America.

The Republican party also stands for "honest money"—the gold standard. Go back in this book and re-read the chapter about "Why a New Medium of Exchange Is Needed" and see whether you think the gold standard is intended to help the working class or the capitalist class.

The Republican party is also in favor of imperialism—the conquering of foreign peoples, even at the cannon's mouth, for the sake of trade. If you have any doubts as to whether, in standing for imperialism, the Republican party desires to help the working class or the capitalist class, go back in this book and read the chapter about commercial wars and why they are fought.

But the Republican party has not a word to say against the ownership of the garden and the hoe by one man and the ownership of the hunger by the other man.

Nor is the Republican party sufficiently devoted to labor to pass an eight-hour law, an anti-injunction law, or any other measure that would really help labor by wresting from the capitalist class any of the rights that belong to the working class.

In short, the Republican party is the exponent of the aims and purpose of the great capitalists. The great capitalists are the ones who control its organization and write its platforms. And the party is faithful to those who furnish its ideas and provide the money with which to influence the public in such a direction that the ideas may become effective.

What of the Democracy? The Democracy is the party of
the small capitalists—the small fry who are being eaten by the big fish. It is therefore a dying party, as the small capitalists of which it was once composed are rapidly going out of existence as individual factors in industry. This is so because the factories, the stores and the other places of business of the small capitalists are either being driven out of existence by the trusts or being absorbed by them. The small capitalists, naturally, do not like to be swallowed by the great capitalists and therefore they protest pitifully through their party. But within a few years there will not be enough small capitalists left to protest and then the Democratic party will disappear in fact, as it has already disappeared as a formidable rival of the party of the great capitalists. For the last eight years, the desperate Democracy has been flirting with the growing Socialist sentiment of the people by advocating the government ownership of certain public utilities, like the railroads, telegraphs and telephones; and the New York Democracy, during the great coal strike of 1902, even went so far, when it needed votes, as to declare for the government ownership of the anthracite coal mines. This plank in the New York platform, by the way, was written by ex-Senator David B. Hill, who, in 1904, labored with August Belmont and other Wall street bankers to bring about the nomination by the Democracy of Judge Alton B. Parker for president.

That the Democracy, however, is not different in vital principle from the Republican party is proved by the fact that it also has nothing to say against the ownership of the garden and the hoe by one man and the ownership of the hunger by the other man. The Democracy, judging by its actions, is entirely willing that a few men shall own all of the means with which wealth may be produced, while the many, who must produce wealth or starve, must obtain access to the gardens and the hoes on such terms as their owners may see fit to impose. The Democracy simply insists that the large men with the plows shall not put out of business the small men with the hoes. But it has never tried to place the man who has only hunger on an equal basis with the man who has
a garden and a hoe, by declaring that all men should have a right to use gardens and hoes by vesting the ownership of all gardens and all hoes in all of the people.

And the final proof that the Republican and the Democratic parties are not different in vital principle is proved by the fact that capitalists dictate the policies of both parties and vote both tickets. It is a well known fact that the Gould interests always contribute to the campaign funds of both parties. The same has been said of the Rockefeller interests, and it is unquestionably true of other great interests.

The Democracy opposes imperialism, of course. What else could it do? If it is to remain a separate party, could it agree with the Republican party in everything? Not that Mr. Bryan was insincere in his opposition to the acquisition of the Philippines and the war that followed it. Anyone who knows Mr. Bryan knows he is honest. But anyone who knows Mr. Bryan also knows that he is oftentimes "shaky" on his political economy. Mr. Bryan cried out against the injustices of the American subjugation of the Philippines, as any man of quickened conscience might have cried out, but he was not so alive as his Republican brethren to the necessity of foreign markets in which to dispose of the surplus goods that must accumulate under the capitalist system of industry. Mr. Bryan opposed the subjugation of the Philippines on principle. The Republican statesmen advocated the acquisition of the Philippines because the Republican capitalists who controlled the party demanded an opportunity to obtain profits. And the saddest thing about the capitalist system of industry is that when principles and profits come into conflict principles are so likely to go down.

Coming to the money question and the tariff—the only other features of importance in the Democratic program—it is difficult to say what position the Democracy holds with regard to either of them, and still more difficult to tell what position it may hold four years or eight years hence. The Democratic party used to lean very strongly toward free trade. Now it leans in all directions. One faction is for the free trade, an-
other for moderate protection and another seems to be so well satisfied with the tariff program of the Republicans that it offers no opposition to it. At any rate, the party is so split on the tariff question that it can offer no effective opposition to the Republicans.

For eight years, a similar condition of uncertainty has existed within the Democracy regarding the money question. Both parties were in favor of a medium of exchange that would enable the capitalists to make profits off the working class, but a part of the Democrats were in favor of a system that might have decreased the exploitation a trifle, while the others were in favor of the same system that the Republican statesmen advocated. Some Democrats still prefer silver as the standard of value—some still prefer gold.

The Prohibition party may be dismissed quickly. Such importance as it may have is derived solely from the fact that it seeks to eliminate the horrors wrought by alcohol—an object that is entirely worthy of the sympathy of every good citizen. But the Prohibitionists try to remove an unwholesome effect without going back to the cause that produced the effect. To Socialists it seems about as wise to try to stop the sale of liquor by the arbitrary plan proposed by the Prohibitionists as it would to plug a boil instead of taking a remedy to purify the blood.

Here is an outline of the Socialist doctrine so far as it pertains to the liquor question—a question that is unquestionably related to poverty, crime and general human distress:

No man conducts a saloon from choice or because he believes it is the business that is best suited to his tastes.

Few men conduct saloons who, down deep in their hearts, are not ashamed of their business. Somehow or another, they are made to feel that the making of drunkards is not quite the business in which a good man should engage.

But men nevertheless do conduct saloons Why?
P-R-O-F-I-T-S !

That's the whole story.
Because they can sell 2 cents' worth of whisky for 10 cents!

Because they can sell a cent's worth of beer for 5 cents!

Because they can get more money in the saloon business than they can earn in any other business!

And just so long as men can be found who are willing to pay 10 cents for 2 cents' worth of whisky, or 5 cents for a cent's worth of beer, just so long will there be saloons and just so long will these saloons continue to make drunkards.

In other words, there will be patrons of saloons just so long as saloons are in existence and saloons will be in existence just so long as liquor can be sold at a profit.

But suppose the profits were to be squeezed out of the saloon business.

Under a system of industry in which there could be no such thing as profit-taking for anybody on anything, would the man who is even now secretly ashamed of the fact that he is in the saloon business—would he have anything to do with the distribution of liquor?

Why should he? The only incentive that ever drew him behind the bar would have been removed.

Of course, we are creatures of habit and the drink-habit has taken such root that if this were to become a Socialist nation tomorrow it is probable that the drinking of alcoholic liquors would disappear only gradually. But intemperance is more than a habit—in its acute forms, it is a disease; and both habits and diseases disappear slowly. It seems to be a way that nature has of making us pay our debts. But the Socialist plan of removing the cause of the saloon appeals to the reason, while the Prohibition plan of treating the effect, without going to the cause behind it all, does not bear the test of logic. Nor does it work out any better in practical operation. The Prohibition movement has made so little progress that it seems certain that liquor will be drank 10,000 years hence if it be left to the Prohibition party to stop it.

Taking up next the question of the Single Tax: It may be said that those who believe in this theory entirely overlook
the fact that the ownership of the machinery by one class of men—which the Single-Taxers approve—will always give the men who own the machinery an advantage over the men who have no machinery. "But if land is free," say the Single-Taxers, "the men who have no machinery can till the land and obtain the means with which to build machinery of their own." Undoubtedly. But what is to prevent the builders of machinery from combining, just as they do now, and robbing the farmers in the prices of the machinery they buy? And isn't it true that there would always be a class of men who, if they wished to work with machinery, would be compelled either to work on a farm (which also requires much machinery) or work for wages for some owner of machinery? Would there not be a new crop of young men working at a disadvantage to get machinery all the while—the young ones taking the places of the older ones as rapidly as the older ones achieved their purposes? And would not such a plan at first result in all the horrors of fierce, unrestricted competition and then grow into combination of the greater capitalists against the smaller capitalists?

The principal objection to the Single Tax theory is that, while it would make land more nearly free than it now is, it would not solve the problem of the private ownership of the hoe—the hoe without which the land could not be tilled. Under the Single Tax, there would be wage-workers and wherever there are wage-workers there must be exploitation of labor. If there were not exploitation—if the owner of machinery would not withhold a part of a laborer's product as the price of the use of the machine, what incentive would there be for the owner of the machine to hire men to work for him?

And that is where the rub comes. Single-Taxers maintain the principle of the private ownership of machinery. What purpose can there be in the private ownership of machinery if not to give the man who owns the machinery an advantage over the man who uses but does not own it?

Besides, Single-Taxers believe in profit. They say they
do not, but they do. They simply call it by another name. With them, it is the reward of “special ability.” Socialism denies that the labor of the man who schemes to find a market for a thing is deserving of greater reward than the labor of the man who makes it.

Summed up in a word, Socialism would make the garden and the hoe free by vesting their ownership in all the people. The Single Tax would make only the land free, and with the hoe in the private possession of somebody else the man who wanted to use it would have to relinquish a part of his product as the price of its use.
CHAPTER XVI.

How Socialism Will Come.

STRICTLY speaking, it is not correct to speak of the time when Socialism “will” come. Socialism has been coming for a long time. Part of it is here. More is on the way. Every year brings a new consignment. Every year takes away something from the edifice of capitalism. A new economic house is building, piece-meal. A stone in the foundation of capitalism falls; a block of Socialist granite takes its place. A capitalist pillar falls; a Socialist pillar is hoisted in its stead. Day by day and year by year, the change goes on. The more capitalism crumbles the faster it crumbles. Some day all of capitalism will have disappeared and all of Socialism will have appeared. And that moment Socialism will begin to crumble, just as capitalism is now crumbling, and something else will begin to take place of Socialism, just as Socialism is taking the place of capitalism. For if there is anything in this world of which we are sure it is that society is always changing; that it is always in a process of change; that the processes of evolution are constantly carrying it toward a state more nearly perfect and that changes will continue to take place until absolute perfection shall have been reached—until the millennium shall have come. And then civilization will begin to decay. For there is no such thing as a stand-still in nature. The thing that is not dying is growing. The thing that is not growing is dying. And, as no thoughtful Socialist makes the claim that Socialism is the ideal state of existence—that it is a perfect economic scheme of life—no such Socialist expects that the process of change will cease when Socialism is all here. Instead of claiming perfection for Socialism, Socialists content themselves with the statement that Socialism will be a great improvement over capitalism—and that it is the next step.
Socialism has been coming for a long time; part of it is here. To realize the truth of these statements, consider what the elementary principle of Socialism is. Socialism is, first of all a protest against the use of capital to exploit labor. Socialism sees that the ownership of capital by one man enables that man to appropriate the products of another man’s labor without rendering any equivalent of the capitalist’s labor. Against this palpable wrong Socialism inveighs. And, therefore, it may be said that any human tendency to minimize this wrong by curtailing the power of capital to exploit labor is Socialistic in its nature, “Socialistic” being understood to mean that those who endorse such tendencies resemble Socialists in this particular—not that they are like Socialists in all particulars.

The demand of Socialism being that all of the power of capital to exploit labor shall be destroyed, it necessarily follows that any diminution of the power of capital to exploit labor is a step toward Socialism. And, if it can be proved that there is and long has been a tendency to curtail the amount of labor’s products that the capitalist can obtain merely by his ownership of capital, proof will have been furnished for the statements that Socialism has been coming for a long time and that part of it is here.

Looking for proof of this nature, what is more common than the laws that have been passed the world over, limiting the rates of interest that may be legally collected? Interest is a very tangible and a very real thing to the man who pays it. He does not yet realize that all interest in excess of the natural decay of the capital* borrowed is an unjustifiable and unjust charge, but long ago he recognized the fact that interest was a burdensome load to carry and straightway he proceeded, by legal enactment, to reduce it to what his mistaken sense of honesty caused him to consider a fair rate. What is this but a tendency to curtail the confiscating powers of capital in one direction? And while the man who believes in limiting the rate of interest that may be lawfully charged for the use of

* Money is not capital—only the representative of capital, which may be machinery, buildings or anything else used in production.
capital may also believe in the private ownership of capital and the competitive system of industry the fact remains that, unconsciously or not, in this respect, he is Socialistic, because he seeks to accomplish a part of what the Socialists would accomplish in its entirety—to decrease the amount of labor's products that capital may appropriate. In other words, it may be set down as a general proposition that anything is Socialistic that has for its purpose the prevention of one man, merely by the ownership of capital, from claiming the ownership of wealth produced by another. This may be a little broader definition of that which approaches Socialism in its character than is familiar to the average reader; but it is nevertheless a truthful definition.

Another example of the Socialistic tendency of contemporary thought may be found in the numerous instances of late in which municipal corporations have sought to limit the dividends of public-service corporations. At the time of writing, there is before the common council of the city of Detroit a proposition to grant a franchise to a certain public-service corporation, provided it shall be incorporated in the company's charter that its charges for service shall never be more than enough to permit the payment of 6 per cent upon the capital invested. And, while the possibilities of juggling in corporation bookkeeping are so great that the provision, if made a part of the company's charter will probably amount to little or of capital, proof will have been furnished of the statements nothing, the fact remains that public sentiment has compelled the municipal authorities to seek to limit the amount, over and above its operating expenses, that the corporation may take from the people, merely by virtue of the ownership of the corporation of certain capital invested in machinery that is used to supply a public want. This policy, so frequently applied of late to public-service corporations, stands for something. It does not stand for capitalism. It is hostile to every instinct, desire and principle of capitalism. But it is not hostile to the principles of Socialism. On the contrary, it is entirely in harmony with the highest development of Socialist thought.
The prime object of Socialism, therefore, is the prevention of the individual from obtaining the products of the labor of his fellows merely by the ownership of capital. And, as we have seen, the unmistakable tendency of the times is toward the curbing of the power of capital to appropriate the products of labor. Next comes the question of how the exploiting power of capital shall be destroyed. Socialism declares that the exploiting power of capital can only be destroyed by transferring the ownership of all capital—that is, of all wealth used to produce more wealth, the land and machinery with which men work, in other words—from private to public hands. Hence comes the demand of Socialism for public ownership, through the government, of all capital, in order that each individual may have an opportunity to use the tools with which he must work without paying tribute to their owner for their use.

It having been demonstrated that there is a growing public sympathy for the purpose of Socialism—the destruction of the power of privately owned capital to exploit labor—let us now see if it can be shown that there is a growing public demand that the methods of Socialism shall be applied to obtain relief. For, if it can be shown that the methods of Socialism have been and are being applied, even in a small way, further proof will have been afforded of the statements made at the beginning of this chapter that "Socialism has been coming for a long time and part of it is here."

Perhaps the most frequently quoted instance of the adoption of a Socialistic method for the solution of a given problem is in the governmental operation of the postal system. The carrying of mails would afford a rich field for exploitation if in the hands of private individuals, yet the government performs this service at public expense without desire to make a profit. And the postal service is operated by the government, notwithstanding that it is no more necessary that the mail of any citizen shall be transported at cost than it is that his clothing or his food shall be sold to him at cost. As a matter of fact, if the American people could obtain at cost their meat,
their fuel, or any other necessity of life for which they now pay prices that include large profits, it is probable that they could well afford to pay 5 cents each to a private corporation for carrying their letters. But, when the government was formed it reserved to itself the function of carrying the mails, and therefore the most "conservative" citizen now has nothing to say against the plan, just as the most "conservative" citizen would have nothing to say against the public ownership of the packing houses or the coal mines if the government had always furnished meat and coal to the people at cost. This is true because the "conservative" citizen always approves old methods of government with which he is familiar, whether they be good or bad. And he shys at improved methods only because they are new.

Merely mentioning the fact that the public operation of the schools and the fire and police systems of cities are examples of the application of Socialistic methods, let us consider the more important fact that the tendency all over the world is toward the public ownership of what are called "public utilities." In England, the government, with its parcels post, is carrying packages for the people at cost. In this country, we are still permitting the express companies to perform the same service for prices that afford enormous profits. In many European countries the telephones, the telegraphs, the street railway systems, the tenement houses and many other industries, necessities and conveniences are owned and operated by the government. And here in the United States there is an unmistakable public sentiment in favor of the public ownership of the railroads, the telegraphs, the telephones and the street railway, gas, water and lighting system in cities. Indeed, many cities already own their water and lighting systems, and Chicago is preparing to take over the ownership and operation of its street railway systems, which has been demanded by a vote of five to one of its electorate.

All these things are matters of common knowledge, yet they mean nothing more than that in the case of a few wrongs which the people have seen, because the wrongs were so plain
they could not be overlooked, the people have demanded the application of Socialistic remedies. For the demand for the public ownership of what are called “public utilities” means only that public sentiment is crystalizing into the belief that exploitation by the public-service corporations can be stopped only by causing the government to take over the capital used by such corporations. Plainly, this is nothing less than the application of a Socialistic method to the problem of preventing the exploitation of labor by capital in these specific instances. Yet why is it more material that we should substitute public for private ownership of capital invested in street railway lines than that we should substitute public for private ownership of capital invested in industries that supply food, clothing, fuel and shelter? Is it not as advisable to save a dollar in one place as in another, and do not all of us pay more for food, clothing and shelter than we pay for street railway service, water from the public mains, or for sending messages by telegraph or telephone? And is it not reasonable to suppose that, after the people have learned from actual experience that the public ownership of some capital is more advantageous than its private ownership, the people will gradually compel the public ownership of all capital? For all capital is alike—it is wealth used by labor to produce more wealth—and so long as it is owned by private individuals those individuals can compel those who must use it if they work to pay tribute to them for its use.

The demand for the government ownership of public utilities is therefore a step toward Socialism, yet it is not, strictly speaking, a Socialist remedy. Socialism demands the public ownership of public utilities, as well as of all capital; and public ownership and government ownership, while they should mean the same, unfortunately often stand for widely different things. There is government ownership of railroads in Russia, for instance, but no public ownership, for the most simple reason that in Russia the public does not control the government. And what is true in Russia is true in smaller measure throughout the world. In this country, for instance, the politicians relieve
us of most of the cares of government. They manipulate conventions for us and we have only to choose between two or more sets of candidates, none of whom may represent our real desires. And that is why Socialists always lay stress upon measures that are designed to put the politicians out of business and restore the government to the control of the people. That is why Socialists advocate (1) the initiative, by means of which the people could pass laws that they could not obtain from their regularly constituted legislative assemblies; (2) the referendum, by means of which the people might vote upon and, if they liked, veto laws that had been passed by their legislatures and congresses; and (3) the imperative mandate, by means of which the people, by ballot, could recall before the expiration of his term any lawmaker or other official who had betrayed the people by breaking his promises, or in any other way going counter to their interests or desires.

Let us now see if “part of Socialism has come” by the adoption of any of these remedies. Oregon, after a long struggle, has the initiative and referendum, and many other states are working for these reforms. Why? Because intelligent men recognize the fact that the people no longer control the state governments or the national government—that the politicians have usurped this power on behalf of the capitalist class. What else does Oregon’s initiative and referendum law mean? What else is meant by the demand of active minorities in other states for the same law? Yet, the control of the national and state governments by the people, through the operation of the initiative and referendum and the imperative mandate, are Socialist remedies. Does not Oregon’s adoption of the initiative and referendum indicate that another part of Socialism has “come?”

Perhaps the most important proof, however, that capitalism is going and Socialism is coming may be found in the fact that the trust has come. Capitalism is based upon the contention that unlimited competition is good—that “competition is the life of trade,” as the old saw has it. The trust, which the great capitalists have now enthusiastically endorsed, is the
acknowledgement of capitalism's fundamental error in endorsing competition. Socialism declares that competition is industrial war and that the instinct of self-preservation will, in the end, compel those who are competing in any line of industry to merge their capital and co-operate. Capitalism for years scoffed at this theory of Socialism, but in the end was compelled to accept it and act upon it. And, in defending the trusts in 1899, the late Senator Hanna said it was not a question of whether the people liked or disliked the trusts; that the man of large capital who had gone into industrial combinations had been compelled by competition to do so or go out of business.

The trust being an economic development, it has come to stay and all the laws that congresses can make will be insufficient to drive it out. For the trust literally means “truce” so far as it pertains to the industrial war of competition; and no government can compel men engaged in the same business to fight. The destruction of the Northern Securities Company has not disturbed the “harmony of interests” that pervades the ownerships of the various railroad companies that were once represented by the securities company. And the coal trust, which is perhaps the most oppressive trust in the country, has no legal existence, being controlled entirely by a “gentlemen’s agreement” among the presidents of the various coal carrying railroads. Of course the law says that such agreements are “conspiracies in restraint of trade,” but no one has yet quite figured out how one coal road president can be prevented from issuing a schedule of prices and the other roads can be prevented from adopting the same schedule.

The trusts being here to stay, as they assuredly are, the only question is whether the great economies they effect shall be enjoyed by the public, or whether private interests shall pocket all the savings and, in addition, rob the people by virtue of the monopoly that the trusts give. Under capitalism, the monopolistic and piratical character of the trusts will remain, while the percentage of capital invested in trusts will become greater as the ferocity of competition drives small capitalists to co-operate.
In conclusion, the only question of importance to consider is: When will the final great change come — when will the public, through the government, take over the ownership and control of all capital? No one can name the year. Any well-informed Socialist can name the time. The time will be when sufficient degrees of distress and economic intelligence are co-existent to work the change. In other words, industrial panics are becoming more numerous and more terrible and, under capitalism, must continue to become so. The next panic, the signs of which are now present, will produce greater suffering than any that has preceded it, for the reason that the increasing productivity of labor, due to improved machinery and methods, makes it necessary for production to be carried on for a shorter period to accumulate such a stock of surplus products that goods can no longer be manufactured at a profit, because they cannot be sold. This means that as the period of production becomes shorter the period of non-production and idleness becomes longer. And all signs point to the conclusion that the time is not far distant, when in one of these periodical seasons of distress, when most of the workers in the nation are out of employment and are suffering, one of two things will happen:

Either public sentiment will compel the government to take over and operate for use the manufacturing industries that the capitalist class refuses to operate except for profit, in which event the government will never be able to let go and Socialism will have come;

Or the hungry, maddened men, ignorant alike of the cause of their suffering and the proper remedy to apply, will plunge the country into revolution, just as other countries have been plunged into revolution by men who held their governments responsible for their wrongs.

In this connection, these questions arise: “How are the people, through their government, to get possession of all the machinery of production and convert it into public capital? Shall the private capitalists be paid for their capital, and if not, will it not be a monstrous crime—in fact, confiscation—to
take their capital from them and convert it to the use of the public?"

These are natural questions and must be satisfactorily answered before Socialism can make a successful appeal to the conscience of the nation. And, in reply, Socialism makes the following answers:

The welfare of all is the supreme consideration, and before it the welfare of any individual, or individuals, must, if necessary, give way. When capitalism breaks down, the welfare of all will demand that the working class be given an opportunity to use the tools of production to produce food, clothing and shelter for itself; and, as the refusal of capitalists to let the working class use the tools of production will undoubtedly be the cause of the collapse of capitalism, it necessarily follows that the welfare of all will then demand that the people, through their government, take over all private capital to themselves, in order that the working class may obtain access to the tools to which capitalists will have denied them. This follows because it is inevitable that the time shall come when all industry will be at a standstill because the workers will not have received enough in wages to buy the things they made and capitalists will close their shops because they can no longer manufacture at a profit; or because of "over-production," as they will say.

Socialism further takes the ground that in converting private capital into public capital no wrong will be done to the private capitalists for the reason that all the wealth in their possession has been produced by the working class and of right belongs to them, since it has been taken from them only by unjust laws that permit the private ownership of tools with which all must work and thus compels the workers to work for such parts of their products, in the form of wages, as they can get.

But Socialism nevertheless recognizes the indisputable fact that law is law and should be obeyed until it is repealed, and that the capitalists, therefore, have a legal title to all of their possessions. Socialists would simply change the law;
and, in proposing to exchange the law, they deny that to do so would be wrong, or that individual capitalists, having long profited by unjust laws, would have any right to complain merely because such laws were not permitted to operate perpetually, to the advantage of a small class and to the disadvantage of all the rest of the people.

When Socialists make this proposition, capitalists cry out that the Socialists want to "divide up," and they solemnly declare that if all the property were to be "divided up" those who are now rich would soon be rich again and those who are now poor would soon be poor again. The "dividing up" bogey is so old that it should have lost its power to mislead; but it is a strong weapon to use on those who have given little or no attention to economic questions. Socialists do want to "divide up," but it is opportunity and not capital that they wish to divide. They want to give every human being an opportunity to use the tools of production—without which he can not labor—without giving any part of his product to a private capitalist as the price of their use. Therefore, they want to divide opportunities—access to the tools of production—and, to do so, they advocate the acquiring of those opportunities from those of whom they do not of right belong and the giving of them to those to whom they do belong. And, if it be conceded that every human being has a right to live, it must also be conceded that these opportunities now held by the capitalist class really belong to all of the people, since the right to live is of no more value than the right freely to apply one's labor to land and machinery to obtain those things without which life cannot be sustained.

It will be seen, therefore, that the plan of Socialism does not contemplate the "dividing up" of capital among individuals, except in their collective capacity. No single individual would have any more title in any capital than any single individual now has in the capitol at Washington, or in any other property that the people, through their government, now own. And, so far as concerns the capitalist contention that if all capital were to be "divided up" it would soon sift back to
those who now own it, Socialism makes only the reply that under a capitalist form of government, which gives the few an opportunity to exploit the many, what the capitalists say would most assuredly be vindicated by events. But Socialists are not advocating that sort of a government or that sort of a system of industry. In fact, they are advocating quite the reverse—a system of industry under which things should be made for use and not for profit, and a government that would not countenance the collecting of interest for the use of capital or rent for the use of machinery.

Going back to the proposition that the people, through their government, acquire the ownership of all capital, in a legal way—for Socialists advocate no other method—it is interesting to read something that Benjamin Franklin said about private capital and the power of society to use it for its own good. In 1776, Franklin was speaking before the convention that had been called to adopt a new constitution for the state of Pennsylvania. And, in speaking of the origin and obligations of private property, he led up to the rights of society with relations to the property of individual, in a speech bristling with statements about the right of wealth to be represented in government, that should be of great interest at this time when wealth is so potent in legislation and administration. He said:

"Why should the upper house, chosen by a minority, have equal power with the lower, chosen by a majority? Is it supposed that wisdom is the necessary concomitant of riches and that one man worth a thousand pounds must have as much wisdom as twenty who have each one only nine hundred and ninety-nine? And why is property represented at all?

"Suppose one of our Indian nations should now agree to form a civil society; each individual would bring into the stock of the society little more property than his gun and his blanket, for at present he has no other. We know that when one of them has attempted to keep a few swine he has not been able to maintain a property in them, his neighbors thinking they have a right to kill and eat them whenever they want provision, it being one of their maxims that hunting is free for
all; the accumulation, therefore, of property in such a society, and its security to individuals in every society, must be an effect of the protection afforded to it by the joint strength of the society, in the execution of its laws.

"Private property, therefore, is a creature of society, and is subject to the calls of that society, whenever its necessities shall require it, even to its last farthing; its contributions to the public exigencies are not to be considered as conferring a benefit on the public, entitling the contributors to the distinctions of honor and power, but as the return of an obligation previously received or the payment of a just debt.

"The combinations of civil society are not like those of a set of merchants, who club their property in different proportions for building and freighting a ship, and may therefore have some right to vote in the disposition of the voyage in a greater or less degree according to their respective contributions; but the important ends of civil society, and the personal securities of life and the liberty there, remain the same in every member of the society, and the poorest continue to have an equal claim with the most opulent, whatever difference time, chance or industry may occasion in their circumstances.

"On these considerations, I am sorry to see the signs of a disposition among some of our people to commence an aristocracy, by giving the rich a predominancy in government."

Benjamin Franklin has been a longtime dead and in the minds of capitalists the truth that he so fearlessly proclaimed is as dead as is the physical body of the illustrious patriot who helped to establish this government. But the truth he uttered still lives and the time will come when necessity will compel its recognition by all. Doubtless, if the masses were familiar with Franklin's statements, their truth would be generally recognized today. But that would not bring Socialism. Such an industrial crisis as will some day come—and apparently it will come soon—will be necessary to cause the people to make use of the truth proclaimed by Franklin in the solution of the grave problem that will beset them.

For the public mind is slow to operate, as a rule, and how-
ever much the principles of Socialism may be favored in the
abstracts it is doubtful if they will be applied until the actual
collapse of capitalism, which now seems near, compels the sub-
stitution of a new system of industry; and the new system of
industry—the co-operative commonwealth—will not be applied
by men who do not know its meaning. In other words, eco-
nomic education must be co-existent with poverty if the change
to Socialism is to come at the next opportunity. Otherwise,
the change may be impossible of achievement until further
suffering, not only in peace but perhaps in war, shall have
sufficiently stimulated national thought to compel the transition
to Socialism.

But this fact should be borne in mind: A few men always
do the thinking for a nation. It has always been so; it doubt-
less will always be so. A few thoughtful men fight years for
an idea, and, after having been ridiculed and reviled, every-
body suddenly endorses their idea and the nation acts upon it.

With the lowering clouds about us, no man can perform
a greater service for those who now live, or for posterity,
than by advocating the principles of Socialism and voting
the Socialist ticket. Mr. Debs was not elected president of
the United States in November, 1904, but the vote he received
caused thousands of persons to investigate the principles of—
Socialism; and it is to those who understand something of the
principles and purposes of Socialism that we must look for
relief when capitalism breaks down—when millions of men
are idle and the ignorant and the unthinking call for blood to
revenge their wrongs.

Socialism wants no blood. It wants only active brains.
VORWAERTS

A Milwaukee German Socialist Weekly.

The history of Socialism, theoretical and practical, has been told in the German language.

Vorwaerts, the Milwaukee German Socialist paper, was established in 1882, and has been battling for better economic and social conditions for the toilers for nearly thirty years.

It is an eight-page weekly paper. It records all the Socialist news from week to week. Congressman Victor L. Berger is a regular contributor to its columns.

Subscription Rates

Twelve months, $1.50; six months, 75 cents.

A POWERFUL POLISH SOCIALIST PAPER

It was the Polish soldiers who turned back the tide of the Turkish invaders of Europe in the fourteenth century when all else had failed.

There are hundreds of thousands of the descendants of these sturdy Poles in the United States who are ready for Socialism when they know what it is and what it stands for.

So simply and so effectively has Naprzod the Polish Socialist weekly, told the story of Socialism that the Polish wards are among the strongest Socialist districts in Milwaukee.

Use Naprzod for Polish propaganda literature.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

Twelve months, $1.00; six months, 50 cents. In bundles, 75 cents per hundred; $5.00 per 1,000. Samples sent on request.

Social-Democratic Publishing Company

528-530 Chestnut St. Brisbane Hall Milwaukee, Wis.
SEND US YOUR JOB PRINTING

THE

Co-operative

Printery

We are prepared to do printing of all descriptions in a way that spells satisfaction. Special attention paid to mail orders.

528-532 CHESTNUT ST., - MILWAUKEE
Subscribe for The Milwaukee Leader

and watch the progress of labor on the political and industrial field

In the columns of The Milwaukee Leader you will get all the news you find in any daily paper, told from the angle of the wealth producers, instead of the wealth appropriators, as is the custom of most daily papers. The Milwaukee Leader is owned, controlled and edited in the interest of the toiling masses, not only in Milwaukee, but the nation. It is a first class up-to-date metropolitan newspaper. The Milwaukee Leader is your paper. Subscribe for it. Get your friends to subscribe for it and thus help build up the labor press.

Six Cents a week by carrier in Milwaukee. By mail in any part of the United States or Canada, $3 per year.

The Milwaukee Leader
Brisbane Hall, Milwaukee, Wisconsin